

**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
CITY OF WIXOM
49045 PONTIAC TRAIL
MONDAY, JULY 6, 2009 - 7:30 PM**

Chairman Day called the meeting to order at 7:32 pm.

The Pledge of the Flag was given.

PRESENT:

William Day, Chairman
Kurt Gottschall, Vice Chairman
Jim Crowley
James Maher
Guy York
Nick Kennedy
William Henning
Cory Lupinacci

CITY CONSULTANT:

Carmine Avantini, LSL

CITY STAFF:

John Lipchik, Building Official

RECORDING SECRETARY:

Jennifer Garrett

ABSENT:

Phillip Carter (excused)

There being a quorum, the meeting was declared in session.

CHANGES OR ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA:

There were no changes or additions made to tonight's agenda.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Planning Commission Workshop Meeting - June 22, 2009

MOTION and second by Mr. Gottschall and Mr. Lupinacci to accept the June 22, 2009 Workshop Minutes as submitted.

VOTE:

MOTION CARRIED

CORRESPONDENCE:

Mayoral Appointments to the Boards and Commissions

Chairman Day stated the commissioners had a copy of a memo to the City Council regarding Mayoral appointments to the boards and commissions, which include the reappointments to the Planning Commission of him (William Day) and Nick Kennedy. He wanted to thank the Mayor and the City Council for giving him the opportunity to serve in this capacity for another three years. He appreciates it and enjoys it.

CALL TO THE PUBLIC:

There was no public present for public comments.

CONSENT AGENDA:

There were no items listed under the consent agenda for this meeting.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

There was no unfinished business listed on the agenda for tonight's meeting.

NEW BUSINESS:

SPR #05-947-09: TRIJICON PARKING LOT EXPANSION: QUADRANTS INC., 30475 WIXOM ROAD, WIXOM, MI 48393: The applicant is seeking a parking lot expansion of 101 spaces. The Trijicon facility is located on the east side of Wixom Road at Schafer Road, and the parking expansion is proposed on a separate parcel directly to the east of Aarmark. Access is from a common drive along the north side of the Aarmark property. The property is located at 30780 Wixom Road and zoned M-1, Light Industrial. The tax parcel number is 22-05-106-011.

Mr. Avantini began by saying you should have a revised site plan review letter dated June 24, 2009 for the Trijicon parking lot expansion and said we have recommended approval on this, and he was going to go to the conditions of approval. He indicated there are a number of questions (some of which we have received answers from the applicant since that time) and so going through the conditions he thinks will make this go a little more smoothly. There were some information items also that we identified in the review letter that we since have received information on. We are recommending approval and some of the conditions of our recommendation include the following. First of all, we need to see this particular parcel combined with the Aarmark parcel because parking is not a permitted use by itself. So it has to be combined with the other parcels. The applicant has agreed to do that. It is basically pulling it all into one complex. His understanding is that as well as what Trijicon is doing they are basically going to continue to develop it as a campus for their manufacturing operations which is why they are here with this request. They need additional parking.

Mr. Avantini went on to say we have also asked them to clarify, which they have done; but we had questions about the truck storage for those surrounding uses. Maybe Mr. McCormick can give a better explanation of some of the future plans that he is aware of, but the goal is to incorporate all of these buildings into one complex. They have given Mr. Lipchik a letter supporting the need for the excess parking spaces. He thinks by the end of the year they anticipate going up to 269 employees, and their projections show that that is going to continue to increase into the future, which is why they are requesting the spaces here. It doesn't make sense to just add a few spaces and then have to come back and construct more after that.

Mr. Gottschall said he was a little confused when he was reading through this the first time because it said that it had to be combined and that it was not an accepted use in that one.

So it had to be combined with that other property, which is also an M-1. At that point he thought it was going to be for Aramark for their parking. Now how is this unfolding? Is this going to be for Trijicon for their employees and it is on their current property?

Mr. Avantini replied that it is going to be for Trijicon employees.

Mr. Gottschall then asked if it is on Trijicon's property currently.

