Regular City Council Meeting
November 23, 2015
Agenda

7:30 p.m.  Call to Order
Pledge of Allegiance
Roll Call
Approval of Minutes: Nov. 9, 2015
Approval of Bills: None
Approval of Agenda
Public Comment

I. Old Business-
   1. Consider approval of funding for the City's portion Safe Routes grant funding

II. New Business
   1) Consider appointment/resignations from City Commissions:
      a. Karl Richards resignation from the Cable Commission
      b. Rich Neely appointment to the Parks and Recreation Commission
   2) Consider approval of final site plans for Thomasville Development on 11 Mile Rd
   3) Request to address Council by Dr. Kaplan regarding drive approach to Kaplan Chiropractic 410 N Lafayette St.
   4) Consider setting public hearing date for CDBG application – projects Senior Center and HAVEN
   5) Consider renewal of lease agreement with SLARA for two year term.
   6) Consider adopting resolution opting out of Public Act 152 for 2016
   7) Consider cancellation of the second City Council meeting in December per past practice

IV. Manager's Report
V. Council Comments
VI. Adjournment
The City of South Lyon
Regular City Council Meeting
November 9, 2015

Mayor Wallace called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.
Mayor Wallace led those present in the Pledge of Allegiance.

PRESENT: Mayor Tedd Wallace
Council Members: Dixson, Kivell, Kopkowski, Kramer, Ryzyi, and Wedell
Also Present: City Manager Ladner, Chief Collins, Chief
Kennedy, Department Head Martin, Attorney Wilhelm, and Clerk/Treasurer Deaton

MINUTES

Councilman Wedell stated on page 5, the second administrative fee should be changed to administrative service.

CM 11-1-15 MOTION TO APPROVE MINUTES

Motion by Kivell, supported by Kramer
Motion to approve minutes as amended

VOTE: MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

BILLS

Councilman Kivell asked if the heater for the water tower radio will help with the radio service. Chief Kennedy stated they believe it will help with the interference issue. Councilman Kivell stated he would like to know where the property is located for the refund of $13,000. Clerk/Treasurer Deaton stated that is for a Michigan Tax Tribunal Case. Councilman Kivell stated he would like to know which property that is. Clerk Deaton stated she will let him know.

CM 11-2-15 MOTION TO APPROVE BILLS

Motion by Wedell, supported by Ryzyi
Motion to approve bills as presented

VOTE: MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

CERTIFICATION OF ELECTION
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Mayor Wallace stated before we follow through with the certification of the Election, he would like to take a few minutes for some farewells. Councilmember Kopkowski stated she wants to thank everyone that supported her for 10 years on Council and she has learned a lot and it has been an interesting experience. Councilmember Dixon stated she enjoyed being on Council for the last 4 years and she hopes the new Council will continue working with Colonial Acres Phase 4 with the dedication of their water mains in the near future. Mayor Wallace stated he is proud to say he was a coach, or umpire for 15 years, 26 years employee of the South Lyon school system. He further stated he worked with the cable channel for over 31 years. He showed 302 football games, over 90 parades to make sure all the kids were on tv. He stated he was also a member of the South Lyon Lions Club for over 33 years. He further stated he was one of the original 12 people that started Pumpkinfest in 1985. He has spent over a 1/3 of his life on Council and he has no regrets.

Clerk Deaton stated we had a successful November General Election with a 20% voter turnout which was better than expected. She then swore in the new Mayor and Councilmembers.

Clerk Deaton administered the Oath of Office to the following:

John Galeas, Jr. Mayor 2- year term
Joe Rzyyi- Councilmember- 4 year term
Margaret Kurtzweil- Councilmember- 4 year term
Mary Dedakis- Councilmember- 4 year term

Mayor Galeas stated he would like to thank Mayor Wallace for all the work he has done for the City and he is honored to follow in his footsteps. He further stated Mayor Wallace will be missed and it will be a change, but he is looking forward to this.

AGENDA

CM 11-3-15 MOTION TO APPROVE AGENDA

Motion by Wedell, supported by Rzyyi
Motion to approve the agenda as presented

VOTE: MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

PUBLIC COMMENT

Carl Richards of 390 Lenox stated he would like to congratulate the new Mayor and Councilmembers and he hopes this will benefit the community of South Lyon. He further stated he is an activist and will continue to work on things in the City. He further stated the City needs to have a better working
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relationship with the surrounding Townships. He further stated there are many changes and he hopes
they are nearer than further. Mr. Richards stated he has resigned from the Cable Commission but is
interested in being on another Commission such as Parks and Recreation or ZBA.

Steve Brummer of 714 Kestrel Ridge stated he would like to congratulate the new Mayor and
Councilmembers and thanks to all the past members. Everyone on Council has heard the call of public
service and he wants to thank everyone for their service and he knows everyone has the best intentions
for the public and he wants to thank everyone for that. He further stated he would like to thank the City
for being a part of the Safe Routes to School program. Mr. Brummer stated the Council should consider
a new process for Council Meetings. He stated the School Board has had many study sessions and it
helped them become a team and they work together much better because of it. He hopes the Council
can work together as a team.

Ryan Lare of 716 Grand Court stated he would like to congratulate the new members and thanks to the
previous Council members, it isn’t easy for them to sit up there when their decisions aren’t always the
popular decision. He stated he also wanted to thank Mayor Wallace for dedicating his life to South
Lyon.

OLD BUSINESS

1. Consider approval of funding for the City’s portion of the traffic signal at Marjorie Ann and
   Pontiac Trail due to possible delay in Safe Routes funding until 2017

2. Leslie Zawada stated she is the owner and president of CES which is the Engineering Firm for Lyon
   Township. She stated she would like to give an overview of the Safe Routes to School plan. She stated
   the City, South Lyon Schools, Lyon Township and the Road Commission have been working together for
   the past 8-10 months. She further stated this program is funded through MDOT and the federal
government and it is a wonderful program. This is an example of 4 jurisdictions working together for the
safety of the children. This program affects approximately 1800 school children. She stated there has
been significant public comment for a traffic signal at Pontiac Trail and Marjorie Ann. She stated a traffic
signal is not grant eligible. They still wanted to include this for the improvements. She further stated
the Oakland County Road Commission has offered to cover 1/3 of the construction cost if they install the
signal. She stated the original plan called for sidewalks along Marjorie Ann, Valerie and Lillian, but they
have open ditches, and we found it would be very expensive because the ditches would have to be
enclosed. She stated the plan currently includes sidewalks along Marjorie Ann, improvements at 9 mile
intersection and 2 crosswalks along 9 Mile. She further stated it will also include improvements near
Princeton. Ms. Zawada stated the City will not be paying for any improvements in Lyon Township, nor
will the Township be paying for improvements in the City. Councilmember Kurtzweil stated she would
like to know why the grant eligible money changed originally from $146,000 to $254,000. Ms. Zawada
stated the current grant eligible is actually $458,000 and part of the reason is there are 3 schools within
the 1 mile distance which enabled them to raise the amount of grant eligible money
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Ms. Zawada stated the Township is just under $120,000, the City’s match is just above $92,000 and the schools match is $106,000, with the Road Commission contributing $50,000 which is a 1/3 of the signal construction cost. Ms. Zawada stated the plan for the construction of the signal will be done in 2016. The plan is to submit the entire plan in December, if everything is acceptable, it will allow for a bid letting in May of 2016, so it is possible the improvements could be done in 2016 but there is a funding portion and if the funds are used before that, the construction will be completed in 2017.

Councilman Kramer asked if Council is being asked to approve the entire project funding or just the traffic signal. City Manager Ladner stated the $92,304.20 was already approved in the budget, she is asking Council to move forward with the design and construction for the traffic signal. Councilman Wedell stated the original spread sheet reflected the City paying approximately $58,000 just for the signal, and now we are looking at $92,000 for the entire project. There is a significant difference. City Manager Ladner stated Council may approve just the signal cost and wait for another time to approve the entire cost. Councilman Kivell stated he is concerned about moving forward and would like more comprehensive information. He further stated he would like to know how the original numbers were so skewed. Councilman Kivell stated it now appears that everyone is now paying an equal amount, but he doesn’t like the idea of the bridge and there are other things he would like more of an understanding of what is planned. Ms. Zawada stated she will make sure there is information available at City Hall. She further stated the only thing that will not be included is the signal. Councilman Ryzyi stated he is very happy with the project but would like to know how much money has been spent so far. Ms. Zawada stated her firm has expended $30,000 but she isn’t aware of the Planning Consultants charges.

Councilman Ryzyi asked if this has been approved by the Lyon Township Board. Ms. Zawada stated it has been approved and included in their budget, but she doesn’t know if it has gone before the Board. Councilmember Kurtzweil stated she understands the numbers have shifted, but she asked Ms. Zawada if the $92,000 is a firm number. Ms. Zawada stated she doesn’t like to bid low, but we still have to remember this is an estimate, but it is a slightly conservative estimate. If construction costs change, the numbers could be affected. Discussion was held regarding the State’s priority for the funding. Ms. Zawada stated it is basically first come, first serve basis. Discussion was held regarding the timeline for applying for the grant and information they still need. Councilman Wedell stated he is supporting this motion because the numbers are much more realistic for the signal than what was brought before Council at a previous meeting, but he would like more time to review the entire package.

**CM 11-4-15 MOTION TO APPROVE FUNDING FOR TRAFFIC SIGNAL AT PONTIAC TRAIL AND MARJORIE ANN**

- Motion by Kramer, supported by Kurtzweil
- Motion to authorize the engineering and construction expenses for the City’s portion of the Traffic signal at Pontiac Trail and Marjorie Ann, related to the Safe Routes to School grant

**VOTE: MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**
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3. Consider adopting new athletic field/court use application and permit policy and procedure and set administrative fees for processing use permit applications

City Manager Ladner stated this was brought before Council at a previous meeting and Council requested some changes to the permit/policy. She further stated Parks and Recreation had a special meeting and they have made the changes requested. Diane Beagle stated they clarified the fees being charged to the larger groups, not the individuals, along with a change in the categories of groups. Mayor Galeas stated he is happy this is being addressed, this has been an issue in the past with knowing who has the field and when, and the area is continuing to grow.

Councilmember Kurtzweil stated she read the minutes from the last meeting, but didn’t understand some of the questions. She asked how much revenue they expected to gain from the fees. Amy Allen stated they are expecting between $75.00 and $100.00. Councilmember Kurtzweil stated she has spoken with many parents and they are already spending a lot of money for their equipment, uniforms, and membership to the organizations. Councilmember Kurtzweil stated she is not against user administrative fees, but that is a minimal amount of money, if that is all you’re gaining, she doesn’t understand why that is being charged. She further stated she read in the minutes there is an issue with the time it takes to schedule the fields. Councilmember Kurtzweil stated it may be a good idea to update the technology and use scheduling software. She further stated there would be many benefits with that. It would be consumer friendly and they could schedule their own games, which would be relieving time as well. Councilmember Kurtzweil stated she would advocate all the municipalities sharing a cost in getting such software. Councilman Kramer stated the purpose of the user fee was for the amount of time it takes to schedule the multiple dates and fields. Councilman Ryzi stated it is good to have a policy and he understands the scheduling must be a logistic nightmare. He stated he does feel since the fields are public property there should not be any fees charged. Denise Semion stated originally the City scheduled the fields. The City asked South Lyon Recreation to take the scheduling over. She understands his point that this should be free, but Northville charges for the use of the fields, and this is a way to recoup the costs of her time. City Manager Ladner stated she would like to clarify that, up until 2012 South Lyon Recreation scheduled the fields. The previous City Clerk took on the responsibility due to some conflict with someone at South Lyon Recreation. In 2014 Clerk Deaton asked South Lyon Recreation to take that task back on considering they are one of the major users of the fields, along with Junior League and other organizations. This is not something the City has always done; they City only handled the scheduling for approximately 2 years. Ms. Semione stated she is interested in looking at other communities and how they handle their fields. Mayor Galeas stated he would like to see that information as well. The money is a moot point; it is more of a matter of someone committing to dates and fields. He further stated he is for technology but he doesn’t want that to hold this up. Councilman Kivel stated this is a good idea, and the fee spread out among each kid playing, it shouldn’t be a large amount. He further stated he would rather see money going for programming instead of scheduling software. Councilmember Dedakis stated they did a good job on the language and it clarifies the information. She further stated she understand Amy’s time is valuable. Councilmember Dedakis stated she is also interested in learning what other communities are doing and she is also interested in looking into what scheduling software is available. Councilmember Kurtzweil stated she problem solves
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by identifying the problem and tries to see if the solution solves the problem. She doesn’t think the $75.00 will solve the problem. There will always be people changing dates, or fields. She further stated there has to be a certain level of tolerance. Councilmember Kurtzweil stated she tried to present an alternative solution which would solve the problem. She further stated the language reflects the requests must be given by fax, in person or drop box. She stated most families do not have access to fax machines. She further stated there is a disconnect from the taxpayer and she is trying to impress upon the delivery of services that are welcomed by the taxpayer. Councilman Ryzyi stated he would like email accepted because most places accept email, not just fax requests. Mayor Galeas stated technology is great, but sometimes it can bog down the process.

CM 11-4-15 MOTION TO APPROVE PARK APPLICATION AND PERMIT POLICY

Motion by Kivell, supported by Dedakis
Motion to adopt and authorize the use of the revised application and permit policy and Procedure and use permit application

VOTE: MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

NEW BUSINESS

1. Appointment- Mayor Pro-Tem

Councilman Ryzyi stated he has enjoyed serving as Mayor Pro-Tem and you have to have been able to communicate with the Mayor. He stated he knows of a gentleman that is on Council that has experience, that knows Roberts Rules of Order, is well respected by the Community and he would like to nominate Harvey Wedell. Councilmember Kurtzweil stated she supports that nomination as well. There has been a lot of change tonight, and it will be nice to have someone experienced that has the respect of the other Council Members and he knows how to run a meeting. She further stated Mr. Wedell actively worked the polls and he should be commended for throwing his hat in the Mayoral ring and running a clean campaign. Councilmember Kurzweil further stated he has demonstrated he has commitment to the process

Councilmen Wedell stated he fully intended on nominating Councilman Kramer, for all the previous reasons stated, Councilman Kramer would be a good Mayor Pro Tem, but he appreciates the nomination.

