

CLINTON TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION

REPORT OF MEETING

AUGUST 24TH, 2017

PRESENT: Kirkanne Moseley, Chairperson
Ronald DiBartolomeo, Vice-Chairperson
Denise C. Trombley, Secretary
Stephen Charron
Michael Deyak
Lawrence Opalewski Jr.
Daniel Spatafora
Joie West

ABSENT: George Brumbaugh (Excused)

STAFF: Carlo Santia, Director
DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Ms. Moseley called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. DiBartolomeo requested that Item #4 (St. Paul of Tarsus Catholic Parish Expansion) be deleted from tonight's agenda at the request of the petitioner. He noted that the public will be re-notified when it is placed back on an agenda.

Motion by Mr. DiBartolomeo, supported by Ms. West, to approve the agenda as revised, with the deletion of Item #4. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – DiBartolomeo, West, Charron, Deyak, Moseley, Opalewski, Spatafora, Trombley. Nays – None. Absent – Brumbaugh. Motion carried.

9.71 ACRES OF VACANT LAND LOCATED AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF 18 MILE AND GARFIELD ROADS (SECTION 7) (PARCEL 16-11-07-476-003)

- **PROPOSED REZONING FROM RML MULTIPLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL (LOW-DENSITY) TO B-3 GENERAL BUSINESS (PARCEL “A”) AND TO RMH MULTIPLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL (HIGH-DENSITY) (PARCEL “B”)**
 - **PUBLIC HEARING**
FILE #17-6772: PETITIONED BY MR. FRANK ARCORI AND MR. JOE PALUZZI, OF VERUS DEVELOPMENT GROUP
REPRESENTED BY MR. TIM PONTON AND MR. MICHAEL PANNELL, OF STONEFIELD ENGINEERING AND DESIGN, LLC
-

Ms. Trombley read the letter into the record dated August 14th, 2017 from the Assistant Director of the Department of Planning and Community Development. She advised that notice of this item on tonight’s agenda was mailed to 220 owners and/or occupants located within 300 feet of the land in question, with 19 of those returned as undeliverable.

Mr. Tim Ponton, Stonefield Engineering and Design, LLC, the design engineer for this project, explained this is a 9.7-acre site at the northwest corner of 18 Mile and Garfield, and it is currently zoned RML Multiple-Family Residential (Low-Density). He indicated the Master Plan for Future Land Use recommends commercial use on the corner, surrounded by office use. He stated their plan is consistent with the Master Plan to break the property up into two zonings, but instead of office, they are seeking approval to change the current multiple-family low-density residential to a higher density. He noted that 18 Mile and Garfield is a very busy intersection and there is a reason this property has been vacant for so long. This site has never been for sale, although there have been numerous developers who have tried to purchase it from the owner. He stated the owner is now deceased and the property will be sold, so he clarified that something is going to be developed on this corner, and it will not “stay as a green piece of land forever”. He pointed out that the corner is on a major intersection so it will be a commercial use, and they are proposing the remainder to be a newer product more in demand than office. They would like to build higher-end three-story apartment buildings that will be a compliment to the area. He cautioned that they could construct three-story office buildings that would result in a much more intense use. He assured that they are not looking at high-rise, but it will be a nice product that will be attractive at this intersection.

Ms. Moseley explained that this is a public hearing to address the proposed rezoning.

Motion by Ms. West, supported by Mr. Spatafora, to open the public hearing.
Roll Call Vote: Ayes – West, Spatafora, Charron, Deyak, DiBartolomeo, Moseley, Opalewski, Trombley.

Ms. Rachel Walkowicz, 40547 Rehse, Clinton Township, Michigan 48038, questioned whether part of this plan is to build another gas station on the corner.

Ms. Moseley explained the request is for a rezoning, so although the petitioners can explain what they intend to do, once the property is rezoned, they would be permitted to come up with a site development plan for anything that would be permitted within that zoning district. She added that they will be required to submit those plans for approval.

Ms. Walkowicz inquired as to whether there will be any studies done to show how apartments will affect the values of the surrounding homes. She questioned the desirability of homes and condominiums that are abutting apartments.

Ms. Moseley replied she does not know if the petitioners have done any studies, but she stated they will take all the comments and questions from the residents, and will then ask the petitioner to come up and address some of those concerns.

Ms. Walkowicz felt there is enough development in the area, and she indicated she would like to see the property be made into a park for the children in the area, or possibly a park where events such as a farmer's market could be held.

Mr. Dean Enrici, 16620 Chris Drive, Clinton Township, Michigan 48038, a resident of the Garfield Manor Condominiums, stated he is opposed to a change in the zoning. He admitted that the property may not be able to remain vacant, but he stressed the area does not need another gas station, and he questioned whether the Planning Commissioners would like to live directly behind a high-rise apartment building. He was concerned that a gas station will bring more pollution and traffic to the area. He inquired as to the buffer that would be required between the existing condominiums and the proposed multi-level complex. He was concerned there would be a cinder block wall.