Mr. Avantini told him it is on a separate parcel and said if you go to your plans you will see that it is on a separate parcel behind the Aramark building.

When Mr. Gottschall said he saw where the location was Mr. Avantini stated it has to be combined with the Trijicon parcel.

Chairman Day stated you are saying combined with the Trijicon parcel, but we are talking about combining with the Aarmark parcel. If it is going to be for Trijicon's use why would it not be combined with the Trijicon parcel?

Mr. Lipchik explained that Trijicon has bought the Aramark building and Aramark has a lease that may or may not go away within the next five years. Trijicon, as fast as they are expanding, anticipates that at some point in the future they will come before you and join their main building to the Aarmark building with an addition and make a great big building; but in the meantime they are going to need the excess parking.

Chairman Day commented that makes sense as long as the Aramark parcel is owned by Trijicon. It didn't make sense to him otherwise.

Mr. Avantini said it all kind of ties in together.

Mr. Gottschall questioned if that transaction has been completed and they own that now, and Mr. Lipchik replied yes.

Mr. Gottschall commented that alleviates that.

Mr. Avantini added that they have agreed to the combination of the lots. There is also a need for a shared access easement agreement with the buildings to the north. There has to be a shared access easement agreement with those because of the configuration of the property, and they have agreed to that also.

Chairman Day commented one of those buildings is using parking that is actually on the Trijicon parcel.

Mr. Lipchik said just so you are aware, the former Quadrants offices and the buildings in behind it have all been purchased by Trijicon also; and Quadrants has moved to the west side of Wixom Road.

Mr. Avantini stated the thing about this he thinks it is a good example of the way things used to be done. It was okay to use the property next door for parking, and it could predate zoning even. But that is kind of how this all developed in the past and now as we go through these exercises like this it gives the City an opportunity to clear things up or clean things so it doesn't present problems in the future. That's why we talk about easement agreements for those properties needing to be in place because what we don't want to do is have someone cut off from being able to operate that building properly.

Also as a recommendation, Mr. Avantini stated there was one sheet that didn't show the five foot wide concrete sidewalk; and they agreed to add that. One of the things we wanted to make sure we included in our conditions of approval is that if there are modifications to the layout based on the wetlands permit they are going to have to come back for administrative review. With respect to the judgment call on Mr. Lipchik's part, the ordinance gives him the ability to make a decision if it is what he considers to be a fairly minor (not a substantive) change to the plan then he can handle it administratively. If it is a major change to the layout then he would kick it back to the Planning Commission for review, but that is pretty much on any site plan that would happen.

Continuing, Mr. Avantini stated we have also indicated any dead or unhealthy trees on the Trijicon site must be replaced. Now, one of the things they are requesting is they want to waiver from the section of the ordinance that requires them to have interior parking lot tree planting. We have taken a look at that waiver and feel that if they were to do that it would eliminate spaces that they need and could potentially create greater impact into the wetlands area. In our mind it is better to have the trees on the perimeter of the parking lot. If this were out in front of the building it would be a little bit different, but frankly no one is going to see this. He doesn't think the interior parking lot trees are going to have a great impact visually anyway so we would rather see the perimeter trees maintained and think the commission should approve the waiver for that.

Mr. Gottschall asked if they are going to be putting in additional trees along the perimeter.

Mr. Avantini said if you look they have plantings going around the detention basin which is directly in front of the parking lot, and then they have some trees in between the connection between the two parking lots and then along the two corners. There is none on the backside, but they are not screening it from anything back there.

Mr. Gottschall stated it is going to be pretty close to the parking lot and asked what the approximate distance is going to be between the two parking lots.

Mr. Avantini indicated if he was to guesstimate maybe 20 to 25 feet between the parking lots.

Mr. Kennedy stated on the layout where they show the trees down in what would be the southeast corner of the property there is nothing there, but yet when he went out there and looked at it there are a lot of large trees out there. He asked how come they didn't mark them on the landscape plan and if they are planning on taking them out.

Mr. Avantini answered yes, where the parking lot is going.

Mr. Kennedy stated there is no parking lot there; it is on the very corner.

