

**CITY OF WIXOM
49045 PONTIAC TRAIL
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
MONDAY, NOVEMBER 7, 2018**

APPROVED

11.26.18

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Day of the Planning Commission at 7:33 p.m. at which time allegiance was pledged to the American flag.

PRESENT: William Day (Chairman), Phillip Carter, Joe Barts, Peter Sharpe and Ray Cousineau
ABSENT: Anthony Lawrence (Excused) and Sandro Grossi (Excused)
OTHERS: Steve Brown (City Manager), Justin Sprague (CIB Planning) and Nancy Fisher (Recording Secretary)

Determination of a Quorum:

A quorum of the Planning Commission was present for this meeting.

Agenda:

No additions or changes were made to the agenda.

Approval of the September 24, 2018 and October 1, 2018 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes:

MOTION and seconded by Commissioners Carter and Cousineau to approve the September 24, 2018 and October 1, 2018 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes.

VOTE:

MOTION CARRIED

Chairman Day noted that the October 1, 2018 Planning Commission minutes in the Commissioners' meeting packet is a marked up copy when ordinarily it has no markups. He believes the minutes are okay as is.

Correspondence:

City Manager's Update – October 23, 2018

Call to the Public:

There were no comments made by the public.

Unfinished Business:

There was no unfinished business listed on the agenda for this meeting.

New Business:

- 1. SITE PLAN REVIEW, SPR #06-015-18, ANDERSON HANDLING MATERIALS, 30397 WIXOM ROAD, WIXOM, MI 48393:** The revised site plan is for a 44,820-sq. ft. light industrial building for Anderson Materials Handling at 30397 S. Wixom Road, which is on the west side of Wixom Road between West Road and Pontiac Trail. This property is the last parcel in a coordinated development that includes office buildings to the north. In addition to the new building, proposed are 54 parking spaces; a 3-bay truckwell; a masonry trash enclosure; lighting; detention pond; and landscaping. The property is zoned M-1, Light Industrial District, where light industrial buildings including warehouse, workshops and accessory office space, are permitted uses in that district. The parcel's tax identification number is 22-06-200-040.

Mr. Sprague referred to Mr. Avantini's November 6, 2018 review letter. He apologized to the Planning Commissioners regarding the meeting packet. He noted that the applicant came in with a few last minute changes since the City could not recommend approval of the applicant's first proposal. The City has been negotiating with the applicant over the last 3-4 days and has since revised the initial staff report. There are still things that would require administrative approval. He would like to highlight a few things from Mr. Avantini's November 6th letter. This site is considered to be the third phase of this development. The first two buildings to the north do not meet setback requirements of 175 feet from the centerline of Wixom Road. The building does not meet the setback which makes the entire development nonconforming. Because the applicant has agreed to keep the front façade of the building and the existing parking in line with the two previous

developed buildings, he does not view this as an expansion which would require a Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) hearing. That will keep it at the existing setback for the previous two buildings.

Mr. Sprague noted there are some access and circulation issues. There is not currently a sidewalk along Wixom Road which is required by the Zoning Ordinance. The Planning Commission has to address that tonight. A cross access agreement will need to be settled administratively. The waste receptacle previously showed an area for pallet storage. If it is not screened, it will need to go to the Planning Commission for a special land use for outdoor storage. The updated plans show screening which would obviate the need for special land use. There is a note required for the natural features indicating there are regulated and unregulated wetlands. Also, in terms of the building design, the proposed front partial side elevations do not meet the material standards of the Ordinance, recognizing that the applicant does not want to match the design of the buildings to the north. The applicant has proposed metal paneling on the front façade which is horizontal metal. Mr. Avantini would like that replaced with horizontal panels similar to the building to the north to match that and tie them together. Also, they were using split face block along the building's edges which he pointed out to the Commissioners on the large-scale diagram. Mr. Avantini wants either block or textured masonry. He does not want smooth split-face block.

Mr. Sprague recommends approval conditioned upon: 1) the following changes be made to the following materials: a) replacement of the proposed vertical insulated sandwich metal panels and column enclosures with the same brushed aluminum architectural panels used on the buildings to the north; and b) replacement of the smooth and split faced concrete block with brick; 2) submission of a revised site plan, for administrative review and approval, that addresses the outstanding items identified above; 3) a full pallet and cradle storage enclosure, similar to the dumpster enclosure, must be provided or a separate special land use request applied for; and 4) review and approval from other applicable consultants, departments and agencies. Mr. Sprague noted that all City departments have reviewed and approved this. Ms. Barker would like to see companion materials for the building façade to the north.

