

**WHITE LAKE TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION**  
Regular Meeting  
7525 Highland Road  
White Lake, MI 48383  
**February 1, 2007 @ 7:00 p.m.**

Chairperson Chabot called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Roll was called and all the commissioners were present.

ROLL CALL: Steve Anderson  
Todd Birkle, Secretary  
David Chabot, Chairperson  
David Lewsley  
Michael Long  
Gail Novak-Phelps  
Sue Schweim, Vice Chairperson  
Beverly Spoor, Board Liaison  
Stan Woodhouse

Also Present: Stephen T. Rumble, AICP, PCP, PWS, Community Development Director  
Sean O'Neil, AICP, Staff Planner  
David Birchler, AICP, PCP, Township Consultant  
Dave Campbell, Township Consultant  
Ole Anderson, Township Engineer  
Lynn Lindon, Recording Secretary

Visitors:33

**Approval of Agenda:**

**Mr. Birkle moved to approve the agenda as presented. Mrs. Novak-Phelps supported and the MOTION CARRIED with a voice vote. (9 yes votes)**

**Approval of Minutes:**

- a. Regular study meeting of January 18, 2007

**Mrs. Spoor moved to approve the minutes of January 18, 2007 as presented. Mr. Birkle supported and the MOTION CARRIED with a voice vote. (9 yes votes)**

**Call to the Public** (for items not on the agenda)

Mr. Chabot opened the discussion for public comment on items not listed on the agenda, but none was offered.

**Public Hearing(s):**

- a. **File No. 06-029 Village Lakes/Mixed Use** (FKA White Lake Development)
- Location: Located on the south side of Highland Road (M-59), east of Elizabeth Lake Road (including frontage on Elizabeth Lake Road), currently zoned (PB) Planned Business District, identified as parcel number 12-22-301-006, consisting of approximately 30.48 acres.
- Request: 1) **Preliminary Site Plan Approval**  
2) **Traffic Impact Study**  
3) **Community Impact Statement**
- Applicant: Kirco Development/Ramco Gershenson  
Mr. Lloyd Sova  
101 W. Big Beaver Road  
Troy, MI 48084

Mr. Birchler reviewed his report dated January 22, 2007. He indicated that this was their 4<sup>th</sup> review and as indicated in their previous review of November 28, 2006, they can not recommend approval of the proposed PBD without prior approval by MDOT of both proposed access drives on M-59 as well as the proposed new signal at the main (west) access drive. If MDOT will not grant approval for a new signal, Birchler Arroyo would recommend significant changes to either the site's access plan and/or proposed land uses. Since the proposed new signal has been disapproved, Birchler Arroyo is recommending that the Planning Commission and applicant discuss alternate measures to provide the site reasonably safe and convenient access. Resolutions of issues related to traffic should be considered a priority at this time.

With regard to the traffic issues, MDOT will not approve a signal at the driveway and traffic will attempt to exit the site at Elizabeth Lake Road to go to the signal. They are recommending a redesign, which would include a dual left turn lane. The applicant is concerned that it puts them in a position for them to construct the intersection, when in fact the development opposite the site will contribute to this also. They discussed an interim solution that addresses their development. The developer needs to analyze the site and determine with Oakland County that they could restripe the pavement and add additional signal heads at Elizabeth Lake Road. In principal, the applicant agrees they will escrow sufficient funds in order to proceed to the final site plan review. It appears the existing pavement on Elizabeth Lake Road is wide enough for 4 lanes, even though it is striped for 3 lanes. This would go as far as required by the Road Commission south of the entrance drive into K-Mart. Because of the light at Elizabeth Lake Road, they could install "trailblazing" signs to direct drivers to the safest route to M-59.

With regard to planning issues, the site plan is 60 spaces short of the required parking. Due to the large size of the project and being interconnected with the other development, another study is required. There is some overlap in the way a large development of this type will operate, and shared parking agreement with Kroger could be acquired. There is a minor issue regarding ¼ acre of wetland identified on the site. The in-house wetlands expert can follow through with this.

