

**APPROVED**  
**FEBRUARY 6, 2023**

**CITY OF WIXOM  
49045 PONTIAC TRAIL  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
MONDAY, JANUARY 16, 2023**

This meeting was called to order by Chairman Day of the Planning Commission at 7:30 p.m. at which time allegiance was pledged to the American flag.

**PRESENT:** William Day (Chairman), Cheryl Tacy (Vice Chairperson), Ray Cousineau, Sandro Grossi, Mark Lada, Anthony Lawrence, Phil Carter

**ABSENT:** None

**OTHERS:** Doug Lewan (Carlisle Wortman Associates), Drew Benson, Assistant City Manager; and Mona Freiburger (Recording Secretary)

**Determination of a Quorum:**

A quorum of the Planning Commission was present for this meeting.

**Changes or Additions to the Agenda:**

Assistant City Manager Benson indicated there is one piece of correspondence related to Maple Glen Minor Site Plan Amendment that City administration is requesting the Planning Commission add under correspondence.

**MOTION** made and seconded by Commission Cousineau and Commission Lada to add Maple Glen Minor Site Plan Amendment to Correspondence.

**VOTE:**

**MOTION CARRIED**

Commissioner Lawrence commented the by-laws indicate the order of business is Old Business followed by New Business. The agenda order was changed to reflect the by-laws.

**MOTION** made and seconded by Commissioner Lawrence and Commissioner Carter to address Old Business ahead of New Business.

**VOTE:**

**MOTION CARRIED**

**Approval of Minutes:**

**MOTION** made and seconded by Commissioner Lawrence and Commissioner Carter to approve the November 28, 2022, Planning Commission Meeting Minutes, as submitted.

**VOTE:**

**MOTION CARRIED**

**MOTION** made and seconded by Commissioner Lawrence and Commissioner Carter to approve the January 4, 2023, Planning Commission Meeting Minutes, as submitted.

**VOTE:**

**MOTION CARRIED**

**Correspondence:**

January 10, 2023, City Manager Update  
Maple Glen Minor Site Plan Amendment – Correspondence

**Call to the Public:** (Limited to 5 minutes per speakers, addressing Agenda items on Agenda only)

No public comments.

**Old Business:**

1. **SITE PLAN REVIEW - SPR#30-019-18: THE LEARNING CENTER, 1725 N. WIXOM ROAD, WIXOM, MI 48393:** Site plan for a 10,000 square foot daycare facility for The Learning Center. The property is located at the northwest corner of N. Wixom Road and Charms Road and is a part of the Stonegate PUD. Along with the new building, a 6,367 square foot outdoor play area, 35 parking spaces, a dumpster, lighting and landscaping are proposed. Access to the site will be from a new driveway along Charms Road. The property is zoned R-2/PUD, One Family Residential/Planned Unit Development Overlay where daycare centers are permitted under Consent Agreement for this site. The parcel number is 17-30-200-018.

Discussion:

The applicant received site plan approval in January, 2019 and an administrative approval in May 2020, for a 10,000 square foot daycare facility for The Learning Center. The property is located at the northwest corner of N. Wixom Road and Charms Road and is part of the Stonegate Village PUD. Along with the new building, a 6,367 square foot outdoor play area, 35 parking spaces, a dumpster, lighting and landscaping are proposed.

Access to the site will be from a new driveway along Charms Road. The property is zoned R-2/PUD, One-Family Residential/Planned Unit Development Overlay where daycare centers are permitted under Consent Agreement for this site.

Per Section 18.17.080 - Validity of approval site plan, site plan approval is valid for a period of one year from the date of Planning Commission approval. As the site plan has expired, the applicant is seeking to renew the approval. The site plans have not changed since the January, 2019 and May, 2020 approvals with the exception of a revised building elevation drawing as requested by the Planning Commission.

Based on the information provided above and review of the submitted site plan, Carlisle/Wortman Associates recommend site plan approval for SPR#30-019-18 for The Learning Center for a 10,000 square foot daycare facility conditioned upon the following:

1. Planning Commission approval of one additional parking space above and beyond the Ordinance maximum;
2. A waiver for the dumpster location;
3. A landscape waiver for the elimination of two canopy trees and three bushes; and review and approval from other applicable consults, departments and agencies.
4. Revised building elevation as presented.

Mr. Lewan referred the Planning Commission to Carlisle Wortman Associates introductory memo dated January 11, 2023. The site plan is before the Planning Commission and because the original site plan expired, the applicant is looking to renew the previous approval. There was previous discussion on the part of the Planning Commission to have the applicant amend the building elevations and the architectural aspects of the project. The applicant made some of those changes.

Carlisle Wortman Associates' summary is dated January 11, 2023 but their review letter is dated January 10, 2023 which is included in the packet for tonight's meeting. Carlisle Wortman Associates outlined some of the changes since the last time the Planning Commission took any formal action. Those changes are shown in the elevation drawings which include some stone banding across the bottom of the facility and some changes to the entry way.

There is also included in the packet a letter from CIB Planning dated May 15, 2020, who recommended approval for the changes the applicant has proposed, and who also is recommending approval of the proposed reinstatement of the previous approved site plan. The site plan expired in 2021. This is also part of the Consent Judgment.

Commissioner Cousineau inquired if there are any provisions in the Consent Judgment with respect to time tables for construction or approval. Assistant City Manager Benson indicated no, to his understanding, there is not a specific timeframe.

Chairman Day commented a sheet of elevations was received on June 16, 2022 and there is another sheet that says it was revised on December 15, 2022 but it appears that the only revision made was revising north and south elevations to be correct; and east and west to be revised, as well. Mr. Lewan indicated he noted it in their report that the elevations have not changed from the last time.

Commissioner Cousineau indicated he pulled up a copy of the plan which he thought the Commission had approved originally. The Commission had comments regarding the addition of gables or dormers which were not shown on the Plan that was approved and those additions have been made on the latest plan that is in front of the Commission tonight.

Chairman Day commented his recollection is that the plan that is on the 8.5 x 11 sheet is the plan that, initially, came before the Commission and was not approved. The applicant went back and came up with this other plan which the Commission has not acted on because the applicant hasn't been present but it was commented on at the Commission meeting in September, 2022. It appears that those comments were unheeded. As part of the site plan approval, elevations were never approved. Assistant City Manager Benson indicated it would be unlikely that a site plan would be approved without elevations. The only variant would be if the Consent Judgment had a pre-laid out site plans that would constitute preliminary approval but this is not the case in this particular instance.

Mr. Lewan commented, according to CIB's review comments of May 15, 2020, it says on April 17, 2019, the Planning Commission reviewed and approved the site plan for the Learning Center. Elevations were not present at that time but are now being reviewed administratively for compliance with the Consent Judgment.

Mr. Chris Buell, applicant, 1350 Manufacturing Street, Dallas Texas, 75207. Chairman Day asked Mr. Buell if he was given information regarding the comments that were made at the meetings where he was not able to be present. Mr. Buell answered yes. Initially, the comments that they addressed were, specific to the east and north elevations. There were some awnings added to the elevations to give it a little more residential feel. Since he was unable to attend the last meeting, further comments were addressed with regard to enhancing the plan further. There are some gables on all four sides of the building; the stone added to surround the two columns at the entry way and stone wrapped around the bottom of the building below the brick. Mr. Buell indicated they have enhanced the building to make it a lot more residential in appearance and addressed the comments made by the Planning Commission.

Mr. Buell discussed the privacy fence. The privacy fence is typical because there are children out in the playground and they want them to be private in their activities. A six foot privacy fence wraps around the whole playground; it extends further west to the western edge of the playground and then extends north to the north corner of the playground and then extends to the east to the northwest corner of the building. Along the north side of the building, there is a four foot privacy fence which wraps around close to the northeast corner. The fence goes to the mechanical room door which needs easy access for the fire department.

