

---

---

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF WATERFORD  
NOTICE OF PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING  
TUESDAY, MARCH 23, 2021 and 4:30 P.M.

Due to the COVID-19 epidemic declared by the Director of the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services, **this meeting will be held by electronic remote access that provides 2-way telephone or video conferencing** as permitted by and in accordance with the Open Meetings Act as amended by Public Act No. 228 of 2020.

**Planning Commission Pre-meeting - 4:00**

Agenda Review

**Planning Commission Meeting - 4:30**

- I. Call the Meeting to Order  
Chairperson Werth called the meeting to order at 4:31 p.m.
- II. Roll Call  
Present:  
Sandra Werth, Chairperson, remote from Waterford, MI  
Colleen Murphy, Commissioner, remote from Waterford, MI  
Matt Ray, Secretary, remote from Waterford, MI  
Tony Bartolotta, Commissioner, remote from Waterford, MI  
Dave Kramer, Commissioner, remote from Waterford, MI  
Scott Sintkowski, Commissioner, remote from Waterford, MI  
Steve Reno, Commissioner, remote from Escanaba, MI  
  
Also Present:  
Jeffrey Polkowski, Superintendent/ Planning  
Scott Alef, Planner II  
Amy Williams, Departmental Aide  
Rob Merinsky, Director/Engineering  
Gary Wall, Township Supervisor  
  
Public Present: Approximately 30
- III. Approve the Agenda of the March 23, 2021, regular meeting of the Planning Commission.

**MOTION AND VOTE**

*Moved by Bartolotta*

*Supported by Reno: Resolved to **Approve** the March 23, 2021 Planning Commission Meeting Agenda.*

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY ROLL CALL VOTE**

**(7 - 0)**

- IV. Approve the Minutes of the February 23, 2021, regular meeting of the Planning Commission.

**MOTION AND VOTE**

*Moved by Kramer*

*Supported by Bartolotta: Resolved to **Approve** the February 23, 2021 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes as written.*

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY ROLL CALL VOTE**

**(7 - 0)**

- V. Approve the Consent Agenda

**MOTION AND VOTE**

*Moved by Kramer*

*Supported by Bartolotta: Resolved to **Approve** the Consent Agenda.*

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY ROLL CALL VOTE**

**(7 - 0)**

- VI. Site Plans and Public Hearings

**1. Rezoning Request No. PZ 21-03-04, JLG Property**

**Parcel I.D. No. 13-18-100-008**, T3N, R9E, SEC 18 PART OF NW 1/4 BEG AT PT DIST S 00-05-37 W 125.23 FT & N 89-54-23 W 60 FT FROM N 1/4 COR, TH S 00-05-37 W 1357.11 FT, TH N 89-57-13 W 547.95 FT, TH N 00-06-38 E 736.11 FT, TH ALG CURVE TO RIGHT, RAD 630 FT, CHORD BEARS N 41-29-08 E 828.38 FT, DIST OF 903.95 FT TO BEG 15.19 A 10-28-19 FR 007

**Requesting:** Rezone from PL to R-1C

**Property Location:** Northeast corner of N Williams Lake Rd. and Hatchery Rd.

**Property Zoned:** PL, Public Lands

**Applicant:** JLG Property

Applicant or representative present: Joe Locricchio

**Mr. Polkowski** gave a brief history of the property including the previous rezoning and site plan request and the substantial changes between them: notably the decrease in zoning intensity from R-M2 to R-1C and density of residential development from 108 attached condos to 66 detached units.

Polkowski indicated that the applicant offered two conditions for the rezoning:

1. That they successfully obtain the property from the Road Commission
2. The site plan is approved as the 66 units

He advised those in attendance that properties zoned Public Lands, when removed from government control, need to be rezoned unless controlled by a nonprofit or quasigovernmental organization. Polkowski went on to describe the request, the areas surrounding the subject property, and the possible uses that could go on the property as zoned. The applicant has reduced his plans based on feedback this past fall to develop a 66-unit site condominium development.

Mr. Polkowski explained that some form of development is expected here over the next several years and that single-family detached housing would likely be the least impactful type of development.

**Mr. Locricchio of JLG Properties**, 6005 Maplewood Ct, Clarkston, is the applicant. He indicated that, based on the current zoning map, R-1A and R-1C zoning are the predominant zoning districts in the Township and added that this development would be consistent with the area and is less invasive than the large traffic generating uses that could be developed under the current Public Lands zoning designation. He reiterated the list of the Use by Right uses under the current zoning. As part of the consideration, he completed a medical use plan that included multiple two story buildings with over 130,000 sqft. of building space meeting all Township requirements.

He discussed that though the Public Lands zoning district is intended to be a buffer between residential and nonresidential uses, the current list of uses actually does the opposite. The accessibility makes this an attractive site for development. While the existing potential uses may be attractive to developers, it would not be attractive to surrounding properties.

He finished by stating that they have conditioned their rezoning request on a particular single family site plan and if approved, they will not be coming back to the Township for a different request.

**Chairperson Werth** opened the public hearing. During the public hearing portion of the meeting, the following spoke on this request.

**David McDonald** of 2256 Richardson Ct. is opposed. He and his family have lived in the home since 1965 and have had to endure several inconveniences such as the party store and a halfway house. He enjoys the peace and quiet in the area, does not want to see crime, noise, litter and loss of wildlife. He wants the lot to remain vacant and that the developer donates the property to become wildlife preserve or park.

**Lori Ford** of 7176 Hatchery. She referenced the previous request and how residents of the area were clearly opposed to development of the property. She did not understand how this request will be substantially different from the previous in terms of impacts and stated that traffic patterns have not changed in the last 6 months and voiced concerns for noise, traffic, and safety and cause damage to the roads. She would like to see the development go to other properties that would not disrupt greenspace. She would like to see this stay public land.

**Kenneth Pyle** of 2246 Richardson Ct. He is the owner of the former party store on Hatchery and is opposed to this request. He has lived there for 13 years and enjoys the quiet. He believes the development will be an overburden on traffic and would rather see a park go in. He wants to preserve the open space. He doesn't want this to be a big city. He has had problems with the halfway house down the road.

**Greg Bower** of 6950 Hatchery. He has been here for 21 years and remembers being opposed to the airport expansion, and stated that the property was owned by Ida Booth who sold it to the State for recreational purposes. This property is an attraction to neighbors who enjoy the woods. Wants the County to leave the property as it is and was intended. Understands that if the property was private the owner would have the right to develop it but believes it is publicly owned lands. He is hoping to coordinate with a conservancy and raise money to allow the property to remain a pristine woodland.

**Kathy Schemers** of 7000 Hatchery. She agrees with Greg. She went around the neighborhood with 500 fliers during the previous request to show the negative impacts of the development. She appreciated that the Township listed and finds it concerning that we are back at the same point again. There are residents in the neighborhood that are interested in contributing to the conservancy and see no point in building in that spot. She believes that there are other areas that can be built upon and wants the opportunity to see what they can do to get this incorporated in a conservancy so that it can't be developed.

**Chairperson Werth** asked how long Kathy Schemers had been working with the conservancy. Schemers responded that they had contacted the DNR last year and had been directed to the conservancy and the discussion had been ongoing.

**Jacquelyn Brown** of 945 Oregon Blvd. She stated that there are several Waterford residents that are working with authorities such as the conservancy. She stated that they are almost to a solution and would request that they have more time to organize.

**Mark Monohon** of 3517 David K Dr. He is a Trustee speaking as a Waterford resident. He is opposed to this for a number of reasons and agrees with the previously stated reasons. all voiced similar concerns and the hopes for more time to get into a conservatory.

After the public hearing was closed, **Mr. Polkowski** read comments turned into the Township by email, text, mail or chat from the following:

**Ray Bows** messaged to keep the land natural.

**Lori Ford** messaged continued opposition of the rezoning of the property. She is not sure of the difference between the requests and traffic patterns have not changed. Williams Lake Rd is 50 mph and is very busy. Hatchery is very busy with motorist ignoring traffic laws and endangering pedestrians. The sale of the condominiums will increase traffic and cause further damage to Hatchery Rd. There are other abandoned properties that JLG can build on. The corner of Hatchery and Williams Lake is the home to wildlife and should be preserved. She expressed environmental concerns and does not want the additional noise and traffic and damage to the roads.