With regard to architectural requirements, the details on the plan are fairly well met. The Planning Commission was concerned with materials and quantities of materials used. The Ordinance requires certain types of high quality materials and requires use of other types be minimized. It appears there may be too much synthetic plaster type material as well as concrete panels. The Planning Commission needs to address this when reviewing color samples, etc.

The applicant has added a drive thru for a freestanding restaurant and there is a concern with vehicles coming out conflicting with traffic on the circulation drive. One fix would be to flip the floor plan, but this could present visibility problems for the restaurant. Another alternative is to add a "no right turn" sign.

Mr. Birchler continued by reviewing minor issues regarding landscaping. The applicant will have to provide size, species, and quantities on the final plan. The main concern is with landscaping to the rear of the development where it joins the residential neighborhood. The rear of the building was being treated differently than the front with regard to materials, etc. Additional attention is appropriate since it faces residential. Also, there is confusion with what is being proposed with the nature of the landscape screening. Greater details need to be provided so it meets the township standards. He noted that a lot of this will be dealt with on the final site plan review. Also, there are a couple of locations on the plan where

there are deficiencies in plant material, but Birchler Arroyo is satisfied they have met the intent of the ordinance, but the Planning Commission could deem that additional screening is appropriate due to the nature of this development.

With regard to the storm water basin, Birchler Arroyo has been promoting that the applicant should attempt to work on an agreement with Kroger/K-Mart to create a single basin and share it with the development rather than have 2 storm water basins seen from Elizabeth Lake Road. This could provide additional outlot sites as well. They also encourage the applicant to continue attempting an agreement with the neighbor and are hopeful that this project will bring township utilities to that location, resulting in Kroger/K-Mart connecting to the township water/sewer system.

Details on lighting equipment should be shown with future submissions.

Mr. O. Anderson reviewed his report dated January 18, 2007. He is recommending approval of the Preliminary Site Plan with the condition that all comments in his report be satisfactorily addressed on the final site plan and construction plans. If it is determined that the proposed retention basin is inadequate then significant revisions to it may be required. As noted, it is recommended that the introduction of a regional basin to serve the immediate surrounding area be explored. He feels that many of his earlier issues have been addressed. There are still issues regarding a conflict of trees and utilities. The applicant is presuming they can get a variance for parking spaces and a greenbelt. They will request a waiver and Mr. O. Anderson indicated that he would support this.

Mr. Lewsley asked Mr. O. Anderson about leaching basins. Mr. O. Anderson indicated the applicant is showing leaching basins to drain backyards of adjacent subdivisions. These can be problematic and this particular area is known for heavier soils. Leaching basins are intended to handle small areas of storm water but if they didn't work, there would be problems.

Mr. Rumble noted for the record that the ¼ acre of wetland is not regulated. He added that while the applicant is deficient by 60 parking spaces, rarely would these developments be underparked. He would rather see more width of the spaces. He is recommending a 9.5 ft. stall and feels 60 spaces can easily be made up. He asked the Planning Commission to be mindful of the residential area to the east.

Applicants Mr. Lloyd Sova and Mr. Mike Piat, among others, were present to discuss the development. They gave a computer-generated presentation. Mr. Piat noted that St. Joseph's got approval for a medical office building 4-5 yrs ago. He reviewed the layout for the medical center and retail that will occupy the land. He reviewed 4 segments of the revised site plan with a heavily landscaped boulevard entry. He indicated that they have initiated discussions with Kroger/K-Mart. While there is no commitment as of today, Kroger/K-Mart would like to see this happen as well. Their major tenant has accepted the responsibility of being pushed back on the site. They have tried hard to accommodate interests and have compromised by putting in outlots and gathering places. They feel the frontscape of the development establishes a new standard. They have added several pedestrian walkways, brick paving, gathering places and benches in an attempt to create an opportunity to gather. With regard to landscaping, they will address species on the final site plan.

Chuck Fossey, the architect for the development, reviewed the retail elevations. He stated they like lighter materials to contrast. Color in fabric awnings and split faced block is limited to the base of the larger buildings and the bases of the columns. They are 10% or less in block. Cornice details are in efface and are 18-24" high. There is a transition to the larger tenant, with a darker bottom and lighter top with coated concrete panels adds to the overall aesthetic. With the elevations they went with a darker base and lighter top. He showed examples of other centers in Oakland County and noted that White Lake Township will have a lower percentage of efface. Mr. Fossey then reviewed samples of the materials that will be used.

Mr. Rumble noted that John Holland with the Fire Department was present. He had issues with buildings a,b,c,d,e. There is one building separated into 5 units and the applicant is showing 2 fire department connections. Mr. Holland stated that 1 fire department connection is adequate right now and he is also fine with the proposed access.

Mrs. Novak-Phelps stated not much has changed from the conceptual plan to the revised plan other than the applicant has added another building. She asked the applicant if they had even considered the comments and suggestions given by the Planning Commission in prior meetings. Mr. Piat indicated that he was only aware of one conceptual plan change where the idea was in lieu of having all retail on the east was the ability to have a drive north/south on the site and have retail on each side. The idea was put forth and other issues prevented them from doing this. A second restaurant was added with the intent to add an outlot and create a frontscape. Mrs. Novak-Phelps noted that the applicant did not incorporate any recommendations from the Planning Commission. Mr. Piat indicated that they did consider, but the tenant felt it was unacceptable and created a visual obstruction for St. Joseph.

Mr. Lewsley indicated the township has a new standard for a mixed-use development which includes integration for residential into this development. The Planning Commission, at prior meetings, felt this development could meet the standard if residential were developed with it concurrently. The applicant has previously talked about senior housing, but it is not being proposed now. The Planning Commission made it clear that residential had to be part of this development. Mr. Piat indicated that the future intent is to have a multi-family development. Mr. Lewsley feels the applicant has ignored the recommendations from the Planning Commission. A mixed use with retail and residential is what the township has envisioned for this site.

Mr. Woodhouse stated that he is not happy with the drive thru as it conflicts with traffic patterns and pedestrian walkways.

Mr. Birkle agrees that the drive thru restaurant takes away from the site. He also questioned what would happen if the applicant were not able to secure an agreement with the retention pond area.

Mrs. Spoor noted there is standing water in one area, and she would like to see this incorporated into the storm water detention plan. Mr. O. Anderson indicated there are opportunities for this site especially if they can get an agreement with Kroger/K-Mart. The K-Mart basin was designed as a dry basin and is not intended as a wet basin. He feels this could be made into a water feature rather than hiding it with landscaping. Mrs. Spoor agreed and added that other communities have attractive options.

Mr. Chabot opened the public hearing at 8:09 p.m.

Mr. Woodhouse added that it is important in this process for the township and property owner to enter into a development agreement so there is completion of the project.

Sylvia Hurry, 241 Decca, indicated that when K-Mart was proposed she asked Terry Lilley what it would do to her wells. When K-Mart went in, 5 wells went dry. She is opposed to leaching basins facing residential. She was also told there would be a street light at Teggerdine.

Amy, Manosky, 253 Decca, is opposed to smells from garbage, standing water, and leaching basins. She doesn't want to see the back of a building, and is also concerned with residential wells/septic. If the developer has all this money to spend, they should guarantee replacement of their well if it goes dry. Another concern is with the drive thru restaurant and dumpster smells are a concern. There are also vacant strip malls and developments in White Lake. She questioned how many large tenants would be interested in the site if Penney's doesn't survive.