To that, Mr. Avantini said he doesn't think the grading is going to remove any trees on there.

Chad McCormick, 30475 Wixom Road, Wixom, MI 48393, stated he is with Quadrants. He explained there is a few trees or several trees along that southeast corner. Jim Budwick (their landscape architect) has had several conversations with Ms. Maise in regards to this and the type of tree. A lot of them are dying, and the size allows us to just go in and remove them. Therefore we did a few extra plantings within the new development to compensate for that.

Mr. Avantini mentioned a note on the last page and said when we did the landscape review (and it was certified by an arborist) of the woodlands. None of the trees were protected under the Woodlands Ordinance. They were all elm, ash and common apple; and they didn't identify any that qualify as landmark trees.

Mr. Kennedy asked if that means this is going to be clear cut.

Mr. Avantini replied they probably aren't going to take down trees they don't have to, but if it is required because of grading that is the only thing that would require it.

Mr. Kennedy inquired if we are looking at a landscape plan of what the final project is supposed to look like, and Mr. Avantini answered yes.

Mr. Kennedy said but those trees are not there on this plan, and Mr. McCormick told him it will be grass.

Mr. Avantini said so, yes, they are gone. The thing to keep in mind is the Woodlands Ordinances don't just regulate the size of trees; it is also the quality and species of the tree too. You can have a great stand of elm trees, but they are not regulated.

Moving on, Mr. Avantini stated the other issue is something that down the road we might want to take another look at, but there is irrigation required of all landscaped areas in the ordinance currently; and the ordinance is what it is. They haven't included it but it is required. Usually irrigation (especially with parking lot islands) is critical right along or along the front locations of buildings. This is set fairly far back, but it is required under the ordinance. Once again that is something in the future when we have a workshop session we might want to take a look at and see (when you have parking lots that are at the rear of industrial buildings that are in most cases not visible from any right-of-way) if that is something you want to stick to. It might be better in certain cases to look at more water resistant plant species as opposed to putting what is required under the ordinance that really requires an irrigation system.

Mr. Avantini said that is it for our recommendations and the conditions. As he said, we had a number of detailed items in here (like whether fencing would be required around the detention pond (and it isn't) and those sorts of things that we have gone through with them; and we feel meets the requirements of the ordinance. He then offered to go through any other questions if there were any.

Chairman Day stated he was looking at LSL's recommendation and then the next page which is a summary of the revisions. He asked how those two correlate. He said if you are looking at your recommendation there are nine items, and then there is another page that has a list of a number of items which is a summary of your revisions.

Mr. Avantini indicated that is their summary of responses to our previous letter.

Mr. Maher mentioned the area in which the one parking lot ties into the existing Trijicon lot and asked what the reason is for that. Is that just for emergency purposes?

Mr. Avantini told him that is the employees. In all likelihood they'll go into one lot and then if they cannot find a space they are going to go into the other lot. It is a little bit farther away from the building.

Mr. Maher said so that is for vehicle traffic then, and Mr. Avantini replied yes.

Mr. Maher asked if these two parking spots on the existing Trijicon will be removed then, and Mr. Avantini replied yes.

Mr. Maher mentioned lighting and asked if they reviewed the lighting photometric.

Mr. Avantini answered yes and said they are proposing two 400 watt fixtures in there that are going to be shielded. We have looked at those, and they are acceptable because obviously we are concerned about the lighting safety. They have them all around the perimeter of the parking lot.

Mr. Maher said correct but asked if that 1.2 or 1.1 in the center of the parking lot is adequate.

Mr. Avantini answered yes. Usually if you are over one foot candle you are in the one to two range which is plenty of light. Usually the maximum that you need to get good illumination is three. You can get up to seven, eight or nine and it doesn't make a difference; but to get good coverage if you are somewhere between one and three foot candles you are doing well. The big concern on a parking lot like this is you don't want to have any dark spots. You don't want it to go from light to dark in the light because that is where you have safety problems. So the goal here is to get overall even numbers throughout, and if you look it is anywhere from 1.2 on up to 3.5 which is a pretty good distribution of light.

