

**CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF YPSILANTI
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
Tuesday, June 17, 2026
6:30 pm**

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

Elizabeth El-Assadi, Chair
Bill Sinkule, Vice Chair
Darrell Kirby, Secretary
Bianca Tyson
Gloria Peterson
Amy Kehrner
Crystal Lecoq

STAFF AND CONSULTANTS

Mark Yandrick, Planning and Development Director

- **CALL TO ORDER/ESTABLISH QUORUM**

MOTION: Ms. El-Assadi called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm.

Planning Director Yandrick welcomed the new Planning Commission member.

- **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

MOTION: Ms. Peterson **MOVED** to **APPROVE** the agenda as presented. The **MOTION** was **SECONDED** by Mr. Sinkule and **PASSED** by unanimous consent.

- **APPROVAL OF THE MAY 12, 2026, REGULAR MEETING MINUTES**

MOTION: Mr. Kirby **MOVED** to **APPROVE** the May 12, 2026, regular meeting minutes. The **MOTION** was **SECONDED** by Mr. Sinkule and **PASSED** by unanimous consent.

- **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

CLASS A NONCONFORMING DESIGNATION – CAR WASH “GROVE STREET AUTO WASH” – 2171 GROVE ROAD – TO CONSIDER THE CLASS A NONCONFORMING DESIGNATION APPLICATION TO PERMIT THE

RENOVATION OF A VEHICLE WASH OF AN EXISTING LEGAL NONCONFORMING STRUCTURE

Planning Staff informed the Commission on the application for the Class A Nonconforming Designation. The proposal was from the Black Star Building Group to renovate the existing car wash at 2171 Grove Road. The car wash, located on the northeast side of the road between Grove Road and Lakeview Avenue, was just over 1.1 acres and in the general business (GB) district. The Domino's next door was in the same zoning district, and there were many multi-family and single-family residential units in the adjacent facility. The car wash had been occupied for the past six or seven years.

Planning Staff informed the Commission that the site plan was the most involved process for larger, more intensive projects. Article 9 of the Zoning Code outlined the standards and what the applicant needed to provide for review.

Planning Staff reviewed the approval process for the Special Land Use criteria. Planning Staff reported that a Class A nonconformity was a nonconforming structure or use of land that has been designated by the Planning Commission to be allowed to be perpetuated and improved in accordance with the provisions of the article and approved site plan. The existing car wash had been vacant for a long time, but it still stood, and the applicants sought to modify and enhance the site. The location was presented. Some of the private improvements of the subdivision, when the County Road Commission expanded Grove Road, were taken.

The proposed site plan was presented. Most of the improvements were behind the building in creating a more cohesive planting for stacking and drying. The stacking would allow for the required number of spaces. The proposed building renovations were presented.

The existing building was too close to Grove Road at 13.4 feet. The Class A non-conforming designation allowed the building to be reutilized. The current requirement was 20 feet, and the specific use for vehicle washes was 50 feet.

Planning Staff reviewed the Special Land Use criteria. The analysis from Planning Staff showed that the criteria for harmony, in accordance with the purpose of the ordinance, would be met, depending on the Commission's decision on the flexible ordinance provisions. There was no natural environment in the vicinity. Ford Lake was nearby, but residential uses were across the street, and the applicant proposed steps to

mitigate on-site waste. It would be compatible with the Master Plan. The analysis showed that the criteria for the site being adequately served by public facilities and services were met. The site would not be detrimental or hazardous to existing or future neighboring uses, persons, property, or public welfare, provided that security systems limit unauthorized use of the site. The site would not create additional public costs for public facilities or services that would be detrimental to the community's economic welfare.

Planning Staff reviewed the designation criteria for Class A. The structure was non-conforming due to its existing setback. The non-conforming did not negatively impact nearby property values, and the renovations would have a positive impact. The criteria for non-conformities contrary to public health, safety, and welfare could be met, with renovations improving vehicular circulation if the pathway is added along Grove Road. Granting the Class A designation would allow the re-use of the building and site to be renovated and also allow the property owner to make other improvements to the building in the future. Based on staff review, the Planning Commission would determine the adequacy, but there was a positive recommendation regarding the site plan. Other conditions could be attached to ensure structural support.

The conditions were reviewed. The project shall meet the accessibility requirements in the Building Code, as determined by the Building Official. The final site plan shall show the security camera and alarm system information on the plans, as required by Section 812. Suggested doors to enclose the bays were proposed, but the applicants stated that doors could not be added because they would conflict with the equipment. The property would use on-site cameras, and it was recommended that the security proposal be discussed. The proposal for the landscape screen along the eastern property line was deficient by 16 large evergreen trees and 83 narrow evergreen trees. There was a limited area, but it was a requirement based on the distance from the property line. The proposed Grove Road street-yard landscaping did not meet the intent of the ordinance and was deficient by five large deciduous trees and two other trees, but there was not much area to plant them. The possibility of cut-through traffic between Grove Rd. and Lakeview Ave. was likely to be/not likely to be an issue, and on-site signage prohibiting cut-through traffic is/is not required needed to be discussed. There was a pedestrian pathway in the vehicle lanes, but a path could not be added due to the road's slope. A pathway was added on the pavement itself. The proposed CMU block for the dumpster screen is/is not compatible with the materials used on the building facades, which was used to determine whether another material

should be used. The proposed dimension of the loading area would accommodate the businesses' needs.

Mr. Kirby (Commissioner) asked how far away residential properties were. Planning Staff reported that there were none immediately adjacent. There were residential zones across the street on the north side of the property. The neighborhood to the north and the multi-family residential homes across Grove Road were the closest residential homes. Mr. Kirby asked whether the Road Commission had reviewed traffic flow. Planning Staff reported that traffic was evaluated, there was no change in use, and no increase in traffic was expected compared to when there was a car wash previously. The queuing on site would be the larger aspect to control. There were many self-serve car lanes, which were expected to mitigate traffic congestion.

It was asked when the property was rezoned to create the non-conformity. Planning Staff reported that it was non-conforming because the property had been vacant for over a year and was a new business. The zoning ordinance had changed in 2022.

The engineer for the project, Matt Cole, discussed the site plan. The Road Commission was contacted, and an agreement was reached. The pavement in the front was reduced somewhat, and green space of shrubs was added to focus the traffic. The Road Commission had asked for no plants to be planted in that space. On the site, there were six self-service bays and two automatic bays. In the automatic bays, the total time from pay to driving out was five minutes. There would be eight cars able to stack, but realistically, only three spaces were needed due to the time required. The ordinance was met by keeping the added green space, but it could also be made into grass if the Commission wanted that instead. Along the church property, the new vacuums were being added, and the setback requirements were met. There were some pine trees, and they were being infilled with more pines. The greenery looked nicer than a fence, so the applicant was proposing that instead of a fence.

Mr. Sinkule (Commissioner) asked about the eastern side and the deficiency of trees. Matt Cole explained that the deficiency was based on the entire property line, and the screening was only needed between the adjacent property and the vehicle use. The number of trees was calculated based on the number of vacuum spaces rather than the entire car wash area. The only other deficiency was on Grove Road, where the Road Commission asked that no trees be planted. Mr. Sinkule stated that he would defer to the Planning Staff for clarification on the two different interpretations. When examining the entirety of the east side, the number of trees was large. If the

Commission did not decide to add a wall, Mr. Sinkule stated that he would like to see more trees.

Ms. Kehrer (Commissioner) asked for more details on the security plan and how the security issues were being prevented, particularly during the night hours. She also asked if there were any concerns about the 24-hour facility impacting neighbors. It was reported that there would be cameras and a professional monitoring system. The bays would be wide open, helping prevent security issues. The area would be actively monitored 24 hours per day. Ms. Kehrer asked how the monitoring worked and if someone would be actively watching the cameras. The property owner, Jeff Hanson, stated that he would likely not have someone watching the cameras 24 hours a day. He asked whether there were any issues during the prior car wash or only after the building was vacant. He anticipated that having the business open and with lights would prevent crime. Ms. Kehrer asked if the applicant had consulted with the sheriff. Jeff Hanson reported that he had not.

Ms. Peterson (Commissioner) stated that it was important for the residents to feel comfortable. She asked how far the bushes were from housing. Tom Alsman reported that the houses were quite far away, and the bushes were closer to the church. The bushes would be shielding the property from the church. Ms. Peterson stated that they needed to know if the security would be sufficient since the business was open 24 hours a day. She noted the importance of security and stated that the prior car wash was not open 24/7. It was reported that it was only open 24 hours per day since it was self-service. There would be lighting, cameras in each corner to monitor activity and who was present, and cameras on all light poles. If the business had to be shut down from 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m., they could find a way to turn off the self-service bays. It was assured that the doors for the automatic washes were secured. Ms. Peterson asked which security company's proposal was submitted. She stated that they should be able to see what was occurring in the automatic washes and with the cameras. The applicant confirmed that they would work it out.

A Commissioner asked about staffing and whether any staff would be present. It was confirmed that staff would be present daily during the day to clean up and collect trash. Ms. Peterson asked about a heater that melted ice and snow to prevent accidents. It was confirmed that a heating system would be installed underground as part of the final plan.

Mr. Sinkule (Commissioner) asked if the vacuum arms would contain a light fixture. It was confirmed that there was an LED light along the length of the arm, and it would be shown in the final plan. Mr. Sinkule asked how the lighting would be reduced after hours. It was reported that the lighting did not go down and met the site's photometric requirements. Mr. Sinkule asked whether the pole feet's mounting height would be reduced to 18 feet. It was confirmed that they would comply with the ordinance.

Ms. Peterson (Commissioner) asked if the applicant would consider fewer hours. Jeff Hanson stated that he wanted the car wash to be available to those working third shift or late shifts. He stated that he wanted the car wash to be open 24 hours a day. He discussed that there would only be a few people going through every hour. There would be no loud music, and the business would be low-volume. Ms. Peterson expressed concerns about the community's safety and stated that she believed security was important. Jeff Hanson ensured he would run a professional, safe business, and he noted that he lived nearby.

Mr. Kirby (Commissioner) stated that the main concern was ensuring proper security cameras and a timely response. He acknowledged that many self-service car washes were open 24 hours a day and that it was low volume. Jeff Hanson assured that there would be plenty of cameras and lighting.

Ms. El-Assadi (Commissioner) asked whether there was any study on people who used 24-hour car washes. It was reported that the volume of people overnight dropped dramatically. Ms. El-Assadi asked whether the cleaning hours could be adjusted occasionally to allow someone to check in during the overnight hours. Jeff Hanson stated that they could explore that option.

It was asked if the automatic car washes were also open 24 hours. It was confirmed that they were.

Ms. Lecoq (Commissioner) asked if there were any other similar facilities in the area. Jeff Hanson reported that there were fewer, since they did not generate a large volume. He stated that he had experience refurbishing some self-serve car washes but had not built a new one in a long time. It was added that the closest self-serve car wash was on Carpenter, across from the Meijer Store. Ms. Lecoq asked about Jeff Hanson's experience operating car washes and what he invested in the property. Jeff Hanson reported that he was a mechanical engineer and a project manager, so he knew a lot about project management. He also discussed reading a lot about how car washes

worked and ran. Ms. Lecoq asked what drew Jeff Hanson to the property. Jeff Hanson stated that he was looking for an post-corporate opportunity that was closer to home, challenging, and exciting.

Mr. Sinkule (Commissioner) asked whether the applicants would be open to signage prohibiting cut-through traffic. Jeff Hanson stated that he would add signage.

Ms. Peterson (Commissioner) asked if the applicant understood that the gate should be made of wood. It was reported that a metal frame was installed to prevent sagging, and composite deckboards were recommended. Planning Staff reported that the Commission had the flexibility to allow the different material. Ms. Peterson asked if the safety path would be put in or put in escrow for a later date. Matt Cole reported that they planned to add it. The planned path was a small, five-foot-wide path.

Ms. Kehrner (Commissioner) asked to see the safety path on a plan. The safety path was shown on the plan, and the reasoning for the location and width was explained. Ms. Kehrner asked if there would be a separate path. It was confirmed that there was no separate path in some of the areas. Planning Staff requested markings to improve safety for vehicles and pedestrians.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED AT 7:33 PM

A resident whose house faced the back of the car wash commented. She stated that she was happy to see the business, but raised concerns about the lighting and sound of the automatic wash bays. The resident noted that she was the only homeowner in the area, but two other houses were under construction. She commented that most foot traffic was behind the car wash, not in front. She asked if the entrance was only on Lakeview. The applicant clarified that people could enter off of Lakeview or Grove Road. The resident raised concerns about potential traffic backups. Clarity was provided on how people could easily exit. Planning Staff assured that every commercial business had to follow lighting standards and that the light would not spill onto the public road. The applicant reported that the automatic doors at the back of the car wash bays would close, preventing sound from exiting.

PUBLIC HEARING ENDED AT 7:39 PM

MOTION: Mr. Sinkule **MOVED** to **APPROVE** the Class A Non-Conforming Designation application for the non-conforming front yard of the Grove Road Auto Wash Renovation project at 2171 Grove Rd. – PARCEL K-11-23-105-001

submitted by Blackstar Building Group on a site zoned GB, General Business District, with the following conditions:

1. The property owner shall comply with all current Township Ordinance standards regarding all other aspects of the site design, as determined by the Planning Commission.

The **MOTION** was **SECONDED** by Ms. Kehrler.

Roll Call Vote: Ms. Tyson (Yes), Ms. Kehrler (Yes), Mr. Sinkule (Yes), Ms. Lecoq (Yes), Ms. Peterson (Yes), Mr. Kirby (Yes), and Ms. El-Assadi (Yes). **MOTION PASSED.**

SPECIAL LAND USE – CAR WASH “GROVE STREET AUTO WASH” – 2171 GROVE ROAD – TO CONSIDER THE SPECIAL LAND USE APPLICATION TO PERMIT A RENOVATION OF A VEHICLE WASH ON A SITE ZONED GB, GENERAL BUSINESS.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED AT 7:39 PM

Hearing None.

PUBLIC HEARING ENDED AT 7:40 PM

Planning Staff noted that the landscaping requirement applied to both automotive and institutional land uses. The regulation intended to protect against sound. While landscaping did not eliminate sound, it helped mitigate it. Staff stated that it was a large deficiency. The amount required was based on the entire frontage, which created the amount needed.

Ms. Kehrler (Commissioner) asked whether the frontage applied only between the church and the car wash. Planning Staff confirmed that this was correct. Ms. Kehrler asked whether the automotive designation was the type of business. Planning Staff confirmed that this was correct.

Ms. El-Assadi (Commissioner) asked if the vacuums would also make a larger noise. Planning Staff stated that they could. Ms. El-Assadi asked whether the church had a walkway that the safety path would meet up with. Planning Staff stated that part of the requirement was township-wide and county-wide, that part of it placed the

improvement on the property owner, and that the goal for Grove Road was eight feet. Staff stated that, in certain circumstances, eight feet was logistically challenging and that the Planning Commission should discuss it. The master plan's long-term goal was to improve connectivity.

Mr. Sinkule (Commissioner) stated that he was okay with the five-foot safety path along the frontage due to logistical constraints. He stated that there needed to be a middle ground on the number of trees. He raised concerns about the neighbors' exposure to the light and recommended further discussion.

Ms. El-Assadi (Commissioner) recommended adding markings as a requirement for the five-foot safety path.

Mr. Kirby (Commissioner) agreed with the concern about lighting but raised concerns about dimming lighting for safety reasons. He recommended increasing the number of trees to make it more sufficient.

Ms. Kehrner (Commissioner) requested that the applicant or engineer discuss the CMU block and its consistency with the building's façade. It was reported that the height of the two center bays was being increased, and masonry blocks would be used on the walls. On the sides, the existing brick would be repaired and painted. The masonry units would be painted to match the building's color.

Ms. El-Assadi (Commissioner) noted that the loading area still needed to be addressed. It was reported that large semi-trucks typically came in, but only a van was delivering, resulting in a smaller parking space and loading zone.

Mr. Kirby (Commissioner) stated that he was still unsure how much the business would be monitored. It was explained that it would be sporadic and could potentially use artificial intelligence (AI) support. The shields would help protect the lighting. Planning Staff noted that the Commission had previously required that the videos from the camera system be available for 30 days.

Ms. Peterson (Commissioner) asked if the security cameras would not run 24/7. It was clarified that they would run 24/7, but they would not be monitored 24/7. Ms. Peterson recommended adding conditions to make clear that the police department should assess them, keep them for 30 days, and that the cameras must be in the ports. Planning Staff agreed that it would be helpful to add conditions under the preliminary site plan.

Mr. Sinkule (Commissioner) agreed that it was important to have cameras on both the Lakeview and Grove Road sides, the back parking lot, and the bays 24/7, and to have the video be available for 30 days.

The Commissioners agreed that the CMU block was compatible, provided it was painted in line with the rest of the area. The Commissioners were comfortable with the smaller loading area as presented.

The Commissioners and Planning Staff discussed the number of trees. Planning Staff recommended eight large trees and 41 narrow trees. The landscaper was encouraged to use Michigan-native plants to increase the longevity of the trees.

Mr. Kirby (Commissioner) asked if it was feasible to increase the number. Planning Staff stated that it was reasonable to add the narrow trees. The applicant stated that they could alternatively add the fence if the number of trees was not possible. Mr. Kirby asked to get in as many trees as they could. Planning Staff stated that if they could not plant the tall evergreen trees, they could plant two smaller trees in place of each tall tree. Staff noted that the decision was up to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Sinkhule (Commissioner) suggested recommending working with staff on the final site plan, focusing on the two-to-one ratio and some trees around the vacuums where it would be noisier.