**Ryan K** (no full name) messaged that he is opposed to the development of the land. He has been a resident of Waterford for 36 years.

**Leslie Mason** messaged that they are opposed and asked if we did not hear what they said 6 months ago. They stated that this was an embarrassment of elected officials and that the request was a waste of time and money.

**Denise Mosher** messaged that she is opposed to the request. She has lived in Waterford for many years and values the natural land that still exists. The property provides a natural habitat and serves as a buffer to the airport. She and other residents are pursuing all available options for keeping the land natural and wants to keep Waterford a nice place to live.

**Kathleen Zimmers** messaged and asked if this was the same property that was up for rezoning last year and if we knew what Mr. Locricchio was intending on doing there so that she may reach out to other residents so that they may voice their objections.

**Steven Klien** messaged that since Mt. Polkowski stated earlier that since the property is sold and the rezoning is legally necessary, the application to the rezoning has no meaning whatsoever.

Mr. Polkowski stated he will respond to the comment after the Public Hearing portion as the implication is that it will be approved by default, which he stated is not true.

Mr. Klien's message continued to say that state lands should not be sold to developers under the guise of an airport expansion. It was allocated for conservation and was not approved to be sold for this kind of thing – only airport purposes. The County should not be selling this property.

**Jacquelyn Brown** messaged that Waterford Township was granted over \$9 million in stimulus money and the majority of residents want to keep this parcel public land. We would like more support from public officials to save this land and need more time to get the funds together and organize. There are residents across Waterford that are willing to donate time and money to keep this property public land.

**Wendy Royer** messaged that she is in opposition to this request as she believes Waterford does not need more housing and we need to keep our greenspace green.

**Chairperson Werth** closed the public hearing.

**Commissioner Bartolotta** spoke up to consider the resident comments in their hopes to purchase the property and get into a conservatory but they did not designate any

timeframe since the last meeting regarding this property. He stated he would prefer the residents buy this and asked how long they would need to come up with the money to buy the property as sooner or later it will be developed. He mentioned that JLG has a good reputation and is a fine company.

A member of the audience spoke up. Mr. Polkowski reminded the Commission that anything said at this point is not part of the public comment and suggested options for reopening the public comments.

**Commissioner Murphy** spoke up and stated that since there was an impression by the residents that nothing was going to happen on the site until they received the new notice, that they had not been working on this since last year. We need to define a timeline for a conservancy to be established. The Planning Commission had not been made aware of the possibility of a conservancy and believes that they have an obligation to the residents to give it an opportunity.

**Mr. Locricchio** reminded those present that this property was up for auction, and is under contract with the Road Commission and they cannot consider other purchases to anyone else. The land is not public land owned by the public, it is zoned public lands and if a conservancy wanted to be in line behind him for the property then that would be fine. He brought up the potential developments that could be developed as a use by right without opposition and would be less desirable by the community. He said that after all the comments this past fall such, he has been trying to do right by the community to address the concern that there would be no tax paying residents, and to offer the best use as this property will be developed. He explained the difference between the perceived condominium and the proposed single-family homes on site condos and that they will be consistent with the surrounding properties. The proposition of a conservatory has no legal merit.

**Chairperson Werth** re-opened the public hearing for further comment.

**Kathleen Zimmers** stated that residents viewed the rezoning of the property as dead and had been working on the side to establish a conservancy to buy that property. If they had believed that there was a possibility that there would be another rezoning they would have worked harder.

**Mr. Polkowski** read additional comments in chat:

**Jacquelyn Brown** wrote 30 to 90 days. She asked how can you have it under contract without the rezoning approved first. It sounds like there is a disclosure agreement between Joe and the RCOC. Does this mean that the RCOC will not consider any other offer at this time because they have been evasive to be honest.

**Steven Klien** wrote that it is not only historically public land but is owned by the County which makes it Public Land at that time.

**Lori Ford** wrote if you were doing right by the community, you would move along and find a different piece of property and stop with the threats.

**Wendy Royer** wrote is your contract with the county contingent on the rezoning?

**Kim Markee** wrote does Mr. Loccrichio have a contract with the County for first right of refusal for this property?

**Mr. Wall** said that he has spoken with several residents regarding this issue. Basically, Oakland County wants to sell the land and whoever purchases it will develop it. The County first offered it to the Township but we declined it as it was hard to justify buying it with taxpayer money in the midst of COVID-19 and the tight budget.

He understands people want park land. The Township has 850 acres of park land in the township but we are principally a residential community.

He further tried to appeal to the community to understand this, and for them to consider that though they may not want anything there, what would they prefer be developed here. He has visited the site on several occasions and did his own traffic count, and did observed a lot of wildlife.

He also pointed out that the original rezoning request was withdrawn and had not been voted on by the Board of Trustees.

**Mr. Polkowski** read further chat comments given during the re-opened public hearing:

**Frank** wrote can you put up the list of uses already approved?

**Jacquelyn Brown** wrote that we have grant money that is entitled to be allocated to residents needs and most of us want to conserve the land so please do that for us. We want it to be part of the Waterford Parks and Rec.

**Wendy Royer** wrote we want the land to remain undeveloped.

**Chairperson Werth** closed the public hearing.

**Mr. Polkowski** pointed out that the conditions are approval of the site plan and sale of the property.

**Commissioner Sintkowski** spoke up to address some of the concerns. He said that it is encouraging to see people get involved, and wants them to know that the Planning Commission cares about what goes in here. Regardless of how this goes, they do not have the final say. The Planning Commission is just giving a recommendation to the Township Board who has final approval. The Planning Commission does care what the residents think, but the Township does not own the property and therefore cannot

donate it. He commented that this proposal is for single-family homes, not a site condo and is encouraged them to consider that the property will be developed by the purchaser, and to consider the other types of developments that could be built here without opposition. While we all can appreciate the natural land, and the wildlife within, also consider that this property used to be contiguous with the State park, with no roadway in between. These animals are now at greater risk to road kill. Subdivision street conditions are an issue all over the county. If the need for a special assessment came up, the additional development would contribute and help lower the individual costs.

## **MOTION AND VOTE**

*Moved by Bartolotta*

*Supported by Reno:* to forward a **favorable** recommendation in Case No. 21-03-04 on to the Township Board, to rezone the subject property of this application from PL, Public Lands to R-1C, Single Family Residential District based on the following findings and conclusions under the Ordinance approval recommendation guidelines which are based on assessment of the information and statements presented in this case by or for the Township Staff, Applicant, and members of the public.

### **Findings:**

- A. The requested zoning change **is** consistent with the adopted Master Plan as amended.
- B. The requested zoning change **is** consistent with existing uses and zoning classifications of properties within the general area of the subject zoning lot.
- C. The subject zoning lot **is** physically suitable to provide all dimensional and site requirements for the range of uses permitted under the proposed zoning classification.
- D. The trend of development in the general area of the subject zoning lot **is** consistent with the requested zoning change.
- E. The Township and other public agencies **do** possess the capacity to provide all utility and public safety services that would be required for the range of land uses permitted under the proposed zoning classification.
- F. The requested zoning change and the resulting range of uses permitted under the proposed zoning classification **will not** result in any significant environmental impacts.
- G. The proposed zoning amendment **will not** be detrimental to the public interest.

### **Accepting the applicant's conditions that:**

- 1. Approval or the related Conceptual Site Plan # PSP 21-1353-A.
- 2. The completion of the purchase and sale closing with the current property owner, the Board of County Road Commissioners of the County of Oakland. In the event the closing is not completed the zoning would revert to its current zoning of PL- Public Lands.



***MOTION CARRIED BY ROLL CALL VOTE***  
***(6 - 1) with Commissioner Murphy Opposed***

**2. Site Plan No. PSP 21-1353-A, JLG Property**

**Parcel I.D. No. 13-18-100-008**, T3N, R9E, SEC 18 PART OF NW 1/4 BEG AT PT DIST S 00-05-37 W 125.23 FT & N 89-54-23 W 60 FT FROM N 1/4 COR, TH S 00-05-37 W 1357.11 FT, TH N 89-57-13 W 547.95 FT, TH N 00-06-38 E 736.11 FT, TH ALG CURVE TO RIGHT, RAD 630 FT, CHORD BEARS N 41-29-08 E 828.38 FT, DIST OF 903.95 FT TO BEG 15.19 A 10-28-19 FR 007

**Requesting:** Site Condominium Development

**Property Location:** Northeast corner of N Williams Lake Rd. and Hatchery Rd.

**Property Zoned:** PL, Public Lands (Rezone to R-1C)

**Applicant:** JLG Property

Applicant or representative present: Joe Locricchio

**Mr. Polkowski** gave a brief history of the proposal stating that the request is for a 66-unit development of three varied units with an average lot size of 6,536 sqft. with the lots fitting well in the R-1C zoning district range. Access to the property is from Hatchery Rd. He stated that the applicant is requesting a rezoning with a significant reduction in density compared to what was previously presented this past fall. This is a conditional request on the approval of the site plan and completion of the sale of the property. He further gave staff comments and noted that the plan lacks green/shrubbery requirements and Master Deed and by laws (that are being reviewed) meet with approval. This is conditional on the Re-zoning being successful.

**Chairperson Werth** inquired about sidewalks. Mr. Polkowski explained the sidewalk arrangement within the plan. Mr. Locricchio commented that the landscape plan does not show the details well.

**Commissioner Kramer** made comments on the site plan and appreciated the houses facing Richardson Ct. He questioned 14 large Pine trees that he would like to see remain and whether the applicant was preserving as much landscaping as possible. Mr. Locricchio confirmed this and stated that undesirable undergrowth would be removed though he was not sure about the location of the specific trees pointed out.

Commissioner Kramer questioned whether a landscape architect had walked the property and wants to see the tree survey. Mr. Locricchio confirmed that he had an architect but had not finished the tree survey but would meet all requirements.

**MOTION AND VOTE**

*Moved by Bartolotta*

*Supported by Reno: to **Approve Site Plan No. PSP 21-1353-A** with the condition of them providing an approved landscape plan to address landscaping requirements to be brought before the board as its own topic.*

**MOTION CARRIED BY ROLL CALL VOTE**

*(6 - 1 ) with Commissioner Murphy Opposed.*

**3. Rezoning Request No. PZ 21-03-01, Joe Attisha**

**Parcel I.D. No. 13-34-427-030**, T3N, R9E, SEC 34 MENIWATERS SUB LOTS 166, 167, 168 & 196 1-3-20 FR 002, 003 & 020

**Requesting:** Rezone from R-1D to R-1C

**Property Location:** 4235 Cass Elizabeth Rd

**Property Zoned:** R-1D, Single-Family Residential

**Applicant:** Joe Attisha

Applicant or representative present: Joe Attisha

**Mr. Polkowski** gave a brief explanation of the request. The applicant wants to split a portion of the property and develop with single family home and will meet all other zoning requirements. The portion of the property is within the Single Family Master Plan District.

During the public portion of the meeting, no one spoke regarding this request.

**MOTION AND VOTE**

*Moved by Kramer*

*Supported by Bartolotta: to forward a **favorable** recommendation in Case No. 21-03-01 on to the Township Board, to rezone the subject property of this application from R-1D, Single-Family Residential to R-1C, Single-Family Residential based on the following findings and conclusions under the Ordinance approval recommendation guidelines which are based on assessment of the information and statements presented in this case by or for the Township Staff, Applicant, and members of the public.*

**Findings:**

- A. The requested zoning change **is** consistent with the adopted Master Plan as amended.
- B. The requested zoning change **is** consistent with existing uses and zoning classifications of properties within the general area of the subject zoning lot.
- C. The subject zoning lot **is** physically suitable to provide all dimensional and site requirements for the range of uses permitted under the proposed zoning classification.
- D. The trend of development in the general area of the subject zoning lot **is** consistent with the requested zoning change.

