

WEST TRAVERSE TOWNSHIP
REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 14, 2022

Chairperson Mooradian called the to order at 7:00 p.m.

Roll Call: Repasky, Moore, Green, Varner, Uutinen, Mooradian

Absent: Wallin

Visitors: Eric Blessi, Shane David, Ken Lane

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited by all.

Approve Agenda as presented: **Agenda was approved by consensus.**

Public Comments: Blessi gave his update to the board.

Approval of October 12, 2022, Regular Meeting Minutes: **Uutinen made a motion to approve the minutes as submitted. Green seconded the motion. All yes.**

New Business:

- a. **Case #04-2022** – Site Plan Review, application submitted by Brett Bandi on behalf of 3609 Backus Dr, LLC to construct a commercial storage building at 3609 Backus Drive. Mooradian asks Lane to introduce the case. Lane states “it is my understanding it is 5000 square feet, is it going to be 8 separate units inside of there?” David replies “yes”. Lane states each unit will be roughly 625 sqft. David agrees. Lane states “property zoned I-1, light industrial, commercial, 1.35 acres. There is an aerial photo included in the packet.” Lane states “there are 2 existing pole structures on the property, one is 5,000 sqft and the other is 3,750 sqft. Access is through an easement called Backus Dr.” Lane states “the surrounding properties are zoned I-1. Comparable uses surround the property. Lane reviews the criteria with the board. Lane states “FEMA has designated this property to be in a floodplain.” Lane states he is not “suggesting that it means you can’t build the additional pole building as proposed, but part of the requirements of that is that for any future construction on the property; the owner has to make sure they’re meeting Federal and State regulations for floodplain management.” Lane states “on the site plan, retention and drainage specifications were included.” Varner asks Lane “so how do you know it meets the height requirements?” Lane states “because in their application, they said it is only going to be 18 feet.” Lane states “not all the items listed in the site plan; graphic requirements were included on the site plan. But there is a provision in the zoning ordinance, that allows the zoning administrator discretion to sort of waive the requirement for a sealed engineered set of plans.” Lane asks if there are any questions or comments.
Mooradian asks the applicant to share what they have. David asks the board what questions they have for him. Repasky wants to go over the list that was not satisfied. Moore asks Lane if there is a set of sealed drawings. Lane states “no this is the only plan

Proposed: December 14, 2022

Approved:

that has been submitted.” Repasky asks “is there a reason they are not sealed?” David says if approved then they will go through with the seal. David states “it has all of the elevations on there, so there is some topography. It shows the water retention and snow areas; as far as lighting it shows it on the original building, and that is the only place we are going to have lighting. The new building will not have any power. As far as the dumpster, we do not have dumpsters on storage sights.” David says they are going to have the customers take the garbage off site. David states “as far as parking, people will use the whole place as a parking lot. As long as we have enough sites there, it should be sufficient.” Repasky asks “why are you presenting it that way?” David states “we are not. We have parking on the 2 buildings that are existing, but we don’t have any on the 3rd.” Repasky asks “so you are saying no one is going to operate the way this site plan is showing?” David states “yeah no body does that.” Repasky asks why he is showing it that way? David states “we have to have parking, so that’s the only way to get all of the parking spots in there, but no body uses parking spots at a storage facility.” Repasky asks “wouldn’t it be appropriate to show where you intend people to park?” David states “they park at their door.” People pull in they get their stuff; it is a brief thing.” Repasky states “unloading and loading are fine, but shouldn’t we see what you are anticipating so that we can evaluate it for safety concerns?” The board discusses the parking situation. Moore asks, “is there anywhere in the application or on the drawings that actually reference the 8 units?” David says there was an initial application submitted in October, and then a revised application was submitted that was consistent with this revised site plan. David stated “that in the initial site plan it mentioned the 8 units inside. Moore would like a floor plan. Mooradian states “there should be elevations and doors on there.” David states “I did try to get them to add the elevations to this page and the lighting questions.” Mooradian states “it is one of the graphic requirements of the plan and it would show a couple of things; that there is 8 units, how many doors you have, and it gives the height of 18 feet which the applicant gave.” Mooradian states “on this whole site, it is being treated as one parcel, but it has an underlying land division on it.” Mooradian reviewed the drawing. Mooradian asks Lane if the easement goes through O’Neill Dr? Lane states “I thought at the fence line it was private, I thought it was storage.” Moore says he looked up the easements and that is an emergency vehicle only ingress/egress. Moore states that the 30-foot easement on Backus Dr. that the applicant shows, and the condition of that easement should be addressed. The applicant states he can get it fixed. Mooradian recaps the discussion “so we have 8 units, elevations, and will ultimately be sealed.” Moore would like the actual legal description. Mooradian discusses lighting on the buildings with David. David states he will put all electrical specifications on the drawings. Varner asks, “are they going to be responsible just for the access in front of their property or all the way out to main road?” Mooradian states “that the road maintenance agreement amongst the property owners would say.” Moore asks if there is any lighting in the parking lot since it is 24-hour access. David states “as far as I know there is one light, and it is on the end of the first building.” Mooradian states the center building has lighting on it. The board reviews the drawing. Moore feels that a section in the I-1 regulations should be brought up; the regulation requires them to pave from the road to the front setback. Mooradian believes they have the ability to wave that. Mooradian reads the regulation. Mooradian states a motion needs to be made to postpone to gather further information.

Uutinen made a motion to postpone until January 11, 2023, Case #04-2022 Brett Bandi on behalf of 3609 Backus Dr, LLC for a site plan review of a 5,000 square foot storage building at 3609 Backus Drive in West Traverse Township. Tax parcel 16-15-12-350-029. And as shown on the site plan dated November 17, 2022, because additional information is needed per applicants and the boards discussion in regard to consideration. Moore seconds the motion.

Roll call: Repasky-yes, Moore-yes, Green-yes, Varner-yes, Uutinen-yes, Mooradian-yes.

Unfinished Business

- a. Continued discussion – work list item-draft text amendments. Mooradian and the board did a phone conference with Denise Kline and reviewed and discussed changes to the amendments.

Other

- a. Zoning Administrator Report – The board had no comments on the administrators report.
- b. Township Board Representative Report – None
- c. Correspondence – Chairperson gave his report.

Planning Commissioner Comments (open discussion) – Mooradian thanked Repasky for his time with the Planning Commission.

Public Comments:

Next Meeting: Planning Commission Regular Meeting, January 11, 2023 7:00 PM

Adjournment: **Mooradian made a motion to adjourn at 9:12pm.**

Respectfully Submitted by:

Dawson Moore, Secretary

Transcribed by:
Paige Fisher

Proposed: December 14, 2022
Approved: