

CITY OF BURTON
REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
MARCH 13, 2001, 6:00 P.M., COUNCIL CHAMBERS

The Regular Meeting was called to order by Jerry Grantner, President, at 6:00 P.M.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Brawner, Grantner, Hohloch, Perez, Walls, White and Young.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Mayor Charles Smiley and Bertram.

OTHERS PRESENT: J. Major DPW Director; T. Strasser, Deputy Planning Official and C. Ladd, Deputy Clerk.

A. APPROVAL AND AUTHORIZE THE MINUTES OF THE FOLLOWING MEETING(S):

Young moved and Bertram seconded the following motion:

Approve and authorize the minutes of the Regular Meeting of February 13, 2001 at 6:00 P.M., as printed. Motion carried 7-0.

B. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

1. ZC #259

BY: Blake Rizzo
5273 Empress Drive
Grand Blanc, MI 48439

RE: Parcel No: 59-25-200-009, 59-25-300-001,
59-25-300-001, 59-25-400-010, 59-25-100-003
Section 25
Zoned SE Suburban Estates to R-1B Residential

FOR: Single Family Development.

James Spoor, Landscaping Architect from CHMP, provided a packet for each member, summarizing the proposal Mr. Rizzo is planning. He said there is approximately 195 acres encompassing the site and is accessible

from Bristol Road, Vassar Road and Atherton Road. There are a variety of physical features including steep slopes, open fields, woodland and regulated wetlands. The property is in the Atherton and Davison School districts. Currently the zoning is SE and the zoning to the west is SE and R-1B. To the north and east the adjacent zoning is SE and R-1B. South of the parcel along Bristol Road, the adjacent zoning is R-1B. The applicant is proposing that this property be re-zoned to R-1B, single family residential. There is a variety of lot sizes ranging from 8400 sq. feet minimum (70 ft.) to over 16,000 sq. feet. Almost all of the wetlands will be protected and on-site detention areas will be provided. The impact of this project is consistent with the low-density development pattern in the area. Utilities such as sanitary sewers, water, gas, electric and cable will all be available and can be provided for the entire project. On-site detention and sedimentation basins are proposed which will collect storm water run-off and slowly discharge to the wetlands. Preliminary calculations suggest the need for approximately 6 acres of detention area (4' deep).

Audience Participation:

Roy Fletcher, 6322 E. Bristol Rd., asked if a zoning case is requested, does the City have to legally consider the proposal. He asked if the zoning was approved, could the developer put in cluster homes, including condos or apartments? He said the residents in the area would be unhappy with two houses per acre. There are too many unanswered questions. We don't want the zoning changed so that later, Mr. Rizzo can go back and request something else and find there are loopholes. He commented about the increase of students in the Davison School

District and the possibility of having to ask for more millage. He is against the rezoning.

Mr. Strasser responded that condos or apartments are included in this zoning.

Rick Tidwell, 6245 E. Bristol Rd., stated he has lived in Burton for 35 years and he doesn't want to look out the back of his home and see rooftops. He likes where he lives, but this development is a great concern to him.

Pauline Dargel, 6119 Hugh St., asked if there is something in the handout that shows the necessity for a change in the zoning. She inquired about the soil, wetlands, proposal for drainage, utilities and environmental impact. She commented that there are other proposals for R-1B zoning which are yet undeveloped.

September Mizener, 3328 S. Vassar Rd., stated there has been no demonstrated need shown and there are other parcels of land being rezoned to R-1B. She doesn't think what is being proposed is compatible with the surrounding area. On Vassar Rd., there is one home per acre of land. She said this will be a negative impact on the Davison School District and would destroy the country feel in the area. She would like to see the master plan completed before approving this rezoning. Mrs. Mizener thinks this area has great potential for more expensive homes with larger lots. She thinks a variety of housing options need to be available for people in this City.

Stanette Amy, 6128 E. Atherton Rd., said she heard that none of the wetlands would be affected. How would this happen? The environmental impact needs to be discussed and she would like to more information before the rezoning is approved.

Mr. Major said the zoning request is for low density and this conforms to the existing master plan and the zoning should be approved. Regarding the questions asked by the audience, most of them will be addressed during the site plan review process. The DEQ issue and water and sewer issues should be addressed at another time by this board, should you approve the zoning issue.