Chairman Day asked how long the two buildings to the north have been there. The applicant said since 2006. Chairman Day asked why there is no sidewalk. Mr. Sprague said that it may not have been part of the Ordinance then but it is now. Chairman Day confirmed with Mr. Sprague that the other sidewalk is just in front of the building. Chairman Day asked whether the setback has changed since the buildings were built. Was there a variance? Mr. Sprague said there was no variance. Setbacks may have changed when the Ordinance was updated. Now it is 175 feet from the centerline of Wixom Road, making the two previous buildings nonconforming when they were built (he referred the Commissioners to the aerial photo). They put in a driveway and parking with the intention of fencing this development. However, the site was never completed.

Commissioner Barts noted Ms. Barker's request to have the exterior along Wixom Road match as closely as possible and said that it does not look like it except for the circle in the middle. It has glass corners. Mr. Sprague said that it does not match and asked the applicant to later address this. It is not what the City considers to be a high-quality material or an architectural panel. He passed around a sample of the material the applicant would use. He noted that the design team is attempting to integrate the colors of the applicant's corporate logo. Commissioner Carter noted that the general design appearance of the building would remain the same and they would just use different materials to support that. Mr. Sprague noted that as it closely matches the buildings to the north, the panel that is going up and down would be horizontal instead of vertical. Commissioner Carter confirmed with Mr. Sprague that he is concerned only with the front of the building.

Bill Clark, CEO, Quadrants Development, 49132 Wixom Tech Drive, Wixom. Mr. Clark also introduced the two men accompanying him tonight, David Streefkerk and Bob O'Dette, both from Anderson Handling Materials. Quadrants designed the two buildings to the north years ago. He built it more as a legacy to Quadrants and himself. Accordingly, he spent way more money than he would have otherwise. It is made of granite and MCM panels. It is not financially practical to mimic those buildings. He takes exception to the idea that the buildings do not meet the City's standards. He referred the Commissioners to Section D of the Ordinance which governs concrete, masonry and glass. He believes he has complied with the Ordinance. He showed the rounded archway on the plans which pulls in the features of the building next door. The columns are clad in that material. The panels are architectural flat panels 3 feet wide which are smooth. They are designed to meet the energy code and will not fade. They are very expensive material. The block is high end, factory-colored split-face block containing chips of marble. He showed the Commissioners a sample of the

metal panels. It is smooth and not ribbed siding. There is more than the recommended amount of glass. There is a feature at the bottom introducing some of the granite. He made efforts to mimic some of the features. This building is far superior to a lot of the structures currently situated on Wixom Road. During the 2008 economic downturn, the third building was given back to Comerica. Someone else bought it and he is buying it back through Anderson. The owner had architectural approval and he is more than happy with this design. He straightened out the driveway at the request of the City Planner. There is existing striped asphalt and he will be adding some asphalt. He pointed out the current entryway on the large-scale diagram. He noted that the applicant wants two driveways, one on the south for traffic and one on the north for vehicles. When he built the first two buildings, sidewalks were never mentioned. The first time you encounter a sidewalk on the west side is Wixom Road and Old Wixom Road. There is a lot of mature landscaping that has been growing for 12 years which he was trying to preserve. Mr. Sprague noted that the Ordinance says that sidewalks should be provided on all major thoroughfares unless payment is made in lieu thereof. The City Engineer needs to determine that. Chairman Day noted this was done in the past with the properties close to the Wixom Road split. Mr. Sprague noted that was also done with Wilson Marine. Chairman Day noted that he would prefer payment in lieu of building it rather than a sidewalk with no connection on either end. The applicant said that would be acceptable.

Chairman Day noted that the applicant indicated that duplicating the façade of the two buildings would not be financially feasible. Are the architectural panels as expensive or more expensive than the ones suggested by the City? The applicant said that the MCM panel is the most expensive siding. Block costs about \$12-\$15 per square foot and this is \$25 per square foot. MCM is \$40 per square foot. Chairman Day asked how many square feet it is. The applicant said that it would add \$100,000-\$125,000 to the project cost. On the large-scale diagram, he pointed out an area which would comprise \$62,000 worth of MCM panels. Chairman Day confirmed with the applicant that it would be a \$15 per square foot cost differential. The applicant said it would cost between \$50,000-\$60,000 depending on the total square footage. Also, using MCM panels does not meet the current energy code unless you back them with something like drywall or insulation. These panels meet the energy code as far as the R-value. Mr. Sprague referred to the Ordinance regarding materials. He noted that Mr. Avantini considered these to be pre-fabricated steel paneling which is why he sent it to the Planning Commission. He considers MCM panels to be decorative architectural panels. The applicant pointed out the standard ribbed siding on the building which to his thinking is not decorative. He noted that a friend of his had a building approved on West Road which is corrugated. He is trying to construct something that the City and Anderson Materials can be proud of since it will be their headquarters. They have been in the City since 1995. Chairman Day asked what kind of signage the applicant wants. The applicant said that is undecided. It could be a monument sign or a combination of signage.