Commissioner Cousineau inquired about the timeline for construction. Mr. Buell indicated the plans are being designed right now. The architect has been engaged and submitted to the tenant. Once the plans are complete, the plans would be submitted to the City of Wixom building department for review. Mr. Buell anticipates the project to commence in mid-March.

Mr. Lewan commented the advantage of making a motion to extend the original site plan approval is that any previous conditions that were made during the full details of the previous site plan would still be in effect.

Commissioner Carter commented that in the staff report, there was Planning Commission approval, one additional parking space above and beyond the maximum allowed by ordinance; landscape waiver for eliminating two canopy trees, three bushes, review and approval from consultants and revised building elevations which were discussed. Commissioner Carter did not see anything that he took exception to.

Chairman Day indicated there was significant discussion with the dumpster issue and the difficulty in finding appropriate placement. He thought the applicant did the best they could given the site.

**MOTON** made and seconded by Commissioner Carter and Commissioner Lawrence to approve the extension of **SITE PLAN REVIEW - SPR#30-019-18: THE LEARNING CENTER, 1725 N. WIXOM ROAD, WIXOM, MI 48393**: Site plan for a 10,000 square foot daycare facility for The Learning Center. The property is located at the northwest corner of N. Wixom Road and Charms Road and is a part of the Stonegate PUD. Along with the new building, a 6,367 square foot outdoor play area, 35 parking spaces, a dumpster, lighting and landscaping are proposed. Access to the site will be from a new driveway along Charms Road. The property is zoned R-2/PUD, One Family Residential/Planned Unit Development Overlay where daycare centers are permitted under Consent Agreement for this site. The parcel number is 17-30-200-018; one year extension from today's date of January 16, 2023.

**VOTE:**

**MOTION CARRIED**



1. **SITE PLAN REVIEW - SPR#22-014: WAREHOUSE BUILDING, 30397 S. WIXOM ROAD, WIXOM, MI 48393.** The applicant is requesting site plan approval for a 45,400 square foot industrial warehouse facility, located on the west side of Wixom Road, approximately one-half mile south of Pontiac Trail, and immediately north of the CSX railroad. The site is zoned M-1, Light Industrial. It is currently undeveloped, with the exception of nineteen (19) paved parking spaces at the front of the site. The parcel number is 22-06-200-040.

Discussion:

The applicant is requesting site plan approval for a 45,400 square foot industrial facility located on the west side of Wixom Road, approximately one-half mile south of Pontiac Trail, and immediately north of the CSX railroad. The site is zoned M-1, Light Industrial. It is currently undeveloped, with the exception of nineteen (19) paved parking spaces at the front of the site. A light industrial/office building currently exists on the property to the north of the site. Parking on the subject site and parking on the aforementioned site are connected by a cross access drive that the applicant proposes to keep.

The applicant proposes to lease the facility to two separate tenants, signifying building area for warehousing, office space, and retail. The applicant plans to capture storm water in an existing storm water basin, located in the southwest arm of the site. Tree plantings are proposed around the perimeter of this basin. Further landscaping is proposed, primarily, along Wixom Road, per the requirements set forth by the ordinance.

As per letter dated January 6, 2023 from Carlisle Wortman Associates, staff recommends approval of SPR-22-014 for 30397 S. Wixom Road, with the conditions/revisions to be submitted via a revised site plan and reviewed administratively prior to the issuance of building permits.

Mr. Lewan reviewed Carlisle Wortman Associates' letter dated January 6, 2023 to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Lewan indicated the applicant is proposing three potential uses within the warehouse. This is a site plan, not a special land use or PUD. This is a situation where if the applicant meets the minimum standards for site plan approval, the City is compelled to approve the project.

This is zoned M-1 Light Industrial. The property around the site is also zoned M-1 Light Industrial.