Mr. Strasser reminded the audience that this is a recommending body and the Planning Commission decision will go to the City Council for the final decision.

Mr. Spoor stated this is a low density development and it's true that the SE zoning is one acre per lot, but that doesn't always guarantee that the environmental issues will be any better protected than with a 2.5 acre parcel. We are very aware about the wetland issues that are raised on every project and it is to the developer's best interest to simply not touch them. They should build around them and protect them with buffer zones. A lot of projects use wetlands as an enhancement to the project rather than a liability. In R-1B zoning, there are cluster home options, but this concept plan doesn't show that. He said there are things that could be done with R-1B zoning that would protect the site and environmental issues quite well. Single family low-density housing is a viable part of your master plan and

Mr. Rizzo feels this is a viable kind of zoning and product he would like to offer to his customers.

Mr. Young asked the difference between R-1A and R-1B zoning.

Mr. Strasser said the difference has to do with density and lot sizes. The R-1B he is asking for allows a minimum lot size of 70 feet wide and 120 feet deep with a total of 8,400 sq. feet. The R-1A allows 85 feet wide and 125 feet deep with a total of 10,600 sq. feet. It comes down to how many homes per acre are allowed. R-1B is 4.8 and R-1A is 3.8 homes per acre. Mr. Rizzo is proposing overall density of 2.5 homes per acre.

Mr. Young asked if it is within the ability of the Commission to deny R-1B and recommend R-1A. He also inquired about the master plan.

Mr. Strasser replied the Commission could recommend R-1A zoning. He said the master plan might be presented to the Commission at the next regular meeting to set a workshop.

Mr. Young also asked if the Commission could do a better job by looking at the master plan before making a recommendation to the Burton City Council.

MARCH 13, 2001/6:00 P.M.

PAGE -3-

Mr. Major replied that when looking at that particular area, you are either looking at an open space classification if you review the Rowe proposal and if you review the DPW proposal, you are looking at a low-density classification. In either case, clustering within the open space concept, you would probably find no less number of units per acre under the open space concept. There would be a better number of units per acre than what the open space would allow. In either case, Mr. Rizzo has reduced the number of homes per acre to far diminish what could be allowed under either proposal. If you have a hearing and delay for 60 days, these numbers come back, they will be within whichever range of a master plan that you will adopt.

Mr. Grantner said there would not be a significant difference.

Mr. Major replied the open space concept would allow Mr. Rizzo more lots per acre than what you see now, because he is reserving so much land for the retention pond and he has cut the number of homes down per acre, that it is virtually the same thing.

Mrs. Walls asked if there is any chance that Mr. Rizzo would come back and want to put in manufactured homes there.

Mr. Rizzo replied no, the homes would all be stick built.

Mr. Hohloch said that in 1961 the health department created the SE zoning, which was the sanitary sewer zoning, and had nothing to do with a land use issue. It allowed the homeowner to allow two septic systems in case of failure. It's a health issue, not a land use issue. Now the City has sewers, that is where R-1A and R-1B some of the other zoning classifications came from. He said he wanted to make this issue known to the residents.

Mrs. White asked if there was a radio tower located within this zoning.

Mr. Rizzo replied the tower is south of the Vassar Road entrance of the plan.

Mr. Perez stated he is not opposed to the project and is happy to see that most of the lots are larger, but the 70-foot lots are not good. We put so much pressure on the Zoning Board of Appeals and people come back time and time again asking for variances. As far as the layout, he has no problems.

Mr. Brawner commented that he has empathy with the people because he had a country feel where he built and now there is a subdivision to the east and west and a subdivision building too big a home for such a small lot. Being on the City Council, he recognizes the need and appreciates the new subdivisions coming in because it has added good tax dollars. We have several locations that have been approved and are underway, but at what point it will end? This is only a change for zoning, and has no problem with the rezoning, but he is going to have some problems, if this passes tonight, with the site plan review or plat review that will come before us later on.

Mr. Young said he has a real problem looking at rezoning this large an area when we will soon have the new master plan before us. Until he has a chance to look at the master plan, he doesn't feel he can vote on this issue.

Moved by Young to table zoning case #259 until after the master plan is reviewed. Motion died for lack of support.

