

Conditions

1. *Address all applicable comments from other City departments and outside agency review letters, prior to final approval by staff.*
2. *Provide a landscape cost estimate for landscaping and irrigation, plus inspection fees, as adjusted as necessary by staff in the amount of \$39,220.00, and posting of bond prior to temporary grade certification being issued by Engineering.*
3. *That the entrance of unit five that currently faces Tienken be turned to the west side of the building to face the alley, prior to final approval by staff.*
4. *Staff to review the plantings in the alleyway and by the building to the north to recommend a species more feasible to growing in the shade, prior to final approval.*

A motion was made by Kaltsounis, seconded by Hooper, that this matter be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 6 - Dettloff, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Bowyer, Weaver and Neubauer

Nay 2 - Brnabic and Gaber

Excused 1 - Reece

After each motion, Chairperson Brnabic stated for the record that the motion had passed six to two. Mr. Berent thanked the Commissioners, and said that they listened to the concerns. They wanted the project to succeed more than anyone. He would look into the landscaping; they were working with Don Westphal, who would work with staff. Mr. Dettloff thanked them for their investment.

2020-0133

Public Hearing and request for a Wetland Use Permit Recommendation - City File No. 19-026 - for impacts up to approximately 5,471 s.f. for construction activities associated with Hamlin Outdoor Storage, a proposed recreational vehicle storage facility on 9.7 acres located on the north side of Hamlin between John R and Dequindre, zoned I Industrial, Parcel No. 15-24-326-004, Michael Klieman, Wiegand Development, Applicant

(Reference: Staff Report prepared by Kristen Kapelanski, dated April 16, 2020, Site plans and landscape plans had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)

Present for the applicant were Michael Klieman, Wiegand Development,

37580 Mound Rd., Sterling Heights, MI 48310 and Lori Shink, Shink Engineering, 4146 Pine Grove Rd., Fort Gratiot, MI 48059.

Ms. Kapelanski advised that the applicant was proposing an outdoor storage facility for recreational vehicles on Hamlin east of John R. There were no structures proposed. The site was zoned Industrial, which permitted the intended use. In order to provide the required screening, the applicant had shown a berm surrounding the parking area along with associated landscaping. The site was subject to the previous version of the Tree Conservation Ordinance, and 171 trees were being removed and replaced on site and with payment into the City's Tree Fund. She noted that there were three wetlands on site, and a Wetland Use Permit was required for impacts. The areas to be impacted were of low ecological value, and approval of the Permit and a Natural Features Setback Modification was recommended by the City's environmental consultant, ASTI. All staff recommended approval, subject to some minor modifications.

Mr. Klieman introduced himself and said that Wiegand was a family business that had been in business since 1969. They had owned the subject site for quite a while, and it was somewhat of a challenge to find a suitable use for it, especially since there was a landfill directly to the north. They decided on the storage facility, and felt that it would be good for the area. He said that they were available for questions.

Mr. Hooper asked what type of vehicles would be stored. Mr. Klieman said that it would vary from boats to campers. Mr. Hooper asked the maximum height of a vehicle, and Mr. Klieman said he believed that nothing would be over 13.5 feet. Mr. Hooper believed that was a little high and that it would be closer to 12 feet. He said that screening would be needed for 12 feet, and Ms. Kapelanski agreed that there was a berm and plantings. Mr. Hooper had reviewed the cross section for the berm provided, and it appeared that the berm was measured from the inside, which showed a four-foot, four-inch berm screening. He had observed that they would be adding about three feet of fill over the entire site, and with the 4.4 foot berm with plantings, that would not provide an opaque screen. Even though they were adding ten-foot evergreens, it would be seven to eight years before they filled in to make an opaque screen. He suggested that they would either have to add a lot more trees or raise the berm. He indicated that he was not concerned about screening from the landfill to the north. He pointed out that for the 280-foot berm on the south, there were only 30 or 32 trees proposed, and with only a four-foot berm, everything parked would be able to be seen.

Mr. Klieman thought that the plans showed a six-foot berm, although he could make it as tall as they would like. He suggested that there were a lot of plantings by the landfill that they could move to the front. Ms. Kapelanski suggested that Ms. Shink could explain more about the berm cross section.