- E. The Township and other public agencies **do** possess the capacity to provide all utility and public safety services that would be required for the range of land uses permitted under the proposed zoning classification.
- F. The requested zoning change and the resulting range of uses permitted under the proposed zoning classification **will not** result in any significant environmental impacts.
- G. The proposed zoning amendment **will not** be detrimental to the public interest.

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY ROLL CALL VOTE  
(7 - 0)**

**4. Text Amendment No. PZ 21-03-02, – Electric Vehicle Charging Stations**

**Requesting:** Text Amendment to permit Electric Vehicle Charging Stations as an accessory use within all zoning districts; as a Special Approval Use within the C-1, C-2, C-UL, and C-UB zoning districts; and as a principle use within the C-3, C-4, HT-1, HT-2, and the Summit Place Overlay Zoning District

**Applicant:** Waterford Township

**Mr. Polkowski** gave a brief summary for this text amendment. The Township has been permitting electric vehicle charging stations as an accessory use without any type of ordinance. Staff does not feel it would be fair to subject these uses to the regulations of fueling stations. These would be allowed within the commercial districts as a principle use in commercial and the HT districts and excluded from the higher intensity districts. Accessory uses of these stations would be permitted in all districts.

During the public portion of the meeting, the following spoke on this request.

**Patrick Lloyd** of 2970 Frembes is the applicant. He feels this will be good for the community and businesses. They need to offer more places to get groceries and charge cars.

**Mark Monohon** of 3517 David K also supports this request and likes to see Waterford progressing toward the future.

**MOTION AND VOTE**

*Moved by Kramer*

*Supported by Bartolotta: Resolved to forward a **favorable** recommendation in Case No. PZ 21-03-02 on to the Township Board, to amend the Zoning Ordinance for all zoning districts on the findings and conclusions under the Ordinance approval recommendation guidelines which are based on assessment of the information and statements presented in this case by the Township Staff, and members of the public.*

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY ROLL CALL VOTE  
(7 - 0)**

**5. Special Approval No. PSA 21-03-03, Patrick Lloyd – Electric Vehicle Charging Facility**

**Parcel I.D. No. 13-04-151-002**, T3N, R9E, SEC 31 SUPERVISOR'S PLAT NO 12 N 72 FT OF LOT 1

**Requesting:** Special Approval to permit an Electric Vehicle Charging Facility

**Property Location:** East side of S Williams Lake Rd., north of Cooley Lake Rd

**Property Zoned:** C-UL, Union Lake Business

**Applicant:** Patrick Lloyd

Applicant or representative present: Patrick Lloyd

**Mr. Polkowski** gave a brief summary and comments for a proposed Electric Vehicle Charging Station as a principal use on this property subject to the adoption of the Text Amendment. The subject lot is very unique and does not meet the requirements for any zoning district. The master plan does support this use. No landscape improvements are proposed, and there is a concern for lack of waste management facilities plans. There would also be a need for setback and impervious lot coverage as well as a lack of hydrant coverage.

During the public portion of the meeting the following spoke regarding this request.

**Patrick Lloyd** of 2970 Frembes is the applicant. He said that he would address these concerns and feels that this will benefit the community. A green solution to provide energy for cars.

**MOTION AND VOTE**

*Moved by Sintkowski*

*Supported by Kramer: Resolved to **Approve with conditions** the request for special approval in **CASE NO. 21-03-03 Special Approval for an Electric Vehicle Charging Facility within the C-UL Union Lake Business District** based on the following findings and conclusions under the Ordinance review criteria and considerations, which are based on assessment of the information and statements presented in this case by or for the Township Staff, Applicant, and members of the public.*

**Findings:**

- A. The proposed use is in accordance with the objectives of the Master Plan and with future land use plans for the area as adopted or maintained by the Planning Commission.
- B.1 The proposed use will be compatible with adjacent uses of land in terms of building and activity location, scope of activity, character, hours of operation, and compliance with the performance standards required under ARTICLE II, Division 2-2.
- B.2 The proposed use will not have an adverse effect on the environment or adjacent properties beyond the normal effects of permitted principal uses in the same zoning district.