Thomas Johnson, 9136 Buckingham, complimented the applicant on their roofline. He feels it is fortunate that this ¼ acre wetland is not regulated by the DEQ. Leaching basins and standing water is a concern of his. The township should cut down on breeding places for mosquitoes. By changing the configuration of Elizabeth Lake Road, the applicant is overlooking the fact that a semi is 65 ft. long. Trucks turn into the shopping center for deliveries and if narrowed, the truck will not clear the thru lane. This will also interfere with traffic coming out. Large trucks need extra room. He feels this is a safety issue.

Cathy Morgan-Hall, 2132 Lake Haven, asked about the detention pond on K-Mart's property and if drainage goes across M-59. Mr. O. Anderson stated that drainage does go across M-59 and into Brendel Lake. Mrs. Morgan-Hall feels the applicant should be talking to adjacent property owners to allow additional drainage onto their property. She doesn't know that K-Mart would have the authority to increase drainage onto other properties. She would like to see drainage out to M-59 sewers. She asked

if there would be any upgrade to the walkway on M-59 and if there were a pedestrian crosswalk embellished on the property. With the proposed road configuration at Elizabeth Lake Road and M-59, the applicant is assuming that the vacant land to the southwest should take on the responsibility of upgrading that intersection. Funds should be escrowed and Penneys and the 4-5 additional buildings need to be a part of that upgrade as well. It should not be left to the last large landowner/developer. MDOT quotes \$1million per mile and this is an expensive undertaking. She is hopeful the drive thru restaurant will not be like the Wendy/Tim Horton's situation.

Faye Hinkle, 193 Decca, stated that these new stores would be behind her home. In the summertime, litter from Kroger/K-Mart blows across the field behind her house. She has had problems with spotlights being too bright. She talked to managers and ordinance director, who was able to address this within 24 hours. There have been 5 major wells go dry since she has lived here. There is not a lot of water pressure and this will not get any better. She uses her backyard a lot and now she will see a berm and garbage disposal.

Cathy Morgan-Hall, 2132 Lake Haven, asked if the sewer will go along M-59. Mr. Rumble stated that it would and water would also be available. She asked if the subdivision would be forced to tie into the system. Mrs. Spoor stated it would be an individual hook up unless the entire subdivision wants an SAD.

Thomas Johnson, 9136 Buckingham, noted that issues with berms came up when Lowe's came in. They put up a retaining wall and lighting has also been addressed. Garbage should be considered for a decorative barrier to hold it back.

Katherine VanHoye, Beachway, is concerned with traffic. There will be a big increase with Kohl's and this new development. She is concerned with M-59 as it is dangerous to make a left onto it as it is. She suggested considering the possibility for rights only out of businesses then proceeding to a place to make a turn with a light to come back the other way. She doesn't feel the road is ready for a boulevard with a Michigan turn. Consider getting the road ready before inviting in this kind of traffic. There are retention pond/drainage issues. She asked what happens to the runoff from building/roofs. She assumes it drains under the pavement, but it sounds like it goes under the pavement down to Brendel Lake. There is no chance for the water to slow down. There is a lot of pavement at Meijers, Kohl's, and the Marketplace, with a lot of water running into the Huron River system. What can be done with all this drainage to keep it non-pollutant? She asked if all the proposed greenery is enough to create a habitat for birds, etc. She asked if the proposed berm would be dirt or grass.

Steve Shower, 669 Hillwood, feels there is a lot of traffic: Kohl's Meijers, Home Depot, Walmart, and now Penney's. He feels the township is following the blueprint of Sterling Heights. SEMCOG counts show 20,000 vehicles through per day and 60,000 on M-59 and Hall Road. There are high crash traffic areas, two of them being at M-59 and Airport Road and M-59 and Williams Lake Road. The M-59 White Lake corridor has more crashes. Consider improvements to M-59. A boulevard area is a way to go. If it has to turn right, we will avoid crashes of people turning left. He thinks this can be done with proper planning. He suggested consulting with Sterling Heights, who had the same problem, but were able to get with MDOT to resolve M-59 further east.

