

---

**PITTSFIELD TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**

---

**Members Present:** Dennis Ward, Richard Plisko, Wilma Luna, Christina Lirones, Stuart Dowty, John Norton, Maria Constant.

**Members Absent:** None.

**Others Present:** Michael Rein, Brendan Cousino, Amy Christianson, Lynn Malinoff, Thomas Zeimet, Azadeh Izat, David Bell, Tim Grohnke, Drew Chorney, Otis Carter, Greg Elliott, Hugh Kennedy, Mike Brown, Mike Piette, Terry Bilovus, Joe White, Chester Juszczye, Senior Planner Paul Montagno, Assistant Planner Suzanne McCoy, and Recording Secretary Laura Ford.

**1.0 Call Meeting to Order at 7:30 p.m. / Determination of a Quorum.**

Chairperson Lirones called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. A quorum was present.

**2.0 Pledge of Allegiance**

Chairperson Lirones led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**3.0 Approval of Agenda**

**Motion by Commissioner Luna, supported by Commissioner Ward, to move Item 7.1 to follow Item 5.2.**

**MOTION CARRIED**

**4.0 Items from the Floor**

None.

**5.0 Public Hearings**

**5.1 CUP 06-09 Carpenter Crossings**

[submitted for conditional use permit/drive through]

Assistant Planner Suzanne McCoy reviewed her report. She said that the request is for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for a drive-through. She said that the site is developed and is zoned C-2. She said that the existing building would be demolished and two buildings constructed.

Mike Rein, Bowers and Rein Associates, stated that they are requesting CUP's for a drive through for the coffee shop and the two outdoor seating areas.

Chairperson Lirones opened the public hearing.

There were no comments.

**Motion by Commissioner Ward, supported by Commissioner Luna, to close the public hearing.**

**MOTION CARRIED**

**5.2 CUP 06-10 Carpenter Crossings**  
[submitted for conditional use permit/outdoor seating]

Planner McCoy reviewed the report. She said that this request is for two areas of outdoor seating. She said that one area would be for the coffee shop and one for the retail building. She said that the applicant has not submitted tenants for the building. She said that the site does meet parking requirements, although if a second restaurant was proposed the parking calculations could change.

Chairperson Lirones opened the public hearing.

There were no comments.

**Motion by Commissioner Ward, supported by Commissioner Luna, to close the public hearing.**

**MOTION CARRIED**

Item 7.1 moved to follow Item 5.1 and 5.2 of the Public Hearing.

Chairperson Lirones stated that the Washtenaw County Road Commission (WCRC) might require a wider entrance. She said that WB-50 trucks must be able to enter the site without crossing into the opposite lanes. She said that the Township has not spoken with the WCRC.

Senior Planner Paul Montagno reviewed a letter from the WCRC. He said that they look favorably on the project. He said that they recommend a shared access drive. He said that signal modifications would be needed.

Chairperson Lirones asked the width of the entry point.

Planner Montagno stated that the letter did not speak to that. He said that this was not a full review from the WCRC.

Planner McCoy reviewed her report and stated that the site meets all bulk and setback requirements. She said that there are parking calculation concerns. She said that various items need to be addressed in the engineering report. She said that Planner Carl Schmult's report mentioned the entrance on Carpenter Road in his report, mentioning that a fifteen (15) foot entry lane and two twelve (12) foot wide exit lanes could be required.

Commissioner Ward asked if there would be issues with the stacking of cars waiting to turn left onto Carpenter Road. He said that staff should look into this and discuss it with the WCRC.

Chairperson Lirones asked the applicant if they discussed the width of the driveway with the WCRC.

Mr. Rein stated that they met with the WCRC early on. He said that there is an existing traffic signal that services Target and the other stores. He said that they are updating the traffic signal to take the commercial development into account. He said that they are okay with moving the entrance. He said that the connection points were discussed when they met with the Township. He said that there are a few issues he has with the Township reports. He said that they are going to lose a space and widen the entrance to accommodate the WB-50 trucks. He said that they do not have the calculations for the restaurants.

Chairperson Lirones asked Mr. Rein if the names of the tenants are going to be provided on the final site plan.

Mr. Rein stated that the proposed tenants want the plans approved first. He said that different companies would be attracted to the national coffee company that is proposed.