Moved by Walls, seconded by Young to recommend approval of Zoning Case #259, contingent upon DPW recommendations. Roll Call Vote: Grantner, yes; White, yes; Perez, yes; Walls, yes; Young, no; Brawner, no; Hohloch, yes. Motion carried 5-2.

Mr. Grantner said this will go before the Burton City Council, tentatively in April.

Recessed at 6:39 P.M.

Reconvened at 6:47 P.M.

REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

MARCH 13, 2001/6:00 P.M.

PAGE -4-

2. ZC #260

BY: Alan Reno
1088 W. Vienna Rd., PO Box 370
Clio, MI 48420

RE: 2026 Covert Rd.
Lot 73, except the East 201 feet, Hammond
Homesites No. 2, Section 3
Zoned R-1B Residential to C-2 Commercial

FOR: Offices and Parking

Alan Reno, 1088 W. Vienna Rd., PO Box 370, Clio, MI, said he is asking for a parcel to be rezoned to commercial for the purpose of parking.

Audience Participation:

Virgil Linn, 2038 Covert Rd., said he doesn't like the idea of rezoning that property to commercial. He has lived there for eight years and has had nothing but problems with Muffler Man. They build racecars and use our road for a drag strip. I don't want them right next door to me. Mostly it is the employees.

Jim Rupert, 2050 Covert Rd., said he lives next to Mr. Linn and he is also the Pastor of Emmanuel United Methodist Church. He said he was asked by the Church Members to come and speak against the proposed rezoning. They are against the business going that far back into the subdivision, because they fear a loss of property value. He said he is concerned about the water run-off. Cars leak oil and there is an extreme problem with noise. People coming in for waste removal seem to want to come in at 6:00 a.m. and I am against the rezoning. If you change the zoning, it may not be for the sole purpose of parking. It could be used for anything allowed in that particular zoning classification. These are good people, but the Church people are against the rezoning. There is property located across the street, so possibly that property could be used.

Tom Sedgewick, Modern Street Design, said he has been working with Mr. Reno on rebuilding his business since it burned down. The building that burned was on the lot line of the residential lot and to rebuild the building as it was, there is no buffer from the residential property to the business. By rezoning this property, there would be a buffer to the residents and the parking will be concentrated to the rear portion of the lot. This would enhance the business.

Mr. Major said the master plan indicates that if the property is rezoned, it should be a C-1 classification. We have to recommend denial as it violates the existing master plan.

Mr. Brawner commented that during the presentation it was indicated that the property would be used for parking, but in the application, it says the property would be used for offices and parking. Will it be used for both?

Mr. Reno replied it would only be used for parking at the present time, but may be used for offices at some time in the future.

Mr. Young clarified that Mr. Reno should be asking for C-1 and not C-2 zoning?

Mr. Major replied that the master plan indicates that the lot would be C-1 and he has non-conforming rights to that. It's been there prior to the development of our existing master plan and that is why it is C-2 zoned.

Mrs. White asked if that lot was rezoned to C-2, then it would be possible for him to expand the muffler shop at a later date?

Mr. Major said yes, under special approved use.

REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
MARCH 13, 2001/6:00 P.M.
PAGE -5-

Mr. Brawner asked if the applicant knew that this was not in the master plan?

Mr. Strasser replied he didn't believe so.

Mr. Perez asked if the applicant would be happy with C-1 zoning?

Mr. Reno said C-1 zoning would be sufficient. He would like to use the old footings that are presently there and he would use the back yard for parking.

Moved by Walls, seconded by Young to recommend approval of Zoning Case #260. Roll Call Vote: Grantner, yes; White, no; Perez, no; Walls, no; Young, no; Brawner, no; Hohloch, no. Motion to approve failed 6-1.

3. LS #01-08

BY: Agree Realty Corporation
Attn: David Prueter
31850 Northwestern Hwy.
Farmington Hills, MI 48334

RE: Parcel #59-31-100-026
Section 31

FOR: Commercial Use.

Dave Prueter, 31850 Northwestern Hwy., Farmington Hills, MI, explained that the request is for a lot split and the outside dimensions of the existing three parcels do not change. This is a reconfiguration of the three parcels in conjunction of the development of the shopping center.

There was no one in the audience who wished to speak.

Mr. Strasser said this parcel is on the south side of Bristol Road west of I-475. This is just a reconfiguration of the property lines.

Moved by White, seconded by Perez to approve Lot Split #01-08, contingent upon DPW recommendations. Motion carried 7-0.

C. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

Pauline Dargel, 6119 Hugh St., spoke concerning Board Discussion dealing with Site Plan Review for Seeley Sub location. She also inquired about the preliminary site plan prior to final site plan review. She thought the recommendations of the drain office and road commission should be considered under the zoning change because of the environmental impact it may have. She also commented on shields being installed on the lights at the Amoco Station on Belsay Road.

D. SITE PLAN REVIEW(S):

1. SPR #01-19

BY: Sam Arabbo
17445 W. Ten Mile Rd.
Southfield, MI 48075

RE: Blackberry Creek Village
4101 Blackberry Creek Drive
Parcel #59-34-100-009

FOR: Review of previously approved site
plan under new ownership.

Sam Arabbo, 17445 W. Ten Mile Rd., Southfield, MI, said he is the new owner of the site and will carry through with the previous commitment. They plan to enhance the development and hope to begin construction later this year.

Audience Participation:

Pauline Dargel, 6119 Hugh St., asked if there were any restrictions in the agreement or on the deed that go with the previous commitment of the Blackberry development.

Mr. Arabbo replied there were no restrictions that he is aware of.

Mr. Major commented that there is still a viable site plan on file and this is a change of ownership. We felt this was a significant enough of a project to get the owner in to meet the Planning Commission. This is our first apartment complex, of any size, in about 30 years. The proposal is definitely an upgrade from what you previously approved. The emanates would be a pool, a club house, enhanced road system, enhanced cross-section for the road, enhanced style of apartment as previously presented to the Planning Commission. We are looking at a complex similar to the Auker development. It is an upscale and we wanted to show the Planning Commission the developer's intention. The original approval doesn't run out until sometime next month, so this will give the developer an opportunity to move ahead with financing and get his engineering plans underway. We will bring back a landscaping plan to you as those are developed.

Mr. Young asked, having previously approved a site plan, and now there are changes from the original site plan, what are we approving tonight without seeing?

Mr. Major replied the Planning Commission is approving the change of ownership. The site plan is essentially the same if he wants to build it that way.

Mr. Young asked if Mr. Arabbo does the kinds of things outlined on the list, then will he have to come back before the Planning Commission for approval?

Mr. Major replied if there are upgrades, he wouldn't have to come back, because he is going above and beyond what the Planning Commission approved in the site plan. This could come back before you, but he only plans to enhance the development, not downgrade it.

Mr. Hohloch asked if the basic layout, road geometry, building layout changed at all?

Mr. Arabbo replied that overall, there will be an enhancement to the project from the previous approval. We will be creating a larger clubhouse, will add curb and gutter and will have additional landscaping.

Mr. Hohloch said he agrees with Mr. Young and would like to see the site plan. Is there any way we could accommodate the developer and yet see the changes being considered?

Mr. Major commented that the DPW would never allow a downgrade, but this development is considered an A+. He said you could grant an approval for change of ownership and we will bring back the site plan for action.

Mr. Arabbo agreed to bring back the site plan for approval.

Moved by Perez, seconded by Hohloch to approve the site plan for change of ownership for Blackberry Creek Apartments and contingent upon DPW recommendations. Applicant to make changes as needed and DPW to bring changes before the Planning Commission for approval, if needed. Motion carried 7-0.

REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
MARCH 13, 2001/6:00 P.M.
PAGE -7-

1088 W. Vienna Rd.
Clio, MI 48420

RE: Muffler Man
4275 Davison Rd.
The W ½ of Lot 70 & Lots 71, 72, 73
Hammon Homesites #2

FOR: Rebuild Muffler Repair Shop.

Alan Reno, 1088 W. Vienna Rd., Clio, MI, said he is uncertain about what to do since his request for rezoning was denied. He asked about rebuilding the structure as it was previously, without the addition.

Mr. Grantner asked if the site plan was over the lot line. He was advised no. He asked Mr. Reno if he wished this to go forward as presented, with the exception of the north side or the additional building.

Mr. Major stated there is no reason he can not continue. He said he advised Mr. Reno that this is a new site plan and the old building does not exist. The site plan you have represents a review by the DPW as if no building previously existed. There are curb cuts that need to be reworked and screening requirements around the perimeter between the residential zoning.

