# PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING <br> LOCATION: TOWNSHIP ANNEX, 7525 HIGHLAND, WHITE LAKE, MICHIGAN 48383 <br> (FORMER WHITE LAKE LIBRARY) <br> THURSDAY, OCTOBER 07, 2021-7:00 PM 

White Lake Township | 7525 Highland Rd | White Lake, MI 48383 | Phone: (248) 698-3300 | www.whitelaketwp.com

## AGENDA

1. CALL TO ORDER
2. ROLL CALL
3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
A. Regular Meeting Minutes of September 2, 2021
6. CALL TO THE PUBLIC (FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA)
7. PUBLIC HEARING
8. CONTINUING BUSINESS
9. NEW BUSINESS
A. Redevelopment at 9328 Highland Road

Location: located on the north side of Highland Road (M-59) and west of Fisk Road.
Consisiting of approximately 1.17 acres. Currently zoned
(GB) General Business.
Identified as parcel number 12-203-201-010
Request: Final Site Plan Approval
Applicant: White Lake Retail Management, LLC
30200 Telegraph Road
Bingham Farms, MI 48205
10. LIAISON'S REPORT
11. PLANNING CONSULTANT'S REPORT
12. DIRECTOR'S REPORT
13. OTHER BUSINESS
14. COMMUNICATIONS
15. NEXT MEETING DATE:
A. October 21, 2021 \& November 4, 2021
16. ADJOURNMENT

## WHITE LAKE TOWNSHIP

## PLANNING COMMISSION

7525 Highland Road
White Lake, MI 48383
SEPTEMBER 2, 2021 @ 7:00 p.m.

Chairperson Anderson called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Roll was called.

| ROLL CALL: | Steve Anderson, White Lake, MI <br> Peter Meagher, White Lake, MI <br> Rhonda Grubb, White Lake, MI <br> Merrie Carlock, White Lake, MI <br> Matt Slicker, White Lake, MI <br> Scott Ruggles, White Lake, MI |
| :--- | :--- |
| Absent: | Mark Fine <br> Debby Dehart <br> Joe Seward |
| Also Present: | Sean O'Neil, Planning Director <br> Hannah Micallef, Recording Secretary |
| Visitors: | No members of the public present |

## Approval of Agenda

Commissioner Meagher moved to approve the agenda as presented. Commissioner Grubb supported and the MOTION CARRIED with a voice vote: $\mathbf{7}$ yes votes.

## Approval of Minutes

a. August 19, 2021

Commissioner Carlock added that she chaired the August $19^{\text {th }}, 2021$ meeting.
Commissioner Meagher moved to approve the minutes of August 19, 2021 as amended. Commissioner Carlock supported and the MOTION CARRIED with a voice vote: $\mathbf{7}$ yes votes.

Call to the Public (for items not on the agenda)
There were no members of the public present.

## Public Hearing:

A. 2022-2027 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP)

Planning Director O'Neil summarized what a CIP was and the CIP process. The CIP serves as a tool for Township infrastructure projects and to get said projects off the ground with funding spread out over 6 -year periods. This is done every September; and the CIIP serves as a budgeting tool for the Township Board. The CIP acted as a wish list, it was not a budget. There was a threshold of $\$ 50,000.00$ when identifying capital projects. Water and sewer projects, for example, end up being CIP projects, due to their cost. Sewer lining and the design of the Triangle Trail were two completed processes that were considered a success this year. The Planning Commission was charged with holding a public hearing for the CIP and to approve the document to send to the Township Board. The Township Board will consider the CIP for acceptance at their September meeting. Planning Director O'Neil wanted to thank the departments and staff within the Township for their help with putting the CIP together, and especially wanted to thank Staff Planner Quagliata for his efforts and work this year.

Chairperson Anderson asked if the resolution put out by the state for the CIP required a 6 -year rolling plan. Planning Director O'Neil said yes, and the Township was required to prepare a CIP per the State because there were public utilities that the Township maintained.

Commissioner Carlock asked if the Planning Commission adopted CIP, did the Township Board needed to adopt it as well. Planning Director O'Neil said it was the Planning Commission who adopt the CIP, and the Township Board was the entity who accepted it. If the Township Board did not accept the CIP, the CIP would come back to the Planning Commission for changes to be made.

Chairperson Anderson opened the public hearing at 7:22 P.M. Seeing no public comment, Chairperson Anderson closed the public hearing at 7:24 P.M.

Commissioner Slicker asked staff about the water supply fund, Planning Director O'Neil said the water projects were funded out of the enterprise fund, and the sewer projects were funded from the general fund. Commissioner Slicker said the upgrades to the sewer systems should be funded by the enterprise fund. Planning Director O'Neil said general fund contribution should be added to page 2-4. He added that the sewer revolving funding would go into the Bogie Lake/Lakeland High School project, and will be a project that would be done through the school district and the Township. The majority of the project would be paid by the school district by means of the sewer revolving fund. The sewer revolving fund money comes to the Township, as the Township was the beneficiary for the funds, and then the school district would pay the money back through the Township. Planning Director O'Neil said Director Potter would have more information. Commissioner Ruggles said the DPS department typically had the funding to cover their projects, and the project to take sewer down M-59 westbound would be costly.

Chairperson Anderson asked staff about the pump station at Lakeland, and wanted to know if the installation of the booster station would be added to the station to enhance its effectiveness. Planning Director O'Neil said the booster would continue to move the pressure through the system to avoid friction in the pipes.

Commissioner Meagher asked staff why the police didn't have a lot of projects. Planning Director O'Neil said it was because they didn't have many projects over $\$ 50,000.00$. The new Public Safety building project costs was under the general fund. Chairperson Anderson asked if
the new safety building would be funded by the millage. Planning Director O'Neil said that was unknown at this time. Commissioner Ruggles asked Planning Director O'Neil if the public safety building would be incorporated with the Civic Center development project. Planning Director O'Neil said Mr. McGraw from River Caddis wanted to workshop with the Planning Commission in the future, and wanted to bring this up as a topic.

Chairperson Anderson asked staff about the new generator and if it would be transferable if the Township moved facilities. Planning Director O'Neil confirmed.

Chairperson Anderson asked staff about the fire ladder truck, and asked why a 100' ladder truck was needed. Planning Director O'Neil said 100' was standard, and it was an operational item the Fire Chief could speak to.

Commissioner Slicker asked staff if the CIP was for the current calendar year. Planning Director said it was a six-year rolling plan, and the projects were rated and called out in different years.

Commissioner Meagher moved that the White Lake Planning Commission adopt the 20222027 as presented and make a recordation to the Township Board to accept the CIP as presented. Commissioner Carlock supported, and the motion CARRIED with a roll call vote: (6 yes votes)

(Slicker/yes, Carlock/yes, Ruggles/yes, Anderson/yes, Meagher/yes, Grubb/yes)

## Continuing Business

No continuing business.

Old Business:
No old business.

## New Business:

No new business.

## Other Business:

No other business.

## Liaison's Report

Commissioner Grubb said the Parks and Rec provided totes for the run that was held in August. The shipping containers are going to be removed from Hawley, and the signs and picnic tables will be in Stanley Park soon. The water testing at Stanley Park went well. There will be geocaching at Vetter Park. Halloween at Fisk Farm was scheduled for October $16^{\text {th }}$.

Commissioner Carlock said the Harvest Happenings will happen in October in Hess-Hathaway Park in Waterford.

Commissioner Ruggles said that the Township Board had a special meeting with the Fire Department. The Fire Department was currently a BLS (Basic Life Support) system, and they requested to be moved to an ALS (Advanced Life Support) system. The paramedics would be able to assist a resident in need without the STAR paramedic team. Currently, the fire department relies on STAR for further acts to save a life, and STAR has an average response time of 20 minutes. There would be increased costs to do this, and the Township Board approved a motion to begin exploring the requirements and costs for the
transition. If the transition was approved, the Fire Department would be in a probationary period of two years from the State and would have a choice to continue after that.
Commissioner Ruggles said the Township Board voted to extend the COV ID state of Emergency until the end of the year. It gave Supervisor Kowall the authority to meet via Zoom or in person, and the Township Board will vote monthly to assess what meeting method will go forward.

The Dublin Senior Center parking lot paving project was presented before the Township Board. DLZ had a project cost of $\$ 60,000.00$ just for design. The asphalt estimate was $\$ 90,000.00$. The Township Board declined to move forward due to the costs.

## Planning Consultant's Report

No report.

## Director's Report:

Planning Director O'Neil mentioned again that Mr. McGraw would like to meet with the Commissioners in small groups near the end of the month. The Sonic redevelopment project will be back to the Planning Commission as their loading dock problem was resolved at the Township Board. The Elizabeth Lake Retail project was looking to resubmit preliminary site plans, and could be before the Planning Commission in October.

## Communications:

Next Meeting Dates: September 16, 2021
October 7, 2021

## Adjournment:

Commissioner Grubb moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:0 p.m. Commissioner Carlock supported and the MOTION CARRIED with a voice vote: 7 yes votes.

## Director's Report

Project Name: Redevelopment at 9328 Highland
Description: Final Site Plan Approval
Date on Agenda this packet pertains to: October 7, 2021
$\square$ Public Hearing
-Initial SubmittalRevised Plans
$\square$ Special Land UseRezoning
$\square$ Other: $\qquad$Preliminary Approval
®Final Approval

| Contact | Consultants <br>  <br> Departments | Approval | Denial | Approved <br> w/Conditions | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sean O'Neil | Planning <br> Director | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\boxtimes$ | Per comments below. |
| DLZ | Engineering <br> Consultant | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\boxtimes$ | See letter dated <br> $09 / 13 / 2021$ |
|  <br> Associates | Planning <br> Consultant | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\boxtimes$ | See letter dated <br> $09 / 17 / 2021$ |
| John Holland | WLT Fire <br> Chief | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | See email dated <br> $09 / 20 / 2021$ |
| Jeanine <br> Smith | WLT <br> Assessor | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\boxtimes$ | See memo dated <br> $09 / 02 / 2021$ |
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September 13, 2021

Sean O' Neil, Director
Community Development Department
Charter Township of White Lake
7525 Highland Road
White Lake, Michigan 48383

## RE: 9328 Highland Road- Commercial Building with Drive Thru - Final Site Plan and Final Engineering Plan-1 ${ }^{\text {st }}$ Review

DLZ \# 2145-7233-10

Dear Mr. O' Neil,
Our office has reviewed the above-mentioned plans prepared by Stonefield Engineering and Design and dated August 30, 2021. These plans were reviewed for conformance with the Township Engineering Design Standards. We offer the following comments for your consideration:

Preliminary Site Plan Comments-The following comments from our Preliminary Site Plan review letter dated July 7, 2021 are listed below. We have provided responses to those comments in bold typeface.