Mr. Maher said okay and added that his only concern with the photometric is the vehicle access from the one parking lot to the existing. We don't have any lighting in there. Also he is assuming the bridge for pedestrians has no lighting.

Mr. Avantini stated that is a good point, and really for that walkway that would be a good opportunity to maybe put some bollard lighting in or because it is a crossing over a drain there maybe something right on the structure to light it. They are going to have to do something on there.

Mr. McCormick stated we have looked at fixtures, a gooseneck type that is going to come up from the deck and hang down. In reference to the drive area here connecting the two parking lots there is a current pole there that he believes has three heads on it which sheds some light onto there. This pole on the proposed parking lot on the very south end we can put an extra head on it facing the other way if you would like.

Mr. Maher commented that it seems like right in the middle of this access we are deficient, but again he is not a photometric expert. He understands what Mr. McCormick is saying about putting an extra light on each, end but it seems like that middle is still deficient.

Asking if he could respond to that, Mr. Avantini stated the thing that is tricky on this is they are not showing the photometric for the existing site. He thinks if you looked at the spillover from that you would have some light spilling over onto the drive there. We don't know exactly what those numbers are, but his guess is (based on the proximity to that head) they are still going to probably be in the one to two foot candle range. By the time you get over the crossing and you are getting towards the other parking lot you are getting up close to one foot candle anyway. So you really are not going to have much of a dark spot there in his estimation. The bigger concern would be the walkway, making sure you have enough light there when people are walking out. Once again, it is more of a safety issue than anything else.

Mr. Maher asked if it would make sense to get an updated photometric to show both the pedestrian walkway and also the vehicle access.

Mr. Avantini answered yes and said what you would want to do is make as a condition of approval that there be adequate lighting of the walkway and have us verify that there is adequate minimum foot candle lighting all across the drive between them. He can go out with his light meter and check it once it is in, and then if for some reason it is too dark if you make it a condition of approval we can go back to the applicant and make sure they adjust that. There is just no sense in putting it in there if it is not needed, but if it is needed we can handle that administratively. That is a good point.

Mr. Maher asked if he was okay with that, and Mr. McCormick replied no problem.

Regarding the parking lot, Mr. Kennedy noted that right up against the walkway there is a parking space and asked if that parking spot isn't going to block the majority of that walkway.

Mr. Avantini said well you have access from both sides of it.

Mr. Kennedy stated if there is a car in that parking spot it looks like there is two and a half feet worth of entrance and Mr. Avantini told him that is wider than two and a half feet.

Mr. Kennedy commented that looks like a problem and asked if this is something you would allow.

Mr. Avantini stated he doesn't necessarily have a problem with it.

Mr. McCormick offered that he thought that was a typo.

Mr. Avantini stated that is more like five to seven feet at least. Actually what he is more concerned about around the entrance there is he thinks it should be striped just so cars coming out will know that is a pedestrian area and maybe even put a stop sign there. It would probably be a good idea to put a crosswalk there and a stop sign because someone is going to be walking across there to get onto the walkway at some point in time. If people get used to the fact that there is cross walk stripe and there is a stop sign there they are going to look out for pedestrians. He thinks that would be far more effective than taking out parking spaces.

Mr. Lupinacci inquired if a "Yield to Pedestrians" sign might be an alternative to a stop sign, and Mr. Avantini replied sure and said either way as long as there is a designation of it being a pedestrian crossing zone because people get out of work and can't wait to get home.

Mr. York indicated he had a couple of items with all the discussion of the lighting level shown on sheet 1 of 1. He too is disappointed in that we don't show proper lighting levels at the crosswalk and the cross through drive. He is also disappointed that the lighting levels don't take into consideration the effect of the existing lamps, but he respectfully disagrees that three heads on the existing southern lamp and a second head that is located at the south end will be sufficient to give you reasonable lighting levels. Now, perhaps moving the lamp that is at the south end of the parking lot further south would suffice both areas (both the south end of the parking lot and the driveway). He supports the recommendation that a revised lighting level drawing be provided for the entire area of concern, including the effect of the existing lighting. He is also surprised that there is little or no information on the bridge other than some verbiage that is given on sheet A1. We don't have any indication of the span or of the width. We have curvilinear styles shown on here which probably isn't going to be what is in there unless posts are going to be provided down into the wetlands, and he doesn't even know if the Oakland County Drain Commission would allow that.