Chairperson Lirones stated that the doors on the elevation do not meet the sidewalks that are shown.

Mr. Rein stated that it is generic and speculative. He said that they are providing green space between the front sidewalk and the façade. He said that the requirement of the WCRC and WCDC granting preliminary approval would be a problem. He said that he is confused about the requirements.

Planner Montagno mentioned that these are standard comments and procedures.

Chairperson Lirones stated that the Commission looks for tentative approval from the WCRC and WCDC. She said that the site has a good layout and it will be an excellent project.

Mr. Rein mentioned having preliminary and final approval at the same time.

Chairperson Lirones stated that they would address these issues at their staff meeting.

Mr. Rein discussed the building materials and stated that this is a softer gray design. He mentioned that there would be no E.I.F.S.

Commissioner Ward mentioned a standard attachment point so that the sign does not leave streaks and holes behind it.

## **6.0 Old Business**

### **6.1 CUP 06-07 Interfaith Center for Spiritual Growth** [submitted for a conditional use permit]

Chairperson Lirones stated that the Commission reviewed this petition at a previous meeting.

**Motion by Commissioner Ward, supported by Commissioner Luna, to approve the resolution of approval for CUP 06-07 Interfaith Center for Spiritual Growth.**  
(Attachment #1)

#### **ROLL CALL:**

**YES: WARD, PLISKO, LUNA, LIRONES, DOWTY, NORTON, CONSTANT.**  
**NO: NONE.**  
**ABSENT: NONE.**  
**ABSTAIN: NONE.**

#### **MOTION CARRIED**

### **6.2 RZ 04-11 Madison Corners (formerly West Town / Mayflower)** [submitted to rezone C-3 to PUD and for preliminary plan]

Chairperson Lirones stated that the Commission reviewed this petition at a previous meeting.

**Motion by Commissioner Ward, supported by Commissioner Luna, to approve resolution #1 recommending approval of RZ 04-11 Madison Corners to the Township Board. (Attachment #2)**

**ROLL CALL:**

**YES: WARD, PLISKO, LUNA, LIRONES, DOWTY, NORTON, CONSTANT.  
NO: NONE.  
ABSENT: NONE.  
ABSTAIN: NONE.**

**MOTION CARRIED**

**Motion by Commissioner Ward, supported by Commissioner Dowty, to approve resolution #2 recommending approval of RZ 04-11 Madison Corners to the Township Board. (Attachment #3)**

**ROLL CALL:**

**YES: WARD, PLISKO, LUNA, LIRONES, DOWTY, NORTON, CONSTANT.  
NO: NONE.  
ABSENT: NONE.  
ABSTAIN: NONE.**

**MOTION CARRIED**

**6.3 CSPA 05-05 Carpenter Center**  
[submitted for final site plan]

Planner Montagno reviewed his report. He said that the original Planned Unit Development (PUD) was approved on September 11, 1990. He said that the approved PUD uses are C-1 and C-2 uses. He said that the bulk area, lot width, and floor area ratio are acceptable. He said that the net lot coverage is acceptable based on the approved area plan. He said that they are meeting the parking requirements.

Chairperson Lirones asked if the island would be removed.

Planner Montagno stated that the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ) sent notice that the tanks were removed. He said that there is a potential future driveway to the south at Discount Tire. He said that the tree calculations are not correct.

Shirin Naaseh, owner, reviewed the calculation of the trees. She explained how they did their calculations based on 2,195 linear feet instead of 2,495 linear feet. She said that ninety-eight (98) canopy trees are proposed. She said that they would use conifers to make sure that there would be green during the winter months.

Chairperson Lirones stated that they would verify the number of trees and the mixture of species with staff.

Ms. Naaseh discussed the future access to the neighboring property. She said that she has tried to gain an easement from Gordon Food Services and they would not provide the easement. She said that they have provided the location on the plans and they are committed to it.

Chairperson Lirones stated that they have to provide that easement. She said that there might be a note on the plan that states when the back lot develops they must complete the driveway. She said that they should provide it now when the developer is present. She said that if they wait years down the road it might not be put in.

Commissioner Ward stated that the Township residents might end up being stuck with this. He said that the Township might not be able to convey the authority on the new owner.