- B.3 The proposed use will not result in an impairment, pollution, and/or destruction of air, water, natural resources and/or the public trust therein.
- C. The proposed use is not located in any Special Approval use service areas identified and adopted by the Planning Commission.
- D. The proposed use will not impose an unreasonable burden upon public services and utilities.
- E. The proposed use will be in compliance with the regulations of the Zoning District in which it is proposed to be located.

**Conclusions:**

- A.1 The proposed use is of such location, size and character as to be compatible with the orderly development of the Zoning District in which it is proposed to be situated.
- A.2 The proposed use will be compatible with the orderly development or use of adjacent zoning lots.
- A.3 Pedestrian circulation will not be hindered by the proposed use.
- A.4 Outdoor operations and display in connection with the proposed use will not burden and/or disrupt uses on adjacent properties.
- A.5 The natural and surrounding environment will not be negatively impacted by the proposed use.
- B. The proposed use will be within the capacity limitations of the existing or proposed public services and facilities which serve its proposed location.
- C. The proposed use will be conducive to fulfilling a gap in the geographic coverage of such services to Township residents.

**Conditions:**

The conditions of this approval, which have considered the Planning Commission’s ability to impose reasonable restrictions to ensure compliance with the performance standards established in the Zoning Ordinance, are as follows:

- a. A Final Site Plan, satisfying all requirements by the various departments, will be required prior to final approval***
- b. A landscape plan will be required.***
- c. All necessary variances will be obtained***
- d. A waste management plan is required***
- e. The Planning Commission reserves the right to modify this approval or impose additional regulations or requirements subject to safety concerns or complaints that may arise during operation.***

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY ROLL CALL VOTE  
(7 - 0)**

**6. Text Amendment No. PZ 21-03-05, - Kennels in Commercial Zoning Districts**

**Requesting:** Text Amendment to permit Commercial Kennels as a Special Approval Use within the C-3 and C-4 Commercial Zoning Districts

**Applicant:** Waterford Township

Applicant or representative present:

**Mr. Polkowski** gave a brief summary. Kennels are currently only allowed in residential zoning, and feels that there is a better need to have these in commercial. The goal for this is to encourage moving kennels from residential areas, where this may be considered a nuisance, to indoor commercial facilities.

During the public portion of the meeting, no one spoke regarding this request.

**MOTION AND VOTE**

*Moved by Bartolotta*

*Supported by Ray: Resolved to forward a **favorable** recommendation in Case No. PZ 21-03-05 on to the Township Board, to amend the Zoning Ordinance for the C-3, General Business and C-4, Extensive Business Districts on the findings and conclusions under the Ordinance approval recommendation guidelines which are based on assessment of the information and statements presented in this case by the Township Staff, and members of the public.*

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY ROLL CALL VOTE**

**(7 - 0)**

**7. Site Plan No. PSP 21-1367, Marihuana Caregiver Facility**

**Parcel I.D. No. 13-26-326-026**, T3N, R9E, SEC 26 PART OF NE 1/4 OF SW 1/4 BEG AT PT DIST N 88-51-00 W 1011.56 FT FROM CEN OF SEC, TH S 01-09-45 W 457 FT, TH N 88-51-00 W 199 FT, TH N 01-09-45 E 457 FT, TH S 88-51-00 E 199 FT TO BEG 2.09 A 7/20/83, R 015

**Requesting:** Marihuana Caregiver Establishment

**Property Location:** 3751 Elizabeth Lake Rd.

**Property Zoned:** M-1, Light Industrial

**Applicant:** Heather Matty

**8. Site Plan No. PSP 21-1367, Marihuana Caregiver Facility**

**Parcel I.D. No. 13-09-251-023**, T3N, R9E, SEC 9 WILLIAMS LAKE ROAD INDUSTRIAL PARK LOT 10

**Parcel I.D. No. 13-09-251-023**, T3N, R9E, SEC 9 WILLIAMS LAKE ROAD INDUSTRIAL PARK LOT 10

**Requesting:** Marihuana Caregiver Establishment

**Property Location:** 4525 Perry Dr

**Property Zoned:** M-1, Light Industrial

**Applicant:** Gumma Group

VII. Discussions

**1. CDBG Con Plan Needs Survey Discussion**

**Mr. Merinsky** gave a brief overview of the 5 year consolidated plan for CDBG as required by HUD for federal funding. He further explained how the program worked and how funds, which are approximately \$400,000, were targeted and allocated mostly toward the housing rehab program and code enforcement efforts in target areas. He stated that we are in the last year of our current 2016-2020, 5-year consolidated plan and we have prepared a draft document to submit to HUD for review that will be posted and publicly available soon.