CM 11-5-15 MOTION TO APPROVE APPOINTMENT OF MAYOR PRO-TEM

Motion by Ryzyi, supported by Kramer
Motion to appoint Councilman Wedell as Mayor Pro-Tem

VOTE: MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY
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MANAGERS REPORT

City Manager Ladner stated she would like to remind everyone that Wednesday is Veterans Day and she would like to thank all the veterans and the people currently serving our Country. She further stated although most municipal offices will be closed, along with banks, South Lyon City Hall will be open with normal business hours. City Manager Lander stated she also would like to thank Mayor Wallace, and the previous Council Members and she enjoyed working with them. City Manager Ladner congratulated the new Mayor and Councilmembers and she hopes to meet with each person regarding any new ideas they may have. City Manager Ladner stated Michigan Seamless Tube has been asked to remove the boats from their property as soon as possible, and they ensured us they will do so. City Manager Ladner stated there was a problem with water lines at the Knolls but it is being handled.

COUNCIL COMMENTS

Councilman Kivell stated the water main at the Knolls that was cut open, has been fixed and it will not affect the quality of water for anyone. Councilman Kivell stated he would like to thank the former Councilmembers for their efforts and congratulations to the new members.
Councilmember Dedakis stated she would like to thank all the voters and also the former Councilmembers for all they have done for the City, and she wishes everyone a happy Veterans Day.
Councilman Ryzyi stated he is happy to be a part of the new Council and he is looking forward to making some positive changes in the City. He also thanked the volunteers that assisted him with his campaign and to thank all the voters. Councilman Ryzyi stated he is not comfortable asking the voters to vote on a 2 mill ballot proposal and that was a vision of the old Council. He would like that issue revisited.
Councilman Wedell stated he would like to thank the voters. He further stated there will be a ceremony on Veterans Day at 11:11 a.m. held by the VFW and the American Legion if anyone is interested in attending.
Councilman Kramer stated he would like to congratulate everyone that won the Election and he hopes to move forward peacefully. Councilman Kramer stated something needs to be done at the bike trail at 9 Mile, it is a very busy area and it is hard for people to get across. City Manager Ladner stated she will look into that, it is a fundable area.
Councilmember Kurtzweil asked if the City Manager could add the 2015-2016 City Budgets to the website and she would like a hardcopy as well. Councilmember Kurtzweil stated she will be highlighting her experiences at local businesses especially when they support the arts and the Cultural Arts Commission of South Lyon. She stated she attended a poetry reading at Third Monk Brewing Company and there were a total of 8 poets, and 2 of them were from South Lyon. Councilmember Kurtzweil stated they were masters of the written craft and they spoke with the most incredible command of the English language. They were recipients of creative awards presented to them by their peers, and most were accomplished authors. It was a well-recognized and organized event and this is going to be the new South Lyon. She further stated she would like to thank Jeff from Third Monk for bringing his business to South Lyon and to thank him for supporting the Arts. She stated she would also like to thank
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Josie Kearns and Joseph Metusick for bringing the vision of poetry to a whole new audience.
Councilmember Kurtzweil stated she wants to thank everyone that voted on Election Day, whether you voted for her or not, it is important that you participated in the Democratic process. She further stated she will work to meet everyone's expectations or exceed them. Councilmember Kurtzweil stated we are creative, out of the box thinkers and we think and we choose to succeed and not to fail. She further stated she is full of enthusiasm, hope and good will and wants to thank everyone for their votes of confidence.
Mayor Galeas stated he would like to thank everyone and he moved here 25 years ago, and his children grew up here, it is a little surreal. He stated he attended a Planning Commission meeting, and spoke with Mayor Jeff Potter, which started his career in city politics by being a member of the Planning Commission. Mayor Galeas stated he has watched the changes happening in South Lyon and he thinks there are some needs being met, and some are not. He further stated there are some strong personalities on Council and everything will work out fine. We can agree to disagree and do so with respect. Mayor Galeas stated he would like to thank the previous Mayor and Council for their years of dedication to the City. He further stated he is looking forward to serving the City.

ADJOURNMENT

CM 11-6-15 MOTION TO ADJOURN

Motion by Kivell, supported by Ryzyi
Motion to adjourn meeting at 9:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

______________________________  ________________________________
John Galeas Jr.  Mayor         Lisa Deaton Clerk/Treasurer
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"Resignation Certificate"

October 24, 2015

To: Lesa Deaton - City Clerk

Subject: Eligibility for Office in City
Ref: Section 5.1 "article(d)"

Time of day: 10:45 AM

I hereby effectively resign from the South Lyon Cable Commission as per this day, date, and time. "I greatly appreciated the opportunity to serve the commission and the community."

Genuinely,
Carl W. Richards

Witness:

[Signature]
CITY OF SOUTH LYON

Application for Appointment

Date: 10.22.15

Name: Rick Neely

Address: 6417 Harlen Creek

City, State, Zip Code: South Lyon MI 48178

Home/Cell Phone: 248-420-2059

E-mail address: neely.rickly@yahoo.com

Occupation: Customer Support Specialist

Employer: Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan

Education & Related Experience: Graduate of South Lyon High School
2 years of Oakland Community College, Studying Business Administration, also BCBS and UAW Local 1178 representative Board and Health & Safety Volunteer at Crossroads Community Church

Are you a citizen of the United States? Yes [ ] No [ ]

Are you in default to the City? Yes [ ] No [X]

Is any member of your family an elected official of the City? Yes [ ] No [X]

If so, who?

Please select which position(s) you are interested in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board/Commission</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Recreation Commission</td>
<td>[X]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Board of Appeals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Board of Appeals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Arts Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
November 19, 2015

City Council  
City of South Lyon  
335 S. Warren Street  
South Lyon, MI 48178

Subject: Thomasville Site Condominium, PD Rezoning & Preliminary PD Site Plan

Description of Application: The applicant is requesting Planned Development rezoning and Preliminary PD Site Plan approval for the proposed development of a 60 unit single-family residential development on an 11.635 acre parcel.

Site Location: South side of 11 mile, 1/4 mile west of Pontiac Trail

Applicant: Tom Schroder  
52401 Trailwood Dr.  
South Lyon, MI 48178

Zoning: RM-1, Multiple-Family Residential District

Plans Dated: 11-17-15

Dear City Council Members:

We have reviewed the above revised PD Rezoning and Preliminary PD Site Plan request to construct a 60 unit, detached single-family residential site condominium development fronting 11 Mile Road and abutting Colonial Acres. The site is triangular in shape and bordered by 11 Mile Road and single-family residential to the north; the railroad and condominium units to the south; and condominium units to the east. A pond is also located at the northwest corner of the site, next to the railroad track and 11 Mile Road. This property was originally approved for the construction of fifteen (15), 6-unit condominium buildings with outside parking, identical to those immediately east of the site. If developed under the original plan, a total of 90 units would be constructed. The proposed single-family development would use the same entryway location as shown on the original plan. The applicant has indicated that current lending requirements make the development and sale of attached condominium units impractical.

BACKGROUND

At the August 13, 2015 meeting, the Planning Commission recommended approval of the Preliminary PUD Site Plan to City Council, with conditions. This project was originally reviewed conceptually by the Planning Commission at the May 29, 2014 meeting with the Commissioners generally in favor of the development, citing the need for this type of housing. Commissioners also expressed the need for quality and variety with the houses that would be built. Although no action was formally taken, the use of the One Family Cluster Housing Option seemed appropriate at that
time. The applicant is now applying for virtually the same project under the PD, Planned Development Option, since the process is virtually the same as that for the One Family Cluster Housing Option but provides more flexibility. The Planning Commission also provided additional comments to the applicant at the June 11, 2015 meeting, after holding a public hearing.

CURRENT ZONING REQUIREMENTS

The RM-1 District allows the development of single-family residential units as a permitted use, provided the dimensional requirements of the R-3 District are met. The R-3 District permits a maximum density of 3.7 units per acre (Section 102-457(n), Notes to schedule of regulations) with a minimum lot size of 8,750 square feet. Based upon the total acreage, this means that 44 units would be allowed by right under the R-3 District while a total of 60 units are proposed. To develop the site as shown, the applicant must utilize the PD, Planned Development Option.

PD, PLANNED DEVELOPMENT REVIEW PROCESS

The proposed PD, Planned Development Rezoning and corresponding Preliminary PD Plan approval would provide general acceptance of the road layout, lot (unit) sizes, open space, preliminary landscaping, and housing designs. A public hearing has been held, as required under the ordinance, for PD Rezoning and Preliminary PD Plan review, and a positive recommendation from the Planning Commission made. If the PD Rezoning, and corresponding Preliminary PD Plan, is approved by City Council, the applicant will return to the Planning Commission for Final PD Plan review and recommendation to City Council. All of the requirements for site plan submissions in Article IV of the zoning ordinance must be complied with at that time.

PD, PLANNED DEVELOPMENT REZONING REVIEW STANDARDS

Section 102-382 of the zoning ordinance lists the following standards that must be met for consideration of a Planned Development rezoning request:

(a) The uses proposed will have a beneficial effect, in terms of public health, safety, welfare or convenience or any combination thereof, on present and potential surrounding land uses. The uses proposed will encourage a more efficient use of public utilities and services and lessen the burden on circulation systems, surrounding properties, and the environment. This beneficial effect for the city (not the developer) shall be one which could not be achieved under any other single zoning classification.

Review Comment: The proposed use will create less density than the originally-approved attached single-family condominiums and be easier for purchasers to finance. It will also improve access for the existing Colonial Acres development and provide moderately-priced new construction housing for the community. The Lexington Oaks project helped fill that need but those units have already sold out.

(b) The uses proposed shall be consistent with the master plan of future land use for the city.
Review Comment: The proposed future land use designation for the site is Suburban Residential, which includes “Planned developments that may contain a mix of suburban and traditional residential.”

(c) The zoning is warranted by the design and amenities incorporated in the development proposal.

Review Comment: Given the unique characteristics of the site (unusual shape, a pond, proximity to a railroad, etc.) a Planned Development is more appropriate than a project developed under RM-1, Multiple-Family Residential zoning regulations, or even the density requirements of the R-3, Single-Family Residential District.

(d) Usable open space shall be provided, at least equal to the total of the minimum usable open space which would be required for each of the component uses of the development. The city may, if deemed appropriate, require for planned developments more or less open space than that required by this chapter.

Review Comment: Given the challenging shape of the lot and unique characteristics of the site, the open space is provided between the units that back up to one another, thereby preventing the creation of through-lots. The pond at the northwest corner of the site is also being maintained as-is, the trees along 11 Mile Road will be preserved, and a small pocket park has been added just west of the pond.

(e) Off-street parking sufficient to meet the minimum required by section 102-476 shall be provided and the city may, if deemed appropriate by the city require for planned developments more or less parking than that required by this chapter.

Review Comment: Each unit will have a garage and the amount of parking required under the proposed PD rezoning will be the same as that under the R-3 zoning designation.

(f) Landscaping shall be provided so as to ensure that proposed uses will be adequately buffered from one another and from surrounding public and private property. The city may, if deemed appropriate, require for planned unit developments more or less landscaping than that required by this chapter.

Review Comment: Landscape buffering is to be provided along the south and east property lines, abutting the existing condominium units. Any additional landscaping needed to buffer properties will be determined under Final PD Plan review.

(g) Vehicular and pedestrian circulation, allowing safe, convenient, uncongested and well-defined circulation within and to the district shall be provided.

Review Comment: Vehicular access to the property will be from 11 Mile Road and meets the above criteria, while improving accessibility for the existing Colonial Acres project. Sidewalks are also provided within the project, to be reviewed as part of the Preliminary PD Plan review.
Natural and historical features of the district shall reasonably be protected and preserved.

Review Comment: The pond and perimeter trees on the northern edge of the property will be preserved under this project.

PRELIMINARY PD PLAN REVIEW COMMENTS

Section 102-131(a) of the City of South Lyon Zoning Ordinance lists the submittal requirements for site plan review. Based on our review of the proposal, discussions with the applicant, and comments received from the Planning Commission during Conceptual Review of the project, we offer the following for your consideration:

1. **Overall Density.** Section 102-387(b)(1), General design standards, of the ordinance states that "The maximum permitted residential density for single-family dwelling shall not exceed the density allowed for the area currently zoned single-family as shown on the zoning district map." The current zoning designation for the subject property is RM-1 but the ordinance states that "The standards of the schedule of regulations applicable to the R-3 one-family residential district shall apply as minimum standards when one-family detached dwellings are erected." Footnote (n) for the R-3 District also states that "Single-family detached condominiums in condominium subdivisions shall meet all requirements and standards of the district in which such dwellings are to be constructed, including minimum floor area requirements, and excepting minimum lot size, which shall be so developed that the number of dwelling units per gross acre shall not exceed the following: (4) R-3, 3.7 dwelling units per gross acre." The applicant is requesting 62 units, to meet the benefit of providing moderately priced new housing, citing that the overall density will still be much lower than the previously approved 90 units and close to the 5.0 units per acre under the One Family Cluster Housing Option. A waiver will have to be granted to allow an overall density of approximately 5.3 units per acre.

2. **Area and Bulk.** The proposed site was reviewed in accordance with Section 102-459, Open space preservation option, as described in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Provided</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area</td>
<td>8750 sq. ft. min.</td>
<td>Average of 4200 s.f.</td>
<td>A waiver will be needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Width</td>
<td>60 ft. min.</td>
<td>40 ft. min.</td>
<td>A waiver will be needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Density</td>
<td>3.7 units/acre max.</td>
<td>Approximately 5.15 units/acre</td>
<td>A waiver will be needed but also note that the One-Family Open Space Option allows a maximum density of 5.0 units per acre, which is comparable to this development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front yard setback (single-family)</td>
<td>25 ft.</td>
<td>25 ft.</td>
<td>In compliance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. **Overall Layout.** The overall layout of the proposed development seems reasonable and matches that recommended for City Council approval at the August 13, 2015 Planning Commission meeting.

4. **Emergency Access.** The Police and Fire Departments requested the installation of a paved, gated emergency access drive to 11 Mile Road. This has been provided and details for construction and maintenance will have to be provided at the time of Final PD Plan review. They also indicated the need to have the main drive (Lexington Drive) connect with the drive for Colonial Acres to the north for improved emergency access.

5. **Park Area.** Per direction from the Planning Commission, two (2) units were removed from the previous Preliminary Plan and replaced with a park area, to the southwest of the pond.

6. **Preliminary Landscape Plan.** The preliminary landscape plan provides both the required street trees and replacement trees. In addition, the planting size for almost all of the proposed trees exceeds ordinance requirements and is considered a benefit of the project. Since residents from the existing condominium units to the south and east expressed concern about buffering between developments, the landscape plan indicates the planting of evergreen trees (minimum 10’ height) along the property line.

7. **Building Elevations.** The use of high-quality building elevations and materials is critical to the successful development of a small lot, single-family project such as this. The preliminary building elevations are attractive and have the potential to meet this standard, conditioned upon the proper variety of elevations and acceptable building materials/colors. The Planning Commission did express the need for architectural variety and the introduction of a third, and possibly fourth, elevation should be considered under Final PD Site Plan review.
RECOMMENDATION

Based upon the above discussion, the Planning Commission recommends approval to City Council for the PD, Planned Development rezoning and Preliminary PD Site Plan for the Thomasville development, with approval of waivers to allow: a) an average lot area of 4,200 s.f.; b) a minimum lot width of 40 ft.; c) an overall density of 5.3 units per acre; d) a setback of 10 feet between buildings; and e) a rear yard setback that in some cases drops below 35 ft.

If you have any further questions, please contact us at 810-335-3800.

Sincerely,

CIB PLANNING

[Signature]

Carmine P. Avantini, AICP
MEMO

To: Kristen Delaney, Community Development

From: Mike Kennedy, Fire Chief

Date: May 16, 2014

Reference: Eleven Mile Planned Development

Upon review of the Eleven Mile Planned Development, I have the following comments.

I. Unit Density
   The plan does not have exact measurements, but I have significant concern of the density of units. If this density were to be allowed, I would strongly petition for the inclusion of residential sprinklers to be required.

II. Fire Apparatus Access Road
   Based on the proposed number of units, the developer will be required to add a secondary fire apparatus access road or install residential sprinklers in all of the units.

   SECTION D107 ONE- OR TWO-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENTS
   D107.1 One- or two-family dwelling residential developments.
   Developments of one- or two-family dwellings where the number of dwelling units exceeds 30 shall be provided with separate and approved fire apparatus access roads and shall meet the requirements of Section D104.3.

Exceptions:
   1. Where there are more than 30 dwelling units on a single public or private fire apparatus access road and all dwelling units are equipped throughout with an approved automatic sprinkler system in accordance with Section 903.3.1.1, 903.3.1.2 or 903.3.1.3, access from two directions shall not be required.
   2. The number of dwelling units on a single fire apparatus access road shall not be increased unless fire apparatus access roads will connect with future development, as determined by the fire code official.
III. **Road Width**

Road width is not addressed. Depending on the road width, one or both sides of the street will need to be designated as fire lane.

**503.2 Specifications.**

*Fire apparatus access roads shall be installed and arranged in accordance with Sections 503.2.1 through 503.2.7.*

**503.2.1 Dimensions.**

*Fire apparatus access roads shall have an unobstructed width of not less than 20 feet (6096 mm), except for approved security gates in accordance with Section 503.6, and an unobstructed vertical clearance of not less than 13 feet 6 inches (4115 mm).*

**503.2.2 Authority.**

*The fire code official shall have the authority to require an increase in the minimum access widths where they are inadequate for fire or rescue operations.*

**D103.6.1 Roads 20 to 26 feet in width.**

*Fire apparatus access roads 20 to 26 feet wide (6096 to 7925 mm) shall be posted on both sides as a fire lane.*
CITY OF SOUTH LYON

REZONING APPLICATION

REZONING REQUEST

I (We), the undersigned, do hereby respectfully make application and petition the governing body to amend the zoning map a hereinafter requested, and in support of this application, the following factors are shown:

(Complete either 1 or 2)

1. The property is part of a recorded plat. The property sought to be rezoned is located at

   11 Mile Road between Pontiac Trail

   and Dix Barro on the South side of the street, and is known as Lot(s) Number of Thomasville
   feet, and a depth of feet average.

2. The property is in acreage, and is not, therefore, a part of a recorded plat. The property sought to be rezoned is located and described as follows:

   (Indicate total acreage also)

   Tax ID # 21-19-126-002 containing 11.635 acres of land

   See attached legal description

3. The property sought to be rezoned is owned by:

   Name: Cornerstone Land, LLC

   Street Address: 10752 Waterfall Court

   City: South Lyon, MI 48178

4. It is desired and requested that the foregoing described property be zoned from:

   RM-1 to PD

5. It is proposed that the property will be put to the following use:

   single family residential

6. It is proposed that the following building(s) will be constructed:

   62 single family residential units with attached garages
7. Attach a statement hereto indicating why, in your opinion, the change requested is necessary for the presentation and enjoyment of substantial property rights, and why such change will not be detrimental to the public welfare, nor the property of other persons located in the vicinity thereof.

8. Attach fifteen (15) prints of a parcel map drawn at a scale of not less than 1" = 200' if the parcel is under three acres and 1" = 100' if the parcel is three acres or more, showing the lot or parcel in question, and all adjacent and abutting property lines, public right-of-way and existing zoning.

Signature of Applicant:
Address: 10758 Waterfall Court South Lynn
Phone Number: 248 613-3752

9. Applicants' basis of representation (e.g., legal representative, owner, option to buy):
   Owner

A. ACTION TAKEN BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION
   1. Date of first appearance of petitioner: ____________________________
   2. Findings of the Planning Commission: ____________________________
   3. Recommendation to Governing Body: ____________________________

B. ACTION TAKEN BY GOVERNING BODY
   1. Date of public hearing: ____________________________
   2. Findings of the governing body: ____________________________
   3. Action of the governing body: ____________________________
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April 11, 2015

City of South Lyon
335 South Warren
South Lyon, MI 48178

Attn: Mr. Scott Lanam, Chair
     Planning Commission

Re: Thomasville
    Preliminary Site Plan Review

Dear Mr. Lanam:

We have reviewed the preliminary site plan for the proposed Thomasville Site Condominium as prepared by Monument Engineering Group Associates, Inc (dated March 12, 2015). Based on our review of the conceptual site plan, we offer the following comments:

1. The proposed 11 Mile Road approach improvements will require the review and approval of the Road Commission for Oakland County.

2. Per the City Standard Engineering Specifications, two (2) water main connections are required. The water main will need to connect to the existing 12 inch water main to the east along 11 Mile Road.

3. Show the proposed gate valve locations on the plans.

4. The proposed sidewalk should connect to the existing sidewalk to the south on Lexington Drive.

5. Per the City Standard Engineering Specifications, the proposed mountable curb will need to be 30 inches wide (Detail R2-C).

Subject to the items noted above being addressed in the final site plan, we have no objections to the conceptual plan as submitted. A revised plan which includes added details should be submitted to this office for the final site plan review. This office is available to discuss the particulars of this review with the Applicant or his engineer, at their request. If you have any questions or require any additional information, please contact the undersigned.

Very truly yours,

HUBBELL, ROTH & CLARK, INC.

Michael P. Darga, P.E.

MPD/mpd

pc: City of South Lyon; L. Ladner, B. Martin, K. Delaney, D. Smith
    CIB Planning; C. Avantini
    HRC; J. VanDeCreek, J. Booth, File
Motion by Chaundy, second by Rose
To approve the June 11, 2015 minutes as amended.

Voice Vote: Ayes: Unanimous
Nays: None

MOTION APPROVED

PUBLIC COMMENTS (non-agenda items)

Carl Richards, 390 Lennox – Mr. Richards commented about the demolition of the grain mill. The permit expiration is 5/31/2017, he wondered if they have to wait till 2017 to see if they will file a new permit to build a new building. He thought that they have to move on it. Mr. Lanam explained that the site plan lasts for one year. Mr. Richards thought it would be nice if a sign was put up stating “new site of replica building”.

Mr. Richards commented on the newspaper article in terms of vacancies in the downtown area. He commented on the City obtaining the display cases in the business at 390 Lafayette, along with the trusses in the roof. He recommended that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council that the City act as the general contractor in the demolition of this building.

Diane from Diane’s Doll House– She stated that she is concerned about the article in The Herald dated August 6, 2015 “City seeks Economic Developer Director to breathe life into downtown”. Under boosting downtown many of the businesses are wondering how the City Manager, Lynn Ladner, came up with the idea of incubator spaces, allowing a whole base business to have a downtown location and to pursue pop up store fronts and the idea of food trucks. She questioned how this will bring business to the current businesses? She feels that they need more walking traffic. By creating that more businesses would want to open in our downtown. The empty buildings are an opportunity to locate people to come in. She appreciated the paintings in the area as well.

OLD BUSINESS

1. Thomasville PD Site Condominium: Consideration of a tabled request to rezone an approximate 11.635 parcel tax ID (18-21-19-126-002) Thomasville, fronting 11 Mile Road and abutting the westernmost end of Colonial Acres, from RM-1 Multiple Family Residential District to PD, Planned Development District.

Mr. Avantini reviewed the CIB Planning memo dated July 27, 2015. He explained since the last Planning Commission meeting he did have an opportunity to meet with the Police and Fire Chief to discuss any concerns they may have with the connection to Colonial Acres. After that meeting, they indicated that they do want the connection to Colonial Acres and also indicated that they want an emergency access drive located along Eleven Mile Road, immediately west of where the main entrance is. The applicants have removed the two units adjacent to the pond and included a small park area in its place. The removal of the two lots does drop the density down to about 5.3
units per acre. At the last meeting it was also expressed about not having a fence between this project and Colonial Acres so the applicant has agreed to install a row of evergreens along the entire property line at a minimum of 10 feet tall. The building elevations will be reviewed at final site plan review. He knows there were a lot of comments made at the last meeting in terms of who would want to buy these homes, in terms of the type of development it is comparable to the Lexington Oaks project. It's going to be a similar target market. Of the 36 applications he looked at every single one is retirement age or retired. Only one had a child that is 16 years old in the Lexington Oaks project.

Mr. Avantini recommended that the Planning Commission recommend approval to City Council for the Planned Unit Development rezoning and Preliminary PD Site Plan for the Thomasville development. Conditioned upon the approval of waivers outlined in the review letter.

Mr. Avantini commented that the property is zoned for Multiple Family Residential and could be developed by right as an apartment complex. They encouraged the applicant to go in this direction because it is less intense and disruptive and better for the residents. They think it is much better for the City and adds more value to the community.

Mr. Lanam stated that the meeting was held with the Fire and Police Departments and they are vehemently against approving anything that does not have the connection to Colonial Acres. He explained that the easement is already in place.

Mr. Lanam questioned if there were any meetings between the developer and Colonial Acres. Ms. Janie Thompkins, Manager for Colonial Club Land Company, which is the owner of the current parcel, she explained after the last meeting she spoke to the Board at Colonial Acres and they said they don't want a fence separating the property and would prefer evergreen trees. Also, if at all possible they did not want the road to connect but that they understood if the Fire and Police Department wanted it.

**Resident** — She commented that they are going to be special assessed to take care of Heritage Boulevard, if they have to pay for that, with this extension how can they do that.

**Resident** — She commented for the Police and Fire Department to use the excuse that the connection will provide better access is false, since they have access to Raleigh Court, they have never had a problem getting to them before.

Mr. Lanam explained that there are rules with the Fire Code where the access has to be, the fact that there hasn't always been doesn't really mean anything.

Mr. Lanam confirmed there will be 2-3 more elevations added before final. He also wants to see material boards and renditions. He wants to see something more creative in the park area, not a wood chip path and a bench and include some maintenance into the documents for the public space. The developer confirmed with Mr. Lanam that the emergency path will be paved asphalt. Mr. Lanam confirmed there will be no on street parking on Lexington.
**Lucy Sullivan, Colonial Acres** - She questioned if the City has a recommendation of what land has to be left open? Mr. Lanam stated it is zoned residential multiple which means they could develop it as 90 apartments. Ms. Sullivan asked if the development will then be right up to the property line of Colonial Acres. Mr. Lanam stated that there will be a buffer with 10-12’ evergreens instead of a vinyl fence.

**Lenora, Colonial Acres** – She stated that the fact that they saw applications to another development has absolutely no bearing on this at all. That is a totally different thing, it has nothing to do with who will be living in this area. No one has ever brought up that the access road was supposed to be in 19 years ago and the Fire Department has never had a problem getting in or out of the development before, and they come often. If this development did not go in that road would not open, they would put it through to 11 Mile. Mr. Wilhelm stated clearly the Chief is saying that he desires better access to that far point. If there is going to be a development they are looking for better access for all areas. She wants to make sure that the beauty that has been there is maintained, it has been a nice green space and it’s been special to the people that have lived there.

Mr. Avantini explained that they have come up with the best plan that is the most compatible development for the City. If it’s going to be developed then they want to make sure it’s the most compatible development to Colonial Acres, it is much better than apartments which is what it’s currently zoned for.

Mr. Lanam confirmed there is one entrance off of Eleven Mile Road along with an emergency access. Traffic calming measures were briefly discussed. Mr. Avantini stated that they could refer traffic calming measures to the traffic consultant at final.

**Motion by Chaundy, second by Chubb**

To recommend the preliminary approval for Thomasville with the conditions stated by the Fire Chief and Mr. Avantini.

Voice Vote: Ayes: Unanimous
Nays: None

**MOTION APPROVED**

2. **Jamestown Site Condominium:** Consideration of a request for preliminary site plan approval for the proposed site condominium development of an attached 22 unit on an approximate 2.0 acre parcel. The property is located on the south side of 11 Mile Road, just west of the intersection of Pontiac Trail.

Mr. Avantini reviewed the CIB Planning memo dated June 30, 2015. He explained that one of the key requests that was made at the last meeting was to clarify the process. Mr. Avantini briefly reviewed the process for approval.

Mr. Avantini stated that the applicant did retain a well-respected landscape architect and a detailed landscape plan has been provided which shows a more formal arrangement at the entrance of the site.
The meeting was called to order by Mr. Lanam at 7:03 p.m.

Roll Call: Scott Lanam, Chair
Jerry Chaundy, Secretary
Frank Leimbach, Commissioner
Maggie Kurtzweil, Commissioner
Steve Mosier, Commissioner
Carol Segal, Commissioner

Absent: Wayne Chubb, Commissioner
Keith Bradley, Commissioner
Jason Rose, Commissioner

Guests: 52+

Also Present: Carmine Avantini, Planning Consultant, CIB Planning
Tim Wilhelm, City Attorney

Mr. Lanam noted that the absent Commissioners are excused.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Mosier added an update to the Planning Commission meeting dates to the agenda.

Motion by Mosier, second by Chaundy
To approve the agenda as amended.

Voice Vote: Ayes: Unanimous
Nays: None

MOTION APPROVED

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

A. Approval of the May 14, 2015 Minutes

Minor changes were made to the minutes.

Motion by Mosier, second by Leimbach
To approve the May 14, 2015 minutes as amended.
Voice Vote: Ayes: Unanimous  
Nays: None

MOTION APPROVED

Ms. Kurtzweil commented on the concerns the City Council had regarding the increased fee for the Recording Secretary. She explained that she was the sole person who complained about the minutes not being detailed, having inaccuracies and had resident’s comments either deleted or distorted. She was disappointed that the City Manager did not have a complete understanding of the importance of preserving the records for the municipal corporation for the City of South Lyon.

PUBLIC COMMENTS (non-agenda items)

Carl Richards, 390 Lennox – Mr. Richards commented that he is on the Cable Commission and they met last night but had to sit outside because they have no key to get in.

