

**CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF VAN BUREN
PLANNING COMMISSION
JULY 26, 2017
MINUTES**

Vice Chairperson Boynton called the meeting to order at 7:35 p.m.

ROLL CALL:

Present: Franzoi, Budd, Atchinson, Kelley and Boynton.

Excused: Thompson.

Staff: Director Akers and Secretary Harman.

Planning Representatives: McKenna Associate, Patrick Sloan and Fishbeck Associate, David Potter.

Audience: Five (5).

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

Motion Atchinson, Kelley second to approve the agenda of July 26, 2017 as presented.

Motion Carried.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Motion Kelley, Atchinson second to approve the regular meeting minutes of June 28, 2017 as presented. Motion Carried.

Director Akers introduced David Potter of Fishbeck, Thompson, Carr & Huber, Inc. (Fishbeck).

NEW BUSINESS:

ITEM # 1 17-023 – PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN APPROVAL

TITLE: THE APPLICANT, SMITH GROUP JJR, IS REQUESTING PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN APPROVAL TO BUILD A FOUR (4) STORY OFFICE/LABORATORY BUILDING AT THE GRACE LAKE CORPORATE CENTER LOCATED AT 1 VILLAGE CENTER DRIVE, VAN BUREN TOWNSHIP, MI 48111.

LOCATION: PARCEL NUMBER V125-83-045-99-0020-705, ADDRESS: 1 VILLAGE CENTER DRIVE. THE DEVELOPMENT IS LOCATED BETWEEN ECORSE ROAD AND TYLER ROAD AND BETWEEN HANNAN ROAD AND I-275.

Patrick Westerlund of Smith Group JJR gave the presentation. Mr. Westerlund displayed the preliminary site plan and discussed the location of the proposed building on the west side of Grace Lake. He also discussed the desire to keep the pedestrian flow by extending the existing walkway, minor changes to the existing parking lot to include a drop off zone, the addition of an overlook on the west side of the lake and displayed samples of the exterior façade materials.

Patrick Sloan of McKenna Associates presented his review letter dated 7-21-17 recommending preliminary site plan approval subject to the following conditions:

1. The total areas and tax identification numbers must be included on the site plan.
2. Setback dimensions must be included on the plans to ensure compliance.
3. That the number and dimensions of parking spaces shown on the plans be approved based on previous site plan approvals, as well as the unique nature of the scale and the variety of uses on the site.

4. The applicant shall clarify the interior landscaping and add at least one tree to any island that does not have a tree or light pole.
5. The landscaping calculations reflect what is required and what is provided for interior landscaping.
6. Any replacement trees must be clearly labeled on the landscape plan and are in addition to the required landscape trees.
7. The light poles proposed for relocation and their proposed location must be shown, as it is unclear from the site plan.
8. That any new signs, other than wayfinding signage within the site, must be included on the site plan.

Fishbeck Associate, David Potter, presented his review letter dated 7-21-17 recommending the Planning Commission grant preliminary site plan approval subject to the following conditions:

1. A revised BOD be submitted for the Grace Lake Corporate Center Water System master plan, based up on the current Master Site Plan expansions.
2. A revised BOD be submitted for the Grace Lake Corporate Center Sanitary Sewer master plan, based upon the current Master Site Plan expansions.
3. An overland flow route be identified for Grace Lake and the overland flow route be coordinated with future development to preserve the overland flow route to a positive outlet.
4. It should be noted that while the existing access is through Lake Shore Drive, it will be necessary for the Developer to revise the traffic study for the Grace Lake Corporate Center transportation plan, based upon the current Master Site Plan expansions.

Director Akers presented the Fire Department review letter dated 7-26-17 recommending approval. The applicant agreed to the conditions presented in the planning, fire and engineering reviews. Commissioners inquired if the Building B is a spec building, the applicant does not have tenants lined up yet. No comments from the audience.

Motion Kelley, Budd second to grant Smith Group JJR preliminary site plan approval to build a four (4) story office/laboratory building at the Grace Lake Corporate Center located at 1 Village Center Drive based on the analysis and conditions in the McKenna Associates review letter dated 7-21-17, Fire Department review letter dated 7-26-17, Fishbeck review letter dated 7-21-17 and accepting the existing parking lot requirements. Motion Carried. (Letters Attached)

ITEM # 2 17-022 – SITE PLAN AMENDMENT

TITLE: THE APPLICANT, INFINITY CONSTRUCTION SERVICES, IS REQUESTING AN AMENDMENT TO THE APPROVED COUNTRY WALK SITE PLAN FOR REVISED SINGLE FAMILY ARCHITECTURAL ELEVATIONS.

LOCATION: THE UNFINISHED COUNTRY WALK SUBDIVISION IS THE SUBJECT OF THE REQUEST. THE DEVELOPMENT IS LOCATED ON THE EAST SIDE OF MARTINSVILLE ROAD, NORTH OF SAVAGE ROAD.