Mr. Lipchik indicated they do allow that, but it is subject to their oversight.

Mr. York thinks for a complete set of documents it would be appropriate for that to be detailed a little bit more thoroughly. He doesn't know that the Planning Commission necessarily has to see it where we can go through an administrative approval process, but it just limits the amount of information the Planning Commission gets to see and doesn't think that is appropriate.

Mr. Avantini stated the reason we didn't get into a lot of detail on that is the fact that that's pretty much dictated by the permits they are going to have to get. That is totally out of our hands in terms of what design, materials and construction they want to see. Obviously if they come forward with something that we find unacceptable when the construction documents roll in after they have their permits we are going to take a look at it and will raise a red flag if there is a problem with it, but that is why it doesn't do a lot of good to really get into the details of the design at this point until they have their permits. It is just the way the process works.

Mr. Gottschall asked what exactly a wetland/watercourse permit is. What is the applicant trying to accomplish here?

Mr. Avantini stated whenever you disturb a wetland or you do a crossing of it you have to get a permit for it because it is considered a disturbance under the law.

Mr. Gottschall said okay now he thinks we have two different issues here. We have the Patton Drain that there is going to be some modification of; and then they have the detention basin in there, and then they have a wetland as well.

Mr. Avantini stated they are all treated the same. Well, they are treated differently; but it is the same thing. You have to go and get a permit. You are disturbing that water body whether it is the wetland or the drain.

Mr. Gottschall said so one permit is going take care of it.

Mr. Avantini told him they may need several permits, but he is saying that there is an agency that you have to get the permit from. They are going to say yea or nay. You can do certain things when you disturb it or there are certain things you can't do. So they have to go through that process.

Mr. Gottschall mentioned also that with regards to the updated letter from the Fire Department dated this date that was a modification to their review letter from May 11, 2009. He sees that items 3 through 6 have dropped off since the May 11th letter. Those items were to provide "No Parking Fire Lane" signage on both sides of both access drives, to provide appropriate turning radius for the Fire Department access throughout the parking lot. The Fire Department access road shall have an unobstructed width on not less than 20 feet and an unobstructed vertical clearance of not less than 13 feet 6 inches, and Fire Department access road 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. He asked if all of those have been addressed because on the plans he didn't

see anything that would indicate they have all the radiuses and everything they need for vehicles of that size.

Mr. Avantini responded that some of those questions have to be answered when the construction drawings are turned in, like for example the weight, that they can handle the weight load of the fire vehicles.

Mr. Lipchik stated they have been reviewed and accepted. Also there was an agreement on the placement of the fire hydrants, and he does have a signed copy of that agreement that we just received from the City Attorney's office earlier this afternoon. So, all of that is in place.

Mr. Gottschall pointed out at the bottom of today's letter it says "At this time the plan does not meet the requirements of the City of Wixom Engineering Design Standards. The Fire Department has received a letter of agreement between the City of Wixom and Trijicon Corporation. The agreement addresses the concerns listed above. The Fire Department grants conditional approval of the project based on the terms set forth by the attached agreement." He stated so we really don't have any detail on items 3 through 6 as to whether those objectives have been met.

Mr. Lipchik indicated they have been met, and that is why they no longer appear on that latest letter.

Mr. Kennedy brought up the fact that on the drainage area map/storm sewer design sheet there is a six-inch drain that runs right along the edge of the property.

Mr. Avantini asked which sheet he was looking at, and Mr. Kennedy stated it is the drainage area map/storm sewer design. It is right along the north edge of the Trijicon property. He asked if he could see that and said he didn't see it on the paper, but he went out and saw it out there on the property site. It is a six-inch plastic drain tile that runs east and west right along the north side of the property.

Mr. Avantini stated it is not shown on the plans and asked if it is on the current Trijicon site.