The applicant has met all of the Area, Width, Height and Setbacks or bulk requirements, with the exception of parking located within the front yard area. Front yard parking within this part of the City on Wixom Road is required to have a front yard parking setback of 145 feet. There is an alternative way to allow parking closer than 145 feet from Wixom Road; that is if the applicant installs a 20 foot landscape buffer, which they have done. There is one more criteria which is no more than 50% of the green belt area can be covered by parking spaces. The green belt area is different than the front yard setback. The applicant has to have no more than 50% of that area paved. If they have less than 50% area paved. Just as a point of reference, from the aerial photograph or site plan, the parking the applicant is proposing matches up with the parking to the north. The applicant is not proposing something that is completely out of character with the area, but it is, technically, not complaint. Mr. Lewan indicated they were not able to calculate the 50% parking within the front greenbelt area; possibly the applicant can shed some light on this standard, if it can be met.

With regard to natural resource, Mr. Lewan overviewed some of the items within the natural resource section on pages 3 and 4 of their report. The applicant has no issue with natural features onsite; and no issue with the location of site arrangement.

With regard to parking and loading, Mr. Lewan indicated they have calculated the correct number of parking spaces to be required. The applicant is proposing three uses: warehouse storage, building offices and a small amount of retail space. Each of those has a slightly different parking calculation which is provided on pages 4 and 5 of their report. In addition to parking, the applicant has to provide a certain number of loading spaces. They are required to provide three loading spaces based on the size of the building. Mr. Lewan indicated he was not concerned with the loading; he thought they have enough loading onsite but it is required that loading spaces be dimensioned. Prior to this project going into construction phase, this is something that needs to be shown on the site plan.

With regarding to site access and circulation, this is the area of the site plan that has the most important comment. The city engineer has indicated that they are desiring that the south entry point be eliminated. They are awaiting to hear from the Road Commission for Oakland County, if they are also desiring to have that access point to be removed. The Planning Commission could move this project forward pending that decision from the Road Commission, whether the access point would be removed. Mr. Lewan indicated he spoke with Mr. Darga from HRC. From a planning aspect, Mr. Lewan supports the way the circulation is being proposed on the site plan because it appears the applicant would have a significant amount of truck traffic. If the southern driveway is removed, trucks are going to have to circulate back up through the front of the building and then around to the main entrance in front of visitor parking, and employee parking. Mr. Darga was in agreement with this sentiment but are now awaiting on the Road Commission to comment on the access.



With regard to sidewalks and safety paths, the applicant is requesting that payment in lieu of construction to be considered for this site. This is up to the Planning Commission to determine if this should be allowed in this case. Mr. Lewan's recommendation is for the sidewalk to be constructed now as it becomes difficult for the sidewalk to be constructed in the future.

Landscaping is discussed on pages 6 through 8 on Carlisle Wortman Associates report. There are a few technical issues with some of the notes on the Plan. None of those are critical and Mr. Lewan will be checking those prior to construction to make sure that the right number of green belt trees, parking lot trees and landscape trees are installed.

Mr. Lewan did not have any issue with the lighting proposed. The applicant did provide a lighting plan.

The only issue with signage, Mr. Lewan would like to see the height of what the applicant is proposing for the monument sign; however, even if they do have a height on the site plan, the applicant does have to apply for signage, separately.

With regard to floor plan and elevations, Mr. Lewan did not have any further comment other than what has been discussed prior to having dimensions on what the applicant is proposing. The applicant provided mechanical equipment screening. All mechanical equipment at the ground level, would need to be screened as required by ordinance.

There are eight items to be addressed by the applicant prior to the start of construction. The most significant of those is the issue with the Road Commission for Oakland County and whether they are going to allow the second driveway access to Wixom Road.

In addition to Carlisle Wortman Associates' report, there are reports in the packet from HRC which provided a number of technical details that are needed prior to start of construction. There is also a letter from the fire department dated November 16, 2022 and a letter from the building department, who have no issue with what is being proposed at this time.

Chairman Day inquired if there has been any written response from the applicant on any of the items that were raised by Carlisle Wortman Associates. Mr. Lewan answered no.