Rino Suave of Infinity Acquisitions, LLC gave the presentation. Infinity Construction has been in business 16 years and is currently working in a dozen communities. The applicant is purchasing about

forty (40) lots in the Country Walk subdivision and is seeking an amendment to the site plan to construct the proposed home elevations in phases 3 and 4.

Director Akers presented his staff memo dated 7-21-17 recommending that the Planning Commission approve an amendment to the site plan for the Country Walk development in order to allow Infinity Homes to construct homes consistent with the provided plans, which depict elevations to be constructed in phases 3 and 4 of the Country Walk development conditioned upon the following:

1. Township Planning Staff shall review each application for a new single family home in Country Walk Phase 3 and Phase 4 in order to determine that the new home meets the required setbacks and that the elevation meets the Township's "Substantially Different" architectural design stands set forth in the PRD agreement for the Country Walk development.

Commissioners discussed how many lots will be built upon, the sales model and spec homes, how the different home elevations will be marketed, phases the lots are located in, square footage requirements for the PRD and how the smallest home elevation affects those requirements, brick to the belt core to be required on the back of all home elevations and the Commission and Staff encouraged the builder to communicate with the homeowners association of each phase during the building process regarding road maintenance.

No comments from the audience.

Motion Kelley, Franzoi second to approve the amendment to the site plan for the Country Walk development to allow Infinity Homes to construct homes consistent with the provided plans which depict elevations to be constructed in phases 3 and 4 of the Country Walk development with approval based on staff review and subject to the recommendations in the staff review letter dated 7-26-17 with an additional condition for the applicant to make a revision to the Oakhurst plan to change the brick to the belt core on the back side of the home elevation. Motion Carried. (Letter Attached)

GENERAL DISCUSSION: None.

Motion Atchinson, Budd second to adjourn at 8:32 p.m. Motion Carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Christina Harman
Recording Secretary



July 21, 2017

Ms. Carol Thompson, Chairperson
Van Buren Township Planning Commission
Charter Township of Van Buren
46425 Tyler Road
Van Buren, MI 48111

Re: Grace Lake Corporate Center – Building B Preliminary Site Plan Approval
Van Buren Township Case No. 17-023

Dear Ms. Thompson:

At the request of Van Buren Township, Fishbeck, Thompson, Carr & Huber, Inc. (FTCH) has reviewed the preliminary site plan package dated July 14, 2017, for the proposed Grace Lake Corporate Center (GLCC) – Building B development, which is located on the west side of the GLCC. The project involves the new construction of Building B, which is a proposed four story building with a lake side walk-out level.

Water Main Service

The Developer is proposing to extend the existing utility tunnel located north and east of the proposed building, which will include the extension of a watermain within the tunnel. The watermain is proposed to be extended to provide a fire control system service to Building B. A watermain hydrant service lead is also to be extended from this tunnel extension, to provide service to a fire hydrant that is proposed to be located along the west side of the building. Water service to the building will be provided by a separate water service lead, which will be indicated in detail on final site plan. A water service connection permit will be required.

It should be noted that the while the existing water main to be extended may have the capacity to provide water service for the proposed Building B, as part of the final plan preparations – it will be necessary for the Developer to revise the Basis of Design (BOD) for the Grace Lake Corporate Center Water System master plan, based upon the current Master Site Plan expansions.

Sanitary Sewer Service

The Developer is proposing to provide sanitary sewer service to the building by connecting to Sanitary Manhole Number 595, which is part of an existing 10-inch sanitary sewer servicing the GLCC, located on the north side of the proposed building. A sanitary service connection permit will be required.

It should be noted that while the existing 10-inch sanitary sewer may have the capacity to accept sanitary flows from proposed Building B, as part of the final plan preparations – it will be necessary for the Developer to revise the BOD for the Grace Lake Corporate Center Sanitary Sewer System master plan, based upon the current Master Site Plan expansions.

Storm Water Management

The proposed construction activities consist of demolition of exist storm drain pipe and structures that will be rerouted to allow construction of the building footprint. The discharge points of the proposed storm drain pipe and structure reconstruction are consistent with the existing storm drain discharge points into Grass Lake. Stormwater runoff will flow downstream and is proposed to pass through the existing water quality structure (No. 3085), before discharging into Grace Lake.

Revised hydraulic pipe calculations will be required to show feasibility with final plans. Storm water discharge points into Grass Lake will have to be properly protected to limit erosion of the Grass Lake shoreline, with details being provided during final plan preparation.



An observation deck is proposed to be constructed adjacent to Grass Lake and is indicated to extend over and above Grass Lake. No details have been provided, but will be required as part of the final plan that address proposed filling or pile construction to support the deck above Grass Lake and occasional high water levels. A turbidity curtain is proposed outside the limits of disruption adjacent Grace Lake.