Ms. Naaseh stated that she would like a copy of the letter that states that Gordon Food Services must provide this easement.

Chairperson Lirones mentioned that this is a nice addition to the corridor.

**Motion by Commissioner Ward, supported by Commissioner Dowty, to approve the final site plan CSPA 05-05 Carpenter Center with the following conditions:**

**That the applicant revises and submits four (4) complete sets of the final site plan for administrative review that:**

- 1. Address all issues in the Township Engineer's report dated August 4, 2006.**
- 2. Address all issues in the Township Planning Consultant's site plan review report dated August 14, 2006.**
- 3. Address all issues in the Zoning Review dated August 11, 2006.**
- 4. Verify landscaping information with staff and correct as necessary. The Planning Commission finds that the mixture of trees provided is acceptable.**
- 5. Construct necessary improvements for cross connection if required on the adjacent site plan.**

#### **MOTION CARRIED**

#### **6.4 SP 05-01 Rosewood Meadows** [submitted for tentative preliminary plat]

Planner McCoy reviewed her report. She said that the applicant is proposing the street trees for the mitigation requirements. She added that this is not acceptable. She said that there are regulated wetlands on the site. She reviewed the engineering report and stated that much of the sanitary sewer shown on the plan is oversized. She said that there are issues with the sanitary sewer manholes. She mentioned that Planner Schmult's report cited the regulated wetlands.

Anne Vaara, ECT, reviewed the history of the project. She reviewed the items that need to be put on the plans. She said that they need to show the wetlands on the plans, or submit a permit to fill the wetlands with a mitigation plan. She added that she believes that the wetlands are essential. She said that acceptable updated base drawings with the boundaries clearly shown on the site should be submitted. She said that they should provide a legend with the wetland details. She said that construction should be kept out of the wetlands.

Chairperson Lirones asked if they are preserving the high quality wetland of 2.4 acres.

Ms. Vaara replied yes.

Commissioner Ward asked the applicant about the wetlands.

Greg Elliott, attorney, replied no. He stated that this site is farm fields. He added that other than wetlands F, G and L the other wetlands are in farm fields. He said that they are not disputing the wetland characteristics.

Chairperson Lirones asked the applicant to submit a wetland application.

Mr. Elliott stated that they would apply for a wetland permit. He said that wetland F merits discussion. He said that the road on the approved area plan still clips this wetland. He said that they would try to realign the road although they would not want to rezone the property.

Planner Montagno stated that the Land Development Standards require a twenty-five (25) foot buffer around the wetlands.

Chairperson Lirones stated that the area plan is not set in stone. She said that she likes the idea of moving the road to get it out of the wetland.

The Commissioners and the applicant discussed the wetlands.

Commissioner Ward stated that there were issues with a few other developments where there was a natural elevation and it made some of the houses seem considerably higher. He asked if the WCRC would require any traffic calming measures on the large stretch of roads.

Mr. Elliott stated that the Subdivision Advisory Committee (SAC) has seen the plan. He said that they would have to submit a traffic report for approval.

Chairperson Lirones mentioned that a traffic signal at Michigan Avenue and Textile Road would be a good enhancement for the neighborhood.

**Motion by Commissioner Ward, supported by Commissioner Luna, to postpone action on SP 05-01 Rosewood Meadows, and direct the applicant to:**

- 1. Address wetland issues, and Planning Commission comments.**
- 2. Accept applicant's letter dated August 17, 2006, agreeing to the postponement.**

#### **MOTION CARRIED**

#### **6.5 CSPA 06-04 State Street Business Park Units 5 & 6** [submitted for preliminary site plan]

Planner McCoy reviewed her report. She stated that they meet all bulk and setback requirements. She said that there are no regulated wetlands onsite. She said that the sidewalk between the street sidewalk and the building should be five (5) feet from the driveway curb. She added that the Township requires separation for the safety and convenience of pedestrians. She reviewed the engineering report. She said that they have WCDC and WCRC preliminary approval. She said that the outstanding items that can be taken care of in the final site plan approval.

Chairperson Lirones mentioned the sidewalk coming up from the pathway.