As part of the needs assessment, a survey was prepared. The survey had 368 respondents with the majority of respondents being homeowners. He was pleased that survey results were substantially higher this year than in the past. He went over the public survey results and provided the top three areas where they feel the funding is most needed.

Commissioner Kramer questioned how the survey was conducted. Mr. Merinsky explained that it was done electronically through Google Docs and posted on the Township website.

**Jacquelyn Brown** wrote in chat that Waterford had received over \$9 million in stimulus funds and asked how much of the funding went to CDBG programs.

**Mr. Merinsky** replied that we did not receive any additional annual funds through CDBG. There were 2 waves CDBG/COVID from CARES Act funding. The first installment was \$200,000 and the second was \$300,000 and it was to be utilized to address the impact of COVID on the community. The Township set up a Rental and Mortgage assistance for those in the low-mod areas. There was also funding, up to \$10,000, for some businesses for lease/rent and some improvements to meet social distancing requirements. There has been a very good response to this.

**Commissioner Ray** asked about the response to this. Mr. Merinsky responded that it had been positive.

**Commissioner Murphy** asked how the information was shared. Mr. Merinsky indicated that it was mostly word of mouth social media. There had been a substantial number of applications up until recently. The drop in participation appears due to an overlap in support from the state.

**Commissioner Bartolotta** asked if the age of the survey responders was tracked. Mr. Merinsky said it was not tracked but phone conversations revealed that many respondents were older.

**Mr. Wall** spoke up to mention the American Rescue Plan Act and that information will be forthcoming to explain where and how this money can be used to help the community. He will forward information when it is available to him. The first round of funding should be available in mid-May.

**Commissioner Murphy** asked if essential workers that continued to work throughout the pandemic could get a bonus.

**Commissioner Ray** asked if there was guidance on where the money could be spent. Mr. Wall indicated that he was attending a meeting later that night that may provide guidance and he would let everyone know what the rules were going to be.

VIII. All Else

**Commissioner Ray** asked about the elevations for the electric vehicle charging station and about the elevations and who will build the units for the Locricchio project. Mr. Polkowski indicated that he can request the elevations for the Planning Commission but they are generally not required.

IX. Adjourn the Meeting

Chairperson Werth adjourned the meeting at 6:32 p.m.

X. The public may participate in each meeting through GoToMeeting by computer, tablet or smart phone using the following link:

<https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/142685181>

New to GoToMeeting? Get the app now and be ready when your first meeting starts:

<https://global.gotomeeting.com/install/142685181>

You may also dial in using your phone:

United States (Toll Free): 1 866-899-4679

United States: 1 517-317-3116

Access Code: 142-685-181

Members of the public will only be able to speak during the during the public comment period at the end each public comment agenda item and such comments will be limited to three minutes per person. To provide for orderly public participation, a person wishing to speak must first state their name and request to be recognized by the Chairperson of the meeting. The Chairperson will recognize all persons wishing to speak during the public comment period. Prior to the meeting, members of the public may contact the members of the Planning Division to provide input or ask questions by email or mail to the Township employee/official and at the addresses listed below. Persons with disabilities in need of accommodations to be able to participate in the meeting should provide at least 24-hour advance notice to the listed Township employee by phone, email, or mail and an attempt will be made to provide reasonable accommodations.

Jeffrey M. Polkowski, AICP

Superintendent of Planning & Zoning

5200 Civic Center Drive, Waterford, Michigan 48329

Email: [jpolkowski@waterfordmi.gov](mailto:jpolkowski@waterfordmi.gov)



Phone: (248) 618-7446