Ms. Barbara Hering, 41335 Donna Drive, Clinton Township, Michigan 48038, a resident of Garfield Manor Condominiums, stated there are condominiums all around the subject property. She is aware the property will not remain vacant, but she stated she does not want another gas station. She pointed out that Kroger's may still put in another gas station, and then there will be six gas stations within a half mile. She felt the entire property should be developed with condominiums like Garfield Manor.

She stated she has lived at this address for 28 years and this proposal is not what the residents want. She hoped the Planning Commission will pay attention to the wishes of the people in the area.

Mr. Frank Lucido, 16635 Brookwood, Clinton Township, Michigan 48038, a resident in Garfield Manor Condominiums, agreed with some of his neighbors that low-rise condominiums would be acceptable. He stated he faces the subject property, and does not want to see it developed as a commercial use. He pointed out that the Burger King in the area closed, and so have some of the other businesses in the area. He felt the best option would be low-rise condominiums.

Ms. Gayle Savocchio, 16545 Dawn Drive, Clinton Township, Michigan 48038, a resident in Garfield Manor Condominiums, stated she would like to see a park on this property, and she felt the property should “stay green”. She explained she and her neighbors are concerned because they are in one-story condominiums, so if the property must be developed, they would like to see one-story condominiums to match the neighboring development. She complained that there would be three gas stations on four corners. She pointed out that the commercial shopping centers have a lot of vacancies, the Burger King is closed, ACO closed, and Kmart is not doing well and may close. She also noted the Black Market has changed hands several times, Checkers closed, and she did not feel any more commercial is needed in the area.

Ms. Taya Rondeau, 16625 Dawn Drive, Clinton Township, Michigan 48038, a resident in Garfield Manor Condominiums, stated she agrees with low-rise condominiums being developed on this site. She questioned whether the developer wants to build condominiums or apartments. She stated she lives in the second condominium from the vacant property, and she inquired as to whether the streets in the proposed development will connect with the streets in her development.

Ms. Moseley assured they will try to get as many answers as they can, but she cautioned they do not yet have a site development plan because this is a petition for a rezoning only. She advised that when they get to the point where a site plan is submitted, they can address some of these questions.

Ms. Rondeau questioned whether the residents will have another opportunity to come back and speak about the site plan.

Ms. Moseley assured they will have another opportunity when a site development plan is submitted.

Ms. Sandra Lantz, 41435 Kevin, Clinton Township, Michigan 48038, a resident of Macomb Village, stated her concern is the appearance of

constructing a large three-story building. She questioned how large the building will be, and how many people it will accommodate. She complained that it is very dangerous for her to turn out of her subdivision, and she questioned how much traffic will be generated with this development.

Ms. Karen Valenti, 16565 Dawn Drive, Clinton Township, Michigan 48038, a resident of Garfield Manor, questioned whether this will be one building or multiple buildings, and how they will get in and out. She questioned whether the access will be off Garfield, 18 Mile Road or both.

Ms. Moseley stated that, without having a site development plan, they cannot answer those questions. She assured the petitioner will answer the questions he can now.

Motion by Ms. West, supported by Mr. Spatafora, to close the public hearing. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – West, Spatafora, Charron, Deyak, DiBartolomeo, Moseley, Opalewski, Trombley. Nays – None. Absent – Brumbaugh. Motion carried.

Mr. Ponton stated he will try to address as many of the questions as possible. He added that he appreciated all the comments from the neighbors, and assured they want to be a good neighbor. He stated he wants to make sure everyone understands what is being proposed and how they arrived at this proposal. In looking at the property, he estimated that in 99% of communities, this parcel would be zoned commercial/retail. He showed an aerial, pointing out the developments in the area along Garfield, and stated that as planners and designers, it would appear as though commercial/retail and fast-food restaurants with drive-thru windows would make sense. He noted, however, that there are already a lot of vacancies in the area. The developer has been in Clinton Township for many years, and he could not envision putting up more retail on Garfield. He was concerned that they would only pull tenants from the other local shopping plazas so it would not help the area. He emphasized that the corner of 18 Mile and Garfield is a good parcel to rezone to commercial because no one would want to live right on the corner for safety and other reasons. Mr. Ponton pointed out the Master Plan also reflects commercial for the corner.

Mr. Ponton clarified it is not “high-rise” versus “low-rise”, so it is not based on the height of the building. He explained the current zoning district will allow a 35-foot-high building, and under the new zoning, they can still build something of that height. The rezoning allows them to have more people in the community. He clarified that they could build three-story apartments under the current zoning and would not need the rezoning, but they need to build more units and create a “community feel”. To build a quality development, they are seeking the rezoning so they can add density. He stated the good news is that the condominiums to the rear face north and south, so they do not face the subject property. He has

observed that, in each of the abutting condominiums, there are two small windows facing Garfield. He did not know what rooms offer these views, but he did not suspect they will have a negative impact. He stated they want to make sure this development is attractive to the surrounding properties. They are seeking a rezoning tonight and will have to come back with a site development plan.

Mr. Ponton explained that, regarding the proposed gas station, they are considering the new trend, which is to have a larger building that offers more to the community in the way of a convenience store. He felt that could force some of the smaller, older gas stations in the area to remodel their facilities and “up their game”. He reiterated tonight’s meeting is about the requested rezoning, and they would have to go through the Special Land Use and Site Development process if the rezoning is approved. He explained they cannot commit to any plans now because this is a process and they have a road ahead of them. He replied to inquiry that they have laid out a preliminary plan, and he explained they are looking at providing a 35-foot buffer between the proposed development and the abutting condominiums, and would like to avoid a huge cinder block wall by providing a buffer of evergreens, shade trees, shrubs and ornamental trees. At this point, they are looking at the possibility of three two-story buildings abutting the existing condominiums, and three additional buildings toward Garfield, with a center walkway. At the corner of Garfield and 18 Mile, there would be a 5,300-square-foot convenience store with fueling spaces.

Mr. Ponton addressed the question raised about access and he stated they will meet with the County Department of Roads to make sure they have a good understanding of the Access Management Plan. He assured that the proposed development would not be connected in any way to the abutting residential area, so there would be no interconnecting road, and access to and from the property will be from two access points along Garfield Road and two along 18 Mile Road. He claimed they have talked with the County, and they are agreeable to the Safe Management Access plan. He pointed out that even the proposed gas station and the proposed abutting apartments would be completely separated. Mr. Ponton reiterated these are not high-rise buildings, but will range from 30 to 32 feet in height, which is about the same height as any retail building, office building, or multiple-family residential low-density development, and he assured they will stay within the height requirements. Mr. Ponton addressed the resident’s suggestion about wanting to see a park on this corner, and he agreed that, although it would be nice, that will not happen. Mr. Ponton assured they are trying to bring a nice development to the area, and he explained that when the recession occurred, a lot more people started renting rather than buying, and it has changed the demand in the area. He was confident their proposal would be “their best bet” in terms of adding value to the area. He pointed out they are not proposing a 24-hour fast food restaurant or office building, but this will bring in residents of the community just like everyone else in the area.

Mr. Ponton reviewed the height requirement, noting that will not change between what they intend to build and the limit in the currently zoning district. They are avoiding the development of another retail center because of the vacancies in the existing centers. He referred to some concern about the corner being a gas station, but he reminded this is only in the preliminary stages at this point, so they are not sure, and they would have to come back before this Board to make that happen. Mr. Ponton explained that multi-family residential (high-density) would allow for the development of condominiums, apartments, townhomes, and the units could be sold or rented. He was confident there is a positive stigma associated with high-end apartments. He assured they will be providing all the required traffic studies to make sure there will be no negative impact on 18 Mile and Garfield Roads as part of the site development plan process, but he indicated it is too early for that now.

Ms. Moseley clarified that this is a courtesy to the residents with regard to discussing specifics of a plan at this time. Without seeing a plan, they do not know what is going in. She questioned how the Township can be assured that if they grant the rezoning, the petitioners will not change their minds and construct something that is much higher in height.

Mr. Ponton replied that he is confident they would be willing to agree to limit the height of the buildings as part of a Conditional Rezoning.

Ms. West inquired as to whether they are proposing apartments rather than condominiums due to conditions placed on loans from the bank. She noted that Mocer's high-density residential development at Partridge Creek is proposed as rentals because they claimed they were unable to get funding from the bank for condominiums.

Mr. Ponton replied that the buyer's credit is very solid so he does not believe the choice of apartments over condominiums is a funding issue. He felt it is tougher to get people to commit to long-term mortgages and purchase condominiums.

Ms. West could see the petitioners do not want low-density. She inquired as to how many apartments they are seeking to build.

Mr. Ponton replied they do not have a specific number in mind because they have not yet gone through floor plans. He replied to further inquiry that he anticipates the apartments will lease for \$1,100 for a one-bedroom unit, and \$1,500 for a two-bedroom unit.

Ms. West inquired as to whether some of the buildings will be three stories.

Mr. Ponton replied they do not know that yet because they have not yet designed the site development plan.

Ms. West stated the Mocerri development is absolutely gorgeous, and she pointed out the builder constructed a community building so the people living there know it is a community. She inquired as to whether the petitioner is planning to do something similar at the proposed location, and if not, she questioned what they plan to do to give this a “community feel”.

Mr. Ponton stated that, in their preliminary plans, they have created a courtyard with gardens, walkways, and units with balconies. He acknowledged they may have a leasing office and a community center, but he pointed out some apartment complexes have a community center and others do not. He assured they want to make sure this feels like a community.

Ms. West stated she hesitates to vote to rezone this parcel to high-density without knowing how many units they are going to put in. She added that she is leaning toward voting against this rezoning.

Mr. DiBartolomeo pointed out that the current RML zoning designation would permit three-story buildings, so he inquired as to why the petitioners cannot develop the property as zoned.

Mr. Ponton replied that, in looking at the amount of land and the ordinances, they are restricted as to what they could develop. He explained the number of units they could build on the property is what differentiates the districts, and the lower density would result in a much less quality product.

Mr. Santia replied to inquiry that a high-density zoning would permit a significantly higher building height.

Mr. Ponton assured they are not looking to raise the height, but they know that RML would not give them a density that would be sufficient for this property and its location.

Ms. West inquired as to how many units could be developed on this property.

Mr. Santia explained that RML permits about seven units per acre, whereas RMH would allow between ten to fifteen units per acre.

Mr. Joe Paluzzi, petitioner, felt everyone has brought up some good points. He explained that the portion of property proposed for high-density multiple-family is about seven acres, so they are somewhat limited in what they can do. He stated they must achieve economic feasibility but at the same time accommodate everyone. He noted they are a for-profit organization but they always want to do the right thing, and he stressed they have always done what they say they will do. He stated that the number of units they can develop will be dictated by the size of the property and the number of parking spaces they can provide, He emphasized that this is not “a Mocerri project” in terms of size, and although they

do not have a definitive number of units in mind at this time, there will not be 200 apartments fitting on this parcel. Mr. Paluzzi explained that in some communities, they have a “Planned Unit Development” (PUD) District, where the developer can go in and craft a project that is good for everyone. He stated he would like time to meet with Mr. Santia and his staff to come up with a Conditional Rezoning where they can set definitive agreed-upon items pursuant to the request they are seeking. If it is offered as a Conditional Rezoning, he stressed they will be held to anything that is on the plan. He is confident they will be able to satisfy the abutting neighbors. He admitted that change is not fun, and although a park would be beautiful, he did not anticipate that the Township is in a position to acquire the land and build a park on this corner. Mr. Paluzzi stated that the intersection of 18 Mile and Garfield is very busy, and constructing homes or apartments right at the corner would not make good sense. He is confident that they can all work together to come up with conditions for a rezoning that will make everyone proud of the development at 18 Mile and Garfield.

Ms. West stated she has tried to pull out of the driveway from Macomb Village and it is a nightmare. She stated that, without knowing how many units there would be on this property, she would have concerns and could not vote in favor of the rezoning as proposed.

Ms. Moseley felt Mr. Ponton brought up a good point about the abutting condominiums that are not facing the subject property but each have two small windows overlooking the property. She felt if the developer and his representative are willing to meet with the residents in the area, she felt that would be a good idea. She indicated if those are bedroom windows, possibly the developer would be able to look at coming up with a plan so they would not be looking at the back of a building.

Mr. Paluzzi agreed with the idea of meeting with the residents. He explained they currently have a conceptual layout to accommodate the ordinance, but they would like to meet with the residents and go through their concerns raised this evening, as well as other concerns that may come up as they enter discussions. He admitted they do not have definite answers to some of the questions raised this evening, but they do have a vision, and they would like to work together with the Township and the community.

Ms. Trombley commended the developer on doing a nice job on his projects, but she admitted she is not a fan of apartments. She noted they have indicated that the RML zoning designation will not work for them, but she inquired as to what they are looking at to make the project feasible for them.

Mr. Paluzzi replied the first thing they look at is hard data. They looked at what is available in the way of apartments in the community, and he claimed there are waiting lists of 150+ to get into apartments in this area. A lot of people are not interested in going north of M-59, and they are intimidated by some of the larger

complexes, which is why they are proposing this smaller apartment development. He clarified that they do not know how many units they can work out on this property, but he anticipates it will be between 90 and 140 units.

Ms. Trombley inquired as to whether the petitioner would consider limiting the buildings to a maximum of two stories.

Mr. Paluzzi stated they are limited with architectural design. With three stories, they can become creative with the elevation, similar to Moceri's development, which is higher than 30 feet. He pointed out that there are single-family homes that can be 45 feet in height. Mr. Paluzzi replied to inquiry that they anticipate the apartments would range in size from 950 to 1400 square feet, because that is what is in demand, and the two-bedroom units would have two master suites to meet the demand of the marketplace. He assured they are not talking about the development of public-subsidized units, and he assured this is a high-end market.

Mr. Charron inquired as to the height of the senior housing developments on Partridge Creek Boulevard.

Mr. Santia did not recall the exact height, but he estimated they are between 40 to 45 feet in height.

Mr. Paluzzi estimated those developments are closer to 50 feet in height.

Mr. Charron commended Mr. Santia and the Planning Department in working with the developers of those buildings, as well as the residents in the area, to make sure everyone was satisfied. He stated there is a front and a back, but they did a great job of maintaining an attractive appearance on all sides.