Mr. Grantner asked Mr. Reno if he would prefer to meet with the DPW and come back before this board with a proposal and table this request.

Mr. Reno replied yes, he would meet with the DPW and redo the privacy wall.

Mr. Hohloch asked if the previous building had non-conforming rights. He was advised yes.

Moved by Young, seconded by Walls to table Site Plan Review #01-12 indefinitely. Motion carried 7-0.

3. SPR #01-13

BY: Ted Hu Associates, Inc./Debbie VanKuren-Honea
G-8285 S. Saginaw St.
Grand Blanc, MI 48439

RE: Medical Building for Dr. Lopez
3014 S. Genesee Rd.
Lots 10, 11, & 12 of Merrill Acres
R-O Zoned
Section 27

FOR: Medical Facility.

Richard Hu, Hu & Associates, 8285 S. Saginaw St., Grand Blanc, MI, explained that they have applied to all the appropriate agencies and have preliminary review by the City of Burton Building Department. The building is located on the northeast corner of Atherton and Genesee and is run by Dr. Lopez. When this building was designed in 1992, it was designed for future expansion of another building south of the existing building. We are proposing a new curb cut off Atherton Road with additional parking to the west and we will tie it together with the existing parking. The new building will mimic the existing building.

There was no one in the audience who wished to speak.

REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
MARCH 13, 2001/6:00 P.M.
PAGE -8-

Mr. Strasser commented that the revised print reflects three changes that are indicated on the office print. Probably the most obvious and most controversial is the sidewalk issue. It was originally designed within 1 foot inside private property and walkways are designed to be 1 foot inside the right-of-way. This has been corrected on the print and is

shown along the entire front of Atherton and Genesee Roads. The access drive that links both parking areas on the south is required to be curbed and this is indicated on the revised print. Also, we requested that the dumpster enclosure be relocated from the southeast corner of the development to the southwest corner. They have indicated this has been done. They have more detention area than what is required and comply with all aspects of the site plan review and we recommend approval.

Mr. Hohloch asked if the Road Commission approved the Atherton Road entrance.

Mr. Hu replied yes, the Road Commission approved them.

Moved by Young, seconded by Hohloch to approve Site Plan Review #01-13, contingent upon DPW recommendations. Motion carried 7-0.

4. SPR #01-14

BY: Genesys Health System
One Genesys Parkway
Grand Blanc, MI 48439

RE: Genesys East Flint Campus
Center Rd., Parcel #59-10-100-022
C-2 Zoned

FOR: Medical Facility.

Dennis Rau, Property Manager, Genesys Health Systems, One Genesys Parkway, Grand Blanc, MI, said he has with him Jim Wilson, Civil Engineer from Rowe, Inc. This is a relocation of the majority of services from the old St. Joseph Hospital site. These services include the Emergency Services and Family Health Center and Diagnostic Services. Seawick Construction Company will build the project. Mr. Rau presented a rendering of the proposal. The property is currently vacant. The site is 3.36 acres with Advance Auto to the north and Delphi to the south. There was a misunderstanding with the setback area and we have pulled back 25 feet from the rear property line. We still maintain 147 parking spaces, which is what is required. Mr. Strasser also indicated the sidewalk issue and this has been addressed and will show on the revised site plan. This will be a total of 40,000-sq. foot building with two-story masonry brown brick. The lighting on the site will be consistent with 340-watt lamps on some of the islands with single fixture lighting in the perimeters. The trash receptacles are indicated, as well as emergency generator on the southeast corner of the site. We are proposing to tie in the signs with the building design. We will probably introduce

some elements of the Genesys sign and further delineation of the emergency services toward the emergency entrance.

We anticipate 89 employees at this site and 65 on any given day with approximately 210 patients, with 175 being from the family health center. There will be about 275 vehicles per day. We have other engineering issues to work out with the DPW and request your consideration for approval.

There was no one in the audience who wished to speak.

Mr. Strasser said the sidewalks should be parallel along the right-of-way, per the ordinance.

Mr. Rau said they would comply with the sidewalk requirements.

Mr. Strasser said the way the ordinance is written, before an occupancy permit can be issued, the sidewalk must be installed. A brief discussion was held concerning renaming the facility to the East Burton Campus.

Mr. Rau said the marketing department handles the naming of the facility.

REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

MARCH 13, 2001/6:00 P.M.