Ms. Shink said that the cross section showed an average height of six feet for the berm. It was 4.27 feet on the parking lot side and 7.73 on the external portion. Ms. Kapelanski asked if the taller portion of the berm would face Hamlin Rd., which Ms. Shink confirmed. Mr. Hooper reiterated that with the site raised and the berm and plantings proposed, people would be able to see the vehicles when driving down the road. Ms. Shink suggested that she could do some line of site drawings to see if they should make the berm taller. She maintained that they could not lower the site.

Dr. Bowyer asked if there would be an irrigation plan for the berm, and if there would be a plan for replacing trees if they died. She indicated that trees planted on berms died a lot of times. Mr. Klieman believed that there was a note on the plan about an irrigation system, and he assured that if a tree died that it would be replaced.

Mr. Kaltsounis noted that the berm was about 45 feet wide. Ms. Shink said that there was a one-on-three slope required. Mr. Gaber pointed out that there were details of the berm on the landscape plan. Ms. Shink said that there was a four-foot top on the berm. Mr. Kaltsounis said that he agreed with Mr. Hooper that if they were raising the site, the screening would need to be higher. He asked the size of the root ball of the trees to be installed, and Ms. Shink advised that they would be 24-inches. Mr. Kaltsounis said that he would like the cross section revised and made to scale. Ms. Shink explained that for a vertical scale, one-inch equaled 4 feet, and the horizontal scale was one-inch equaled 40 feet. She asked if he wanted a one-on-one.

Mr. Gaber said that he agreed with Mr. Hooper that a taller screen would be needed, whether it was a taller berm or denser landscape plantings on top. He thought that the matter should be postponed so that line of sight drawings could be submitted showing what the screening would look like on all sides to someone driving or walking by.

Mr. Dettloff also agreed with the screening comments. He had noticed that there would be two employees on site, which would be accessible

24/7. He asked what the employees' roles would be. Mr. Klieman said that they would be his children, and they would act as operators of the site. There would be a key card or biometric entrance through the gate for 24-hour availability. Mr. Dettloff asked if there would be cameras, which Mr. Klieman confirmed, and he added that the site would be lit. He mentioned that the storage facility a few lots down had a six-foot fence, and half of the vehicles could be seen. He agreed that the berm could be raised, although he did not want it to look too out of place.

Mr. Weaver also believed that additional screening would be needed, although he did not think it would be as bad as people thought. He pointed out that there were trees by the walkway closer to the road, as well. He said that he would rather see larger plant material on the berm rather than making the berm taller. It would dry out quicker the higher out of the ground it was. An irrigation system would help, but not during the chilling winds of winter. He suggested larger plant stock, at least along the southern edge and around the corners a bit. He felt that would help more than increasing the height of the berm. He agreed with Mr. Kaltsounis that the sketch on the landscape plan did not match the cross section provided, mainly because the three-on-one and one-on-three were flipped, so he would also like to see a revised drawing showing a one-on-one vertical scale to match the horizontal scale. He asked if any landscaping was proposed around the detention pond.

Mr. Klieman said that there was a lot of existing foliage they were not planning to cut, and it was very full from the roadway to the walking path. He offered that they could add plantings or extend the berm in front of the basin. Mr. Weaver asked how far the berm was from the edge of Hamlin Rd. Mr. Klieman said that the berm was on the other side of the fence, which was relatively new (the fence). He suggested that it could be painted black - there would be no slats put in it. Mr. Weaver asked the grade difference from the walking path to the roadway. Ms. Shink said that it was pretty flat there. Mr. Klieman said that it was a minimum of 60 feet from the road to the fence. Ms. Kapelanski agreed that some plantings could be added between the basin and Hamlin.

Hearing no further discussion, Mr. Hooper moved to postpone.

MOTION by Hooper, seconded by Kaltsounis, in the matter of City File No. 19-026 (Hamlin Outdoor Storage), the Planning Commission hereby postpones until the next available meeting the requests for a Wetland Use Permit, Tree Removal Permit, Natural Features Setback Modification and Site Plan Approval until the applicant can provide line of

site drawings from either direction on Hamlin showing the parked, typical 12-foot RV vehicles with additional landscaping or the berm raised to form an appropriate opaque screen on the southern western and eastern sides; provide gate details at the entrance and how it would look on either end of the berm; provide berm details that show the horizontal and vertical scales matching; provide detention pond plantings between the basin and Hamlin; and provide photos of the existing screening.