Joseph White, applicant, stated that the issue with the sidewalk is because they have two ponds and limited access. He said that the storm system within the park is a private system. He said that it is required by the WCDC to have free area around the ponds. He said that they could move the sidewalk off the line, but they would encroach into the WCDC buffer area.

Chairperson Lirones stated that they should buffer the residences.

Terry Bilovus, architect, stated that if they could get latitude on the types of trees they can use and plant conifers instead of canopy trees and it might utilize the transition strip better.

Chairperson Lirones mentioned the existing asphalt pathway. She said that there is a ten (10) foot wide sidewalk requirement.

Planner Montagno stated that the Township has a sidewalk ordinance that makes the property owners responsible for the sidewalk.

The Commissioners and the applicant agreed on six-foot wide concrete sidewalks.

Commissioner Ward asked that they use more sustainable building material for all of the buildings, other than E.I.F.S.

Mr. White stated that they are looking at different materials.

**Motion by Commissioner Ward, supported by Commissioner Norton, to approve preliminary site plan CSPA 06-04 State Street Business Park Units 5 & 6 with the condition that the following be addressed in the final site plan:**

1. All issues in the Township Engineer's report dated August 11, 2006.
2. All issues in the Township Planning Consultant's site plan review report dated August 2, 2006.
3. All issues in the Zoning Review dated August 11, 2006.
4. Replace existing asphalt pathway with six foot wide concrete sidewalk.
5. Enhance landscaping buffer on final site plan to protect adjacent residences.

#### **MOTION CARRIED**

#### **6.6 CSPA 06-06 State Street Business Park Units 8 & 9** [submitted for preliminary site plan]

Planner McCoy reviewed her report. She stated that the plan meets all bulk and setback requirements. She reviewed Planner Schmult's report. She said that the existing trees along the east property line are in the twenty-five (25) foot transition strip. She said that the trees could be saved if grading and drainage are not permitted in this area. She said that the applicant should consider revising the grading to save all of the trees. She discussed the Gordon Drive entrance being aligned with the entrance across the street. She reviewed the engineering report. She said that they have preliminary approval from the WCRC and WCDC. She said that there are no regulated wetlands on the site.

Chairperson Lirones asked about the comment regarding the trees and grading.

Mr. White stated that the problem is because of the issues on lot 7. He said that there are issues with making the grades match. He said that they would like to save the trees. He discussed the driveway on Gordon Drive.

Chairperson Lirones discussed the Township having to waive their access management standards. She mentioned that the access on Gordon Drive should be aligned with the existing access across the street.

Mike Piette, Kirco Development, asked about the building materials.

Commissioner Ward stated that he would not support approval for a building with E.I.F.S. He said that this material looks terrible over time.

**Motion by Commissioner Ward, supported by Commissioner Luna, to approve preliminary site plan CSPA 06-06 State Street Business Park Units 8 & 9 with the condition that the following be addressed in the final site plan:**

- 1. All issues in the Township Engineer's report dated August 11, 2006.**
- 2. All issues in the Township Planning Consultant's site plan review report dated August 2, 2006.**
- 3. All issues in the Zoning Review dated August 11, 2006.**
- 4. Move the driveway on Gordon Drive to align with the access point across the street.**
- 5. Consult with staff on the possibility of constructing of a landscape retaining wall to save trees in the transition strip.**
- 6. Replace the existing asphalt pathway with a six-foot concrete sidewalk.**

#### **MOTION CARRIED**

#### **6.7 WP 06-01 Arbor Oaks** [discussion only]

Planner Montagno stated that the applicant submitted concept plans to address the wetland mitigation issues and they will still need to resubmit full plan sets. He said that the Commission should give the applicant directions on what to correct.

Ms. Vaara stated that they have to mitigate 1.6 acres. She said that wetland A is not a farmed wetland. She said that it is an open system with a lot of woody vegetation. She said that wetland H has a very small-forested system. She said that their numbers meet the criteria in the Ordinance. She said that the ecological benefits should be looked at. She said that they are proposing a pathway through the wetland. She said that she is against pedestrians using a pathway in a mitigation area. She felt mitigation at the end of the north cul-de-sac adjacent to the remaining wetland would be more appropriate. She said that they might have to drop lots for mitigation.

Chairperson Lirones asked how many lots they would have to remove.

Ms. Vaara replied approximately six (6) lots.

Planner Montagno stated that the last lot encroaches into the wetland.

Tom Zeimet, engineer, stated that this is the same cul-de-sac, they just changed the interior. He said that they did tie-in all of the trees and put them into a conservation easement. He said that they would have to lose five (5) to six (6) lots to put the wetland in.

Chairperson Lirones stated that the consent judgment allows up to ninety (90) units.

Commissioner Ward stated that the applicant requested that the site plan be on the consent judgment.

Chairperson Lirones stated that she is not sure if the pathway through the wetland is needed.

Commissioner Dowty asked the applicant about the use of fertilizer and the runoff that could happen.

Mr. Zeimet stated that a buffer zone would be provided. He said that the buffer zone would trap the fertilizers before they reached the wetland.

Commissioner Dowty asked why they think the ecological importance of the placement of the wetland should be outweighed because they could be losing five to six lots.

The Commissioners and the applicant discussed the wetlands.

Ms. Vaara stated that there are potential issues that need to be resolved at some point. She said that they originally proposed a forested wetland. She added that she was against this idea in the central area. She asked them to come forward with an emerging wetland.

Chairperson Lirones stated that they should remove one lot and complete the remainder of the mitigation in the central portion of the site.

Commissioner Ward stated that they should look at a compromise of removing one or two lots and mitigating and increasing the central buffer.

Planner Montagno stated that he knows that the applicant will not be okay with losing one lot.

Chairperson Lirones stated that if the Commission requested everything that they could, then the applicant could be losing approximately six (6) lots. She said that the applicant should have their wetland expert work with the Township wetland consultant.

## **7.0 New Business**

### **7.1 CSPA 06-16/CUP 06-09/CUP 06-10 Carpenter Crossings** [submitted for discussion only]

Item 7.1 moved to follow Items 5.1 and 5.2 of the Public Hearing.

### **7.2 CSPA 06-15 PRS Medical Building-Golfside** [submitted for discussion only]

Planner Montagno reviewed the report. He listed the neighboring uses. He said that the site is in a mixed use residential zoning district. He said that there is a consent judgment between the property owner and the Township. He said that O-1 uses and other uses in paragraph 11 of the consent judgment are allowed. He said that the bulk requirements and development standards are going to apply to this. He said that the proposed use is a medical building. He said that the floor area ratio and lot coverage are acceptable. He said that the net lot coverage allowed is 50% and they are proposing 59%. He said that there are some items to readjust on the site plan. He said that there is a requirement for a one hundred ten (110) foot setback from the centerline, and they are proposing forty-three (43) feet (from the property line). He said that transition strips are required on two sides of the site between the office and residential uses. He said that they are providing the adequate number of parking spaces but the spaces are only proposed as nine (9) feet. He said that the Ordinance calls for ten (10) foot spaces. He said that the access should be linked with the inner private road network. He said that the Commission could ask for another sidewalk between Golfside Road and the building.

Planner Montagno stated that they are requiring setback information on the site plan. He reviewed the engineering report and noted that truck turning radii should be included in the plans. He said that an area wide map should be submitted. He said that a separate fire protection plan should be submitted. He said that they prefer the building to be sprinkled. He said that this plan needs significant changes before it receives approval.

Chairperson Lirones asked about the lot coverage. She said that they might use the current Ordinance even though the consent judgment notes the 1995 Ordinance.

Hugh Kennedy, engineer, stated that the issue is whether they are dealing with the current Ordinance or the 1995 Ordinance. He said that they are going to take some exception to the setback issues. He added that they are aware of the issues. He said that this is a masonry building. He said that this would be an asset to the area. He mentioned that it would provide easy medical care for people in the area. He said that they want to talk to Lexington Pointe about having emergency access from their driveway. He said that they believe that they can meet all of the landscaping requirements.

Commissioner Dowty asked the applicant if they believe that the standards in the 1995 Ordinance should apply.

Mr. Kennedy stated that he knows that the 1995 standards apply. He said that they are complying with the issues of the setbacks.

Chairperson Lirones stated that the applicant thinks the PUD allows for something other than what the 1995 Ordinance provided for.

Mr. Kennedy stated that the one hundred ten (110) foot setback is related to the seventy-five (75) foot right-of-way to the west and the thirty-five (35) foot setback.