Although the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Study (FIS) did not include a detailed study of the area to be developed with Building B, we would recommend an overland flow route be identified for Grass Lake and the overland flow route be coordinated with future development to preserve the overland flow route.

Site Access

Building B will be accessed thru the existing Lake Shore Drive to the west and West Main Street to the north. Parking will be available using the existing west parking lot.

It should be noted that while the existing access is through Lake Shore Drive, it will be necessary for the Developer to revise the Traffic Study for the Grace Lake Corporate Center transportation plan, based upon the current Master Site Plan expansions.

Recommendation

We are recommending that the Planning Commission grant preliminary site plan approval at this time, subject to the following conditions:

1. A revised BOD be submitted for the Grace Lake Corporate Center Water System master plan, based upon the current Master Site Plan expansions.
2. A revised BOD be submitted for the Grace Lake Corporate Center Sanitary Sewer System master plan, based upon the current Master Site Plan expansions.
3. An overland flow route be identified for Grass Lake and the overland flow route be coordinated with future development to preserve the overland flow route to a positive outlet.
4. It should be noted that while the existing access is through Lake Shore Drive, it will be necessary for the Developer to revise the Traffic Study for the Grace Lake Corporate Center transportation plan, based upon the current Master Site Plan expansions.

If you have any questions regarding this project, please contact me at 248.324.4791 or dpotter@ftch.com.

Sincerely,
FISHBECK, THOMPSON, CARR & HUBER, INC.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'David L. Potter', is positioned above the typed name.

David L. Potter, PE, CSI-CCCA – FTCH

ag2

By email

cc: Mr. James Taylor, Director of Public Works
Mr. Patrick Westerlund, SmithGroupJJR
Mrs. Katerina Kollar, PE, LEED AP – FTCH



Memo

DATE: July 21, 2017
TO: Planning Commission
FROM: Ron Akers, AICP – Director of Planning & Economic Development
RE: SPR 17-022 Site Plan Amendment for Infinity Homes regarding Architectural Elevations in Country Walk Subdivision Review #2.

The applicant, Infinity Homes, is requesting architectural approval for additional home plans and façade elevations for residential dwellings in the Country Walk development. There is an existing Planned Residential Development (PRD) Agreement in place for the property which was approved in 2002 and amended in 2005 which had previously expired. There were several homes completed in the development prior to the expiration of the PRD. A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between Van Buren Township, the Country Walk Three Homeowners Association, and Blue Country Walk, LLC was executed in July 2015 which outlined the responsibilities of the parties with regards to the completion of the development and required compliance with the PRD agreement.

These plans are subject to the PRD agreement, the MOU, and the standards of the Zoning Ordinance, specifically section 4.54 which addresses specific architectural standards in these types of development.

The following is my review of the architectural plan based on the conditions in the MOU and PRD agreement. I offer the following comments:

Comments

1. Site Plan

The setbacks, as described in the approved site plan for the Country Walk development, depict a front and rear yard setback of 25' and a required side yard setback of 10'. The lots sizes in the development vary in width from 75' to 61' and in depth from 120' to 125'.

The applicant has submitted dimensions for all of the proposed house plans. Based on those plans it appears the houses will fit on all of the lots and be able to meet the required setbacks.

2. Floor Area

The PRD agreement requires that the square footages of homes for the 536 units in the subdivision will average at least 1,750 square feet. According to the provided plan the

square footage of the proposed elevations of single family dwellings will range from 1,300 square feet to 2,700 square feet. Due to the PRD agreement requiring the square footages of the homes to average 1,750 square feet, it is allowable for the Township to approve a building elevation which is less than 1,750 square feet. Since the majority of the elevations exceed this, I do not believe that approving the smaller elevations will risk violating this standard of the PRD agreement. Staff will evaluate what is existing in the development and ensure that the entire development maintains this requirement.

3. Façade Elevations

The Zoning Ordinance and the PRD agreement have specific requirements to ensure that the Township's "Substantially Different" architectural design standard is met. Section j(ix) of the PRD agreement specifically requires that the "Substantially Different" requirement be met by varying the following two (2) criteria:

- Roof pitch by varying three or more vertical units in twelve from one another (i.e. 6/12, 9/12, 12/12, etc.)
- Location of major design features relative to main mass by varying the location of at least two major design features that include, but are not limited to dormers, gables, garages (i.e. front-entry versus side-entry), and porches.

The Zoning Ordinance requires that this substantially different requirement be maintained from neighboring lots within three (3) lots of the proposed parcel and within three (3) lots of the property across the street. I have preliminarily reviewed the proposed elevations and offer the following:

Roof Pitch

The applicant has depicted the roof pitch for the specified homes, but as they range between 5/12 and 7/12, they do not vary enough to use them as a criterion where they can be considered substantially different. Based on this we will have to utilize the location of major design feature criteria to meet this requirement.