Mr. Kennedy told him no, it is going to be on the Aramark site. Well, it is hard to tell without boundary lines written on the property. He was wondering if that was going to cause a problem where they don't show any drainage right there. Will all of this change when they do their landscaping or is it something that no one really knows is there?

Mr. McCormick said he would have to go out and take a look at it. He has no idea.

Mr. Kennedy told him if you go right to where Trijicon's dumpster is at and walk just straight across the property line it looks like someone from the Aramark site has dug what looks like a little trench with a shovel to help drain out some of the wetlands back there.

Mr. Avantini indicated that is something to look at, and Mr. Kennedy asked if that has any effect on what we are looking at.

Mr. Lipchik offered that they are going to have to actually show everything on construction drawings at the time of construction that HRC will look at once again.

In regards to not having islands throughout here, Mr. Maher said he understands that we don't want to disturb any more wetlands as possible. He asked if there is any impact on snow removal if we don't have islands to help push the snow up to and asked if there are any concerns there.

Mr. Avantini replied no, not really. Usually (at least in his experience) the islands don't always provide a haven for much snow anyway because they are usually not big enough to do that unless it is a really large area. Usually the snow gets pushed off to the perimeter anyways. The primary purpose of having those interior islands anyways is visual, and where they are at here it is not a huge deal breaker. The other concern we have too is we try to keep the amount of pavement area to the minimum necessary, and obviously they are expanding greatly. He knows personally he would like to see less parking lots than more, and with the way they are growing we are going to see other applications with them in the future. Once again, if this was out in front it would be a totally different situation.

Mr. Maher agreed, but Mr. Kennedy said he doesn't on that. He went on to say between Total Soccer and the Aramark property they have trees right along their edge of the property every 25 feet or so, and it looks pretty nice. He was wondering why they didn't put anything between the Trijicon parking lot and Total Soccer like shrubs or anything like that or if that is going to be left up to the construction also.

Mr. Avantini replied that is the tricky part when you have parking lots butting up against another. In his mind if you were going to do anything that was different you would put a hedge row along the edge of the parking lot.

Mr. Kennedy said he has to tell you that is really nice what they have done back there. It seems like we could probably expect that kind of thing on everything else they do, but it would be nice if we could see a little more required shrubbery or something in there.

Mr. Avantini stated he would not have a problem if the applicant would agree to put a hedge row along that parking lot to block the headlights from the adjacent property.

Mr. Kennedy added that he would think they would want to keep the kids out of their parking lot.

Mr. Avantini said he doesn't know that putting trees back there would accomplish anything, but a hedge row would certainly do the trick.

Mr. McCormick stated he can run it by Steven Bennan. The owner of Trijicon has always been in favor of adding extra landscaping. If he is okay with it we are okay with it. If it is okay with him we will put it in.

Mr. Kennedy inquired if we would have to wait to hear about that or if we should make this contingent upon that.

Mr. Avantini told him if you do, you do.

Mr. McCormick stated we will add some shrubs along that property line, and Mr. Kennedy asked to what extent.

Mr. McCormick then asked if he wants the full length.

Mr. Kennedy said he doesn't know and asked what he could recommend that would look nice.

Mr. McCormick stated he could go back and speak with their landscape architect and see what he recommends.

Mr. Avantini advised that we know the intent of what is being discussed here, and we could handle it administratively.

Mr. York wondered if he could get a little explanation. He said on your letter of June 24, 2009 on page 1 there is an aerial photograph, and then on page 2 there is enlargement of the aerial photograph of the two buildings to the north. He is a little confused by bullet item number two in the recommendations where it talks about an acceptable explanation from the applicant regarding storage. He asked if someone could enlighten him on what these parking lots are and how they are going to change as a result of the new development.

Mr. Avantini told him the issue we had is that the drive in (at least currently with Aramark) they have trucks that get stored in that location, and they are going to have to be shifted elsewhere. Beyond that, he really can't answer any of that.