PAGE -9-

Mr. Grantner said this is something that should be considered.

Moved by Young, seconded by Brawner to approve Site Plan Review #01-14, contingent upon DPW recommendations. Motion carried 7-0.

5. SPR #01-17

BY: Christian Life Center Church
4201 Lippincott Blvd.
Burton, MI 48519

RE: Christian Life Center Church
4201 Lippincott Blvd.
Parcel #59-15-300-014
R-1B Zoned

FOR: Rebuild church and adjacent parking.

Reverend Henry Horton, Pastor, said they tried to build this church for quite some time and have a new architect and plan to start once again. He said they have discussed the requirements with the DPW and are asking for the Commission's approval to proceed. They believe they will get the proper approval from the Drain Commission. He said this process has gone on for a couple of years and they know there are certain things they cannot do, but would like to get started if at all possible.

There was no one in the audience who wished to speak.

Mr. Major commented that this is a modified version of what we recently reviewed. The site plan shows a completely curbed parking facility, absent any type of storm water discharge retention or detention. This is our biggest hang-up.

There is no existing storm system available on Lippincott. The best alternative is some type of metered restricted discharge into the Lippincott Blvd. storm ditch at a rate that does not exceed the agricultural rate of the site. The site plan is in compliance with our ordinance, other than the sidewalk issue and we still must work out the storm water discharge. This is a function of the DPW because of Lippincott and we will have to get approval from the Drain Commission because if we were to discharge this totally without any restrictions, we would flood the streets.

Pastor Horton said that Flint Surveying and Engineering is working on this problem.

Mr. Granter asked Pastor Horton if he agreed with what was indicated by Mr. Major

Pastor Horton replied yes, he agreed.

Mr. Major said the City is recommending approval contingent upon the sidewalks and the storm water discharge plan approved by the Genesee County Drain Commission.

Mr. Young asked if they are planning to tear down the existing building or will you utilize it after the new facility is built.

Pastor Horton said they haven't done the research to find out if the building could be moved and used as a youth center. The plan is to tear it down.

Mr. Young asked if there are sufficient parking spaces.

Mr. Strasser replied that they exceed the number of required parking spaces.

Moved by Young, seconded by Walls to approve Site Plan Review #01-17 subject to meeting all Genesee County Drain Commission and DPW recommendations. Motion carried 7-0.

REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
MARCH 13, 2001/6:00 P.M.
PAGE -10-

E. ADMINISTRATIVE SITE PLAN REVIEWS POSTPONED FROM FEBRUARY 13, 2001:

1. SPR #01-03

BY: Vickie Rosebrough
3381 Greenley St.
Burton, MI 48529

RE: The Lemon Wedge
4476 S. Dort Hwy.
Parcel #59-32-400-026

FOR: Change of use/ownership.

Vickie Rosebrough, 3381 Greenley St., Burton, MI, said she is the owner of the property and The Lemon Wedge. She will be handling antiques and collectibles.

There was no one in the audience who wished to speak.

Mr. Strasser said a veterinarian previously occupied this particular site and all of the paving, curbing and landscaping is in place. The State Highway Department has plans to redo Dort Highway and the sidewalks could be put in when the highway construction is being done.

Moved by Hohloch, seconded by Brawner to approve Site Plan Review #01-03, contingent upon DPW recommendations. Motion carried 7-0.

2. SPR #01-04

BY: At Your Service Cleaning Contractors, Inc.
3300 S. Center Rd.
Burton, MI 48519

RE: At Your Service Cleaning Contractors, Inc.
3300 S. Center Rd.
Lot 42 Follo Acres
Section 28, C-2 Zoned

FOR: Change of use/ownership.

Kim Graham and Brenda Eastman, owners of At Your Service, said they moved their business from Davison to Burton to purchase the building on Center Road.

There was no one in the audience who wished to speak.

Mr. Strasser commented that this site is mostly in compliance with what is required, lacking sidewalks in front of the property. They cannot be installed at this time because of the weather, but we expect them to be installed this summer.

Mr. Grantner asked the owners if they were aware of this requirement.

Mrs. Graham said they called to get the instructions on where the sidewalk should go. Our lot is on a slope and the sidewalk cannot be put in without going down the hill. There would be a big drop off at the end.