He reported that he knew nothing about photographing the Memorial Day Parade. The City Manager chose 4 candidates to photograph the parade and the City Manager paid them out of her own pocket. The instructions were no audio and no discussion.

He reported that he spoke to the new building inspector and Third Monk Brewery has all of the required approvals and permits. They are brewing their first batch of beer and are planning on having a soft opening at the end of the month. There is a woman working on the graphic sign on the exterior of the south side of the building.

He reported that Mo’s Towing is planning on moving and wants to get out of his lease. Mr. Richards commented if Browns goes out next year and Mo’s is gone that whole area will be empty.

He commented on a project and the drastic change in elevation and the tremendous expense to gain an additional 50’.

He reported the BP gas station has made some improvements and it is one of the few places in town that sell the Herald Newspaper. He noted the price of the newspaper will increase to $1.50 the first of July.

He stated that the City wide garage sale was a partial failure because 90% of the sales were baby and toddler items. He felt that the Garage Sale Ordinance should be modified. The Historical Society will be hosting a Trunk Sale in the near future and he hoped it would be permit free.

PUBLIC HEARING

1. Consider a request to rezone an approximate 11.635 acre parcel (tax #80-21-19-126-02) “Thomasville” fronting 11 Mile Road and abutting the westernmost end of Colonial Acres, from RM-1, Multiple Family Residential
District to PD, Planned Development District.

Mr. Lanam opened the public hearing at 7:21 p.m.

Mr. Avantini reviewed the CIB Planning memo dated April 10, 2015. The plans are the same with the one exception that two more units closest to 11 Mile Road were added for a total of 62 units. Originally this was zoned for condominiums similar to Colonial Acre condominiums with more units proposed. These units will be detached units. The density has decreased from what was originally proposed for this development. The original project had 90 units proposed and now 62 units are being proposed. At the previous meetings, residents mentioned having good buffering between their units and the proposed development. The potential use of a decorative vinyl fence to separate from the abutting Colonial Acres was also proposed. Building elevations were submitted as well and he stated that it is a good time to provide preliminary feedback to the applicant.

Mr. Avantini stated that he is recommending approval with the condition that a waiver is approved to allow the average lot area of 4200 sq. feet, a minimum lot width of 40' and overall density of 5.3 units per acre, a setback of 10' between buildings and a rear yard setback of 35' and below in some cases. The approval is also conditional upon the erection of a decorative vinyl fence along the south and east property lines.

The engineer on the project stated that they are working to get the project right and they have no problem with the conditions in the memo from Mr. Avantini. Mr. Avantini referenced the memo from HRC dated June 9, 2015 which states in terms of the overall plan, there are no objections to the conceptual plan as submitted.

Mr. Schroder confirmed the units will be approximately 1800-2200 sq. feet. He explained one plan has an option for a loft and one plan has a master bedroom on the first floor. Ms. Kurtzweil commented that when this came to them before she was concerned because she thought it would be apartments. Her concern was if it was apartments it would introduce transient people to the stable community at Colonial Acres. She felt going with condos they are adding to the community and will have people that stay for a long time because they will be homeowners who are required to make an investment. This project is far more stable than putting in apartments. She liked that there were garages, and will provide options for the residents in Colonial Acres.

Mr. Mosier stated overall the plan looks good; he would like to make sure that every house is not in the same style next to one another. The applicant was agreeable to that.

Ms. Segal asked if the developer has the easement for the connection. Mr. Schroder explained that he does have the easement in place and is open to whatever the Fire Department wants. They can put a gate there or keep it open, they will defer to either option. Mr. Wilhelm stated he has not seen the actual easement, he asked that the applicant forward that. Mr. Schroder confirmed that the project is not a retirement community.
Mr. Lanam questioned what benefit the City will receive for going over on the density along with the variances on lot area, lot width, side yard setbacks and rear yard setbacks.

Mr. Avantini stated one of the reasons this project would go to a PD is the unusual shape of the lot and the railroad tracks it makes it difficult to develop. It is up to the Planning Commission to determine if the additional two units are acceptable or not.

Mr. Leimbach questioned if the applicant maintained the density, with the maximum of 5, does that eliminate some of the variances? They are creating their own hardship. Mr. Avantini stated it may change the side yards and rear yards. Mr. Avantini stated it's important to keep in mind that the people looking for this type of development are looking for smaller lots and are targeted towards empty nesters or people that are just starting out. The owner confirmed that they were planning on having the owners take care of their own yards.

Ms. Kurtzweil stated that she didn't see many families coming in there because the back yard area is not conducive for families; it is not designed for swing sets.

Mr. Lanam stated with this being tight in the rear setback there would be no room for a raised deck or screened in porch, there would only be room for a ground level patio. Mr. Avantini stated that it is a good point but once again, having some sort of buffer will be important along those property lines. Mr. Schroder stated that a cement patio will be within the envelope, with no raised decks or enclosures allowed.

Ms. Kurtzweil stated that adds to the argument that this will be a compatible neighborhood with Colonial Acres since there will only be small patios so there won't be a lot of entertaining.

Mr. Lanam asked about the storm water and if it has been calculated to verify if it is sufficient. The engineer stated that it is sufficient and they are using the existing pond. Mr. Schroder verified that he thought the wetland is at least a square mile.

**Resident** – She provided pictures of the nature that will soon be gone, she stated that she thinks it's a shame.

**Bonnie Campbell 62310 Arlington Circle** – She explained her unit will directly join the development. It was likely it will be people with no children. They live in an isolated community in Colonial Acres, they live amongst their peers, quietly. She moved here to live quietly. She is very concerned, if it was over 55 she wouldn't worry so much. These homes will be entry level homes; they could have a dog, and 2.3 kids. Most of the people at Colonial Acres have little dogs, that don't even touch the ground. It doesn't make any sense to put homes there in this area. When she goes to sell her house which will directly look at those family homes it will affect her value, she moved here for a reason. She never thought about family homes being there.

**Mary Pell, 62512 Raleigh Court** – She commented Eleven Mile is still dirt, and questioned who is responsible for paying for that. Mr. Lanam explained that they can't require developers to pave the road, it is a County road and it may not get paved.
Dave Thompson, Lexington – He questioned what kind of fencing will they have between them and the new property? Mr. Lanam stated that they haven’t gotten that far yet. Mr. Thompson stated that Lexington cannot go through it is a private street. Mr. Schroder stated that the easement is from the landowner from Colonial Acres. Mr. Thompson stated that the road is kept up and plowed by the residents. Mr. Thompson asked if there will be fencing in between, or if the residents of the new development have a big dog will it be on his property. They bought there because it was over 55. Mr. Lanam explained that the zoning does not account for a residential abutting a senior residential, there are no rules on the books. Mr. Schroder stated that they will do whatever the City wants them to do, either keep the road open or put up an emergency gate.

Amy Lakey, Colonial Acres – She commented that she walks her dog early and cars don’t want to take Pontiac Trail, they come through. She has to be careful at 5:30 in the morning.

Cheryl McGrail, 1141 Colt. She commented that she just moved to this unit and it backs up to Eleven Mile. She questioned what changed from last spring when it was said that Lexington was private and it couldn’t be made a thoroughfare. She also asked for an explanation about the dedication of a sewer to the City, and if improvements were needed. She is worried about the impact of the water and sewer system with the amount of people 62 units would bring. She asked what guarantee do they have that their basements won’t be flooded.

The engineer explained that the sewer is on the property and it was designed to hold 90 units. It does not account for the age group of the users; it’s based on square footage and the amount of fixtures. A 90 unit development will require more than 60 units will.

Diana, Arlington Circle, most of the concern is about children and all that goes along with that. Simple remedy, make it an over 55 community so that it’s compatible.

Rick, 62512 Raleigh Court. He explained that they moved from Oakmont, Mill River. They liked the age group that was there when the bought and there were no age restrictions. After 3 years, they decided they wanted a quieter community and they found it at Colonial Acres. His backyard backs up to this development with only 30 feet between them. He stated barking dogs and kids screaming will impact his quality of life. He understood a plastic fence or a natural barrier but those don’t block out barking dogs and kids playing baseball. When two communities are put together with this wide of an age group together there will be conflict. Their expectation is a quiet existence. He is very concerned with the 7 species of frogs that are around the pond. He felt that the condo certificates should have some sort of guidelines regarding the type of fertilizer that can be used in the pond area. Traffic is also a major concern. By opening Lexington to Eleven Mile it also encourages traffic from other sources other than safety and fire departments.

Mary – She commented that privacy is another concern for her. If she has a two story home behind her she will lose privacy.
Mr. Lanam asked the developer what type of buffering they were considering. Mr. Schroder stated that they are open to putting a fence in. Mr. Lanam asked if they would be willing to meet and work with the Colonial Acres residents. Mr. Schroder agreed to meet with the Homeowner’s Association to discuss the buffering.

Ms. Kurzweil asked if the developer is providing a ranch option. Mr. Schroder stated no.

Mr. Leimbach stated that the residents have a valid point that this development is not conducive to Colonial Acres. He felt that some of these things can happen such as some kind of buffer, he felt there should be no connection at Lexington and give 5 units per acre in order to get a little more space between the lots. He suggested making a second row of egress so there are two ways to get in and out for the Fire Department and Police Department.

The engineer stated if a 2nd entrance is required it may kill the deal. Ms. Kurzweil suggested having a boulevard type entrance that can serve as a 2nd entrance/exit. Mr. Avantini stated that there are standards for the length of a cul de sac and this development does not exceed the length of the cul de sac to have a second access. This development doesn’t need a connection to Colonial Acres to make it work. Police and Fire came out very strongly wanting the 2nd access.

Ray Cusumano stated that they would prefer not to make the connection to Colonial Acres. They are flexible in terms of what the City would want. Having an emergency gate for emergency vehicles is the simple solution. Two access points on Eleven Mile kill the project. There are a lot of positives associated to a single family property which could enhance the Colonial Acres property value. They will try to address as many of the resident’s concerns as they can.

Mr. Lanam stated that the Planning Commission is not ready to give a preliminary approval; he is not comfortable with sending this to council with the road connection on the plans and the dimensions. It doesn’t mean they are voting against, the plans are just not ready to go to City Council.

Mr. Cusumano stated if they eliminated two units it wouldn’t change the side yard setback. He is concerned that they are losing time if it’s not approved. The design will not change significantly. They would prefer to have the road connection blocked off. There was brief discussion regarding the process that the project needs to complete.

Ms. Kurtzwell proposed that there are no basketball courts installed, no hoop on the garage, or a standup unit, no basketball stand in the ground. She would like to see a limit on the number of dogs and state a limit on the weight of a dog. There will be no dog houses outside at all. She stated it is very important to maintain the nature balance, and recommended D&G Nature’s Way Lawn Care as the company to use because they use organic fertilizer. She is also concerned with the turtle population in that area. She also proposed removing the two units on the end and redesigning the area with the pond. She thought a nature center with a park bench, blue bird houses would be great and asked that they even consider an art sculpture conducive to nature and have it installed. She stated that they are trying to be consistent with what Colonial Acres has. Mr. Schroder stated he was agreeable to that.
Rick – He stated it will be helpful to have rules and regulations.

Resident – He asked if the homeowners are purchasing and owning the land. Mr. Schroeder stated yes, they will be landowners. He explained that the price point will be in the low $200,000.

Esther, 62320 Arlington Circle – She thanked the Planning Commissioners for their concern for them. She stated Colonial Acres is a beautiful place to live, she feels so fortunate to live there. People look out for each other and they care about their property. She stated that it would be wonderful to see a green space. She did not want to see fences, those deteriorate and need maintenance. She asked that they consider green space; she would rather look at trees, not fences.

Mr. Lanam closed the public hearing at 8:54 p.m. due to no further comments.

Motion by Kurtzweil, second by Leimbach
To table until the next Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. Leimbach briefly suggested a boulevard entrance as well and he asked that a strong recommendation from at least one Commissioner is given to the police/fire to look at not having the connection to Colonial Acres via Lexington since it's not a required connection.

Voice Vote: Ayes: Unanimous
Nays: None

MOTION APPROVED

OLD BUSINESS - None

NEW BUSINESS

1. Request from Pullum Window Corporation located at 415 N. Lafayette for conceptual feedback on site plan.

Mr. Avantini explained that Pullum Window is planning on rebuilding after the fire that occurred. The applicant was here to obtain conceptual feedback from the Planning Commission.

Mr. Pullum stated he would like to have a nice building to reflect the quality of the product. He stated that his ideal situation would be to build the “A” elevation now along with either the “B” elevation or one of the “C” elevations, it depended on his budget. He lost a total of 18,000 sq. feet in the fire and the “A” elevation plus on one of the “C” elevations would provide 15,000 sq. ft. Has a severe water problem, because of the railroad tracks being elevated all of the water drains to his property. Mr. Avantini agreed there are practical difficulties with this site.

Ms. Kurtzweil stated if anything advertises what they do it's this plan. She commented
Richards made comments about demographic information for the South Lyon area and projects going on around town.

OLD BUSINESS

1) Aubree's Pizzeria and Grill Request for LED on Façade

City Attorney Wilhelm explained the possible courses of action for reconsidering Aubree’s request since their request had been denied at the last Planning Commission meeting. Wilhelm recommending making a motion to reconsider since the applicant was present at tonight’s meeting. He noted that making a motion to reconsider did not mean approving the request, rather, it meant giving the applicant a chance to make their case. The Commission could then take a separate vote to approve or deny that request.

Commissioner Leimbach stated that the thought Aubree’s signage was adequate. Commissioner Kurtzweil stated that she like the simplicity of the façade as it was. She feels that the building is gorgeous. Chairperson Lanam stated that he did not see a need to deviate from the ordinance by allowing for the LED.

Ron Evangelista
1040 Drakeshire Drive, Commerce Township

Evangelista apologized for not being present at the last Planning Commission meeting. He stated that he understood the Commission’s rationale for not approving the red LED. He stated that while red LED is part of the corporate look for Aubree’s, he was not sure if would install it, even if he got approval from the Commission tonight. Evangelista stated that he was just looking for the option to do it. He noted that one benefit of doing the LED was to define Aubree’s boundaries within the larger strip center. Evangelista thanked the Commission for their support.

MOTION TO DENY APPROVAL OF AUBREE’S REQUEST TO INSTALL RED LED LIGHTING ON BUILDING FAÇADE:

Motion by Bradley, second by Kurtzweil
To deny approval of Aubree’s request to install red LED lighting and the building façade.

VOTE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

2) Villas of Hidden Lake (11 Mile, West of Pontiac Trail)

Planning Consultant Avantini reviewed his letter dated May 2, 2014. Avantini discussed some of the present challenges that developers currently face when trying to build attached units, and noted that this was one of the reasons that the developer of this conceptual plan is proposing detached units. Avantini stated that while this was just a conceptual plan, he and
Delaney had met with the developer and stressed that high quality housing would be very important. Avantini and Wilhelm reviewed the different density options available. Avantini noted that the previously approved plan, which was a phase of the Colonial Acres development, would have allowed for 90 units and in this conceptual plan, the developer Tom Schroder is proposing 60 units. Avantini noted that everything is conceptual at this point, so there are no hard numbers or specifics, Schroder is simply looking for feedback from the Planning Commission tonight.

Kurtzweil asked Schroeder if he owned the property.

Tom Schroder, Cornerstone Residential Group
10758 Waterfall Court, South Lyon

Schroder responded that he was in the process of purchasing the property but he does not own it at this time. Kurtzweil asked if his offer was contingent? Schroder responded yes, that it was contingent on being able to build homes on the property.

Lanam asked if the plan, as approved for 90 units would be buildable today. Wilhelm stated that he would need to find out, since the property is in the process of being sold. He does not know if it is subject to previous site plan approval. Avantini agreed, stating that they would need to research the answer to this question.

Lanam stated that it would seem if the property in question is being split from the rest of the development, then the previous approved site plan would not apply. Schroder noted that the property still belongs to Colonial Acres and they are initiating the split.

Lanam reviewed the letter from Avantini. He noted that the R-3 zoning option would allow Schroder to build 44 units. Lanam asked if that was commercially viable? Schroder said that it depends, but he needs as much density as the Planning Commission will grant him to keep the development affordable. The larger the lots get, the higher the prices of the units will be. He noted that the site presents some challenges – it is near the railroad tracks and located between Colonial Acres and single family residential. He wants something that will be somewhere between these options, both in terms of size and price.

Lanam asked if the development Schroder was proposing would have age limits similar to Colonial Acres. Kurtzweil asked if it would be a co-op development. Schroder responded that it would not be a co-op and would not have age limits. He wants to appeal to a variety of buyers, both empty nesters and families starting out.

Kurtzweil questioned Schroder about his business, asking what specifically he did. Schroder stated that he was both a builder and a developer and that would be his role in this development, if future plans were approved.

Kurtzweil stated that she agreed with Lanam. She feels that there is a need in this community for this type of housing. She likes the fact that there are garages, not car ports. Kurtzweil stated that she is looking for quality homes with architectural detail and variety. She does not
want to see the same model repeated over and over. Kurtzweil asked Schroder what his price point for these homes would be. Schroder responded that it would be under $200,000. Kurtzweil asked where Schroder had built homes before or is currently building. Schroder mentioned Hidden Lakes, a development in Green Oak. He stated that the name of his development in South Lyon would not be Hidden Lakes, that was the name of his company. He stated that he had also built homes in Tanglewood and Walnut Creek.

Commissioner Chaundy asked about the distance between units. Schroder responded that in the plan as presented to them tonight, the distance between units would be approximately 10’ total.

There was a lengthy discussion regarding questions for the Fire Chief and Fire Inspector about the distance between homes and the need for a second access road off 11 Mile. Avantini stated that these issues could be addressed once a detailed, preliminary plan was submitted.

Commissioner Segal stated that she thought that there would be a problem having only one entrance off 11 Mile Road. Several Commissioners had questions about access roads and connecting to Lexington Drive in Colonial Acres. Avantini stated that it seemed like it would benefit both this new development and Colonial Acres to have a connection on Lexington. Kurtzweil stated that Lexington was a private road so that would be up to the property owner, not the developer.

Leimbach reiterated the need for quality homes. He is concerned about the density presented in the conceptual plan.

Commissioner Mosier asked about the requirements for green space. He stated that the plan does not seem to have much of it. Avantini stated that this would depend on the specifics of the preliminary plan and which approach the developer chooses to take with it. Mosier stated that he would like to see more open space.

Lanam stated that he had some concerns about drainage. This plan is proposing a lot of impermeable surfaces, how will runoff and detention be addressed? Lanam stated that the developer may lose several lots because of this issue. Lanam stated that he was also concerned about 10’ spacing between units. He lived in a similar development but units were 25’ apart. Lanam asked what the size of the smallest unit would be. Schroder responded that it would be 1,400 SF.

Lanam invited the residents present who would like to make comments to come forward.

Lucy Sullivan
62290 Arlington Circle

Sullivan stated that she is concerned about density. She stated that 60 units on 11 acres was quite dense.

Cheryl McGrail
62622 Raleigh Court

McGrail said that she loves the land the way that it is. She thinks there is a demand for senior housing in South Lyon and that the property should be developed as it was previously approved. She would like to see it be 55 years or older like Colonial Acres. She is also concerned about runoff from the site.

Ron McDowell
62662 Arlington Circle

McDowell stated the he wanted to see the property developed as a community for people 55 years and older. He likes peace and quiet and feels he would lose this if there were children in the proposed development. His property backs up to this property. He wants to see some separation or screening between the property and his property.

Lanam noted that once the property leaves the ownership of Colonial Acres, the Planning Commission has no ability to regulate the age of the people who will live there. That is not within the power of the Planning Commission.

David Thompson
25916 Lexington Drive

Thompson said that he is against this development connecting to Lexington Drive. It will be too much traffic and too much noise.

Cathy Suliss
62622 Raleigh Court

Suliss said that she loves the property the way that it is. She considers it part of her backyard and likes to see the birds and the deer there. She wants the property to be developed as a phase of Colonial Acres as approved.

Sullivan stated that she wanted to see trees and bushes to screen the property. Bradley noted that the ordinance would require landscaped screening.

NEW BUSINESS

None.

PLANNING CONSULTANT REPORT

Lanam asked Avantini and Wilhelm about Alexander Center. Wilhelm stated the agreement between the developer and the City gave a June 30, 2014 deadline to have work completed. He has been in contact with the developer’s attorney to check on the status of the work. Lanam stated some concerns about portions of the building that were not supposed to be in use. Delaney stated that she would follow up with the Building Inspector.
City of South Lyon
Site Plan Review Application Form

The Following, To Be Completed By Applicant Prior To Submittal Of Site Plan:

1. Developers Name: **VILLAS AT hidden LAKE - Tom Schroeder**
   Address: 10758 WATERFALL CT, SOUTH LYON, MI 48178
   Phone Number: 248-613-3752

2. Legal Property Owner: **Same Above**
   Address: 
   Phone Number: 

3. Site Plan Designers:
   Name: **Paul Becker**
   Address: 
   Phone Number: 248-425-5254
   Registration Number: 

4. Description of Proposed Development: 
   ✔ New
   Additions

5. If an appeal of the strict application of the standards of the Zoning Ordinance is to be taken, please so indicate below.

   Appeal Requested: 

For City Use Only:

   Initial Site Plan Review fee paid (date): 
   Site Plan Application Number: 

   Residential Site Plan

   Non-Residential Site Plan
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CITY OF SOUTH LYON
SITE PLAN REVIEW CHECK LIST FORM: PAGE 2

Prior to submittal of a site plan, the applicant shall review the following elements for inclusion, where applicable, on the site plan, and shall be in sufficient detail to meet the intent and purpose of the review process. The applicant will check the box in the left hand column marked 'Applicant' only and will mark all applicable elements. A check mark by the applicant for each element involved will indicate that the applicant made the proper notation on the site plan. If the applicant is satisfied that all such information required is properly noted on the site plan, the applicant will sign and date the checklist in the place provided and submit the signed Site Plan Review Application Form with the site plan to the Planning Commission Coordinator. The applicant will check only the column marked 'Applicant'.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Checked by Applicant</th>
<th>Checked by Review Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Name of Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Name, address &amp; phone number of:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Developer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Legal Owner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Designer/Firm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Designer Registration No. and Seal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Scale of Drawing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. If less than 3 acres- 1&quot; = 50'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. If more than 3 acres 1&quot; = 100'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Sheet size shall not exceed 24&quot; x 36&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Legend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. North Point</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Complete legal description of entire site i.e. Metes &amp; Bounds description if acreage Parcel, lot #(s) and subdivision name. All Legal descriptions will include:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Gross # of acres</td>
<td>11.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Net usable acres</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Section Number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Checked by Applicant</td>
<td>Checked by Review Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Vicinity Sketch or Site Map which does not have to be drawn to scale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 8. | Topographic elevations at 10 foot intervals on and off the site  
   a. Existing  
   b. Proposed |                       |
| 9. | Existing drainage courses and existing lake or stream elevation's |                       |
| 10. | The location of all existing & proposed on-site utilities including their connection to off-site utilities  
   a. Water Supply  
      Existing  
      Proposed |                       |
   b. Sanitary Sewer Supply  
      Existing  
      Proposed |                       |
   c. Storm Sewer Supply  
      Existing  
      Proposed |                       |
   d. Electric Supply (above & below ground)  
      Existing  
      Proposed |                       |
   e. Telephone Supply (above & below ground)  
      Existing  
      Proposed |                       |
   f. Gas Supply  
      Existing  
      Proposed |                       |
   g. Other  
      Existing  
      Proposed |                       |
<p>| 11. | Existing Zoning Classification of the parcel |                       |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Checked by Applicant</th>
<th>Checked by Review Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Existing Zoning Classification of adjacent parcels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Existing land use on adjacent parcels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>The location of all existing buildings &amp; structures within 100' of parcel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>The location of all building and structures on site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>All building/structure height's</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Location of all off-street parking spaces including required handicapped spaces, vehicle maneuvering lanes, and service drives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Location of all loading/unloading facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Location of all driveways, drives, and turning lanes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Location of all drives, driveways &amp; intersections across abutting streets from parcel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Names, locations, right-of-way widths, center-lines, and pavement widths of all bordering roads, streets, and easements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Location of all sidewalks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Critical site dimensions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Along property lines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Between buildings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Between parking &amp; buildings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Between parking &amp; parcel lines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Between principal &amp; accessory buildings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>Parking space width/length (typical)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>Vehicle maneuvering lane/service drive widths</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td>Curb radius (entrances)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>Between buildings &amp; parcel lines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j.</td>
<td>Between buildings &amp; retention/detention ponds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Checked by Applicant</td>
<td>Checked by Review Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Building Layouts (typical floor plan) including:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Principal entrances &amp; service entrances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The relationship between units within a building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Exterior building wall facade drawings of all exposed walls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Building elevation drawings showing the type and color of exterior building wall facade materials to be covered by signs to be attached to the building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Location, size &amp; type of signs to be utilized shall be provided for the site and building's on the site. In instances where signs are not determined due to unknown occupants at the time of site plan review, it shall be required that all signs receive the review and approval of the Planning Commission prior to occupancy of a structure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. The location and extent of any outdoor storage areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. The type, height &amp; extent of any outdoor storage areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. The type &amp; height of screening for trash Receptacles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. The location type &amp; extent of any required screening devices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. A complete landscape planting plan identifying all landscape plantings by location, type and height. Where earth berms are used, their height and width shall be noted and a cross section of the berm included.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. The location &amp; type of all outdoor lighting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 33. FOR MULTIPLE DWELLING DEVELOPMENTS:

a. The maximum lot coverage of all buildings shown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Checked by Applicant</th>
<th>Checked by Review Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

b. Formula for distances between buildings shown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Checked by Applicant</th>
<th>Checked by Review Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

c. Site density computations including total number of dwellings units and number of bedrooms per unit. When development is in phases, the requirements for b. and c. above shall be shown for each phase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Checked by Applicant</th>
<th>Checked by Review Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 34. FOR NON-RESIDENTIAL USES:

a. Proposed use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Checked by Applicant</th>
<th>Checked by Review Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

b. Gross & net usable square feet of floor area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Checked by Applicant</th>
<th>Checked by Review Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

c. Seating capacity or maximum occupancy permitted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Checked by Applicant</th>
<th>Checked by Review Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

d. Number of medical examining rooms dental chairs, and square footage of waiting rooms or beds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Checked by Applicant</th>
<th>Checked by Review Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

e. Number of employees in largest working shift

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Checked by Applicant</th>
<th>Checked by Review Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I hereby certify that I have read and understand the above Checklist items and those items that apply to my site plan, are included on the site plan.

Signature of Applicant: [Signature]

Date Received: [Date]

Initials of accepting staff: [Initials]
HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES REPORTING FORM FOR SITE PLAN

Note: This form should be completed and submitted as part of the site plan for all facilities.

Name of business: Villas of Hidden Lake
Name of business owner: Tom Schroder 248 613 3752
Street and mailing address: 10758 Waterfall Ct, South Lyon MI- 48178
Telephone: 248 613 3752

I affirm that the information submitted is accurate.

Owner's signature: [Signature]
Information compiled by: [Signature]

Part I- Management of Hazardous Substances and Polluting Materials

1. Y [ ] N [ ] Will the proposed facility expect to store, use or generate hazardous now or in the future? If yes, please complete this form and submit with your site plan.

2. Y [ ] N [ ] Will hazardous substances or polluting materials be reused or recycled on-site?

3. Y [ ] N [ ] Will any hazardous substances or polluting materials be stored on-site? If yes, identify the storage location on the site plan. Describe the size and type of secondary containment structure here, on an attached page, or as a detail on the site plan:

4. Y [ ] N [ ] Will new underground storage tanks be located less than 2000 feet from drinking water wells serving two or more establishments, or less than 300 feet from a single-family drinking water well?

5. Y [X] N [ ] Are existing underground storage tanks on-site less than 200 feet from a drinking water well serving two or more establishments or less than 50 feet from a single-family household?
If the answers to #4 or #5 are yes, current or proposed activities may be in violation of State of Michigan underground storage tank regulations. Michigan Department of Environmental Quality, Environmental Response Division: 734-953-0241.

6. Y  N Will the interior of the facility have general purpose floor drains?* If yes, will the floor drain connect to: (circle one)
   a. Sanitary sewer system
   b. On-site holding tank; or
   c. On-site system approved by the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality in accordance with groundwater Discharge permit requirements (administered by Waste Management Division).

   *Note: General purpose floor drains should not be connected to a storm drain, dry well, or septic system.

7. Y  N Will hazardous substances or polluting materials be stored, used, or handled out-of-doors near storm drains which discharge to lakes, streams, or wetlands? If yes, describe the type of catch basin or spill containment facilities, which will be used (use an attached sheet with diagram, if appropriate):

Additional information may be requested by the local government to assure that site plans comply with local, county and state environmental protection requirements. (Part II on Following Page)
AGENDA NOTE
New Business: Item #

MEETING DATE: November 23, 2015

PERSON PLACING ITEM ON AGENDA: City Manager

AGENDA TOPIC: Consider setting public hearing date for CDBG application – projects Senior Center and HAVEN

EXPLANATION OF TOPIC: The 2016 CDBG application deadline is December 18th and the City needs to hold a public hearing related to the application and the projects that they would like to support regarding the funds allocated to South Lyon. The City’s funding allocation for 2016 is set at $35,261 with a minimum project allocation this year of $3,000 per project. Due to the minimal amount of funding that the City qualifies for and the limited areas in which the City has in which we can use these funds it seems most reasonable at this time to continue to use the allocation for 2016 to support the projects that we have funded in recent years which include the Senior Center and Public Services for Battered and Abused Spouses (HAVEN). Unless the Council would like to change the projects that the City supports we can set the public hearing for the December 14th meeting which allows us ample time to submit notice to the paper for publication meeting the necessary 10 day requirement.

MATERIALS ATTACHED AS SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS: South Lyon CDBG Map, 2016 Program Allocations, 2016 Program Rules, 2016 Eligible Projects list

POSSIBLE COURSES OF ACTION: Approve selected projects and set public hearing date. Choose different projects and set hearing date. Choose not to submit application for CDBG funding in 2016

RECOMMENDATION: Approve selected projects and set public hearing date.

SUGGESTED MOTION: Motion by ___________________, supported by ___________________ to Approve selected projects and set public hearing date for December 14, 2015.
1. MINIMUM ALLOCATION (THRESHOLD) - Participating communities that generate less than $6,000 by formula will receive an allocation of $6,000. These threshold communities are allowed either a 100% Public Service activity at $6,000 (requiring procurement) or 2 Public Service activities at $3,000 (new micro-purchase, no procurement).

2. MINIMUM PROJECT ALLOCATION (NON-THRESHOLD) - Participating communities that generate more than $6,000 by formula will receive a formula allocation. These non-threshold communities are allowed up to four CDBG projects per program year and must allocate a minimum of $3,000 for each project.

3. PY 2016 PUBLIC SERVICE CAP (NON-THRESHOLD) - Oakland County will allow non-threshold communities to spend a maximum of 30% of their annual allocation on Public Services.

4. MULTIPLE AGENCY PUBLIC SERVICE CONTRACTS - Multiple public service contracts providing the same type of service are not permitted within the same activity.

5. PUBLIC SERVICE CONTRACT DURATION - Public service contracts may have two year duration and start on July 1st.

6. PROJECT SERVICE DELIVERY COSTS - Communities may seek reimbursement for eligible project service delivery costs. These costs include all eligible items related to the delivery of project services.

7. INELIGIBLE USES - CDBG funds may not be used for maintenance of public facilities. The purchase of equipment, fixtures, motor vehicles, furnishings, or other property that is not an integral structural fixture is generally ineligible. CDBG funds may be used to purchase such items when necessary for use in the administration of activities assisted with CDBG funds when such items constitute all or part of a Public Service. For information on the eligibility of Fire Station Equipment, please contact Carla Spradlin at (248) 858-5312.

8. REQUIRED DRAWS - 1 draw every 9 months per activity from Letter to Spend date in the HUD Integrated Disbursements and Information System (IDIS).

9. REQUIRED EXPENDITURES - All funds per year per activity must be spent in 2 years from Letter to Spend date in IDIS. After two years, all unobligated funds will be evaluated for possible recapture.
At this time, Oakland County does not have information on exact CDBG funding levels for Program Year (PY) 2016. **Use the final award figure from PY 2015 to compile your application.** Once exact amounts are available necessary adjustments will be made.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Planning Allocation</th>
<th>Monitor</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Planning Allocation</th>
<th>Monitor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auburn Hills</td>
<td>$69,406</td>
<td>Janeczek</td>
<td>Northville*</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>Spradlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkley</td>
<td>$31,235</td>
<td>Janeczek</td>
<td>Novi</td>
<td>$98,481</td>
<td>Spradlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>$31,336</td>
<td>Janeczek</td>
<td>Oak Park</td>
<td>$110,528</td>
<td>Pucher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloomfield Hills*</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>Janeczek</td>
<td>Orchard Lake Vlg*</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>Rieth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarkston*</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>Janeczek</td>
<td>Pleasant Ridge*</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>Rieth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clawson</td>
<td>$31,331</td>
<td>Rieth</td>
<td>Pontiac</td>
<td>$747,355</td>
<td>Pucher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmington</td>
<td>$22,141</td>
<td>Spradlin</td>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>$23,776</td>
<td>Spradlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferndale</td>
<td>$73,758</td>
<td>Rieth</td>
<td>Rochester Hills</td>
<td>$145,651</td>
<td>Spradlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazel Park</td>
<td>$79,128</td>
<td>Rieth</td>
<td>South Lyon</td>
<td>$35,261</td>
<td>Pucher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington Woods</td>
<td>$9,036</td>
<td>Rieth</td>
<td>Sylvan Lake*</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>Pucher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keego Harbor</td>
<td>$11,691</td>
<td>Janeczek</td>
<td>Troy</td>
<td>$140,123</td>
<td>Spradlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lathrup Village</td>
<td>$6,684</td>
<td>Rieth</td>
<td>Walled Lake</td>
<td>$24,709</td>
<td>Rieth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison Heights</td>
<td>$107,950</td>
<td>Rieth</td>
<td>Wixom</td>
<td>$39,537</td>
<td>Rieth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Township</th>
<th>Planning Allocation</th>
<th>Monitor</th>
<th>Township</th>
<th>Planning Allocation</th>
<th>Monitor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addison</td>
<td>$7,901</td>
<td>Pucher</td>
<td>Milford</td>
<td>$20,935</td>
<td>Pucher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloomfield</td>
<td>$65,339</td>
<td>Janeczek</td>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>$23,406</td>
<td>Spradlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon</td>
<td>$32,137</td>
<td>Spradlin</td>
<td>Orion</td>
<td>$74,931</td>
<td>Spradlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>$70,300</td>
<td>Spradlin</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>$36,639</td>
<td>Janeczek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groveland</td>
<td>$13,915</td>
<td>Spradlin</td>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>$13,242</td>
<td>Pucher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>$42,271</td>
<td>Janeczek</td>
<td>Royal Oak</td>
<td>$15,847</td>
<td>Pucher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly</td>
<td>$14,929</td>
<td>Spradlin</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$28,917</td>
<td>Janeczek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>$75,464</td>
<td>Janeczek</td>
<td>West Bloomfield</td>
<td>$105,084</td>
<td>Janeczek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyon</td>
<td>$29,085</td>
<td>Pucher</td>
<td>White Lake</td>
<td>$66,430</td>
<td>Janeczek</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Planning Allocation</th>
<th>Monitor</th>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Planning Allocation</th>
<th>Monitor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beverly Hills</td>
<td>$14,222</td>
<td>Janeczek</td>
<td>Leonard*</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>Pucher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin*</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>Janeczek</td>
<td>Milford</td>
<td>$13,815</td>
<td>Pucher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly</td>
<td>$21,724</td>
<td>Spradlin</td>
<td>Ortonville*</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>Spradlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Orion</td>
<td>$9,256</td>
<td>Spradlin</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>$10,119</td>
<td>Janeczek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wolverine Lk</td>
<td>$8,043</td>
<td>Spradlin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Threshold Community. Allocations will be increased from $5,000 to $6,000 for Threshold Communities in 2016.

**COMMUNITY & HOME IMPROVEMENT STAFF SPECIALTY AREAS**

*Carla Spradlin - Grant Compliance & Program Coordinator/248-858-5312.* Any questions regarding Eligibility Determinations, CDBG Application, Reprogramming, SHPO

*Mike Pucher - Contract Compliance Supervisor/248-858-0196.* Any questions regarding Contract Compliance (such as Reimbursement, Minor Home Repair, Contracts, Procurement Issues, Davis Bacon, Demolition, etc.)

*Cherri Janeczek - CHI Specialist/248-858-1191.* Environmental Review Issues, Reimbursement
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACQUISITION AND DISPOSITION</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition of Real Property</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposition</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC FACILITIES AND IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station Equipment</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Drain Improvements</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks-Recreational Facilities</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Facilities and Improvements General</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove Architectural Barriers</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Centers</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste Disposal Improvements</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Assessments</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Improvements</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Planting</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Sewer Improvements</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC SERVICES</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services (Battered and Abused Spouses)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Public Services (Child Care Services)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Public Services (Crime Awareness/Prevention)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services (Disabled Services)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services (Emergency Services - Subsistence Payments)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Public Services (Employment Training)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services (General - Housekeeping Services)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services (General - Safety and Repair Services)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services (General - Yard Services)</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Public Services (Health Services)</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services (Housing Counseling Services)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services (Legal Services)</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Public Services (Mental Health Services)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Public Services (Neighborhood Cleanups)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services (Senior Services)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Public Services (Substance Abuse Services)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services (Transportation Services including Senior Center Vehicles)</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services (Youth Services)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSING</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Rehabilitation</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Rehabilitation</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Home Repair (MHR)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home Minor Home Repair (MHMHR)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehab Publicly Owned Residential</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Rehabilitation Administration</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER PROJECTS</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance and Demolition</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Enforcement</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Assistance</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Residential Historic Preservation</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Economic Development (Micro-Enterprise Assistance)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGENDA NOTE
New Business: Item #

MEETING DATE: November 23, 2015

PERSON PLACING ITEM ON AGENDA: City Manager

AGENDA TOPIC: Consider renewal of lease agreement with SLARA for two year term

EXPLANATION OF TOPIC: The South Lyon Area Recreation Authority has historically leased the building located at 318 W Lake St from the City of South Lyon for a two year term. The lease agreement requires that they notify the City 120 days in advance of their intent to continue to lease the property which they did on November 17, 2015. The basic terms of the lease include an increase of 2% in the lease rate which would bring the annual amount of this two year agreement to $9,144.36 paid in 12 equal monthly installments.

MATERIALS ATTACHED AS SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS: Copy of the lease renewal agreement, copy of attorney review letter, copy of email from SLARA director seeking new rental agreement.

POSSIBLE COURSES OF ACTION: Authorize the renewal of the lease agreement between the City of South Lyon and the South Lyon Area Recreation Authority for the property at 318 W Lake St for a two year term. Renegotiate the lease agreement with different terms. Choose not to renew the lease.

RECOMMENDATION: Authorize the renewal of the lease agreement between the City of South Lyon and the South Lyon Area Recreation Authority for the property at 318 W Lake St for a two year term.

SUGGESTED MOTION: Motion by __________________, supported by __________________ to Authorize the renewal of the lease agreement between the City of South Lyon and the South Lyon Area Recreation Authority for the property at 318 W Lake St for a two year term and authorize the Mayor to sign the agreement.
LEASE AGREEMENT

This Lease Agreement ("Lease") is entered into on this ___ day of ____________, 2015, by and between the CITY OF SOUTH LYON, a Michigan municipal corporation, 335 S. Warren Street, South Lyon, Michigan 48178 ("Landlord"), and the SOUTH LYON AREA RECREATION AUTHORITY, a Michigan municipal corporation, 318 W. Lake Street, South Lyon, Michigan 48178 ("Tenant").

RECITALS

A. Landlord is the owner of land and improvements commonly known and numbered as 318 W. Lake Street, South Lyon, Michigan 48178 (the "Premises").

B. Landlord desires to lease the Premises to Tenant, and Tenant desires to lease the Premises from Landlord for the term, at the rental and upon the covenants, conditions and provisions herein set forth.

THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual promises herein, contained and other good and valuable consideration, it is agreed:

1. Description of the Premises. The Premises is located at 318 W. Lake Street and includes the buildings and improvements located thereon, and the Premises is formerly known as the South Lyon Library Building.

2. Term. The term of the Lease shall be two (2) years, commencing July 1, 2016 and ending June 30, 2017.

3. Renewal. If the Tenant is not in default under this Lease, the Tenant may, at its option, renew the Lease for another two (2) year term. Tenant shall exercise such renewal option by giving written notice to Landlord at least one hundred twenty days (120) before the expiration of the term of the Lease. If Tenant elects to renew the Lease, monthly rent shall increase two percent (2%).

4. Rent. For and during the initial term of the Lease, Tenant shall pay to Landlord annual rent of $9,144.36 per year. The annual rent shall be payable in advance in equal monthly installments of $762.03 per month. The monthly payment shall be due and payable on the first day of each calendar month at the following address 335 S. Warren Street, South Lyon, Michigan 48178 or at such other place designated by written notice from Landlord. Any rent payment not made by the fifth day of the month shall be considered overdue and in addition to Landlord’s other remedies, Landlord may levy a late payment charge of $25.00 per month on any overdue amount.

5. Use of Premises. The Premises are to be used and occupied exclusively by Tenant for its general office use and for no other purpose without the prior written consent of Landlord. No activity shall be conducted on the Premises that does not comply with applicable local, state and federal laws, ordinances, and regulations. Tenant shall neither use nor occupy the Premises, or any part of it, for any unlawful, disreputable, or ultrahazardous activity and shall take action to halt such activity.
6. **Condition of Premises.** Tenant has inspected the Premises, finds them in good order and repair, acceptable for Tenant's intended use, and accepts the Premises as is.

7. **Quiet Enjoyment.** The Landlord covenants that as long as the Tenant pays the rent and complies with the other provisions of the Lease, the Tenant may quietly enjoy the Premises for the full term of this Lease.

8. **Right of Entry.** Landlord shall have the right to enter upon the Premises at reasonable hours to inspect the same and for purposes of maintaining and repairing the Premises, provided Landlord shall not thereby unreasonably interfere with Tenant's business.

9. **Utilities.** Unless otherwise expressly agreed in writing by Landlord, all utilities shall be paid by the Tenant.

10. **Maintenance and Repairs.** Unless otherwise agreed to in writing and signed by the parties, Landlord shall be responsible for general building maintenance and repairs which are unrelated to Tenant's use of the Premises, such as general building maintenance (doors, windows, etc), fire extinguisher maintenance, pest control, lighting, lawn, snow removal, but Tenant shall be responsible, at its own cost and expense, for all other maintenance and repairs to the Premises. Tenant shall also use all reasonable care and precautions to prevent waste, damage or injury to the Premises.

11. **Alterations, Additions and Improvements.** No portion of the Premises, building or other improvements located thereon shall be altered, improved, or demolished without the prior written consent of the Landlord.

12. **Taxes.** Landlord will pay any real property taxes, assessments, or other governmental charges that shall or may during the Lease be imposed on, or arise in connection with the use of the Premises.

13. **Signs.** Tenant may construct or place signs in accordance with the rules governing municipal use and with the express written consent of the City of South Lyon.

14. **Parking.** Tenant may utilize city-owned parking areas for employee and visitor parking without charge.