1. A separate connection for a sanitary sewer lead is proposed for the drive-thru restaurant. It needs to be clarified that all kitchen discharge lines are routed to the existing external grease trap. Please also clarify if existing oil and grease separator is properly sized for the new use. Comment addressed. A note has been added to Sheet C-5 that all grease will be routed to the existing external grease trap. It is understood that the existing grease trap is $\mathbf{1 5 0 0}$ gallons per the Sonic As-Built plans which meets Township requirements.
2. The existing watermain easement, where the hydrant and watermain are proposed to be removed, will need to be vacated. Comment remains as a notation. A note to this effect has been added to Sheet C-2.
3. The existing storm sewer easements, where the existing storm sewer is to be removed, will need to be vacated. Comment outstanding. Please add a note to Sheet C-2 with regard to this.
4. The existing detention basin on the northern portion of the site will need to be inspected and maintenance performed prior to a Certificate of Occupancy issuance for the site. Applicant shall provide documentation regarding the existing storm sewer and detention basin maintenance agreement to demonstrate this redevelopment is covered under the original agreement. Applicant will need to update agreements if necessary. Applicant has provided the existing storm sewer and detention basin maintenance agreement and it is understood the maintenance agreement is transferable to new owners. DLZ recommends the Exhibit B sketch and easement descriptions be updated to reflect proposed improvements and easement vacations.
5. The as-built plans for the previous Sonic restaurant indicate an existing storm water quality device in an unmarked location in the area where the existing storm sewer runs westerly at the western property line. The location and existing condition of this device will need to be verified or an alternate means of onsite stormwater pretreatment will be required. Comment addressed. A note has been added to Sheet C-4 indicating that the stormwater quality device will be inspected and repaired as necessary prior to construction.
6. The proposed plan does not cause an increase in impervious area; it has been reduced by approximately 300 square feet. Our office has no concerns with respect to increased storm water runoff from this property. Details regarding proposed storm sewer pipe sizing will be reviewed at the time of Final Engineering Plan submittal. Comment addressed. The design engineer has submitted details indicating that the impervious area for the proposed improvements will not increase.
7. We defer to the Fire Department with regard to items related to fire suppression including proposed hydrant location. Comment remains as a notation.
8. The plan proposes a new benchmark be established at time of construction; a benchmark on NAVD 88 datum will be required to be established and shown on the Final Engineering Plan. Although the design engineer indicates a new benchmark will be established prior to construction, a new benchmark is required to be shown at this time on the Final Engineering Plan.
9. The plan appears to propose 5 foot wide sidewalk in front of the building. Ordinance requires 7 foot walks to account for vehicle overhang. This may be allowable as the plans propose either bumper blocks or handicap signs in front of the spaces which would prevent overhang. We defer further comment to the Planning Department or Planning Consultant. Comment addressed. Sidewalk in front of the building is now proposed as 7 ' wide.
10. The proposed storm sewer easement on the westernmost storm segment is shown over the subject property line. Will this easement be granted by the adjacent property owner? Comment remains, easement has been removed from storm sewer along the western property line. This easement should be included.

## Final Site Plan/Final Engineering Plan Comments-

## General

1. The parcel ID number is in error on the cover sheet. Please revise.
2. Provide notes from WLT Engineering Design Standards section A.8.a.-d. on plan.
3. Attach WLT Standard Details Sheets to plan.

## Grading/Paving

1. Provide existing grade for the northernmost curb connection on the west side of the property.
2. There appear to be two low points proposed along the drive thru area north of the building (965.55 and 965.35). Ensure positive drainage in these two areas.

## Sanitary Sewer

1. Provide sanitary lead slopes; a minimum of $1 \%$ slope is required.

## Watermain

1. Provide details regarding proposed hydrant lead, including length, size, and pipe type.

## Stormwater Management

1. Provide the following items for the proposed storm sewer:
a. Inside diameter for proposed catch basins.
b. Pipe profiles with HGL line shown, all areas of CSB, and all utility crossings.
2. Pipe material shall be RCP CL IV.

## Required Permits and Approvals

The following items, permits, and approvals will be required:

1. An updated Exhibit B within the existing Storm Sewer Maintenance Agreement will be required.
2. Vacated easement for portion of watermain to be removed. No new watermain easement will be required as the proposed hydrant falls within remaining easement limits.
3. Soil Erosion Permit through OCWRC.
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## Recommendation

We recommend the plans be revised to address the above referenced items and be resubmitted for review.
Please provide a response letter to the above comments; this will ensure a more streamlined review of the revised plan by our office.