Mr. Paluzzi stated when this property first became available on the market, he was excited because he has been in this area for a long time, and development many of the houses east of Garfield. He explained when they first put the property under contract, he was looking at developing it with commercial; however, he was proven wrong by the data. He stated that up and down Garfield, the commercial developments are oversaturated with numerous vacancies. He felt this is a fresh approach that will be an asset to the community.

Mr. Spatafora appreciated everyone's comments, and he indicated many of his questions have already been answered. He understood that there will be more steps in the future, including the drafting of a site development plan, but he felt with the number of units anticipated, there will be a lot of open space parking. He inquired as to whether the petitioner or his representative conceptualize these high-end apartments having closed garages.

Mr. Paluzzi replied they will not have closed garages. If closed garages were included, market studies indicate they would have to be attached, and that would result in a completely different product. He added that they are considering covered carports. He pointed out the ordinance determines the amount of parking they will have to provide.

Mr. Spatafora inquired as to whether they could achieve the density they need if they developed some type of units with garages.

Mr. Paluzzi replied they would not be able to arrive at the density they need if garages are provided.

Motion by Ms. West, supported by Mr. Opalewski, with reference to File #17-6772 and application from Mr. Frank Arcori and Mr. Joe Paluzzi, Verus Development Group, 28454 Woodward Avenue, Royal Oak, Michigan 48067, as represented by Mr. Tim Ponton and Mr. Michael Pannell, Stonefield Engineering and Design, LLC, same address, concerning the proposed rezoning of 9.71 acres of land located at the northwest corner of 18 Mile and Garfield Roads (Section 7) from RML Multiple-Family Residential (Low-Density) to B-3 General Business (Parcel "A" – 2.59 acres) and to RMH Multiple-Family Residential (High-Density) (Parcel "B" – 7.11 acres), that further consideration of this matter be postponed to give the petitioners and their representatives an opportunity to follow up on their desire to submit a plan to be considered for Conditional Rezoning. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – West, Opalewski, Charron, Deyak, DiBartolomeo, Moseley, Spatafora, Trombley. Nays – None. Absent – Brumbaugh. Motion carried.

Ms. Moseley explained what the term "conditional rezoning" means, indicating the petitioners and their representatives will sit down and come up with a site development plan for a project. They will come back and request the rezoning based on that specific plan. If it is approved, they will be held to that plan. She indicated that the residents will be able to see exactly what is being proposed. She hoped the neighbors will have discussion with the developers and let them know what they like and do not like. She reminded that the owners of the subject property have the right to develop that property so it will not remain a green space.

Ms. Barbara Hering stated she is president of their condominium association and she would be willing to meet with the developers, along with representation from their association's management company. She exchanged contact information with the petitioner and his representative.

PART OF 1.925 ACRES OF LAND FRONTING THE EAST LINE OF HAYES ROAD, SOUTH OF AMORE DRIVE, ADDRESSED AS 40120 HAYES ROAD (SECTION 18)

- **SPECIAL LAND USE: A THERAPEUTIC MASSAGE FACILITY IN THE B-2 NEIGHBORHOOD BUSINESS DISTRICT (HEALTHY SPA INC. @ COUNTRYSIDE PLAZA, FKA NEW LAKESIDE SPA)**
 - **PUBLIC HEARING**
FILE #17-0550: PETITIONED BY MS. LIAN-YU PIAO
REPRESENTED BY MS. STEPHANIE RUEY-YEH MANN, INTERPRETER
-

Ms. Trombley read the letter into the record dated August 14th, 2017 from the Assistant Director of the Department of Planning and Community Development. She advised that notice of this item on tonight's agenda was mailed to 82 owners and/or occupants located within 300 feet of the land in question, with 16 of those returned as undeliverable.

Ms. Stephanie Mann, 31732 Mayfair Lane, Beverly Hills, Michigan 48025, stated she is serving as Ms. Lian-Yu Piao's interpreter because Ms. Piao speaks very limited English.

Motion by Ms. West, supported by Mr. Opalewski, to open the public hearing. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – West, Opalewski, Charron, Deyak, DiBartolomeo, Moseley, Spatafora, Trombley. Nays – None. Absent – Brumbaugh. Motion carried.

There were no comments from the audience.

Motion by Mr. DiBartolomeo, supported by Mr. Deyak, to close the public hearing. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – DiBartolomeo, Deyak, Charron, Moseley, Opalewski, Spatafora, West, Trombley. Nays – None. Absent – Brumbaugh. Motion carried.

Mr. Charron stated he is looking at the sketch provided, and he inquired as to whether customers will enter by the bathroom.

Ms. Piao, relaying all answers through Ms. Mann, replied that is not a bathroom but it is a closet by the front entrance.

Mr. Charron inquired as to whether there will be a reception area.

Ms. Mann relayed that there will be a counter.