Chairman Day asked if Mr. Lewan was comfortable with all of the items that can be reviewed administratively. Mr. Lewan answered he was comfortable with all of them except the driveway issue; if the Road Commission comes back and indicates the driveway has to go away, then this should come back before the Planning Commission to see how circulation is going to work. The radius that would be required to get a truck back in the northern entry driveway is probably going to take out some parking. Mr.

Lewan recommended if the Road Commission comes back requiring that the southern entrance to be removed, that this request return to the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Cousineau indicated he did see correspondence from the applicant that indicated they did not meet the threshold for a traffic study. Mr. Lewan indicated he did see the correspondence but he did not review it.

Commissioner Cousineau commented there was a potential for three users on the site. The applicant has not identified the users. The interior configuration of the building could change in terms of the square footage of the office and warehouse. The calculations are based upon the applicant's best guess to what the mix is going to be right now. Commissioner Cousineau's concern would be if the office area and retail use increases, this could, potentially, increase the amount of parking required. Mr. Lewan answered this could be reviewed, administratively.

Mr. Neal Ganshorn, applicant, Rand Construction, 1270 Rickett Road, Brighton, MI, spoke in reference to the two driveways. There are three overall building which is only fed by one driveway on the north part of the northern property. The center property would be neglected if there is not a center driveway. The entrance for the trucks would be on the middle driveway which would be accessing both the back truck docks and the whole middle building that is to the north. It is part of the cross access agreement.

Mr. Ganshorn indicated the interior floor plan, originally, was to have two businesses that were existing Wixom organizations that were going to be relocated here; which may or may not happen but they have built the floor plan to be able to accommodate them. The retail and office are both the same parking usage. If there is more office space, they have enough space for parking. There are also a few van spaces which are wider, a little bit deeper.

Chairman Day asked the applicant if they have addressed the contingency of the Road Commission of not allowing the southern driveway. Mr. Ganshorn answered they know the Road Commission will make a decision, but whatever they say, they will have to abide by; totally understanding that is going to be independent of this approval as well.

Mr. Tim Zimmer, Livingston Engineering, 3300 Old US 23, Brighton, MI 48114, indicated they did the calculation of the percent of coverage for the pavement, the drive aisle and parking spaces servicing those parking spaces. It is approximately 35%. They can work with staff to finalize the calculations. Mr. Zimmer added, in terms of the second drive approach issue, he reviewed the rules of the Road Commission. The Road Commission allows additional commercial driveways, if you meet certain criteria, which he believes the applicant does. Mr. Zimmer will work with the Road Commission. It is an important part of the site plan to have the second driveway, but they will behold to what the Road Commission decides.

The applicant did not have any issue with the consultants' notes on the landscaping.

Commissioner Carter indicated he viewed the sample and color version that was provided. He inquired if this is an example of a similar building. Mr. Ganshorn answered this was the photo that led to the design, the concept of the building and the elevations. The building proposed is not the same elevations, so it is a doctored photo of a similar building. It is the same materials, same looks and same entrance. AS far as the site grading, it is not lofted up that high. There is also mostly parking in front of the building.

Mr. Zimmer indicated based on the ITC trip generation schedule for this type of use, it does not appear to meet the threshold for a traffic study.

Commissioner Cousineau got clarification that the applicant would not impact the wetlands.

Commissioner Carter inquired if the southern entrance is not approved, if there would be any modification to the plan to allow trucks. Mr. Ganshorn answered there would need to be modifications.

Commissioner Tacy commented she was a proponent of having the sidewalks installed when they have the opportunity. There is a City initiative to get the sidewalks all connected. Chairman Day was also in agreement to have the sidewalk installed when the site is being developed.

Commissioner Lada commented there were a lot of loose ends in reference to approval of the plan. They are waiting on the Road Commission for the second driveway, including the sidewalk and items to be administratively reviewed.

Mr. Lewan commented the City does have access management standards with regard to the two driveway locations. There are requirements for distance, this is the City's zoning standards. These driveways meet the zoning standards.

Chairman Day commented the HRC letter also stated the truck circulation plan conforms to the City of Wixom ordinance which is included in the review with both driveways in place; although it may not if the second driveway is removed.