15. **Insurance.** Tenant shall obtain and maintain at its own expense, the following types and amounts of insurance:

   a. **Fire Insurance.** Tenant shall keep all furniture, records, and equipment on the Premises, including alterations, additions and improvements insured against loss or damage by fire with all standard extended coverage that may be required by any supplier or lien holder. The insurance shall be in an amount sufficient to cover Tenant for all risks or any event, in the full insurable value of the Premises occupied by Tenant and waive the right of recovering against the Landlord, excluding the cost of excavation and of foundations. If at any time there is a dispute as to the amount of such insurance, the same shall be settled by arbitration.
b. Personal injury and Property Damage Insurance. Insurance against liability for bodily injury and property damage and machinery insurance, all to be in amounts and in forms of insurance policies as may from time to time be specifically required by Landlord, shall be provided by Tenant.

c. All insurance provided by Tenant as required by this section shall be carried in favor or Landlord and Tenant as their respective interests may appear. In case of insurance against damage to the Premises by fire or other casualty, the policy shall provide that loss, if any, shall be adjusted with and be payable to Landlord. Rent insurance and use and occupancy insurance maybe carried in favor of Tenant, but the proceeds are hereby assigned to Landlord to be held by Landlord as security for the payment of the rent and any additional rent under this Lease until restoration of the Premises.

d. All insurance shall be written with responsible companies that Landlord shall approve, and the policies or certificates of insurance shall be delivered by Tenant to Landlord. All policies shall require fifteen (15) days' notice by registered mail to Landlord of any cancellation or change affecting any interest of Landlord.

16. Damage and Destruction. In the event if the Premises, or any portion of it, is damaged by fire, casualty or structural defects that the same cannot be used for Tenant's purposes, then Tenant shall have the right within ninety (90) days following damage to elect by notice to Landlord to terminate this Lease. In the event if such damage does not render the Premises unusable for Tenant's purposes, Landlord shall promptly repair such damage at its cost and expense. Tenant shall be relieved from paying rent and other charges during any portion of the Lease term that the Premises are inoperable or unfit for occupancy, or use, in whole or in part, for Tenant's purposes.

17. Indemnity. Tenant shall indemnify Landlord against, and hold Landlord harmless from, any and all claims, actions, suits, proceedings, costs, expenses, damages and liabilities, including reasonable attorney's fees and costs, arising out of, connected with, or resulting from Tenant's use of the Premises, including without limitation the manufacture, selection, delivery, possession, use, operation, or return of the Premises.

18. Subletting and Assignment. Tenant shall not sublet the Premises, or any portion of it, or assign this Lease without the prior written consent of the Landlord. Any such attempt to sublet or assign the Lease by Tenant shall be a breach of this Lease and cause for immediate termination.

19. Easements, Agreements, or Encumbrances. The parties shall be bound by all existing easements, agreements, and encumbrances of record relating to the Premises, and Landlord shall not be liable to the Tenant for any damages resulting from any action taken by a holder of interest pursuant to the rights of that holder.

20. Defaults and Remedies. If the Tenant defaults on any payments to the Landlord and does not cure the default within five (5) days, if the Tenant defaults on any other obligations under the Lease and does not cure the default within thirty (30) days after written
notification from the Landlord specifying the default, if the Tenant or any agent of the Tenant falsifies any report that Tenant must furnish the Landlord under the Lease, or if the Tenant is adjudicated a bankrupt or makes an assignment for the benefit of creditors, then the Landlord may accelerate the balance of the rent for the remainder of the term and sue for the sum due or may terminate the Lease; alternatively, the Landlord may, without terminating the Lease, enter the Premises dispossess the Tenant and any other occupants of the Premises, remove their effects, and reclaim or relet the Premises under any terms of satisfactory to the Landlord. If the Landlord chooses the latter option, the Landlord shall credit the proceeds from reletting the Premises to the Tenant's account after deducting the costs of entering, altering and reletting the Premises, and the Tenant shall remain liable to the Landlord for the balance owed. If the Landlord brings suit to recover the breach of an obligation that the Tenant should have performed under the Lease and the Landlord prevails, the Tenant shall pay the Landlord's expenses incurred in the action, including reasonable attorney fees. Such expenses shall be deemed to have been incurred when the action commenced and shall be enforceable whether or not the action is prosecuted to judgment.

21. Waiver. Any failure of the Landlord to insist on strict performance of any provisions of this Lease shall not be deemed a waiver of the provisions of the Lease in any subsequent default.

22. Amendment. This Lease may not be changed, modified, or discharged except a writing signed by both parties.

23. Notices. All notices under this Lease shall be in writing and shall be deemed to be given when they are either delivered personally or mailed by certified or registered mail to the receiving party at the address stated in this Lease or at an address furnished to the other party in writing during the term of this Lease.

24. Captions and Headings. The captions and headings used in this Lease are intended only for convenience and are not to be used in construing the Lease.

25. Applicable Law. This Lease shall be construed under Michigan Law.

26. Successors and Assigns. This Lease is binding on successors and assigns.

27. Severability. If any provision of this Lease is unenforceable, the other provisions of the Lease shall remain valid and enforceable to the fullest extent permitted by law.

28. Entire Agreement. This Lease shall constitute the entire agreement between the parties. Any prior understanding or representation of any kind preceding the date of this Lease shall not be binding upon either party except to the extent incorporated in this Lease.

29. Binding Effect. The covenants and conditions contained in this Lease shall apply to and bind the successor's legal representatives and assigns of the parties to this Lease and all covenants are to be construed as conditions of this Lease.

30. Attorney Fees. If Landlord files an action to enforce the Lease, or for breach of the Lease or any covenant or condition therein, Tenant shall pay Landlord reasonable attorney fees for the services of Landlord's attorney in the action, all fees to be fixed by the court.
In witness whereof, each party to this Lease has caused it to be executed on the date first above written:

TENANT
SOUTH LYON AREA RECREATION AUTHORITY

By: ________________________________
Name: ________________________________
Title: ______________

LANDLORD
CITY OF SOUTH LYON

By: ________________________________
Name: John Galaes Jr., Mayor
Title: ______________

By: ________________________________
Name: ________________________________
Title: Lisa Deaton, Clerk
MEETING DATE: November 23, 2015

PERSON PLACING ITEM ON AGENDA: City Manager

AGENDA TOPIC: Consider adopting resolution opting out of Public Act 152 for 2016

EXPLANATION OF TOPIC: Per Public Act 152 of 2011 the City of South Lyon either has three options related to expenditures related to health insurance coverage for City employees. Those options are 1) a hard cap; 2) 80/20 cost sharing; and 3) opt out. The City through its collective bargaining process has worked to implement the 80/20 cost sharing with the employees through a gradual increase each year until the groups reach the 20% cost share. The City will reach full compliance for all union and non-union employees for this on January 1, 2017. For this reason, the City needs to adopt the attached resolution for 2016 in order to maintain compliance with PA 152 of 2011 and exempt itself from the act for one final year.

MATERIALS ATTACHED AS SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS: Copy of the Public Act. Copy of the Resolution.

POSSIBLE COURSES OF ACTION: Adopt resolution and maintain compliance with PA 152 to remain eligible for State Funding including Act 51 Road and Street funding. Reject resolution and become non-compliant with PA 152

RECOMMENDATION: . Adopt resolution to opt out of and exempt the City from the requirements of Public Act 152 of 2011 for Calendar Year 2016.

SUGGESTED MOTION: Motion by ________________, supported by ________________ to adopt resolution to opt out of and exempt the City from the requirements of Public Act 152 of 2011 for Calendar Year 2016.
PUBLICLY FUNDED HEALTH INSURANCE CONTRIBUTION ACT  
Act 152 of 2011  

AN ACT to limit a public employer's expenditures for employee medical benefit plans; to provide the power and duties of certain state agencies and officials; to provide for exceptions; and to provide for sanctions.  


The People of the State of Michigan enact:  

15.561 Short title.  
Sec. 1. This act shall be known and may be cited as the "publicly funded health insurance contribution act".  


15.562 Definitions.  
Sec. 2. As used in this act:  
(a) "Designated state official" means:  
(i) For an election affecting employees and officers in the judicial branch of state government, the state court administrator.  
(ii) For an election affecting senate employees and officers, the secretary of the senate.  
(iii) For an election affecting house of representatives employees and officers, the clerk of the house.  
(iv) For an election affecting legislative council employees, the legislative council.  
(v) For an election affecting employees in the state classified service, the civil service commission.  
(vi) For an election affecting executive branch employees who are not in the state classified service, the state employer.  
(b) "Flexible spending account" means a medical expense flexible spending account in conjunction with a cafeteria plan as permitted under the federal internal revenue code of 1986.  
(c) "Health savings account" means an account as permitted under section 223 of the internal revenue code of 1986, 26 USC 223.  
(d) "Local unit of government" means a city, village, township, or county, a municipal electric utility system as defined in section 4 of the Michigan energy employment act of 1976, 1976 PA 448, MCL 460.804, an authority created under chapter VIA of the aeronautics code of the state of Michigan, 1945 PA 327, MCL 259.108 to 259.125c, or an authority created under 1939 PA 147, MCL 119.51 to 119.62.  
(e) "Medical benefit plan" means a plan established and maintained by a carrier, a voluntary employees' beneficiary association described in section 501(c)(9) of the internal revenue code of 1986, 26 USC 501, or by 1 or more public employers, that provides for the payment of medical benefits, including, but not limited to, hospital and physician services, prescription drugs, and related benefits, for public employees or elected public officials. Medical benefit plan does not include benefits provided to individuals retired from a public employer or a public employer's contributions to a fund used for the sole purpose of funding health care benefits that are available to a public employee or an elected public official only upon retirement or separation from service.  
(f) "Medical benefit plan costs" does not include a payment by the public employer to an employee or elected public official in lieu of medical benefit plan coverage and, for a medical benefit plan coverage year beginning after the later of January 1, 2014 or the effective date of the amendatory act that added this subdivision, includes, but is not limited to, all of the following:  
(i) Any amount that the public employer pays directly or indirectly for the assessment levied pursuant to the health insurance claims assessment act, 2011 PA 142, MCL 350.1731 to 550.1741.  
(ii) Insurance agent or company commissions.  
(iii) Any additional amount the public employer is required to pay as a fee or tax under the patient protection and affordable care act, Public Law 111-148, as amended by the federal health care and education reconciliation act of 2010, Public Law 111-152.  
(g) "Medical benefit plan coverage year" means the 12-month period after the effective date of the contractual or self-insured medical coverage plan that a public employer provides to its employees or public officials.  
(h) "Public employer" means this state; a local unit of government or other political subdivision of this state; any intergovernmental, metropolitan, or local department, agency, or authority, or other local political subdivision; a school district, a public school academy, or an intermediate school district, as those terms are...
defined in sections 4 to 6 of the revised school code, 1976 PA 451, MCL 380.4 to 380.6; a community college or junior college described in section 7 of article VIII of the state constitution of 1963; or an institution of higher education described in section 4 of article VIII of the state constitution of 1963.


**Compiler's note:** Enacting section 1 of Act 269 of 2013 provides:

"Enacting section 1. This amendatory act clarifies the original intent of the legislature and is curative and retroactive as to the exclusion of funding for health care benefits that are available only upon either retirement or separation from service from the definition of medical benefit plan and as to the exclusion of payments in lieu of medical benefit plan coverage from medical benefit plan costs."

15.563 Public employer contribution to medical benefit plan; limitation on amount; allocation of payments; adjustment of maximum payment.

Sec. 3. (1) Except as otherwise provided in this act, a public employer that offers or contributes to a medical benefit plan for its employees or elected public officials shall pay no more of the annual costs or illustrative rate and any payments for reimbursement of co-pays, deductibles, or payments into health savings accounts, flexible spending accounts, or similar accounts used for health care costs, than a total amount equal to $5,500.00 times the number of employees and elected public officials with single-person coverage, $11,000.00 times the number of employees and elected public officials with individual-and-spouse coverage or individual-plus-1-nonspouse-dependent coverage, plus $15,000.00 times the number of employees and elected public officials with family coverage, for a medical benefit plan coverage year beginning on or after January 1, 2012. A public employer may allocate its payments for medical benefit plan costs among its employees and elected public officials as it sees fit. By October 1 of each year after 2011, the state treasurer shall adjust the maximum payment permitted under this subsection for each coverage category for medical benefit plan coverage years beginning the succeeding calendar year, based on the change in the medical care component of the United States consumer price index for the most recent 12-month period for which data are available from the United States department of labor, bureau of labor statistics.

(2) For a medical benefit plan coverage year beginning January 1, 2014 through December 31, 2014, the multiplier used to calculate the maximum public employer payment under subsection (1) shall be $12,250.00 for employees and elected public officials with individual-and-spouse coverage or individual-plus-1-nonspouse-dependent coverage and shall be adjusted each year as provided in subsection (1).

(3) For purposes of calculating a public employer's maximum total annual medical benefit plan costs under subsection (1), "employee or elected public official" does not include an employee or elected public official who declines the medical benefit plan offered or contributed to by the public employer.


**Compiler's note:** Enacting section 1 of Act 270 of 2013 provides:

"Enacting section 1. Section 3(1) and (3) of the publicly funded health insurance contribution act, 2011 PA 152, MCL 15.563, as amended or added by this amendatory act, clarifies the original intent of the legislature that a public employer or elected official who declines the public employer's medical benefit plan coverage is not an employee or elected public official for purposes of calculating the public employer's maximum total annual medical benefit plan costs. These amendments are curative and apply retroactively."

15.564 Public employer contribution to medical benefit plan; limitation on percentage of annual costs; allocation of employees' share of total costs.

Sec. 4. (1) By a majority vote of its governing body each year, prior to the beginning of the medical benefit plan coverage year, a public employer, excluding this state, may elect to comply with this section for a medical benefit plan coverage year instead of the requirements in section 3. The designated state official may elect to comply with this section instead of section 3 as to medical benefit plans for state employees and state officers.

(2) For medical benefit plan coverage years beginning on or after January 1, 2012, a public employer shall pay not more than 80% of the total annual costs of all of the medical benefit plans it offers or contributes to for its employees and elected public officials. For purposes of this subsection, total annual costs includes the premium or illustrative rate of the medical benefit plan and all employer payments for reimbursement of co-pays, deductibles, and payments into health savings accounts, flexible spending accounts, or similar accounts used for health care but does not include beneficiary-paid copayments, coinsurance, deductibles, other out-of-pocket expenses, other service-related fees that are assessed to the coverage beneficiary, or beneficiary payments into health savings accounts, flexible spending accounts, or similar accounts used for health care. For purposes of this section, each elected public official who participates in a medical benefit plan offered by a public employer shall be required to pay 20% or more of the total annual costs of that plan. The public employer may allocate the employees' share of total annual costs of the medical benefit plans among the employees of the public employer as it sees fit.
15.565 Collective bargaining agreement or other contract in effect; inconsistent terms.