With no other comments, Mr. Chabot closed the public hearing at 8:35 p.m.

Mr. Chabot indicated that traffic is a concern with the majority of residents. He asked how M-59 refinements relate to the township and what goes on with MDOT and the State. Mr. Birchler asked to be mindful of the fact that the Macomb County M-59 solution was several million dollars in costs. On the 5-lane section of M-59, it is wider as you go to Highland where the boulevard exists. The twp is supportive of a boulevard but doesn't have as much influence over MDOT since it is a state highway. With the Oakland County Road Commission, the township can decide if they are willing to pay for this and work with the county to get it accomplished. MDOT feels they have to move traffic on highways and they don't like obstructions. Until this area gets to where there is no new development, the township will continue to see increased volumes on M-59. To address handling this traffic more safely, the township has worked on an Access Management Plan, where information is shared between staff and offices and with the DOT of Oakland County transportation offices. The township has a plan for interconnecting developments. This development is building a new, shared driveway. The township is aggressively working with all new

developments to make internal links. We do not have the ability to say all businesses can only turn right off M-59.

Mr. Chabot noted another main concern was the drainage issue. This is a retention pond that doesn't drain. There won't be combined drainage. Mr. O. Anderson indicated there would be underground pipes into retention dual basins; water treatment in one, which then flows into a second part of the basin and then into ground. There is an infiltration system as well. He is suggesting and recommending to discharge surface water offsite if there is any question of the ability for soils. The basin behind K-Mart could be redone to would have a positive overflow that would allow water to come back to a stable level before the next storm. If done properly, you could design features around the basin. However, we don't know at this time if this can happen with K-Mart. Drainage that is currently moving off residential towards that direction will be bermed with an enclosed drain that would bring water underground. K-Mart has a dry basin, with restricted discharge across the field, under the road to the easement.

Mr. Birchler indicated an interim of improvement that would create a 4-lane configuration at the intersection but would install all new signal heads. Not added would be a full southbound thru lane. People are concerned with the impact on their wells. We have tried to get Kroger/K-Mart to hook into the township water system. If they connect, he questioned whether their well system would be decommissioned or operated with the township system. Mr. O. Anderson stated it would be decommissioned. Mr. Birchler noted the aquifer would recover if this happens. There would be a long term benefit on local wells if the entire project connects to township water.

Mr. Chabot asked Mr. Piat to address concerns from residents.

Mr. Piat stated they would work with Mr. O. Anderson to solve the leaching fields issue. If they are allowed to move forward this evening, they will work on the issue of connecting to township water. They are diligently working with Kroger/K-Mart to combine ponds and he is optimistic this will happen.

With regard to elevation, he showed graphics of the rear view of the development. Mrs. Novak-Phelps asked what material would be used in the rear and Mr. Piat stated there would be efface cornice on the brow of building. Ms. Schweim asked if residents would see the roofline of the building when standing in their backyards. Mrs. Novak-Phelps noted that it appears from the graphic that the trees would be 30 ft. tall if this is a 30 ft. tall building.

Mr. Long indicated that the applicant is showing a rendering, and not a true scale. Where the berm is to back of building is 40 ft. Mr. Fossey stated the back of the building is 18 ft. high and Penney's is 24 ft. Mr. Long noted that trees at installation are 8 ft. and these drawings are not perspective. These are 8 ft. trees on a 4 ft. incline. In some spots there is a 6 ft. berm. The applicant is showing at 14 ft. and 16 ft. Mr. Long referenced the east elevation. If the incline sits up 4-6 ft., the building is level with the base of tree.

Mr. Piat addressed traffic on Elizabeth Lake Road, and indicated that they have committed that they will pay their fair share with the other vested parties. With regard to vacancy, Penney's is a strong viable retailer and from that standpoint, Penney's would round out this. Concerning the drive thru, they would propose to redesign and reengineer this particular issue. Regarding lighting, they have to follow the lighting standards in the ordinance.