Please contact our office should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

DLZ Michigan


Michael Leuffgen, P.E.
Department Manager


Victoria Loemker, P. E.
Senior Engineer

Encl. White Lake Township Standard Details White Lake Township Standard Notes

Cc: Justin Quagliata, Community Development, via email Hannah Micallef, Community Development, via email Aaron Potter, DPS Director, White Lake Township, via email Nick Spencer, Building Official, White Lake Township via email John Holland, Fire Marshall, White Lake Township, via email

X:\Projects\GFL\2021\2145\723310 WLT 9328 Highland\FSP \& FEP Review.01\FSP and FEP Review.01.docx

## MCKENNA

September 17, 2021
Planning Commission
Charter Township of White Lake7525 Highland Road
White Lake, MI 48383

| Subject: | 9328 Highland Road |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Final Site Plan Review |
|  | Zoned: General Business (GB) District |

Petitioner(s): White Lake Retail Management, LLC
Location: North side of Highland Road, west of Fisk Road and east of Village Drive
Dear Planning Commissioners:


## Source: Oakland County Property Gateway

We have received an application for final site plan review for 9328 Highland Road, parcel number 12-23-201-010, dated August 30, 2021 consisting of approximately 1.18 acres, currently zoned General Business (GB). The lot is the site of the Sonic Restaurant (currently closed). The final site plan is consistent with the preliminary site plan that was approved by the Planning Commission at their August $5^{\text {th }}$ meeting, subject to the following conditions:

1. Specifications on the number of tables and chairs to be made a part of the final site plan. The petitioner needs to put this on the site plan; however, he verbally stated that there will not be any more than $\mathbf{1 6}$ chairs/4 tables.
2. The Petitioner needs to provide calculations for the amount of the façade that meets the Zoning Ordinance requirements as well as the percentage of windows on the front façade (required to be at least $30 \%$ ).
This has been provided on sheet PP-4. The percentage of durable materials ranges from 53\% to 60\%.
3. Petitioner to provide a copy of the development agreement that addresses the cross-access easements.
This was provided.
4. Determination by the Planning Commission as to the lack of a delineated loading zone. The Township Board determined that the loading zone proposed on the revised preliminary site plan meets the spirit and intent of the Zoning Ordinance, and is preferable to no loading zone. The loading zone, as proposed, is 15 'x $\mathbf{3 0}^{\prime}$.
5. Determination by the Planning Commission as to the lack of a buffer on the west side of the site.
The Planning Commission was ok with utilizing Belle Tire's buffer to meet this requirement,
6. A note on the plan regarding a two-year guarantee and bond for all new plant materials. Note has been added.
7. A note that all landscaped areas that abut parking areas will be separated with a 6 -inch curb. Note added and detail provided.
8. A note that any landscaping materials that are in poor condition will be removed and replaced with materials that meet the Zoning Ordinance requirements.
Noted on landscape plan
9. Dimension of existing pathway along Highland Road added to final site plan. Added to plan
10. Determination by the Planning Commission as to the appropriateness of the existing level of lighting, which exceeds the Zoning Ordinance maximum for foot candles at the lot lines and internally within the site.
At their August $5^{\text {th }}$ meeting, the Planning Commission determined that the proposed lighting and the maintenance of the existing parking lot lights are acceptable as there is no overflow into the traversed portion of Highland Road or Elizabeth Lake Road.
11. The petitioner should revise the proposed (wall sconce) light fixtures with those that meet the Ordinance requirements.
A note was added to the plan; however, new fixtures were not submitted.
12. The Petitioner to provide detail on the wall sign calculations with respect to the front façade area and the area of the proposed wall signs.
A note was added to sheet PP-4 that signage would be coordinated by each tenant to comply with the Zoning Ordinance requirements.
13. Address of the businesses being added to the monument sign in letters at least 6 inches in height,
This was not addressed
14. Determination by the Planning Commission as to the utilization of the existing trash dumpster enclosure.
The Planning Commission determined that, provided the enclosure is in good shape, it may be used.
15. A site inspection showed that the white, metal fence in the rear of the site is in need of repair. A note should be added to this effect on the final site plans.
Noted on the site plan, sheet C-3
16. Sidewalk in front of building be increased from five feet to seven feet. The sidewalk width was increased, however, it appears that the western most portion (in front of the restaurant's front entrance door) is still less than seven feet.
17. Sidewalk on east side of building be increased from four feet to five feet.

The width was increased, as shown on sheet C-3.

## COMMENTS

1. Existing Conditions. The conditions of the site and the surrounding area are summarized below:

| Location | Existing Land Use | Master Plan | Existing Zoning |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Site | Sonic Drive Thru | Planned Business | General Business |
| North | Mobile Home Park | Mobile Home | Mobile Home Park |
| East | Fisk Corners | Planned Business | General Business |
| South | Residential | Planned Business | Local Business |
| West | Discount Tire | Planned <br> Neighborhood | General Business |