Location of Major Design Features

There are 39 different combinations of home style and variation in elevation. In order to meet the substantially different requirement an applicant would need to provide a total of eight (8) different elevations which are "substantially different" from one another.

Staff has picked eight (8) different elevations and has prepared a comparison schedule to determine if eight of these can elevations can meet the substantially different requirement from one another. Based on this review and the attached schedule it appears that this standard can be met.

4. Building Materials

Section i(1) of the PRD agreement requires that all 416 detached units feature brick to the belt on the front and side elevations and requires that on specific lots brick will be required

on the rear elevation as well. Based on the submitted plans all proposed elevations meet the brick to the belt requirement for the front and side elevations. All elevation drawings depict the brick to the belt on the rear elevation except the Oakhurst design.

The applicant has provided a list of the parcels which they are purchasing and I have attached to this review an analysis of which properties require brick to the belt course on the rear elevation. While the applicant could meet this requirement with the proposed elevations, they should understand that the Oakhurst model would not be able to be constructed on the lots which require brick to the belt on the rear elevation.

5. Side Entry Garages

The PRD agreement requires that at least 30% of the single family detached units have side entry garages and specifically indicates which lots are required to have side entry garages. The language in the PRD Amendment states:

“6.1.11. Side entry garages are required on at least 30% of single-family detached units. The following 125 single-family detached units will have side-entry garages. 1-4, 15, 16, 34, 36, 47-49, 58-60, 66-68, 70, 75, 76, 82, 86, 92, 93, 96-110, 115, 117, 120, 121, 128, 130, 135-137, 149-151, 153, 159, 164, 165, 171, 173, 177, 178, 185-187, 192-195, 198, 200, 204, 213, 218, 225-228, 235, 237, 240, 244, 247-250, 253, 254, 260, 261, 266, 274, 286-288, 294, 295, 297, 303, 305, 308, 311-313, 317-321, 323, 324, 326, 327, 330, 363, 368, 369, 381, 390, 398, 400, 406, 407, 411, 413-416.”

The applicant has provided additional elevations of each of the models which depict an attached garage. Based on this the applicant has demonstrated they can meet this requirement.

Recommendation

Based on the comments listed above, staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve an amendment to the site plan for the Country Walk development in order to allow Infinity Homes to construct homes consistent with the provided plans which depict elevations to be constructed in phase 3 and phase 4 of the Country Walk development. This approval should be based upon the staff review letter dated July 21, 2017 and conditioned upon the following:

1. Township Planning Staff shall review each application for a new single family home in Country Walk Phase 3 and Phase 4 in order to determine that the new home meets the required setbacks and that the elevation meets the Township’s “Substantially Different” architectural design standards set forth in the PRD agreement for the Country Walk Development

**Exhibit A
LEGAL DESSCRIPTION**

Units 52, 59, 60 and 77 IN COUNTRY WALK III CONDOMINIUM, according to the Master Deed recorded in Liber 42532, page 1, as amended, and designated as Wayne County Condominium Subdivision Plan No. 842, together with rights in the general common elements and the limited common elements as shown on the Master Deed and as described in Act 59 of the Public Acts of 1978, as amended,
and

Units 3, 4, 5, 6, 21, 23, 26, 28, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 46, 47, 48, 49, 52, 53, 54, 67, 76, 78, 80, 92, 97, 98, 99, 108, 116, 117, 119, 120, 122 and 124 in COUNTRY WALK IV CONDOMINIUM, a Condominium according to the Master Deed recorded in Liber 45621, page 175, as amended, and designated as Wayne County Condominium Subdivision Plan No. 932, together with rights in the general common elements and the limited common elements as shown on the Master Deed and as described in Act 59 of the Public Acts of 1978, as amended.

Tax Item Numbers:

Addresses in Belleville, Michigan 48111:

Country Walk III:

83-091-04-0052-000, as to Unit 52	42600 N Cumberland Court - 354
83-091-04-0059-000, as to Unit 59	42780 N Cumberland Court - 347
83-091-04-0060-000, as to Unit 60	42802 N Cumberland Court - 346
83-091-04-0077-000, as to Unit 77	43144 N Cumberland Court - 329

Country Walk IV:

83-102-05-0003-000, as to Unit 3	42686 Mansfield Ct - 180 - RB
83-102-05-0004-000, as to Unit 4	42718 Mansfield Ct - 181 - RB
83-102-05-0005-000, as to Unit 5	42730 Mansfield Ct - 182 - RB
83-102-05-0006-000, as to Unit 6	42762 Mansfield Ct - 183 - RB
83-102-05-0021-000, as to Unit 21	42919 Colonial Road - 198 - SE - RB
83-102-05-0023-000, as to Unit 23	42863 Colonial Road - 200 - SE - RB
83-102-05-0026-000, as to Unit 26	42773 Colonial Road - 203 - RB
83-102-05-0028-000, as to Unit 28	42739 Colonial Road - 205 - RB
83-102-05-0038-000, as to Unit 38	42451 Colonial Road - 215 - RB
83-102-05-0039-000, as to Unit 39	42437 Colonial Road - 216 - RB
83-102-05-0040-000, as to Unit 40	42413 Colonial Road - 217 - RB
83-102-05-0041-000, as to Unit 41	13763 Chester Ct - 218 - SE - RB
83-102-05-0042-000, as to Unit 42	13735 Chester Ct - 219
83-102-05-0046-000, as to Unit 46	13623 Chester Ct - 223
83-102-05-0047-000, as to Unit 47	13595 Chester Ct - 224
83-102-05-0048-000, as to Unit 48	13567 Chester Ct - 225 - SE
83-102-05-0049-000, as to Unit 49	13529 Chester Ct - 226 - SE
83-102-05-0052-000, as to Unit 52	13590 Chester Ct - 229 - RB
83-102-05-0053-000, as to Unit 53	13628 Chester Ct - 230 - RB
83-102-05-0054-000, as to Unit 54	13652 Chester Ct - 231 - RB
83-102-05-0067-000, as to Unit 67	42872 Colonial Road - 244 - SE - RB
83-102-05-0076-000, as to Unit 76	42898 Colonial Ct - 253 - SE - RB
83-102-05-0078-000, as to Unit 78	13655 Cambridge Ct - 255
83-102-05-0080-000, as to Unit 80	13601 Cambridge Ct - 257
83-102-05-0092-000, as to Unit 92	13375 Stamford Road - 269

W
[Signature]

SE = Requires Side Entry Garage

RB = Requires Brick to belt on rear elevation.

83-102-05-0097-000, as to Unit 97 13248 Stamford Road - 274 - SE - RB
83-102-05-0098-000, as to Unit 98 13274 Stamford Road - 275 - RB
83-102-05-0099-000, as to Unit 99 13296 Stamford Road - 276 - RB
83-102-05-0108-000, as to Unit 108 13524 Stamford Road - 285 - SE - RB
83-102-05-0116-000, as to Unit 116 13755 Stamford Road - 295 - SE - RB
83-102-05-0117-000, as to Unit 117 13727 Stamford Road - 296
83-102-05-0119-000, as to Unit 119 13661 Stamford Road - 298
83-102-05-0120-000, as to Unit 120 13635 Stamford Road - 299
83-102-05-0122-000, as to Unit 122 13579 Stamford Road - 301
83-102-05-0124-000, as to Unit 124 13523 Stamford Road - 287 - SE - RB



July 21, 2017

Planning Commission
Charter Township of Van Buren
46425 Tyler Road
Belleville, Michigan 48111

**Subject: VBT-17-023 SPR; Grace Lake Corporate Center Building B; Site Plan Review #2;
Revised Plans Dated July 14, 2017**

Dear Commissioners:

The applicant, Grace Lake LLC, proposes to construct a 124,000-square foot 4-story office building and a minor laboratory building as part of the Grace Lake Corporate office center, located on the south side of Ecorse Road, east of I-275. The subject site has a total area of approximately 237.57 acres with the area of development being limited to 4 acres according to the application materials. The proposed building is commonly referred to as "Building B."



Aerial Image of Grace Lake Site (Source: Google)

We have reviewed the site plan based on Zoning Ordinance standards and sound planning and design principles. We offer the following comments for your consideration (any items that require changes or additional information are underlined):

COMMENTS

- 1. Zoning and Use.** The site is located in the OT (Office Technology) District. The proposed use is a corporate office building with some research work. Office uses and Minor Laboratories are both permitted uses in the OT district. A "Minor Laboratory" is defined in the Zoning Ordinance as "A laboratory that does not involve any danger of fire, explosion, offensive noise, vibration, smoke, odors, heat, humidity, glare, or objectionable effects." The proposed laboratory use is intended to occupy 25% of the gross floor area, and the proposed office use is intended to occupy 75% of the gross floor area.
- 2. Required Information.** Section 12.203 of the Zoning Ordinance includes the requirements for information on a site plan. The information shown on the revised plans meets the requirements of Section 12.203.
- 3. Lot.** The site plan includes legal descriptions on Sheet G1.0 for parcels 1, 2, 3, and 5. The Grace Lake Corporate Center is located entirely on Parcel 2. The total site area and tax identifications numbers are listed in a transmittal letter (dated July 17, 2017), so we recommend that this information also be added to Sheet G1.0 of the site plan.
- 4. Dimensional Requirements.** The maximum permitted building height is 3 stories/45 feet, with a height increase allowed to a maximum of 5 stories/60 feet, provided the setbacks be increased 1 foot for every foot in height increase above 45 feet. Building B is proposed to be 58 feet tall, as indicated on Sheet G1.0. The 13-foot increase above the maximum permitted height requires a corresponding increase in all setbacks by 13 feet.

The minimum required front yard setback per Section 4.102 of the Zoning Ordinance is 88 feet from the interstate (west) property line (i.e., 75 feet plus 13 additional feet for added building height) and 63 feet from an internal street (Village Center Drive). The minimum rear yard setback per Section 4.102 for this district is 43 feet (i.e., 30 feet plus 13 feet for added building height), and the minimum setback for the side yard is 33 feet. Although the proposed Building B setback information is described on Sheet G1.0, we recommend that the setback lines be added to this sheet to ensure compliance.

- 5. Access and Circulation.** The proposal requires the modification of a limited area of the existing parking area on the west side of the site. The location of the internal access drives through the parking area is to remain unchanged.
- 6. Sidewalks.** The plan proposes a reconstruction of the existing sidewalk on the west side of the new building in conjunction with new curbs and gutters for the parking lot. A sidewalk will also be provided on the north side of the new building to connect to the existing sidewalk on "Main Street." A new 10-foot wide concrete sidewalk is proposed along the east side of the new building (along the lake) as a connector from the existing sidewalk on the south side of Building D to the south end of the existing sidewalk in the parking lot.

Colored renderings and details of a proposed lake overlook platform were provided on the site plan. This overlook would provide outdoor seating areas for employees of the office complex. This area would be constructed with concrete and a steel sheet pile wall.

7. Parking and Loading.

- a. **Space Dimensions.** The newly striped parking spaces are shown with a dimension of 9 feet by 18 feet, which does not meet the minimum requirements in Section 9.104 of the Zoning Ordinance of 9.5 feet by 20 feet. Per the applicant, the spaces are consistent with dimensions needed for parking spaces when the site plan for the entire project was originally approved in 2003. The applicant requests to keep the spaces at the same dimensions. Because of the existing layout of the parking lot and number of spaces needed to support the uses, we recommend continuing these requirements for the existing parking lot. However, any new parking areas must comply with the Zoning Ordinance requirements.

While the parking spaces must be 20 feet in length, they can be reduced to 18 feet if the adjacent sidewalk is 8 feet wide and can accommodate a 2-foot overhang. The adjacent sidewalks are at least 8 feet wide, so this standard is met. The width of parking spaces at 9 feet does not comply with the ordinance, and there is no provision to modify the regulation. Per the site plan notes, even with Building B the site has more than the required number of parking spaces. As previously stated, we recommend continuing the existing parking space dimensions for the existing lot, though any new parking areas added in the future must comply with the Zoning Ordinance.

- b. **Number of Parking Spaces.** The minimum number of required spaces is calculated per Section 9.102 of the Zoning Ordinance. The required number of spaces for professional offices is one (1) space per 300 square feet of gross floor area, and the required number of parking spaces for research office is 5 spaces, plus 1 space per employee in the peak shift plus 4 spaces per 1,000 square feet of gross floor area.

Based on information in the Floor Plan Areas on Sheets A200-A203, the gross floor area of Building B is 108,773 square feet. The plan indicates that 75% of the building will be offices, with 25% devoted to labs, and parking is correspondingly calculated. The office requires 272 spaces while the labs require 157 spaces, for a total of 429 spaces. There are currently more than 429 parking spaces located on the west side of Building B.

Sheet CS1.0 includes a parking table and description for the total required parking on the site, including buildings from the prior site plan approval in 2003. Section 9.101(j) of the Zoning Ordinance allows the Planning Commission flexibility in modifying the number of parking spaces required based on adequate justification by the applicant as required. Based on the description on Sheet CS1.0 regarding the current parking levels (i.e., the campus requires 3,106 parking spaces and 3,148 spaces are provided), we recommend that the current parking areas be accepted as adequate for the existing and proposed uses.

- c. **Barrier-Free Spaces.** Parking spaces along the west side of the site will likely be used by the employees of Building B. The site plan shows that three (3) barrier-free parking spaces will be relocated from the north side to the east side of the parking lot. Sheet CS1.0 includes an explanation of the required parking for the site, as described above, and shows that the proposed number of accessible spaces in the disturbed area will increase from 13 to 15 spaces after construction.

d. Loading. As described above, loading for Building B will be done at the loading docks at Building H. These buildings will be connected through the tunnel system.