Mark McNash, VP of Operations for St. Joseph, addressed the requirement for residential. He indicated that they have had discussions for senior housing and feel this would be complimentary. They will work with the township to ensure this meets the township's standards. Mr. Long noted St. Joseph is now Trinity and he questioned why all of the sudden they go from a medical building to all this retail. Mr. McNash indicated that this was an extensive piece of property and they started partnering. They looked at maximizing the value of the property and medical alone would not achieve this.

Mr. Birkle asked what the hours of operation would be for the medical facility. Mr. McNash indicated there would be normal business hours Monday-Friday and some Saturday hours. This facility would have offices, a laboratory and imaging capabilities. Mr. Birkle stated he has a problem with the road width issue on Elizabeth Lake Road and the medical facility will have to pay their fair share. He agrees that

residential should be included in the mixed use and added that he does not like the restaurant with the drive thru.

Mrs. Novak-Phelps asked Mr. Birchler if there has been resolution this evening with traffic issues. Did the applicant adequately address the concerns or are there still outstanding issues? Mr. Birchler indicated that 3 traffic studies have been done and a variety of changes have been made. Bill Stimpson, traffic engineer, is satisfied that this will work with the improvement of Elizabeth Lake Road. MDOT has said no to a traffic light. The only concern is the amount of cars that will go through the property to go to Elizabeth Lake Road that will use the east/west main front across the existing shopping center. In terms of driveway locations, design, turning restrictions, access to the light and adding a new turn lane with new signal heads, they feel this will handle the amount of traffic. Mr. Long asked why they couldn't go east to get a connection. Mr. Birchler indicated that it is too close to M-59 to make a connection. Mrs. Novak-Phelps feels it is significant for Mr. Birchler to recommend denial. Mr. Birchler stated that he recommended denial first because the plan was not consistent with the Master Plan. Second was the original study, Mr. Stimpson felt it did not solve the problem and there were too many assumptions. The third time through, with modifications, Mr. Stimpson is satisfied so long as those improvements are made at the intersection when the development is built.

Mr. S. Anderson stated the applicant has only provided renderings with what they will do with mixed use, i.e., senior housing (and if that doesn't work), single-family homes. He would like to see renderings on what their commitment is with mixed use. How things have or have not changed. The mixed use is still important. The definition of mixed use in the township is to have residential included.

Mrs. Spoor understands the traffic issue and knows how difficult it is to work with MDOT. The leaching basin is a concern. Façade is an issue and the drive thru is a concern. She would rather see an upscale restaurant rather than a drive thru. There is still the hope for township sewer and water and Mrs. Spoor stated she does not want to see fences and weeds around basins, which is the current situation behind K-Mart. She wants this issue resolved and the developer to come up with something nice. With regard to the medical building, she noted that it is a 3-story building and asked John Holland of the fire department whether this was a concern. John Holland indicated that this building will be better protected than most buildings, and there are surrounding communities that would assist if needed.

Mr. Long stated that the mixed-use requirement was not done. The applicant has added a building, and he sees this strictly as a retail center with a medical building. The area behind Kroger/K-Mart needs to be addressed. He doesn't know if there is enough room to enhance Elizabeth Lake Road. Also, he would like to see the monument sign out front nixed. He suggested doing something for the neighborhood in the back to ensure lighting is not obtrusive. Proposed screening seems nothing more than a fence around things.

Mr. Woodhouse stated screening along the east property line concerns him. Residents will possibly see the drive between the trees. They also have to look at controlling blowing papers, noise from semis, etc. These are issues that can't be resolved tonight and he suggested tabling this case.