Mr. Major said the DPW could take a look at this. If there is something that might cause a safety concern, we may have to ask the City Council to accept a commitment from the property owners to install the sidewalks at a point when we can eliminate that physical impairment.

REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
MARCH 13, 2001/6:00 P.M.
PAGE -11-

Mr. Grantner asked Mrs. Graham if this would be satisfactory with them. She replied yes.

Moved by Hohloch, seconded by White to approve Site Plan Review #01-04, contingent upon DPW recommendations. Motion carried 7-0.

F. ADMINISTRATIVE SITE PLAN REVIEWS:

1. SPR #01-15

BY: Don Novak (Front End Collision)
G-3447 S. Saginaw St.
Burton, MI 48529

RE: Mr. Front End
G-3447 S. Saginaw St.
Parcel #59-29-300-008 & 015
C-2 Zoned

FOR: Addition.

Mr. Grantner said the applicant has asked to have this case postponed.

2. SPR #01-16

BY: Thorsten Ritter
3189 S. Dort Hwy.
Burton, MI 48529

RE: Specmo Enterprises
3189 S. Dort Hwy.
Lots 247-249 & 347-355
Chambers Sub
C-2 Zoned

FOR: Addition.

Larry Leazenby, Creekwood Architects, represented Mr. Ritter. He explained that they plan to build a 2900 sq. foot addition on the existing facility on Dort Highway. He also wants an additional parking facility to keep the cars in an orderly manner when working on them. Mr. Ritter is requesting to have parking along the north side of the building, which would be paved and sloped off, to the large grass area. We did that for two reasons. First, we are doing this instead of putting in an underground system and secondly, it prevents us from overloading any existing storm system by letting it drain into the grass area and dissipating. He will put in lighting that currently is not there. We do show the sidewalk along the front, dealing with the proximity of the paving and the street to his site. I spoke with Mr. Strasser concerning the sidewalk along the back, and he would rather not do that because it is a gravel road and is at the back of his business. We would like to work it out that we do not have to put in the back sidewalk at this point.

There was no one in the audience who wished to speak.

Mr. Strasser commented that he understands the sidewalk issue, but as the sidewalks are put in, they will lead somewhere eventually.

Mr. Grantner said waiving the sidewalk is not within the realms of this Commission. This is a City Council directive and must be complied with unless waived by them.

Mr. Major said the more we get into the sidewalk issue, there are places where construction should be done at a later date or an agreement made to be done in the future. He said he is going to present to the Council some alternatives to

when sidewalks need to be installed, not to remove the requirement of them, but in certain cases such as Dort Highway. Hopefully, the City Council will allow a commitment to complete the sidewalks at a logical time.

REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

MARCH 13, 2001/6:00 P.M.

PAGE -12-

Mr. Grantner said this would seem to be a more realistic approach.

Mr. Leazenby said Mr. Ritter's wish is to do what the City requires. We are willing to work with the City on the back sidewalk issue.

Mr. Major said there is a storm drain out on Dort Highway and he would like to see this tied into that drain versus an open sheet drainage.

Mr. Leazenby said they would work with the DPW on the drainage issue.

Moved by Perez, seconded by Hohloch to approve Site Plan Review #01-16, contingent upon DPW recommendations. Motion carried 7-0.

3. SPR #01-18

BY: Doug Wilcox
10175 Colonial Industrial Dr.
South Lyon, MI 48178

RE: Doug Wilcox Sales Co., Inc.
3332 E. Bristol Rd.
Parcel #59-33-200-002
Section 33, M-1 Zoned

FOR: Change of use/ownership.

Doug Wilcox, 10175 Colonial Industrial Dr., South Lyon, MI, said they are requesting a change of use for an existing building which was previously a banquet hall and would like to use it for light industrial warehousing.

There was no one in the audience who wished to speak.

Mr. Strasser said that according to the site plan that was presented, the only alterations is the three parking spaces in front of the building that needs to be paved. Sidewalks would be required along Bristol Road. He agrees with Mr. Major's idea of presenting the sidewalk alternatives to the City Council.

Mr. Wilcox said he would agree to put in a sidewalk but would like to see everyone get together. We have a 60-foot frontage of which about 30 feet is a roadway to access the property. The radio station is also on this road which leaves 30-foot of sidewalk. You would have our commitment to put in the sidewalk if required.

Mr. Hohloch asked again what the intended new use would be.