Mr. McCormick stated Trijicon has been in contact with Aramark. They know this parking lot expansion is coming and moving forward. They have been advised that once this goes in they will no longer be able to use that area as truck storage so they are seeking alternate areas. Their lease is actually going to be up in August 2010, and at that time Trijicon is prepared to take over the Aramark building. He knows Bill Clark, the owner of Quadrants, has been currently negotiating with Aramark to move them to another building located here in the City. By removing these trucks, they know they are going to be slowly moving themselves out of this building anyway. So, according to Trijicon and Aramark, it is not going to be an issue. As for this other parking area that he believes Gresham Driving Aids is currently using, they were the ones that own this back parcel. That is who Trijicon purchased this from, and since Trijicon had no use for it when they first purchased it they

allowed Grisham to continue parking on it and use that little gravel area; but he is also aware that once this goes in he is going to have to move those cars elsewhere.

Chairman Day asked if they have space on their property to park the cars that they are currently parking.

Mr. McCormick told him he was not sure what he has in mind for those vehicles.

Chairman Day asked if there is no agreement to allow them park in this expanding parking lot.

Mr. McCormick replied no. He previously owned the property and had those vehicles there. Trijicon purchased it and had no real need for it right away to take it over, so they allowed him to keep his stuff there.

When Mr. Gottschall commented maybe that is something that is included as well Mr. McCormick stated he can assure you there is going to be no room for any Aramark trucks or Gresham back there at all.

Mr. Gottschall said he thinks there were a lot of loose ends when he read through this but thinks most of them have been tied up, and he thinks a lot of them can be worked out administratively.

MOTION and second by Mr. York and Mr. Gottschall to approve SPR #05-947-09, Trijicon Parking Lot Expansion, 30475 Wixom Road, Wixom, MI 48393 with the following contingencies that:

1. The lot combination be executed.
2. There is no truck storage or car storage on the development.
3. The shared access agreement is executed and put on file with the City.
4. If there are any modifications to the site plan review that we have reviewed (based primarily on the wetlands permit) the revised site plan would be submitted for administrative review and then the administration determine whether indeed the Planning Commission should review it again.
5. All dead and unhealthy trees on the Trijicon site must be replaced.
6. We agreed that we would waive the requirements for interior parking lot tree plantings, but as a modification to the landscape plan that was submitted we would add a hedge row along the east property line separating the parking lot from Total Soccer,.
7. Underground irrigation be provided for the landscaped areas.
8. Subsequent work be done to demonstrate that there is adequate lighting in terms of foot candle measurement both at the walkway and also at the access drive between the existing lot and the new lot.

9. At the end point of the pedestrian bridge there be a crosswalk added and suitable signage (either a stop sign or yield sign).

VOTE:

MOTION CARRIED

CALL TO THE PUBLIC:

There was no public present for this Call to the Public.

STAFF COMMENTS:

Mr. Lipchik welcomed Mr. Day and Mr. Kennedy back to the commission.

COMMISSION COMMENTS:

For those who were not here last week, Mr. Gottschall said a week from tonight the ZBA will be hearing a request for a variance on a ground sign to be located up here on the corner of Wixom Road and Pontiac Trail which is something that does not comply with the signage requirements ordinance within the VCA. He indicated he would be at the meeting to voice his concerns and was hopeful that those who have an opinion on the subject would join him as well.

Mr. Crowley stated he was driving on Grand River the other day, and it doesn't appear to him that any of those trees have been replaced down by the gas station yet. He wasn't sure if there was any update on the status of that or not.

Chairman Day commented he was driving past the one on Wixom Road and made the same observation.

Mr. Crowley mentioned that they look like they are growing, but we said they needed to be replaced.

Mr. Lipchik stated we have been sending letters back and forth, and that is where it stands at this point.

Mr. Maher remarked that the fireworks this year were spectacular, probably the best he has seen in the City of Wixom in his life of being here. They did a top notch job, and the concert was great. It was very impressive.

ADJOURNMENT:

This meeting of the Wixom Planning Commission was adjourned on motion and second by Mr. Gottschall and Mr. Maher at 8:29 pm.

Jennifer Garrett
Recording Secretary