2. Proposed Use. The Petitioner is proposing to demolish the existing Sonic building and construct a 5,840 square foot building. The easterly portion will consist of 3,000 square feet of retail and the western portion will consist of 2,840 square feet for a restaurant with a drive thru. The Petitioner is proposing to remove the building and parking spaces, with the exception of the thirteen spaces along the Highland Road frontage and reconfiguring the ADA spaces in the front of the building. Fisk Corners Shopping Center is located to the east and Discount Tire is located to the west of the subject property. Retail and restaurant uses are permitted in the General Business District. A drive thru and outdoor dining, which are proposed, are special land uses; however, because the property has been previously approved for such uses, no public hearing or separate special land use approval is required. The Petitioner stated that they approximate four tables and sixteen chairs for the outdoor dining. Specifications on the number of tables and chairs should be made a part of the final site plan review approval.
3. Building Placement; Architecture and Design. The site is of a conforming area and the building complies with all of the setback requirements for the General Business District with the exception of the lot width, which is required to be 200 ' but is actually $148.8^{\prime}$ in width. Additionally, the developer is proposing to keep thirteen of the existing (previously approved) parking spaces that are located in the required front yard setback.

| Applicable Requirement | Required by the <br> Zoning Ordinance in <br> the GB District | Proposed |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Front Yard Setback | 50 feet | 89.2 feet |
| Side Yard Setback | 15 feet | 27 feet (west) 47.9 feet (east) |
| Rear Yard Setback | 20 feet | 158.8 feet |
| Building Height | 35 feet or two stories | 23 feet |
| Minimum Lot Area | 1 acre | 1.18 acres |
| Minimum Lot Width | 200 feet | 148.8 feet |

The building consists of brick veneer on the lower (approximately) one-third of the building, EIFS on the upper two thirds of the building, a prefinished metal coping along the top of the building and windows along the front and on the west and east elevations for approximately 19 feet. A narrow band of EIFS in a contrasting color is also shown just below the metal coping. At the August $5^{\text {th }}$ Planning Commission meeting, the petitioner was asked to increase the amount of durable materials, possibly reduce the amount of EIFS and provide those calculations for percentage of durable materials on each elevation. The elevations were revised as follows:

- The brick veneer was increased on each elevation, most notably the front elevation. Previously, the brick veneer (on the columns) only went up the building approximately half way, the current plan has the brick continuing up to the metal coping. The amount of EIFS was reduced on the other three elevations as well.
- The percentage of durable materials was noted on each elevation, on sheet PP-4.

Four fabric awnings are proposed along each bay of windows and a sign area has been identified above the western most and eastern most bay of windows. The petitioner should provide a section detail and more specifics about the canopies.
4. Site Circulation and Parking. Fifty-three parking spaces are required and proposed. As mentioned earlier, thirteen spaces in the front will remain. The site currently has nine 9' $\times 19^{\prime}$ parking spaces in the rear, adjacent to the fence. They are proposing eleven, 9' by 19' spaces in this same area. The parking spaces on the east side of the site are proposed to be 17 feet long. The Zoning Ordinance allows for 17 -foot spaces if they abut a sidewalk or landscaped area. This landscaped area was reduced from four feet to three feet, reducing down at the southern end of the site to zero feet. This was done to accommodate the wider sidewalk on the east side of the building; however, this is unacceptable as there needs to be a landscaped strip adjacent to those parking spaces - and a strip that will allow plant material to thrive. The previously recommended boxwood (43 of them) are not salt tolerant and will likely not survive in a narrow-landscaped strip adjacent to a parking lot that undoubtably will be salted heavily in the winter months. The petitioner stated that they may reduce the drive aisle on the west side of the site to allow for a 3-4foot landscaped area.
Eight stacking spaces for the drive thru are required and are shown on the site plan. Entry to the site is from a 25 ' cross access easement that runs the width of the property. Curb cuts on Discount Tire and Fisk Corners Shopping Center provide access to this site both in the front and rear. A condition of the approval in 2008 was that the Township and the property owner enter into an agreement stating that the Sonic proprietor would voluntarily enter into a development agreement with the Township ensuring that no new driveways/curb-cuts would be pursued for the Sonic parcel now, or in the future, and that all driveways, parking, maneuvering lane and internal connections would be shared between these three parcels (to the east and west of the subject parcel). This has been submitted by the Petitioner.
Circulation is two way on the east side of the site and one way on the west side (to accommodate the drive thru traffic). As mentioned earlier, a $15^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}$ loading space is shown and the Township Board felt it was adequate.
5. Landscaping and Screening.

- Interior Landscape Requirements:

Per Section 5.19(E) of the Zoning Ordinance outlines the requirements for interior landscaping. A total of $15 \%$ of the total lot area shall be landscaped. Based on the lot area of 51,219 square feet, 7,683 square feet of landscaping is required, which equals 26 trees and 128 shrubs. The petitioner is proposing $\mathbf{1 6 , 4 4 9}$ square feet of overall interior landscaping, 30 trees and 134 shrubs. However, the landscape plan shows18 existing trees and 11 new trees. The petitioner should clarify this difference.

- Parking Lot Landscaping Requirements:

Per Section 5.19 (G) of the Zoning Ordinance outlines that requirements for parking lot landscaping. For commercial spaces, twenty square feet of parking lot landscaping is required for each space. Fifty-three spaces are required/proposed, which equates to 1,060 square feet of required parking lot landscaping - the petitioner is proposing 2,194 square feet.
For every 100 square feet of parking lot landscaping, three shrubs and one large deciduous,
ornamental or evergreen tree. As such, 11 trees and 32 shrubs are required; the petitioner is proposing11 trees and 51 shrubs, which meets the Zoning Ordinance.requirement. However, it appears that there are eight trees and thirty-two shrubs, which is short by three trees. The petitioner should clarify which landscaping materials are meeting the parking lot landscaping requirements as well as which specific plant materials are meeting the interior landscaping requirement.