Mr. Lewsley stated he likes the frontscape, but does not like the drive thru restaurant. There are traffic conflict problems. Consider a restaurant with no drive thru. He previously mentioned putting Penney's and Kroger back to back. These are big walls and the neighbors to the east will be looking at them. He would like to see a better screening plan. The grade is higher and exaggerates the problem. He knows they will work on the other issues. He wants the applicant to put a pedestrian walkway up through the entire development. If this proposal gets approved before the plan for a residential housing component, he feels a big bond will have to be posted and residential will be done within a time period. Residential has to be put into the project.

Ms. Schweim agreed that this has to be a mixed use. Residential must be added.

Mr. Rumble noted that the housing market will not support residential right now. He asked if the Planning Commission wants to ensure residential will get developed. The Planning Commission wants to see residential added to this mixed use in the lower triangular area of the property. Mr. Rumble also noted that the marketplace was approved with future multi-family. Is it not enough that they say we will only

accept some form of residential? There is a wetland on the triangular portion of the property, but Mr. Rumpel feels the township can deal with this.

Mr. S. Anderson indicated the Planning Commission has been looking at developments, and this gives an opportunity for people who live here to use this. There is nothing in White Lake that looks like this.

Mr. Chabot summarized the concerns: Review the east façade elements, view to neighbors, barrier wall, noise, lighting, traffic, drain basin, drive thru restaurant, and a landscape plan is required at final review.

**Mr. Lewsley moved to table File 06-029. Mr. Woodhouse supported and the MOTION CARRIED with a roll call vote: Anderson – yes; Woodhouse – yes; Schweim – yes; Long – yes; Lewsley – yes; Chabot – yes; Phelps – yes; Birkle – yes; Spoor - yes. (9 yes votes)**

**New Business:**

- a. **File No. 06-037 Royal Oak Waste Paper and Metal**  
Location: Located on the north side of Highland Road (M-59), east of Teggerdine Road, currently zoned (LM) Light Manufacturing District, identified as parcel number 12-22-251-014, consisting of approximately 2.88 acres.  
Request: 1) **Preliminary Site Plan Approval**  
2) **Land Use Determination**  
Applicant: Mr. Richie Atto, Representative  
Royal Oak Waste Paper and Metal  
414 East Hudson  
Royal Oak, MI 48067

Mr. Campbell reviewed his report dated January 18, 2007. They are recommending approval of the preliminary site plan, subject to all of the items being resolved prior to final site plan approval. Further, they recommend that the Planning Commission determine that the proposed land use is consistent with the intended land uses within the (LM) Light Manufacturing district, and that special land use approval not be required. He noted that truck traffic is not considered (LM) and the applicant is proposing 11 per day. Also, the applicant needs to clarify how much outdoor storage is proposed, and also needs to address noise, sound, dust, etc.

Mr. O. Anderson reviewed his report of January 18, 2007. The site is well engineered, but handicapped spaces should be relocated. They are showing a water main, but this can't happen until it is extended, which should happen in 2008. This plan shows engineering feasibility and Mr. O. Anderson is recommending approval of the preliminary site plan.

Mr. Chabot questioned whether there were any concerns with access. Mr. Birchler indicated that the access road had been designed to handle an extra lot.

Mr. Rumpel noted the applicant originally came in with another site. This is a good plan and their use meets the intent of the (LM) district.

Mr. Atto of Royal Oak Waste Paper and Metal indicated that they have spent a lot of time with township staff and consultants and have made changes accordingly. They also met with the fire department to address any concerns they may have. They are very environmentally conscious and save 1 million trees each year with paper that gets recycled. They have a large endangered species mitigation bank. The future is in recycling and this location is perfect. This will allow for residents to bring paper and metal in and get paid for it.

Mr. Woodhouse asked the Mr. Atto to verify with the commission the amount of truck traffic there will be. Mr. Atto indicated that it would be based on tonnage and added that there would be no outside storage. Not all trucks are semi's, some are front end loaders, ½ the length and ½ the size of semi's.