8. Landscaping and Screening. The site is part of the Township's largest office park development. Sites are strongly encouraged to exceed Ordinance minimums for landscaping, site design, and building appearance among others. Our comments on individual landscaping requirements are reflected in the following comments:

a. Landscaping Adjacent to the Right-of-Way. Section 10.103(a) of the Zoning Ordinance requires lot frontage to be screened from view from the right-of-way with a continuous landscape screen comprising of 1 deciduous tree per 40 linear feet + 1 ornamental tree per 100 linear feet + 8 shrubs per 40 linear feet. The proposed building will be placed in an area that was previously open space and has no direct frontage onto the public right-of-way. Therefore, this requirement is not applicable.

b. Parking Lot Screening. Section 10.103(B)(1) of the Zoning Ordinance requires parking lots to be landscaped and screened from adjoining public or private rights-of-way. While the proposal does not create any new parking areas on the site, the existing parking to the west side will essentially serve the employees and visitors of the proposed Building B. The Zoning Ordinance recommends a combination of landscaping, berm and screen wall to achieve this goal. The site has an existing greenbelt separating the parking from Village Center Drive, planted with trees. The site also has a raised berm on the western property line providing screening from I-275. We believe the existing landscaping meets these objectives.

c. Interior Parking Lot Landscaping. According to the Section 10.103(B)(2) of the Zoning Ordinance, landscaping within islands in a parking lot is required. At a minimum, 1 tree per 300 sq. ft. of interior landscape area is required, with at least 1 tree per landscaped island required. This requirement was in the Zoning Ordinance at the time the original plan for the site was approved.

The existing parking lot area to the west does not appear to comply with this standard. Many of the landscaped islands appear to have no trees and sparse ground cover only. It is possible this is a result of not including trees in island with light poles. While the Planning Commission has the discretion to modify or waive the parking lot landscaping requirements, we recommend the applicant clarify the interior landscaping and add at least one tree to any island that does not have a tree or light pole. The new site plans show three trees added to parking lot islands, two in the northwest corner and one in the northeast corner, but the landscaping calculations should reflect what is required and what is provided for interior landscaping.

d. Loading Area Landscaping. No new loading areas are proposed as part of the project; therefore this requirement is not applicable.

e. Display Area Buffering. This requirement is not applicable.

f. Greenbelt Buffering. The proposed area of development on the larger site is located well within the interior of the site and abuts I-275 to the west, Grace Lake and other buildings within the

development to the east, and large tracts of OT zoned land to the north and south. Therefore, this requirement is not applicable.

- g. Specific Landscaping Requirements for Zoning Districts.** Per Section 10.103(F)(4) of the Zoning Ordinance, landscaping specific to the OT zoning district is required. Foundation plantings along the building must comprise of 1 ornamental tree per 100 linear feet + 1 deciduous tree per 40 linear feet + 10 shrubs per 100 linear feet. The calculations have been added to Sheet LP1.0 to demonstrate compliance with this standard.

Further, the Ordinance requires 1 tree per 40 linear feet within the right-of-way of any internal drive. The right-of-way of the Village Center Drive has existing landscaping and appears to meet this requirement.

- h. Open Space Landscaping.** Section 10.103(G) of the Zoning Ordinance requires one tree per 3,000 square feet of open space area not occupied by buildings or parking. The area must also be provided with ground cover. Sheet LP1.0 shows the calculation of 17 trees for the 46,000-square foot area, so this standard is met.
- i. Other Requirements.** Underground irrigation is required and a note has been added to the site plan indicating that it will be provided.

- 9. Tree Removal Permit.** A tree removal permit is required if the applicant proposes the removal of any trees that are 5 inches caliper or larger per Section 8.106 of the Zoning Ordinance – Woodland and Tree Preservation. Sheet CD1.0 indicates a total of 56 trees to be removed, and notes that 22 of those are 5 inches in DBH or greater.

The landscape plan shows the existing trees that are 5” caliper or greater that are proposed to be removed. While the site plan states that 23 trees will be replacement trees, the landscape plan must identify which trees are the replacement trees and which ones are landscape trees. Any replacement trees must be clearly labeled on the landscape plan and are in addition to the required landscape trees.

- 10. Lighting.** Lighting is mostly regulated by Section 8.105 of the Zoning Ordinance, which includes the maximum illumination and fixture height standards. The site plan shows that bollard lights consistent with existing fixtures will be provided along all walkways and some of the light poles in the parking lot may need to be relocated. Cut sheets for the proposed lighting were added to Sheet CS2.0, which will match the style of existing fixtures on the site. The light poles proposed for relocation and their proposed location must be shown, as it is unclear from the site plan.

- 11. Architecture and Building Details.** The proposed building will be constructed of split face block in two colors and face brick in two colors, with a standing seam metal roof. The main entrance to Building B facing west appears to have an atrium feature, which helps break up the long façade wall of the building. Windows are included on all four sides of the building.