Chairperson Lirones stated that she thought the applicant was going to conform to the Ordinance.

Planner Montagno stated that any development of the subject area has to go through preliminary and final site plan review. He said that the plan should meet all of the requirements in the Land Development Standards.

Chairperson Lirones stated that the Township attorney would need to review the consent judgment. She said that this could result in major changes to the site plan.

Mr. Kennedy stated that the current standards would make the site undevelopable. He said that when Lexington Pointe was constructed a fifty (50) foot right-of-way was provided. He said that they believe that they can conform to the setbacks and the consent judgment. He said that there are other buildings in the area that do not conform to the required setbacks. He said that they would deal with this issue.

Commissioner Constant asked if it is more important that the parking spaces be 10 x 20 because of the people that would be using the site, i.e. elderly patients.

Mr. Kennedy stated that they would be conforming and that this would not be a problem.

## **8.0 Planner's Report**

Planner Montagno asked the Commission if they would like only the updated reports included in their packets.

Commissioner Ward stated that he would like only the most recent reports because of time constraints.

**9.0 Chairperson's Report**

Chairperson Lirones reminded the Commissioners that they should email staff if they are not going to attend the meeting.

**10.0 Commissioner's Report**

None.

**11.0 Approval of Prior Minutes**

**11.1 Minutes of August 3, 2006**

**Motion by Commissioner Luna, supported by Commissioner Dowty, to approve the minutes, as corrected.**

**MOTION CARRIED**

**12.0 Adjournment**

**Motion by Commissioner Luna, supported by Commissioner Ward, to adjourn the meeting.**

**MOTION CARRIED**

Chairperson Lirones adjourned the meeting at 10:37 p.m.

(Attachment #1)

**FINDINGS OF REQUIRED STANDARDS  
AND RESOLUTION OF APPROVAL  
C.U.P. #06-07 Interfaith Center for Spiritual Growth  
August 17, 2006**

**WHEREAS**, an application for a Conditional Use Permit to allow a church in a Business Park (BP) District was received from the Interfaith Center for Spiritual Growth on July 11, 2006, and

**WHEREAS**, the Pittsfield Township Planning Commission held a public hearing on this matter on August 3, 2006, and heard no comments; and

**WHEREAS**, the Commission finds that this use is adequately served by public facilities and services, and the proposed use will not substantially increase demand on public facilities or services; and

**WHEREAS**, the Commission reviewed the plan and application on August 3, 2006, for this use and per the requirements of Section 50.06 of the Township Zoning Ordinance and find the following:

**The proposed use:**

- A. Will be harmonious with, and in accordance with, the general objectives, intent and purposes of this ordinance**
- B. Will be designed, constructed, operated, maintained and managed so as to be harmonious and appropriate in appearance with the existing or intended character of the general vicinity**, because the proposed use is harmonious with the surrounding area. The exterior of the building will not be altered and therefore there will be no visual change to the area. Any alterations to accommodate the use will be minimal and confined to the interior.
- C. Will be served adequately by essential public facilities and services, such as highways, streets, police and fire protection, drainage structures, refuse disposal or that the persons or agencies responsible for the establishment of the proposed use shall be able to provide adequately any such service.**
- D. Will not be hazardous or disturbing to existing or future neighboring uses**, because the majority of the center's activities would generally take place in the evenings and on weekends and therefore, should not create conflicts with the surrounding businesses during daytime operations.
- E. Will not create excessive additional requirements at public cost for public facilities or services**, because this site is adequately served by public services and it does not appear that any additional burden will be placed on these services if the permit were approved.

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**, that the Pittsfield Township Planning Commission hereby approves CUP 06-07 Interfaith Center for Spiritual Growth.

(Attachment #2)

**RESOLUTION #1**  
**FINDINGS OF REQUIRED STANDARDS**  
**RZ 04-11 Madison Corners**  
**PITTSFIELD TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**August 17, 2006**

The Pittsfield Township Planning Commission hereby makes the following findings of the standards in Sections 52.07C and 59.05 of the Zoning Ordinance for a zoning amendment based on the latest version of the area plan, consisting of 29 sheets, date stamped July 14, 2006, as received by Pittsfield Township, with the conditions listed in Resolution #2.