Mr. Wilcox replied that they would distribute sheet rubber goods, sheet plastic, which ultimately are used for truck mud flaps. Our offices are in South Lyon and we would have this facility for two to four people. The usage would be less intense.

Mr. Hohloch asked that since this is a private drive, we don't care if it is graveled?

Mr. Strasser replied this is correct.

Moved by Perez, seconded by Walls to approve Site Plan Review #01-18, contingent upon DPW recommendations. Motion carried 7-0.

REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
MARCH 13, 2001/6:00 P.M.
PAGE -13-

G. BOARD DISCUSSION:

1. Master Plan update
2. Discussion concerning Administrative Site Plan Reviews

Mr. Major said Doug Piggott from Rowe, Inc. has prepared this original proposal for the master plan as to what he derived from the town hall meetings that were held. After several meetings, we prepared the DPW version of what

we thought was decided at the public hearings and we want to show both versions to compare the two. There is only one book for review. He said he proposes to have this presented to the Board at the next Planning Commission meeting with all question marks gone with the justification of the rationale of the DPW. You can then put in your rationale as you do your review and giving you the month of April to review and then set a workshop to go over the two versions, and then set a public hearing at your discretion and your schedule.

Mr. Grantner commented that if this is a small agenda and we get an opportunity to review, we could take the sections one at a time.

Mr. Major said Doug plans on being at the meeting. If you want to review this at the regular meeting that would be fine or set a workshop to do so.

Mr. Grantner said this has been a long time coming, but we need something in place and we look forward to getting this done.

Mr. Young commented that we can work on this as a Commission and if satisfied, we would then hold a public hearing. After the public hearing, would we come back to another work session to discuss any items that may come out of the public hearing before voting on the final draft.

Mr. Major said this book should be like homework to review the plan. Mr. Major said he would like to see more people attend the public hearing than those who were at the previous one.

Mr. Grantner said he would like to postpone the discussion concerning the Administrative Site Plan Reviews because Mr. Bertram is very much interested in this issue and he was unable to attend the meeting this evening due to illness.

Mr. Grantner said he would like to see all motions made in a positive form so the vote is not confusing to anyone.

Mr. Hohloch said he strongly feels that we should get the site plan after the review from the Road Commission and Drain Commission. I don't know how we can make that happen in our checklist. He said he would like to see the recommendations of these two boards come in with the site plan review.

Mr. Major said the Mayor would not be in favor of that because that will delay the developers by 30 to 60 days. It gets done during our review process because we send a packet to those boards and we do not give a building permit until the permits are issued through these two boards.

Mr. Hohloch said registered engineers in the State of Michigan should do all of the site plan reviews.

Mr. Major explained that when Tom receives the application for site plan review, he sends the applicants to the other governmental agencies, but this does take time. It would be nice if the applicants knew that they need to bring them to the Planning Commission or the site plans will not be reviewed. We will let Mike Mansfield and Jeff Wright know they need to expedite these reviews so the Planning Commission, for lack of review, does not delay the site plans.

Mr. Young said if this requirement is put into effect, would not these people realize that in their own planning stage, start to plan in advance by getting the Road Commission and Drain Commission permit approvals.

Mr. Major said he agrees with this.

REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
MARCH 13, 2001/6:00 P.M.
PAGE -14-

Mr. Grantner asked that a letter be written from the Planning Commission to put this requirement into affect.

Mr. Major said if this is the Board's desire, then we will let the applicant know they must get approval from both the Drain Office and Road Commission prior to approval from the Planning Commission.

Mr. Brawner asked if there were any restrictions placed upon the Roadrunner Express. He asked if they donated the property to the City of Burton.

Mr. Major replied they have all the discharge permits and County Road Commission permits and the city was the last one to issue the permits before going on site. They have to build a couple retention ponds and they have the proper permits for this. Mr. Major said there is about 200-300 feet and there is a 6-foot berm that will be constructed in a teardrop shape, with 6-foot diameter pine trees. We had to clear the site. What will be seen upon completion, will be thicker and there is to be a neighborhood park with a gravel parking lot.

The next regularly scheduled meeting will be held on Tuesday, April 10, 2001, at 6:00 P.M.

Meeting Adjourned at 8:40 P.M.

Cheryl M. Ladd, CMC
Deputy City Clerk

CML