Sec. 5. (1) If a collective bargaining agreement or other contract that is inconsistent with sections 3 and 4 is in effect for 1 or more employees of a public employer on September 27, 2011, the requirements of section 3 or 4 do not apply to an employee covered by that contract until the contract expires. A public employer’s expenditures for medical benefit plans under a collective bargaining agreement or other contract described in this subsection shall be excluded from calculation of the public employer’s maximum payment under section 4. The requirements of sections 3 and 4 apply to any extension or renewal of the contract.

(2) A collective bargaining agreement or other contract that is executed on or after September 27, 2011 shall not include terms that are inconsistent with the requirements of sections 3 and 4.


Compiler’s note: Enacting section 1 of Act 272 of 2013 provides:
*Enacting section 1. This amendatory act clarifies the original intent of the legislature that September 27, 2011 is the date on and after which a new contract must comply with this act. This amendatory act is curative and applies retroactively.*

15.566 Deduction by public employer.

Sec. 6. A public employer may deduct the covered employee’s or elected public official’s portion of the cost of a medical benefit plan from compensation due to the covered employee or elected public official. The employer may condition eligibility for the medical benefit plan on the employee’s or elected public official’s authorizing the public employer to make the deduction.


15.567 Applicability of requirements to medical benefit plans of public employees and elected public officials; scope; effect of certain sections found to be invalid.

Sec. 7. (1) The requirements of this act apply to medical benefit plans of all public employees and elected public officials to the greatest extent consistent with constitutionally allocated powers, whether or not a public employee is a member of a collective bargaining unit.

(2) If a court finds the requirements of section 3 to be invalid, the expenditure limit in section 4 shall apply to a public employer that does not exempt itself under section 8, except that the requirement for a majority vote of the governing body of the public employer in section 4 shall not apply. If a court finds section 4 to be invalid, the expenditure limit in section 3 shall apply to each public employer that does not exempt itself under section 8.


15.568 Exemption from act; extension; exceptions.

Sec. 8. (1) By a 2/3 vote of its governing body each year, prior to the beginning of the medical benefit plan coverage year, a local unit of government may exempt itself from the requirements of this act for the next succeeding medical benefit plan coverage year.

(2) A 2/3 vote of the governing body of the local unit of government prior to the beginning of each succeeding medical benefit plan coverage year is required to extend an exemption under this section.

(3) An exemption under this section is not effective for a city with a mayor who is both the chief executive and chief administrator, unless the mayor also approves the exemption.

(4) An exemption under this section is not effective for a county with a county executive who is both the chief executive and chief administrator, unless the county executive also approves the exemption.

(5) An exemption under this section is not effective for a city with a population greater than 600,000.


15.569 Noncompliance by public employer; penalty.

Sec. 9. If a public employer fails to comply with this act, the public employer shall permit the state treasurer to reduce by 10% each economic vitality incentive program payment received under 2011 PA 63 and the department of education shall assess the public employer a penalty equal to 10% of each payment of any funds for which the public employer qualifies under the state school aid act of 1979, 1979 PA 94, MCL 388.1601 to 388.1772, during the period that the public employer fails to comply with this act. Any reduction setoff or penalty amounts recovered shall be returned to the fund from which the reduction is assessed or upon which the penalty is determined. The department of education may also refer the penalty collection to the department of treasury for collection consistent with section 13 of 1941 PA 122, MCL 205.13.

RESOLUTION NO. ______-15

CITY OF SOUTH LYON
OAKLAND COUNTY, MICHIGAN


WHEREAS, the State of Michigan enacted Public Act 152 of 2011 on September 24, 2011, commonly referred to as the Publicly Funded Health Insurance Contribution Act (the “Act”); and

WHEREAS, the purpose of the Act is to limit municipal employer’s expenditures for employee medical benefit plans; and

WHEREAS, compliance with the Act can be achieved through one of the following three options: 1) hard cap; 2) 80/20 cost sharing cap; and 3) opt out; and

WHEREAS, the City desires and intends to achieve the 80/20 cost sharing cap with all of its collective bargaining units and non-union employees by January 1, 2017; and

WHEREAS, the City has reached agreements with the collective bargaining units to increase the employee contributions toward the cost of the medical benefit plans to twenty percent (20%) by January 1, 2017, to achieve compliance with the 80/20 cost sharing cap provided for in Section 4 of the Act, and the City has approved and implemented scheduled increases in employee medical benefit plan contributions for its non-union employees; and

WHEREAS, for the calendar year 2016, the City needs to opt out and exempt itself from the requirements of Public Act 152 in order to comply with the Act;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the South Lyon City Council exempts the City of South Lyon from the requirements of Public Act 152, pursuant to Section 8, for calendar year 2016 in order to comply with the Act.

At a regular meeting of the City of South Lyon City Council, a motion was made by Council Member ________________________ supported by Council Member ____________________ to adopt the above resolution.

Ayes:
Nays:
Absent:

RESOLUTION DECLARED [ADOPTED/FAILED] on this ______ day of __________________, 2015.
CERTIFICATION

I certify that this resolution was duly adopted by the City Council of the City of South Lyon on __________________________, 2015.

Lisa Deaton
City Clerk
South Lyon
MEETING DATE: November 23, 2015

PERSON PLACING ITEM ON AGENDA: City Manager

AGENDA TOPIC: Consider cancellation of the second City Council meeting in December per past practice

EXPLANATION OF TOPIC: It has been the past practice of the City Council to cancel the second meeting in December due to the proximity to the Christmas holiday. This year that meeting would fall on Monday December 28th immediately following a 4 day holiday closure of city offices.

MATERIALS ATTACHED AS SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

POSSIBLE COURSES OF ACTION: Follow past practices of the City Council and cancel the regularly scheduled 2nd meeting of the City Council with the understanding that if urgent business needs to be handled the meeting can take place as scheduled. Choose to deviate from past practice and plan to hold the regularly scheduled 2nd City Council meeting in December.

RECOMMENDATION: 

SUGGESTED MOTION: Motion by ____________________, supported by ____________________ to
Meeting called to order at 7:32pm.

Board Commissioners present:
Rich Perry
Amber King
Dan Pelchat

Board Commissioners absent: Steve Kaukonen

Also present: none.

Approval of Minutes – Motion by Pelchat, supported by Perry, to approve the minutes from the October 14th meeting. Motion carried unanimously.

Approval of Agenda – New item suggested by King; Commission vacancy following Richards’ resignation. Motion by King, supported by Pelchat, to approve the agenda as amended. Motion carried unanimously.

Public comments – N/A

Old Business

1. Volunteer Open House – We intent to host another open house for those unable to attend the one in October, possibly the first or second week of February (to avoid the holidays). It was suggested that we send invitations directly to community leaders to drum up interest in submitting content.

2. Quotes for Digital Playback Software/Hardware – Perry contacted a rep from MasterPlay. They are the ones who have a good product, but was double the cost of MagicSoft. They suggested that their Lite version of software would work for us. It provides us with what we need to push video to the channel, plus stream to the web. The playback cost is $1500. The recorder cost (still confirming) is $1500. We plan to meet this Wednesday at 7pm to discuss software operation and installation with the MasterPlay consultant. Pelchat offered the use of his video camera to help reduce the amount (and cost) of equipment we need in the near term.

New Business

1. Web Page on City Website – We need to contact the City Manager regarding plans for the city website updates. We would like to include information that is
shown on other commission websites such as our email address, our photo(s),
our website, commissioner positions, etc.

2. **Marketing on Facebook** – We plan to post relevant local videos on our page
   and comment on other local Facebook pages when appropriate.

3. **Volunteer Next Steps** – (see old business #1 above).

4. **New Commissioner Vacancy** – With Carl Richards stepping down from the
   commission, we have a vacancy. We discussed posting on our Facebook page
   as one way to get the word out that we are looking for a new member.

**Commissioner Comments** –

- None.

**Adjournment** – Motion by King, supported by Pelchat, to adjourn the meeting at 8:36
  pm. Motion carried unanimously.
South Lyon Historical Commission Meeting
Wednesday, November 4, 2015
Minutes

Members Present: Larry Ledbetter, Bob Tremitiere, Gary Wickersham, Jim Race, Linda Ross, Phil Weipert
Members Absent: Roger Heiple
Others Present: Carl Richards

President Larry Ledbetter called the meeting to order at 7:30PM. A quorum was declared.

October Minutes: Gary motioned to accept the October minutes. Phil seconded and the motion passed.

Steeple Repairs: Bob reported that he called Zach Arvo and told him that we had voted to award him the two jobs. Zach will bill the steeple repairs separately, and expects to do the work around the end of November.

Lamp Donation: We have been offered a donation of an antique oil lamp but with the condition that it be enclosed in a protective case. We agreed that we would not have a use for the lamp if it had to be in a case. Larry will tell Norm of our decision and either Norm or Larry will contact the donor and explain this to him and accept the donation if he agreed to not have it in a protective case.

Cool Yule: Linda said that Cool Yule is back on, and that it would be held on December 5. It will consist of the usual, a parade ending at the Historic Village, followed by a tree lighting, bake sale in the freight house, and music in the chapel. Mike Rushlow will be Santa this year. Linda will need docents for the buildings for that evening. Larry will remind the DPW to clean the sewer across the street prior to the event to preclude an overflow.

Dulcimer Concert: Linda reported that it is scheduled for the weekend after Thanksgiving. Brown's Root Beer is the sole outlet for tickets. Linda said that sales are going very well. She will need docents for the concert.

Outdoor Lighting: Linda asked if any progress has been made to restore the lights damaged during the summer by vandals. Larry said that he will ask Bob Martin.

Other Business: Carl mentioned that there are some nice glass cabinets in the building at 390 South Lafayette that the town is planning to demolish and wondered if we could use any of them. We discussed but the feeling was that we have all of the cabinets that we have room for.

Business having been concluded at 8:04, Phil motioned that the meeting be adjourned. Gary seconded and the motion passed.

Minutes recorded by Bob Tremitiere, secretary
Submitted by Larry Ledbetter, president
AGENDA NOTE
New Business: Item #

MEETING DATE: November 23, 2015

PERSON PLACING ITEM ON AGENDA: City Manager

AGENDA TOPIC: Consider cancellation of the second City Council meeting in December per past practice

EXPLANATION OF TOPIC: It has been the past practice of the City Council to cancel the second meeting in December due to the proximity to the Christmas holiday. This year that meeting would fall on Monday December 28th immediately following a 4 day holiday closure of city offices.

MATERIALS ATTACHED AS SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

POSSIBLE COURSES OF ACTION: Follow past practices of the City Council and cancel the regularly scheduled 2nd meeting of the City Council with the understanding that if urgent business needs to be handled the meeting can take place as scheduled. Choose to deviate from past practice and plan to hold the regularly scheduled 2nd City Council meeting in December.

RECOMMENDATION: .

SUGGESTED MOTION: Motion by _____________________, supported by _____________________ to
South Lyon Historical Commission Meeting
Wednesday, November 4, 2015
Minutes

Members Present: Larry Ledbetter, Bob Tremitiere, Gary Wickersham, Jim Race, Linda Ross, Phil Weipert
Members Absent: Roger Heiple
Others Present: Carl Richards

President Larry Ledbetter called the meeting to order at 7:30PM. A quorum was declared.

October Minutes: Gary motioned to accept the October minutes. Phil seconded and the motion passed.

Steeple Repairs: Bob reported that he called Zach Arvo and told him that we had voted to award him the two jobs. Zach will bill the steeple repairs separately, and expects to do the work around the end of November.

Lamp Donation: We have been offered a donation of an antique oil lamp but with the condition that it be enclosed in a protective case. We agreed that we would not have a use for the lamp if it had to be in a case. Larry will tell Norm of our decision and either Norm or Larry will contact the donor and explain this to him and accept the donation if he agreed to not have it in a protective case.

Cool Yule: Linda said that Cool Yule is back on, and that it would be held on December 5. It will consist of the usual, a parade ending at the Historic Village, followed by a tree lighting, bake sale in the freight house, and music in the chapel. Mike Rushlow will be Santa this year. Linda will need docents for the buildings for that evening. Larry will remind the DPW to clean the sewer across the street prior to the event to preclude any overflow.

Dulcimer Concert: Linda reported that it is scheduled for the weekend after Thanksgiving. Brown's Root Beer is the sole outlet for tickets. Linda said that sales are going very well. She will need docents for the concert.

Outdoor Lighting: Linda asked if any progress has been made to restore the lights damaged during the summer by vandals. Larry said that he will ask Bob Martin.

Other Business: Carl mentioned that there are some nice glass cabinets in the building at 390 South Lafayette that the town is planning to demolish and wondered if we could use any of them. We discussed but the feeling was that we have all of the cabinets that we have room for.

Business having been concluded at 8:04, Phil motioned that the meeting be adjourned. Gary seconded and the motion passed.

Minutes recorded by Bob Tremitiere, secretary
Submitted by Larry Ledbetter, president
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHEET MATERIALS</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLOCKS</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$1.20</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCRETE</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td>$75.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Engineering Costs**

- Sheet Materials: $50.00
- Blocks: $60.00
- Concrete: $15.00
- Total Engineering Costs: $75.00

**Planning Costs**

- Sheet Materials: $50.00
- Blocks: $60.00
- Concrete: $15.00
- Total Planning Costs: $75.00

**Total Costs**

- Sheet Materials: $50.00
- Blocks: $60.00
- Concrete: $15.00
- Total Costs: $75.00
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Crossing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk on Main Street</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk on School Avenue</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk on City Match</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk on Rialto Avenue</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Construction Total:** $120,000
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Total Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction - 9 Mile Streeting at Brookfield and Abbey City of South Lyon</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction - 9 Mile Streeting at Brookfield and Abbey City of South Lyon</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction - 9 Mile Streeting at Brookfield and Abbey City of South Lyon</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$1,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction - 9 Mile Streeting at Brookfield and Abbey City of South Lyon</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$2,050,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction - 9 Mile Streeting at Brookfield and Abbey City of South Lyon</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction - 9 Mile Streeting at Brookfield and Abbey City of South Lyon</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$2,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction - 9 Mile Streeting at Brookfield and Abbey City of South Lyon</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$3,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction - 9 Mile Streeting at Brookfield and Abbey City of South Lyon</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$3,350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction - 9 Mile Streeting at Brookfield and Abbey City of South Lyon</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction - 9 Mile Streeting at Brookfield and Abbey City of South Lyon</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$3,600,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Civil Engineering Services, Inc.**
CONSTRUCTION PLAN - MARJORE ANN
SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL
CITY OF SOUTH LION AND LION TOWNSHIP

DRAINAGE RFS TO BE A MIN OF 6” THICK.
2 CONCRETE WALK CONTINUING ALONG IN MARJORE ANN AND POTENTIAL TRAIL.

NOTE: 1. SEE REFLECTIVE DESIGN PLAN FOR WORK.