The graphic legend provided on Sheet A401 describes six different materials that will be used in the construction and façade of the building. Color renderings have also been provided showing how the buildings will look and how they relate to other buildings in the complex, especially the connection

between Building B and Building D. The building generally fits in with the character of the complex and will have a compatible architectural style.

12. **Dumpster.** As described above, the dumpster for the complex is located at Building H, and will be connected to Building B through the tunnel system. The plan notes that the proposed use at Building B will not generate any hazardous wastes.
13. **Signs.** No new signs are shown on the site plan. The applicant should clarify if there will be any new signs as part of this proposal, other than wayfinding signage within the site. If so, then the proposed signs must be included on the site plan.

RECOMMENDATION

The applicant has revised the plan and satisfied several of our previous Staff Review comments. While there are a few items that remain, these items can be easily modified or corrected for administrative follow-up review. Therefore, we recommend approval of the site plan, subject to the following conditions:

1. The total areas and tax identification numbers must be included on the site plan.
2. Setback dimensions must be included on the plans to ensure compliance.
3. That the number and dimensions of parking spaces shown on the plans be approved based on previous site plan approvals, as well as the unique nature of the scale and the variety of uses on the site.
4. The applicant shall clarify the interior landscaping and add at least one tree to any island that does not have a tree or light pole.
5. The landscaping calculations reflect what is required and what is provided for interior landscaping.
6. Any replacement trees must be clearly labeled on the landscape plan and are in addition to the required landscape trees.
7. The light poles proposed for relocation and their proposed location must be shown, as it is unclear from the site plan.
8. That any new signs, other than wayfinding signage within the site, must be included on the site plan.

Respectfully submitted,
McKENNA ASSOCIATES



Patrick J. Sloan, AICP
Senior Principal Planner



Stephen Hannon
Assistant Planner

David C. McNally II
Fire Marshal
O: 734-699-8900 ext9416

Van Buren Fire Department
46425 Tyler Rd
Van Buren Twp., MI 48111



July 26, 2017

Building and Planning
1 Village Center Dr.
Belleville, MI 48111

Re: Grace Lake Corporation Center Building B # 17-023

I have reviewed the second submittal plans for the above location dated July 14th, 2017. Job number PB 17-023 for the above referenced project. NFPA 1 Fire Code (2012 Edition), NFPA 13 (2007 Edition) and NFPA 101, Life Safety Code (2012 Edition), were the primary reference documents used for this review and I have the following items requiring further detail / attention:

The plans reference new construction for a new 4 story office building.

Below are the following items of concern:

1. Evidence that the current fire pump system is capable / and or designed to handle the additional building and future buildings in the complex. Or a decision to install a standalone fire pump and suppression system.

The following items were noted in the last review and discussed in meetings. No definitive answer has yet been given regarding suppression system.

2. Further Discussion will be needed regarding the possible need for an auxiliary FDC and Hydrant due to length of run from fire pumps.
3. The FDC connection if needed will be a 4 inch Stortz fitting with a 30-degree downturn as required by the AHJ. A sign above FDC shall be labeled as FDC and 150 PSI
NFPA 13 6.8.1.2

Our Mission: The members of the Van Buren Fire Department shall work together in a professional and caring way to protect life and property from the adverse effects of fire, trauma, illness and dangerous conditions. Our services will be provided in a fair, honest, and ethical manner with the highest respect and dignity to all.

4. The building shall be provided with an automatic sprinkler system in accordance with NFPA 13, *Standard for the Installation of Automatic Sprinkler Systems*.
NFPA 1 13.3.2.27.2
5. The building shall include the building address on the building. The address shall be a minimum of 6" high letters of contrasting colors and be clearly visible. The location and size shall be verified prior to installation.
AHJ
6. The location of a key box, (Knox Box) shall be indicated on future submittal. The Knox Box location will be verified prior to the installation on the building.
NFPA 1 18.2.2.1
7. Two-Way Radio Communication Enhancement Systems are required for all new construction, unless after finished construction the occupant can prove through a signal test with the AHJ that it is not needed.
NFPA 1 2012 11.10.1 In all new and existing buildings, minimum radio signal strength for fire department communications shall be maintained at a level determined by the AHJ.

With the above considerations, the plan set is approved with exceptions as submitted.

The fire department requires involvement in the continuing plan review, inspection, and Certificate of Occupancy process and will require various inspections during the construction phases and immediately prior to opening to verify compliance with the appropriate codes. One set of as built construction drawings, schedules, and details, as it relates to construction, fire protection and response, will be required, as well as a digital cad layout of the building by this department prior to our final C of O inspection.

Review and approval by the Authority Having Jurisdiction shall not relieve the applicant of the responsibility of compliance with these codes.

Respectfully Submitted,

Shawn Bell
Fire Inspector