Mr. Lewan recommended if the second driveway is removed, the plan should be returned to the Planning Commission for review.

**MOTION** made and seconded by Commissioner Carter and Commission Lawrence to approve **SITE PLAN REVIEW - SPR#22-014: WAREHOUSE BUILDING, 30397 S.**

**WIXOM ROAD, WIXOM, MI 48393.** The applicant is requesting site plan approval for a 45,400 square foot industrial warehouse facility, located on the west side of Wixom Road, approximately one-half mile south of Pontiac Trail, and immediately north of the CSX railroad. The site is zoned M-1, Light Industrial. It is currently undeveloped, with the exception of nineteen (19) paved parking spaces at the front of the site. The parcel number is 22-06-200-040; with the following conditions to be submitted via a revised site plan and reviewed administratively prior to the issuance of building permits:

1. Provide calculations to show that front parking area is less than fifty percent of the front yard area, per Section 18.09.050.C; and
2. Provide loading space dimensions, as noted in Carlisle Wortman Associates review letter dated January 6, 2023; and
3. Address the concerns held by HRC, the consulting engineer firm, and RCOC (The Road Commission of Oakland County) regarding the removal of the southernmost driveway; and
4. Submit site plans to and request a right of way permit from the RCOC; and
5. To require the installation of the sidewalk on the eastside of the property along Wixom Road; and
6. Address landscaping as noted; and
7. Provide the proposed height of monument sign and ensure height does not exceed six (6) feet (Section 18.16.100); and
8. Provide location and screening method of any proposed equipment that is not already included in the provided diagrams; and
9. The site plan review would return to the Planning Commission if the southern driveway is not allowed by the Road Commission of Oakland County, as it is a major change.

**VOTE:**

**MOTION CARRIED**

**Call to the Public:**

No public comments.

**Staff Comments:**

Assistant City Manager Benson commented there was exciting, big news regarding Total Soccer and new buyers. There has been a news release that Total Soccer on Wixom Road has been sold to another organization, TOCA Soccer, out of California. TOCA Soccer is affiliated major legal soccer; which is also related to training and development. Assistant City Manager Benson anticipates TOCA Soccer will take advantage of the liquor license and the other amenities onsite.

Assistant City Manager Benson indicated the Damas' property located at the I96 and Beck Road is, currently, listed for sale. The City has helped them get connected with the Detroit Regional Partnership to have that property listed on the verified industrial properties program. The intention of this program is to market these high impact sites for attracting notable development. This is a work in progress but commercial recreation is something that comes up from time to time in that area.

**Commission Comments:**

Commissioner Lada inquired about the eastbound entry ramp which was two lanes of full traffic and now one lane. Assistant City Manager Benson commented this question has come up multiple times and there is some information on the City's Facebook page. Assistant City Manager Benson indicated he would forward the email received by City Council to the Planning Commission. It is his understanding this is a temporary arrangement.

Commissioner Lada questioned when the Beck Road construction would begin. Assistant City Manager Benson answered he would see if there is any information by MDOT regarding the construction.

Commissioner Grossi asked when Renaissance Global would install a real sign. Assistant City Manager Benson indicated they have not been issued the full Certificate of Occupancy as of yet. The sign would likely be a condition of the Certificate of Occupancy.

Commissioner Tacy inquired about the windows on Phase 2 on the Wixom Road development. Assistant City Manager Benson indicated he did not have additional information.

Commissioner Lada inquired if Wayfair on Wixom Road would be just a warehouse or will they have a "nick and dent" area to sell to the public also in this space. Assistant City Manager Benson answered not to his knowledge, but that's not to say that it could never happen.

Commissioner Tacy inquired about the VCA ordinance illustrations. Assistant City Manager Benson answered that the map is completely done. They are in the middle of

City of Wixom  
Planning Commission  
Monday, January 16, 2023

14

drawing up the illustrations. He would anticipate the illustrations being on the next Planning Commission agenda.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

This meeting of the Planning Commission was motioned and adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

Mona Freiburger  
Recording Secretary