Per Section 5.19 (G): The requirements, for trees and islands, may be modified when it is found that through careful coordination of parking lot landscaping with peripheral and building plantings an unnecessary duplication of plantings would be created. In addition, consideration shall be given to situations when an excess number of small islands would be created that would only serve to disrupt reasonable traffic patterns and maintenance activities.

## - Greenbelt Standards

The Planning Commission determined that the greenbelt between the subject parcel and the parcel to the west is not necessary given the existing landscape plantings of Belle Tire. On the preliminary site plan, the petitioner had a four-foot greenbelt on the east property line with 43 boxwood shrubs. The final site plan shows this same area as having a three foot greenbelt which reduces down to zero feet. Six existing shrubs are shown to be remaining in this area. The petitioner should increase this greenbelt to at least three feet, preferably four feet, and plant some kind of plant material in that space. The existing shrubs are in very poor condition and it's doubtful that they will survive. Grasses, which are salt tolerant and can reach heights of five feet, would be a good option for this area.

Greenbelts are required between non-residential parking areas and the public right-of-way and shall be at least 20 feet wide and improved with one large deciduous or evergreen tree and eight shrubs for every 30 lineal feet, except that they may be substituted in part with a masonry screen wall, 30 inches in height, at the discretion of the Planning Commission, in which case, a five-foot greenbelt adjacent to the screen wall must be provided.

The Petitioner states that the existing 16.9-foot greenbelt adjacent to Highland Road is an existing nonconformity. Five trees and 40 shrubs are required; the Petitioner is proposing four trees and twenty-nine shrubs. Forty shrubs seem to be employed to meet this requirement; however, they are not located on the subject property and must be removed from the plan.
6. Pedestrian Circulation. Per Section 5.21 of the Zoning Ordinance, an eight (8) foot wide public sidewalk is required along Highland Road. Currently, there is a pathway along the frontage of the property.
7. Lighting. Section $5.18(\mathrm{G})$ of the Zoning Ordinance includes the standards for outdoor lighting. At the preliminary site plan review the Planning Commission determined that the proposed lighting plan, in the parking lot, is acceptable as the level of foot-candles is zero at the travelled part of Highland Road.
Nine, rubbed bronze anodized sconce fixtures are proposed on the building. Article 6, Section 6.8.E.vii of the Zoning Ordinance states floodlights, wall pack units, and other types of unshielded lights, and lights where the lens or bulb is visible outside of the light fixture are not permitted. The intent is wall-mounted decorative or architectural lighting must be fully shielded and directed downward - up-lighting or outward shining lighting are not permitted. A note was added to the plan but the sconces are still shown on the detail sheet. The petitioner should revise the proposed light fixtures with those that meet the Ordinance requirements. Four wall packs are proposed; two on the rear elevation and one on each side elevation. These wall packs are in compliance with the Ordinance as they are directed downward.
8. Signs. Section 5.9 of the Zoning Ordinance regulates signs. The site plan indicates one monument style sign along the Highland Road frontage. The sign is 7 ' -6 " in overall height and 5' wide. The base consists of brick veneer to match the building with a stone cap. The size of the actual sign area is 27.5 square feet per side, which is in compliance with the Zoning Ordinance. The monument sign must have the address of the businesses on it in 6 -inch high figures on the base, rather than the sign portion itself.

Two wall signs are shown on the front elevation. A note has been added to the elevation plan, sheet PP-4, that signage will be submitted per tenant. The proposed location of the signage is in compliance with the Zoning Ordinance.
9. Trash Disposal. The Petitioner is proposing to utilize the existing 9-foot by 22 -foot trash enclosure. At the last Planning Commission meeting, the Planning Commission felt that it was acceptable to use the existing enclosure.
10. Special Land Use Approval. As stated earlier, the Sonic Restaurant received approval for two special land uses: drive thru operations and outdoor dining. A review of the standards as set forth in Articles 6.10 (General Standards for Special Land Uses) and Articles 4.17 and 4.18 (Drive Thru Window Service and Eating Establishments with Entertainment and/or Outdoor Dining, respectively) indicates that the continuation of these special land uses meets the requirements as stated in the Zoning Ordinance; subject to the following items:

- Petitioner providing information as to the number of tables and chairs for the outdoor dining area; and
- Note added to the final site plan indicating that the outdoor dining will comply with the hours of operation for outdoor dining as stated in Article 4.18 A I; and
- Note added to the plan that the noise level from any outdoor speakers will not exceed 70 dB at the lot line; and
- Note added to the plan that the drive thru hours will not exceed those that were approved for Sonic.


## RECOMMENDATION

Several items, as identified above need to be addressed prior to final site plan approval:

1. Specifications on the number of tables and chairs to be shown on a revised site plan.
2. The petitioner should revise the proposed (wall sconce) light fixtures with those that meet the Ordinance requirements.
3. Petitioner increasing the sidewalk in front of the building to seven feet for its entirety.
4. Address of the businesses being added to the monument sign in letters at least 6 inches in height,
5. Canopy section details submitted.
6. Clarification on the landscape plan as to which landscaping materials meet the various requirements for landscaping, as detailed above.
7. Notes as specified above for those conditions relative to the Special Land Use.