Ms. West inquired as to how many employees Ms. Piao will have.

Ms. Mann relayed that Ms. Piao intends to hire a receptionist, and additional employees will be based on how the business does.

Mr. Spatafora inquired as to whether Ms. Piao owns the building or whether she has an impending lease.

Ms. Mann relayed that Ms. Piao is renting this space.

Mr. Spatafora inquired as to whether Ms. Piao intends to do any interior renovations if she receives Special Land Use approval.

Ms. Mann relayed that there is no need for renovations and it will remain the same as it is currently. She added it is not occupied at this time.

Mr. Spatafora inquired as to whether the rooms are already there.

Ms. Mann replied on behalf of Ms. Piao that this was previously used as a massage therapy facility, but she does not know when it was last occupied. She indicated she took it over from the previous owner.

Mr. Spatafora questioned whether Ms. Piao has all of the required licenses to run this massage therapy studio.

Ms. Mann replied on behalf of Ms. Piao that she has her massage license and is currently waiting on approval for the Special Land Use.

Mr. Spatafora inquired as to the proposed hours of operation for the business.

Ms. Piao responded through Ms. Mann that she intends to be open every day from 9 a.m. to 9 p.m., but they will be closed on holidays.

Mr. Spatafora inquired as to whether Ms. Piao has any other locations in the Township or in this area.

Ms. Mann replied on behalf of Ms. Piao that she has no other locations. She replied to further inquiry that she lives on Hazelwood Drive in Sterling Heights.

Ms. Moseley inquired as to whether Ms. Piao intends to hire a receptionist who is bilingual.

Ms. Mann replied on behalf of Ms. Piao that her intent is to hire a bilingual receptionist.

Motion by Ms. West, supported by Mr. Charron, with reference to File #17-0550 and application from Ms. Lian-Yu Piao, 41365 Hazelwood Drive, Sterling Heights, Michigan 48313, as represented by her interpreter, Ms. Stephanie Ruey-Yeh Mann, 31732 Mayfair Lane, Beverly Hills, Michigan 48025, concerning the proposed Special Land Use for a therapeutic massage facility in the B-2 Community Business District (Healthy Spa Inc. @ Countryside Plaza, fka New Lakeside Spa), located on part of 1.925 acres of land fronting the east line of Hayes Road, south of Amore Drive, addressed as 40120 Hayes (Section 18), that recommendation be forwarded to the Clinton Township Board for approval of

the Special Land Use as requested. Roll Call: Ayes – West, Charron, Deyak, DiBartolomeo, Moseley, Opalewski, Spatafora, Trombley. Nays – None. Absent – Brumbaugh. Motion carried.

Ms. Moseley stated that the Planning Commission is a recommending body, and this recommendation will be forwarded to the Township Board for their final consideration at their September 12th, 2017 meeting. She advised that the petitioner and her interpreter will need to be present at that meeting.

PART OF 11.376 ACRES OF LAND LOCATED AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF ROMEO PLANK AND CANAL ROADS, ADDRESSED AS 41300 ROMEO PLANK ROAD (SECTION 9)

- **SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN: ST. PAUL OF TARSUS CATHOLIC PARISH EXPANSION**
 - **REQUEST FOR RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL**
FILE #17-3538: PETITIONED BY MR. GEORGE EICHORN,
ST. PAUL OF TARSUS PARISH
REPRESENTED BY MR. RONALD A. CIESLAK,
MERRITT CIESLAK DESIGN, PLC
-

This item was deleted from tonight's agenda.

3.0 ACRES OF VACANT LAND FRONTING THE EAST LINE OF GARFIELD ROAD, NORTH OF CANAL ROAD (SECTION 8) (PARCEL 16-11-08-151-005)

- **SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN: AHI GARFIELD SENIOR (A SENIOR LIVING FACILITY)**
 - **REQUEST FOR RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL**
FILE #17-6707: PETITIONED BY MR. ROBERT ASMAR,
GARFIELD VENTURES, LLC
REPRESENTED BY MR. JAMES P. BUTLER, P.E., OF PEA, INC.
-

Ms. Trombley read the letter into the record dated August 14th, 2017 from the Assistant Director of the Department of Planning and Community Development. She advised that notice of this item on tonight's agenda was mailed to 549 owners and/or occupants located within 300 feet of the land in question, with 32 of those returned as undeliverable. She indicated there was one letter of objection received and read that letter from Ms. Edda Siano, 42035 Toddmark Lane, Clinton Township, Michigan 48038.

Ms. Becky Klein, on behalf of PEA, Inc., explained they are here to present an upscale addition facility. She indicated the ordinance requires an additional six trees and they have no objection to adding these six trees along the road frontage.

Mr. Charron inquired as to the height of the building.

Ms. Klein replied the proposed building will be four stories, totaling 51 feet 9 inches in height.

Mr. Charron inquired as to the distance of the building to Garfield.