Chairperson Brnabic opened the Public Hearing for the Wetland Use Permit at 9:44 p.m. Seeing no one wishing to speak and confirming that no correspondence had been received and no one was present in the Auditorium, she closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Kaltsounis suggested getting Forestry involved to make sure that the trees would work on the berm. He clarified that the irrigation plan would be submitted prior to final approval. Ms. Shink stated that they did follow the City's Ordinance for landscaping, and the number of trees proposed were in compliance with the Ordinance.

A motion was made by Hooper, seconded by Kaltsounis, that this matter be Postponed. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 8 - Brnabic, Dettloff, Gaber, Hooper, Kaltsounis, Bowyer, Weaver and Neubauer

Excused 1 - Reece

2020-0132

Request for a Tree Removal Permit - City File No. 19-026 - for the removal and replacement of as many as 171 trees for Hamlin Outdoor Storage, a proposed recreational vehicle storage facility on 9.7 acres located on the north side of Hamlin, between John R and Dequindre, zoned I Industrial, Parcel No. 15-24-326-004, Michael Klieman, Wiegand Development, Applicant

Postponed

2020-0134

Request for a Natural Features Setback Modification - City File No. 19-026 - for impacts up to 424 linear feet associated with construction activities for Hamlin Outdoor Storage, a proposed recreational vehicle storage facility on 9.7 acres located on the north side of Hamlin between John R and Dequindre, zoned I Industrial, Parcel No. 15-24-326-004, Michael Klieman, Wiegand Development, Applicant

Postponed

2020-0135

Request for Site Plan Approval - City File No. 19-026 - Hamlin Outdoor Storage,

a proposed recreational vehicle storage facility on 9.7 acres located on the north side of Hamlin between John R and Dequindre, zoned I Industrial, Parcel No. 15-24-326-004, Michael Klieman, Wiegand Development, Applicant

Postponed

2020-0129

Request for a Tree Removal Permit - City File No. 20-003 - for the removal and replacement of as many as 51 trees for Auburn Pharmaceuticals, a proposed 65,000 s.f. office/warehouse facility on 9.6 acres located west of Livernois, south of Avon, zoned REC-W Regional Employment Center, Parcel No. 15-21-276-014, Teresa Bruce, General Development, Applicant

(Reference: Staff Report prepared by Kristen Kapelanski, dated March 12, 2020, Site Plans and Elevations had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof).

Present for the applicant were Teresa Bruce and Bruce Brickman, General Development, Two Towne Square, Suite 850, Southfield, MI 48076.

Mr. Brickman stated that they were present seeing approval for Auburn Pharmaceuticals, a 65,000 s.f. pharmaceutical distribution company off of Rochester Industrial Dr. He said that the project had been approved by all staff, and they had met all zoning, planning and engineering requirements, and they were present to get approval.

Ms. Kapelanski added that the site was zoned REC-W, and the proposed use was permitted in the district. As Mr. Brickman had mentioned, she agreed that the plans were in compliance with the Zoning Ordinance requirements. She noted that the applicant was requesting a waiver to use the existing vegetation along the northern property line for the buffer, which staff supported. She had recommended minimal use of the metal panels on the façade and perhaps some introduction of more color variation, noting that the elevations did meet the architectural guidelines. There were existing wetlands on site that would not be affected, but the applicant was requesting a Natural Features Setback Modification, for which ASTI had recommended approval. The site was under the new Tree Conservation Ordinance, and the applicant had met the required standards for the removal and replacement of 51 trees. She mentioned that staff and the Planning Commission had received emails from the Friends of the Clinton River Trail posing several questions regarding the development. A connection to the Trail had not been proposed, and the applicant was maintaining the buffer along the Trail. The plans indicated a gravel access drive for detention basin maintenance between the proposed basins near the Trail, but the access drive would not connect to