1. The petition is consistent with the land use designation in the Comprehensive Plan. The Plan designates the area for local commercial, community commercial, and office uses, as part of the Michigan-US23 Planned Development Area.
2. Zoning compliance has been reviewed by the Planning Department. The list of proposed uses is suitable for this area of the Township based on the future land use map in the Township Comprehensive Plan. The Planning Commission also discussed with the applicant a number of accessory uses that are also appropriate for this site.
3. The site is adequately served by Township sanitary sewer and water systems. Storm water runoff will be detained in an underground system; and the preliminary drainage plan has been approved by the WCDC. Street access is adequate; both MDOT and the WCRC have approved driveway openings on the public streets. Access to Township police and fire protection is acceptable. Fire station #1 is one mile in distance.
4. The property abuts a residential area to the south. The only potential impacts on these residences would be noise and light.
5. The proposed development will destroy the existing wooded area in the southwest corner of the site. However, based on the trees identified in the area plan, this is a low quality woodland. The site has no other natural features.
6. Topography is not an issue for designing the vehicular circulation system for this site. As noted, MDOT and the WCRC have approved driveway openings on the public streets. The area plan provides internal driveway connections to the adjacent commercial properties.
7. The petition provides sidewalks along the two frontage streets, sidewalks to the buildings, and sidewalks within the building complex.
8. The requested rezoning is justified because it offers an opportunity to replace a standard commercial zoning district, C-3, with a mixed use development that will be controlled by a site plan that has been agreed to by the petitioner and the Township.
9. Approval of the petition will not set any adverse precedents for future zoning in this area.
10. Approval of the petition and the subsequent development in accordance with the area plan will upgrade what has been an underused and derelict property. This will improve property values in the area.
11. The area for this development is identified as a gateway in the Township Comprehensive Plan Corridor Character Plan and therefore requires substantial building material as discussed in chapter 6 of the Plan. The architecture and building materials depicted on the building elevations in the area plan are acceptable for a gateway area.

(Attachment #3)

**RESOLUTION #2  
RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL  
RZ 04-11 MADISON CORNERS  
PITTSFIELD TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION  
August 17, 2006**

**WHEREAS** Pittsfield Township received petition RZ 04-11 Madison Corners from West Town Properties LLC, to rezone a parcel of land totaling 4.10 acres of land in the southeast ¼ of Section 23 on the south side of Michigan Avenue, and the east side of Carpenter Road known as parcel #L12-23-400-031, from C-3 (Highway Commercial) to PUD (Planned Unit Development); and

**WHEREAS** The Pittsfield Township Planning Commission held a public hearing on this petition on September 2, 2004, and received positive comments; and

**WHEREAS** The Pittsfield Township Planning Commission reviewed the petition and required a number of changes in the area plan; and

**WHEREAS** The Pittsfield Township Planning Commission found that the petition, including the area plan, being 29 sheets, date stamped July 14, 2006, as received by the Township, meets the standards for a PUD district as provided in Section 52.07C of the Zoning Ordinance, and for a zoning amendment as provided in Section 59.05 of the Zoning Ordinance.

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** That the Pittsfield Township Planning Commission recommends that the Pittsfield Township Board approve petition RZ 04-11 Madison Corners.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** That the Planning Commission approves the area plan as the preliminary site plan, provided that the Township Board approves the rezoning.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** That the Pittsfield Township Planning Commission recommends that the Pittsfield Township Board attach the following conditions to its approval of this petition:

1. The utilities and landscaping depicted on the area plan are acceptable as concepts only and may change upon review of the final site plan.
2. The following uses may be permitted in addition to those listed on the area plan at the discretion of the Zoning Administrator upon written request from the property owner:
  - a. Outdoor seating for restaurants, provided the seating will not interfere with pedestrian or vehicular circulation and that adequate parking is available.
  - b. A total of two (2) outdoor sales per retail establishment per year with a duration of not more than 72 hours each.
3. All outdoor lighting shall have full cut-off-down-directed fixtures.
4. Adequate landscaping shall be provided to mitigate any impact on neighboring residents.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** That the Pittsfield Township Planning Commission transmits the Township Planner's report of April 19, 2006, as the Planning Commission's report on the petition.