Ms. Klein replied that, per ordinance, the building would be required to be a distance of at least 51 feet 9 inches, which is the height of the building; however, it will be set back 97 feet.

Mr. Charron inquired as to whether they intend to plant greenery along Garfield.

Ms. Klein replied there is some greenery shown on the site development plan, but the greenbelt does not show the trees. The Township has requested the addition of six street trees, and she assured those will be added to their plan.

Mr. Charron inquired as to how many residents can be accommodated at this facility.

Ms. Klein replied they intend to have 90 residents. She replied to further inquiry that 55 parking spaces are required, and they are providing 60 parking spaces, with four of those being handicap-accessible. She replied to still further inquiry that they do not anticipate any problems with parking, and their numbers are based on predicted models, noting that not all of their residents drive.

Mr. Charron inquired as to what they will do if all of their residents drive. He expressed concern that they could have the need for 90 parking spaces, and that does not count spaces for visitors and employees.

Mr. Santia confirmed that the ordinance requirements relating to parking for this type of a facility have been met. He explained they have the potential to add more parking in the event these are converted to regular apartments. He noted that parking requirements for seniors only apartments are established based on national standards.

Mr. Charron disagreed with the requirements, and he assured that, while the petitioner did nothing wrong, he is still opposed to so few parking spaces for so many units.

Ms. Klein explained that typically, the types of residents who move into these facilities need assistance and no longer drive a vehicle. She replied to inquiry that there are 14 employees, and there are two twelve-hour shifts per day.

Mr. Deyak inquired as to the type of senior facility being proposed.

Mr. Robert Asmar, petitioner, replied to inquiry that it is for seniors ages 65 and older, and is considered “assisted living”.

Mr. Deyak noted there is different licensing required for independent living, assisted living and nursing home. He asked once again which category this falls in.

Mr. Asmar replied it is in between. He noted they have 16 facilities and they have been in business for over forty years.

Mr. Santia clarified they are classified as “senior apartments” and are neither assisted or independent. It is housing for those 65 years of age and older.

Mr. Deyak requested a comparison to another development in the Township that would be similar. He inquired as to whether The Gardens of Clinton would be similar.

Mr. Santia compared it to Heritage Estates. He explained that this place would provide amenities such as dining rooms, so residents could be assisted if they wanted their meals prepared; however, it is intended to be for those seniors who can take care of themselves.

Mr. Asmar stated they provide services such as cleaning, bathing, etc. He replied to further inquiry that they will be licensed by the State of Michigan, and the management company is licensed to operate this facility.

Mr. Santia explained that Mr. Asmar is the owner of this development.

Ms. Trombley inquired as to whether they have a general dining room.

Mr. Asmar replied that there will be a general dining room but they can eat in their own units if they are not well enough to go down to the dining room or if they choose to stay in their own room. He explained this is a service that is offered over and above the housing alone.

Mr. DiBartolomeo questioned whether this is considered “independent living”, with the management staff licensed so if the residents want an extra service, they can pay the management staff for that service or they can do it on their own. He questioned whether the management staff will manage the building 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, and the residents pay extra fees for what they need.

Mr. Asmar replied affirmatively to Mr. DiBartolomeo’s questions.

Ms. West inquired as to whether there will be medical staff on site to give the residents their medications.

Mr. Asmar replied they offer these extra services for additional fees.

Ms. West inquired as to who is administering the medications and whether they are registered nurses. She stated she does not feel comfortable approving this tonight without hearing from the management company.

Mr. Santia clarified these are senior apartments only. The residents are provided additional amenities if they want them, and there is a fee for these additional services. He stated if they want someone to bring them their medications, they have to contract with a home health care service to come in and administer their medications.

Mr. DiBartolomeo stated his mother lives in the senior apartments adjacent to Penna's in Sterling Heights, where there is a management company there 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. If they want or need additional services, the management company provides for that. Any type of medical care, including the dispensing of medications, has to be contracted by the senior through an in-home care agency. He emphasized this is not a medical care facility like a nursing home. He cited American House, where they offer this same independent senior living, but they also have wings for nursing care and assisted living.

Mr. Asmar explained there will be a dining room, as well as other amenities if the residents are not able to cook for themselves.

Mr. Spatafora stated the detailed plans show the building elevations. He inquired as to the color of the brick.

Mr. Asmar replied to inquiry he does not have photos to show of the specific colors, but he intends to use earth tone colors with brick and synthetic materials.

Ms. Klein stated they will have some siding with a wood look, and that material will be pre-finished.

Mr. Spatafora inquired as to the colors of the rails in front. He stated he is trying to visualize the building.

Mr. Asmar replied he anticipates they will be beige rails with earth tone accents.

Mr. Spatafora inquired as to whether Mr. Asmar has thought about the color of the shingles.

Mr. Charron questioned whether there is a color rendering of the building elevations.

Mr. DiBartolomeo agreed with his colleagues that there are some concerns. He clarified that it is not because they do not want to go forward with this, but he suggested postponing this to have the management company come in and answer questions for those Planning Commission members who have concerns. It would also give the petitioner an opportunity to submit colored renderings of the building.

Motion by Mr. DiBartolomeo, supported by Mr. Spatafora, with reference to File #16-6707 and application from Mr. Robert Asmar, Garfield Ventures, LLC, 32825 Northwestern Highway, Farmington Hills, Michigan 48334, as represented by Mr. James P. Butler, PE, of PEA, Inc., 2430 Rochester Court, Suite 100, Troy, Michigan 48083, concerning the proposed site development plan for AHI Garfield Senior (a senior living facility) to be located on 3.0 acres of vacant land fronting the east line of Garfield Road, north of Canal Road (Section 8), referred to as Parcel 16-11-08-151-005, that further consideration of this request be postponed to the next Planning Commission meeting so the petitioner can bring in a representative of the management company for the proposed facility, as well as provide color renderings of the building elevations. Discussion ensued.

Mr. Asmar pointed out that they have complied with all ordinance requirements and he could not understand why this matter has to be postponed.

Mr. Spatafora questioned whether Mr. Asmar would be within his right to proceed to the Board without recommendation for approval or denial.

Mr. Santia did not know why a denial would be considered when it meets all requirements of the Township ordinances.

Mr. Spatafora understood that it meets ordinance requirements but he would like to see a color scheme and color renderings of the building.

Mr. Santia replied the petitioners typically do not provide colors. They provide building elevations but they are not required to be in color. The ordinance does not require architectural features to be spelled out specifically when considering site plan approval. He explained if this was a special land use or a conditional rezoning where it is being dealt with at a different level, the colored renderings may be something that could be requested. He stated the Planning Department was satisfied that all of the ordinance requirements have been met.

Mr. Charron indicated he would be willing to make a motion to recommend approval; however, he cautioned the petitioner that he may want to bring a representative from the management company, along with building elevations in color, to the Township Board meeting in the event the Board members have questions.

Mr. DiBartolomeo withdrew his motion to postpone, and Mr. Spatafora withdrew his support.

Motion by Mr. Charron, supported by Mr. DiBartolomeo, with reference to File #16-6707 and application from Mr. Robert Asmar, Garfield Ventures, LLC, 32825 Northwestern Highway, Farmington Hills, Michigan 48334, as represented by Mr. James P. Butler, PE, of PEA, Inc., 2430 Rochester Court, Suite 100, Troy, Michigan 48083, concerning the proposed site development plan for AHI Garfield Senior (a senior living facility) to be located on 3.0 acres of vacant land fronting the east line of Garfield Road, north of Canal Road (Section 8), referred to as Parcel 16-11-08-151-005, that, based upon the Planning Department's recommendation that all ordinances have been met, recommendation be forwarded to the Clinton Township Board for approval of the site development plan as submitted. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Charron, DiBartolomeo, Moseley, Opalewski, Spatafora, Trombley. Nays – Deyak, West. Absent – Brumbaugh. Motion carried.

Ms. Moseley stated that the Planning Commission is a recommending body, and this recommendation will be forwarded to the Township Board for their final consideration at their September 12th, 2017 meeting. She advised that the petitioner will need to submit 24 copies of the plan to the Planning Department prior to Friday, September 1st in order to be placed on that agenda.

REPORT OF MEETING

-- APPROVAL OF THE AUGUST 10TH, 2017 REPORT

Motion by Ms. West, supported by Mr. Opalewski, to approve the report of the August 10th, 2017 Planning Commission Meeting, as submitted. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – West, Opalewski, Charron, Deyak, DiBartolomeo, Moseley. Nays – None. Abstain – Spatafora. Absent – Brumbaugh. Motion carried.

PLANNING COMMISSION SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS

-- NEXT MEETING SCHEDULED FOR THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 14TH, 2017

Mr. Santia confirmed that there will be a meeting on September 14th, 2017 with the following items on the agenda:

- Text amendments with regard to driveway width changes to the Accessory Structures section, and changes to Porches and Decks section.
- Rezoning for the purpose of providing a drive-thru window at the former Palm Palace site. They are proposing to rezone from B-2 to B-3, and he advised that they are interested in submitting a Conditional Rezoning to B-2 that would still allow the drive-thru while still maintaining the B-2 uses rather than the higher-intensity B-3 uses.

- Site Development Plan for Cooper’s Hawk Winery and Restaurant, to be located at The Mall at Partridge Creek.
- Site Development Plan for modification of the drive-thru at McDonald’s, located on Groesbeck, north of 15 Mile Road.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Ms. West, supported by Mr. Deyak, to adjourn the meeting. Motion carried. Meeting adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Denise C. Trombley

Denise C. Trombley, Secretary
CLINTON TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION

ces:08/30/17

ces:09/01/17

Approved 09/14/17