Chairman Day noted that Mr. Clark's original plan was to develop three separate buildings; however, his plans were interrupted by the economic downturn. Was the setback Ordinance changed? Was a variance granted? The applicant said there was no variance. He noted that the other buildings are 170 feet. Commissioner Barts noted that the site plan shows the two driveways. Would that be allowed on one parcel by the County? He noted if the County rejects that proposal, the applicant would have to come back before the Planning Commission. The applicant said that the County has verbally approved the two driveways. He also ran that proposal before the City's engineer and the Fire Department. Mr. Sprague noted that there was a pre-development meeting and the City engineer felt it was within the access standards to do that and be within the required 250 feet for the second driveway. They have to shift it south. Otherwise, the middle driveway would not work.

Chairman Day confirmed with Mr. Sprague that there is no problem with the pallet and cradle storage enclosure and that the only issue he has is the façade and the side wall. Mr. Sprague said that he believes that the Planning Commission has the ultimate determination as to whether the materials meet the intent of the Ordinance.

Chairman Day asked about the distance between the building and the one to its immediate north. The applicant said it is at least 77 feet. He noted that ideally it would have had a campus appearance for the three buildings. Commissioner Carter noted that as depicted on the drawing marked SD.101 it does not line up with the driveway on the east side of Wixom Road. Will that meet the requirements of the Road Commission? Mr. Sprague noted that they will look at it for final approval but the City's engineer did review that. The applicant showed the Commissioners on the diagrams that the existing driveway will end where the other one will be. Commissioner Carter noted that there is enough of a separation between the existing driveways. However, the new, northern driveway will be slightly offset from the other one. Lining

the driveways up could upset the parking plan. He is trying to keep the trucks all to the south side where there is adequate maneuvering room. The only reason that there is a driveway behind the building is for Fire Department access.

The applicant said that there is split face factory-integrated colored block. He pointed out on the only smooth block feature on the large-scale diagram. There will be striated block which is 16 inches long but which has a smooth face. That will provide a decorative look. He pointed out another section of smooth block underneath the siding. Mr. Sprague noted that the applicant brought in a block sample last week which was textured and multi-colored. It was a deep grey and had color variation. It could be used in lieu of brick as a high-quality masonry product. Chairman Day noted that since this building will be set off a greater distance from the initial two buildings, he does not have a problem with the facades not matching.

Commissioner Cousineau said that he does not have experience with this particular product although he thinks it is an acceptable building material. Does it architecturally need the buildings to the north? He thinks there is enough separation. He does not mind some separation. He does not have an issue with this at all. He thinks the vertical panels are a better look than the horizontal. The applicant noted that he ordered a larger sample of the metal siding for the owner. He has never built with less than a quality product here. He has a solid reputation. The siding is 36 inches wide and does not have an industrial appearance. He has similar siding on two buildings in Lyon Township.

Chairman Day said that he does not have a problem since it will be separated by distance. There will also be a curb cut. He would prefer the sidewalk monies being put in escrow for a future sidewalk. Commissioner Cousineau asked whether the monies are escrowed or paid in lieu of sidewalk construction. Mr. Sprague said it is the latter. He noted that Wilson Marine created an escrow because they will eventually install a sidewalk. Chairman Day noted that this site has no sidewalk to the north and south. Commissioner Carter said to keep in mind the recent construction on Beck Road which has a lot of blank space although there may be signage there. Mr. Sprague noted that this façade is far better than the first proposal and it has evolved a lot in the last week alone.

Commissioner Cousineau confirmed with the applicant that the retention basin that is to the west of the property services the entire project; i.e., all three buildings. The applicant said that is being reworked and referred the Commissioners to Sheet 2 in tonight's meeting packet. They are enlarging it slightly. Since it was originally constructed, the storm water Ordinance has changed. They need to slightly enlarge the pond. Commissioner Cousineau asked whether the retention basin is on another parcel. The applicant said that at one point it was. Currently that parcel is set up to become part of Anderson Materials' parcel and there will be a cross access easement agreement. Cross easement access was put in place in 2006. You can travel all the way across Anderson Materials and come out the southern drive. Mr. Sprague noted that he asked the applicant to place a note into the plans regarding this.

Commissioner Sharpe noted that there is an error in tonight's agenda and that the applicant is located on Wixom Road and not Beck Road.