Mrs. Novak-Phelps asked about enforcing water/sewer and the applicant should agree to this in writing. She asked how many employees there would be and Mr. Atto indicated there would be no more than 5. She asked what the hours of operation would be. Mr. Atto indicated the hours would be 7am-5 or 6pm Monday-Friday and 8am-2pm on Saturday, and they would be closed on Sundays. They will only accept

paper/cardboard/metal. Loose paper at this facility will be pushed into a truck with a small compactor. This is a collection facility only.

Mr. Long feels this is a nice operation, but questions the location with a nearby bakery and storage facility. Mr. Rumble noted that the bakery has trucks coming in and out all day.

Mr. Lewsley asked Mr. Atto to review screening. Mr. Atto indicated there are existing chain link fences on the east and west perimeter and he will continue those and add landscaping between the paved area and the fences. Mr. Lewsley noted that the building would be set back from the road and be higher up. Mr. Atto indicated there would not be any material storage outside, but there would be 3-4 licensed tractor-trailers. He assured that this facility would not be a truck yard.

Ms. Schweim was concerned with outside storage, but it has been addressed by the applicant.

Mrs. Spoor stated she has concerns. The township has just started a corridor authority and decided industrial sites would be put on White Lake Road. The building is large and will be hugely visible. She doesn't want bakery customers competing with semi truck traffic. Mr. Atto indicated he is hoping those baking customers would also be recycling customers.

Mr. Atto addressed material. The building will be constructed with 4" masonry units with colors on the Highland Road side, with the other 3 sides of the building being standard masonry. He reviewed samples with the commission.

Mr. Birkle asked what types of metal would be recycled. Mr. Atto stated mainly gutters; no tires and no autos. Mr. Birkle noted for the record that Oakland County has privatized with this company.

Mr. S. Anderson asked if any other trucks would be staying overnight. Mr. Atto indicated that trailers, not trucks would stay overnight, but would leave in the morning to go to Royal Oak. Mr. S. Anderson asked why the applicant chose White Lake. The owner, Habib Mamou stated they are teamed with a large mill and have a retriever program for churches and schools. They saw an opportunity to work well with White Lake Township. Mr. S. Anderson questioned expected growth and Mr. Mamou stated that what they are proposing is their maximum, which is 2,000 tons.

Mrs. Novak-Phelps noted that there have been problems with people stealing metal in other communities and she would like to see the applicant work with local police to report thefts. Mr. Atto indicated that it is easier to steal from a facility like theirs and they will have hidden cameras installed. Mr. Mamou added that they have to report to the federal government names/addresses/ss# for anyone bringing in metal. They will work closely with local authorities.

**Mr. Woodhouse moved in File 06-037 for preliminary site plan approval and make the determination that the land use ties in with the preliminary site plan.**

Mr. O. Anderson asked how the recycling process is done. Mr. Mamou indicated that an end loader pushes material into a truck. There is a flat floor with a pit and conveyor. They have a rooftop ventilator to control dust. From time to time, paper does escape, but this is a management/maintenance thing. Mr. O. Anderson asked about the 3 roll-off containers and Mr. Mamou stated they would be for metal.

**The MOTION CARRIED with a roll call vote: Long – no (he feels this is not a good location); Lewsley – yes; Phelps – yes; Spoor – no (she has a problem with the size of the building and feels there are other areas in White Lake that can accommodate this business); Woodhouse – yes; Schweim – yes; Chabot – yes; Birkle – yes; Anderson – yes. (6 yes votes, 3 no votes).**

**Communications:**

- a. **Next meeting dates:**
  - Study Meeting – February 15, 2007 (Lindon cannot attend)
  - Regular Meeting – March 1, 2007
- b. **Distribution of Updated List of Planning Commissioners**
- c. **Distribution of Executed Planning Commission By-laws**

**Adjournment**

**Mrs. Novak-Phelps moved to adjourn the meeting at 10:28 p.m. Mr. Birkle supported and the MOTION CARRIED with a voice vote. (9 yes votes)**