Based on the above recommendations and determinations, we recommend that the Planning Commission approve the preliminary site plan review for 9328 Highland Road subject to the issues identified above and the submission of revised plans for final site plan review.

If you have any questions about this report or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Respectfully submitted,

## McKENNA



Kathleen Jackson
Senior Principal Planner

cc: Mr. Sean O'Neal, AICP<br>Mr. Justin Quagliata<br>Ms. Hannah Micallef

| From: | Jason Hanifen |
| :--- | :--- |
| To: | Hannah Micallef |
| Subject: | RE: FSP for Sonic Redevelopment |
| Date: | Monday, September 20, 2021 9:26:46 AM |

Good morning Hannah, sorry for the delay. The needs from the Fire Department have been met. Have a great day.

From: Hannah Micallef [HMicallef@whitelaketwp.com](mailto:HMicallef@whitelaketwp.com)
Sent: Monday, September 20, 2021 8:51 AM
To: John Holland [JHolland@whitelaketwp.com](mailto:JHolland@whitelaketwp.com); Jason Hanifen [JHanifen@whitelaketwp.com](mailto:JHanifen@whitelaketwp.com)
Cc: Sean O'Neil [SONeil@whitelaketwp.com](mailto:SONeil@whitelaketwp.com)
Subject: RE: FSP for Sonic Redevelopment

Hi there,

Just a reminder that this one is overdue Thanks!

## Hannah Micallef

Executive Secretary
Planning Department
White Lake Charter Township
7525 Highland Road
White Lake, MI 48383
Ph : 248-698-3300 x163
Fx: 248-698-3995
www.whitelaketwp.com


CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail and any attachments thereto are the property of White Lake Township. This transmission may contain information that is privileged, confidential, and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the information contained herein (including any reliance thereon) is STRICTLY PROHIBITED. Sender accepts no liability for any damages caused by any virus transmitted by this email. If you received this transmission in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from any computer immediately. Thank you.

From: Hannah Micallef
Sent: Thursday, September 16, 2021 3:49 PM
To: Aaron Potter [APotter@whitelaketwp.com](mailto:APotter@whitelaketwp.com); Daniel Keller [DKeller@whitelakepolice.com](mailto:DKeller@whitelakepolice.com); John Holland [JHolland@whitelaketwp.com](mailto:JHolland@whitelaketwp.com); Jason Hanifen [JHanifen@whitelaketwp.com](mailto:JHanifen@whitelaketwp.com)
Cc: Sean O'Neil [SONeil@whitelaketwp.com](mailto:SONeil@whitelaketwp.com)

# Assessing Department 

To: Sean O'Neil, Planning
From: Jeanine A Smith
Date: September 2, 2021
Re: Project Name: Sonic
File No:
Parcel Number:12-23-201-010
Redevelopment

## Comments: No comment

September I, 202 I
Sean O'Neil
Charter Township of White Lake
7525 Highland Road
White Lake, MI 48383

## RE: Engineering Plan Review <br> Proposed Commercial Building with Drive-Through <br> Parcel ID: |2-23-20-0 10 <br> 9328 Highland Road <br> White Lake Charter Township, Oakland County, MI

Sean:
Stonefield Engineering \& Design, LLC is pleased to submit documents to address the comments contained in the Site Plan Review Letter dated July 15, 2021. Please find the following items enclosed for review:

| ITEM DESCRIPTION | DATED | COPIES | PREPARED BY |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Site Development Plans | $08 / 30 / 202$ I | I | Stonefield Engineering \& Design |
| Floor Plans \& Elevations | $08 / \mathrm{II} / 202 \mathrm{I}$ | I | Detroit Architectural Group |
| Site Plan Review Application | $06 / 30 / 202 \mathrm{I}$ | I | White Lake Retail Management |
| Check for Final Site Plan Review Fee $\$ 5,760.00$ | $09 / 0 \mathrm{I} / 202 \mathrm{I}$ | I | Alrig USA Development |
| Reciprocal Easement Agreement | $05 / 02 / 2008$ | I | JPMORGAN CHASE BANK |
| Storm Water Maintenance Agreement | I0/22/2009 | I | White Lake Landholding LLC |
| Electronic Copy | N/A | I | Stonefield Engineering \& Design |

The following is an itemized response to the comments contained within the Planning Commission Review Letter dated July 15, 202I:

## Planning Comments:

I. Specifications on the number of tables and chairs to be made a part of the final site plan.

A tenant has not been finalized for the drive through space. Less than 55 total seats is anticipated.
2. The applicant needs to provide calculations for the amount of the façade that meets the Zoning Ordinance requirements as well as the percentage of windows on the front façade (required to be at least 30\%).

Calculations demonstrating compliance with the $30 \%$ front façade window percentage requirement.
3. Applicant to provide a copy of the development agreement that addresses the cross-access easements.

Cross-access easement has been included within this application.
4. Determination by the Planning Commission as to the lack of a delineated loading zone.

Loading zone signage has been included on the attached Site Development Plans.
5. Determination by the Planning Commission as to the lack of a buffer on the west side of the site.

Planning Commission approved the west side buffering at the August $5^{\text {th }}$ meeting.
6. A note on the plan regarding a two-year guarantee and bond for such for all new plant materials.

Note has been added to the landscaping sheet of the Site Development Plans on the 2-year guarantee.
7. A note that all landscaped areas that abut parking areas will be separated with a 6-inch curb.

A note has been added to the landscaping sheet of the Site Development Plans.
8. A note that any landscaping materials that are in poor condition will be removed and replaced with materials that meet the Zoning Ordinance requirements.

A note has been added to the landscaping sheet of the Site Development Plans.
9. Dimension of existing pathway along Highland Road added to final site plan.

Highland Road existing pathway dimension has been added to the site plan sheet of the attached Site Development Plans.
10. Determination by the Planning Commission as to the appropriateness of the existing level of lighting, which exceeds the Zoning Ordinance maximum for foot candles at the lot lines and internally within the site.

Noted.

I I. The petitioner should revise the proposed (wall sconce) light fixtures with those that meet the Ordinance requirements.
Noted.
12. The applicant to provide detail on the wall sign calculations with respect to the front façade area and the area of the proposed wall signs.

Wall signage calculations have been included on the attached architectural elevations.
13. Address of the businesses being added to the monument sign in letters at least 6 inches in height.

Address has been added to the proposed monument sign.
14. Determination by the Planning Commission as to the utilization of the existing trash dumpster enclosure.

## Noted.

15. Lastly, a site inspection showed that the white, metal fence in the rear of the site is in need of repair. A note should be added to this effect on the final site plans.

Note calling out the fence to be repaired has been added to the site plan sheet of the attached Site Development Plans.

The following is an itemized response to the comments contained within the Fire Department Review Letter dated July 15, 2021:

## Fire Department Comments:

I. The access drive shall be designed and maintained to support the imposed loads of fire apparatus and shall be surfaced so as to provide all weather driving capabilities.

Noted. All areas used for fire circulation shall be surfaced with asphalt.
2. The required turning radius shall accommodate the largest Fire Department apparatus (40').

Truck turning exhibit for a 40 ft fire truck has been included on the attached Site Development Plans.
3. The angle of approach/Departure to and from White Lake roads shall not exceed 8 degrees.

## Noted and provided.

4. The proposed relocation of the existing fire hydrant on drawing C-5 has Fire Marshal approval.

## Noted.

The following is an itemized response to the comments contained within the Engineering Review Letter dated July 7, 2021:

## Engineering Comments:

I. A separate connection for a sanitary sewer lead is proposed for the drive-thru restaurant. It needs to be clarified that all kitchen discharge lines are routed to the existing external grease trap. Please also clarify if existing oil and grease separator is properly sized for the new use.

Note to clarify the existing grease trap has been added to the utility sheet of the attached Site Development Plans.
2. The existing watermain easement, where the hydrant and watermain is proposed to be removed, will need to be vacated.

## Noted.

3. The existing storm sewer easements, where the existing storm sewer is to be removed, will need to be vacated.

## Noted.

4. The existing detention basin on the northern portion of the site will need to be inspected and maintenance performed prior to a Certificate of Occupancy issuance for the site. Applicant shall provide documentation regarding the existing storm sewer and detention basin maintenance agreement to demonstrate this redevelopment is covered under the original agreement. Applicant will need to update agreements if necessary.

## Stormwater Maintenance Agreement has been included within this submission.

5. The as-built plans for the previous Sonic restaurant indicate an existing storm water quality device in an unmarked location in the area where the existing storm sewer runs westerly at the western property line. The location and existing condition of this device will need to be verified or an alternate means of onsite stormwater pretreatment will be required.

The water quality device has been called out to be inspected and repaired as necessary.
6. The proposed plan does not cause an increase in impervious area; it has been reduced by approximately 300 square feet. Our office has no concerns with respect to increased storm water runoff from this property. Details regarding proposed storm sewer pipe sizing will be reviewed at the time of Final Engineering Plan submittal.

## Noted.

7. We defer to the Fire Department with regard to items related to fire suppression including proposed hydrant location.

## Noted.

8. The plan proposes a new benchmark be established at time of construction; a benchmark on NAVD 88 datum will be required to be established and shown on the Final Engineering Plan.

New benchmark will be established prior to construction.
9. The plan appears to propose 5-foot-wide sidewalk in front of the building, ordinance requires 7-foot walks to account for vehicle overhang. This may be allowable as the plans propose either bumper blocks or handicap signs in front of the spaces which would prevent overhang. We defer further comment to the Planning Department or Planning Consultant.

Sidewalks have been extended to 7ft where vehicles overhang.
10. The proposed storm sewer easement on the westernmost storm segment is shown over the subject property line, will this easement be granted by the adjacent property owner?

Noted. Easement limits have been modified to only stay onsite.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact our office.
Best regards,


Mitchell Harvey, P.E.
mharvey@stonefieldeng.com
Stonefield Engineering and Design, LLC

Michael Gold
mgold@stonefieldeng.com
Stonefield Engineering and Design, LLC
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