MOTION and second by Commissioners Carter and Cousineau to approve SPR #06-015-18, Anderson Handling Materials' revised site plan. This approval is conditioned upon: 1) monies being paid by the applicant in lieu of sidewalk construction; 2) the building materials and design will be accepted as submitted in the renderings as discussed; 3) the revised site plan be submitted and administratively reviewed and approved to address outstanding items in Mr. Avantini's November 7, 2018 review letter; 4) the full pallet and cradle storage enclosure, similar to the dumpster enclosure, is acceptable as submitted; 5) review and approval of other City consultants, departments and agencies. The property is located at 30397 Wixom Road, Wixom, Michigan 48393, is zoned M-1, Light Industrial District, and The parcel's tax identification number is 22-06-200-040. **MOTION AMENDED** by Commissioners Cousineau and Carter that the Planning Commission finds that there is not an expansion of the nonconforming site.

VOTE:

MOTION CARRIED

- 2. PUBLIC HEARING FOR THE CITY OF WIXOM MASTER PLAN UPDATE PRIOR TO DISTRIBUTION FOR PUBLIC COMMENT:** The proposed Master Plan includes a number of revisions, including updates to the Future Land Use Plan for the former Ford Wixom Assembly Plant property and frontage property on the east side of Wixom Road. Zoning Plan and Implementation Chapters have also been added to the

draft plan, in accordance with State law. The Master Plan provides guidance to the Planning Commission and City Council in making future decisions related to planning and zoning matters. Copies of the Draft Master Plan Update are available for review in the City Clerk's office and on the City's web page.

Chairman Day said that he assumes that this can now be distributed for public comment. Mr. Sprague said it will now go to City Council. Commissioner Carter noted that in Section 5 under '*Business/ Opportunities for the Ford site*' of the Master Plan update he noticed that it mentions 46 acres of the 314-acre site being developed by Menards for commercial retail use and a discussion of General RV's headquarters. Should this be updated at all? If not, that is fine. He also noted that he feels it is appropriate to remove the changes which were made to the Master Plan map. Chairman Day noted that everything that has been developed was based on the purchase from the prior owner including General RV and Menards. Everything that went in was Menards. He does not think that they need to mention the other developments. Commissioner Carter also drew Mr. Sprague's attention to a typographical error on page 37 of the Master Plan update. A comma needs to be added between 'Total Sports' and 'Puckmasters'.

Mr. Sprague noted that the Master Plan update will go out for comment. Then there will be a final public hearing. The Planning Commission will receive a draft. They would incorporate all changes. Then the map would be changed. That would put everything in its place for the Planning Commission to recommend that City Council adopt it which leaves two more opportunities for the Planning Commission to make changes.

MOTION and second by Commissioners Carter and Sharpe to remove the changes to the Master Plan map, make the typographical change referenced on page 37 and recommend that City Council authorize distribution of the Master Plan update.

VOTE:

MOTION CARRIED

Call to the Public:

There were no comments made by the public.

3. PROPOSED 2019 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING DATES

MOTION and second by Commissioners Cousineau and Carter to approve the proposed 2019 Planning Commission meeting dates as published.

VOTE:

MOTION CARRIED

4. DISCUSSION OF ELECTRONIC MESSAGE SIGNS

Mr. Sprague noted that there was a ZBA request which just occurred in the last month regarding electronic signage. It was a case that went before the ZBA for a property in the VCA. Currently the Zoning Ordinance prohibits any changeable message signs. The ZBA denied the applicant's request. The applicant approached the City Manager and asked what other options they have. They decided to discuss the intent to keep changeable signs out of the VCA or to change the Zoning Ordinance to have changeable message signs in the ZBA or throughout the City. That would include schools, churches, non-profits and governmental units. Do the Planning Commissioners believe the intent is still the same as when it was adopted?

Chairman Day noted that he does not know which institutional use made the request of the City Manager. He noted that the Planning Commission has tried to create something aesthetically pleasing in the VCA and that changeable signs are not appropriate. He does not want to change the Ordinance. Commissioner Cousineau agreed. Commissioner Barts noted that in his dual role as a ZBA boardmember there was another option presented to the applicant who made the request for a changeable sign. He noted that applicant is situated on the edge of the VCA. Commissioner Sharpe agreed. He noted that the changeable signs are getting cheaper with more colors and sizes which can easily get out of control. He does not believe we need any more. Commissioner Carter noted that all of the institutional users may have wanted

changeable signage. He does not want to open that door. Chairman Day noted that he did not want backlit signage. They can easily destroy the progress which has been made.

MOTION and second by Commissioners Carter and Cousineau to reaffirm the Planning Commission's position to not allow changeable message signs within the Village Center Area (VCA).

VOTE:

MOTION CARRIED

Call to the Public:

None.

Staff Comments:

There were no comments made by the staff.

Commission Comments:

There were no comments made by the Commissioners.

ADJOURNMENT:

This meeting of the Planning Commission was motioned and adjourned at 8:44 p.m.

Nancy Fisher
Recording Secretary