Ms. Peterson (Commissioner) asked whether they were setting a precedent regarding the trash can area gate by allowing wood. She also asked about the cost difference. It was reported that the required enclosure would cost \$3,600 to \$5,000, and the proposal would cost approximately \$21,000. A metal substructure was in the proposal with the composite deckboard. Planning Staff noted that the CMU block would be acceptable in another location and that it was compatible with the dumpster screen and the principal structure.

MOTION: Mr. Sinkule **MOVED** to **APPROVE** the Special Land Use application for the Grove Road Auto Wash Renovation project at 2171 Grove Rd. – PARCEL K-11-23-105-001 submitted by Blackstar Building Group on a site zoned GB, General Business District, as the proposal meets the criteria in Article 10, Special Land Use, with the following conditions:

1. The project receives Preliminary Site Plan approval and approval of the requested Class A Non-Conforming Designation.
2. Revise plans based on the Planning Commission's discussion at this evening's meeting, and review comments made by Planning, Engineering, and outside agencies, for the Final Site Plan.

The **MOTION** was **SECONDED** by Ms. Kehrler.

Roll Call Vote: Ms. Tyson (Yes), Ms. Kehrler (Yes), Mr. Sinkule (Yes), Ms. Lecoq (Yes), Ms. Peterson (Yes), Mr. Kirby (Yes), and Ms. El-Assadi (Yes). **MOTION PASSED.**

- **OLD BUSINESS**

None to Report.

- **NEW BUSINESS**

- a. **PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN– CAR WASH “GROVE STREET AUTO WASH” – 2171 GROVE ROAD** – TO CONSIDER THE PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN APPLICATION TO PERMIT A RENOVATION OF A VEHICLE WASH ON A SITE ZONED GB, GENERAL BUSINESS.

MOTION: Ms. Kehrler **MOVED** to **APPROVE** the request for Preliminary Site Plan approval for the Grove Road Auto Wash Renovation at 2171 Grove Rd. – PARCEL K-11-23-105-001 submitted by Blackstar Building Group on a site zoned GB, General Business District, with the following conditions:

1. The project shall meet the accessibility requirements in ICC ANSI A.117.1 2017 in the Building Code, as determined by the Building Official.
2. The proposed camera and alarm system must operate 24/7; cameras must face both streets and into each bay; camera data must be retained for a minimum of 30 days and made available to the Washtenaw County Sheriff.
3. The final site plan shall show the security camera and alarm system information on the plans, as required by Section 812.
4. The proposed landscape screen along the eastern property line does not adequately screen the adjacent property from the proposed car wash use. Planning Commission sets a goal of adding eight large and 40 narrow evergreen trees. If it is not possible to add eight large trees, the applicant

may add two narrow trees for each large tree. If the number of evergreen trees could not be achieved, the final number of trees should be acceptable to the Planning Director.

5. The proposed Grove Road street-yard landscaping meets the intent of the ordinance.
6. The possibility of cut-through traffic between Grove Road and Lakeview Avenue is likely to be an issue, and on-site signage prohibiting cut-through traffic is required.
7. The safety path along the Grove Road frontage shown on the plans is adequate as proposed, and a minimum five-foot-wide safety path is required along this frontage. The five-foot path shall be striped along the edge of the driveway where a separate path cannot be provided.
8. The proposed CMU block used on the dumpster screen is compatible with the materials used on the building facades if painted to match.
9. The proposed dimension of the loading area will accommodate the businesses' needs.
10. The applicant shall revise all plan sheets to reflect the results of this evening's discussion.
11. The applicant shall address all outstanding comments from reviewing consultants and agencies as part of the final site plan review.
12. The applicant shall obtain all applicable internal and external outside agency permits before construction.

The **MOTION** was **SECONDED** by Mr. Kirby.

Roll Call Vote: Ms. Tyson (Yes), Ms. Kehrer (Yes), Mr. Sinkule (Yes), Ms. Lecoq (Yes), Ms. Peterson (Yes), Mr. Kirby (Yes), and Ms. El-Assadi (Yes).

- **OPEN DISCUSSIONS FOR ISSUES NOT ON AGENDA**

- **Correspondence Received**

None to Report.

- **Planning Commission Members**

Ms. Lecoq (Commissioner) introduced herself. Planning Staff noted that she was filling Larry Doe's term, which ran through the end of 2026, and that the position would then be considered for reappointment.

- **Members of the Audience**

None to Report.

- **TOWNSHIP BOARD REPRESENTATIVE REPORT**

Ms. Peterson reported that the Township held its car show, and there was a great turnout. There was a meeting on June 16 to discuss how to address senior citizens' issues and allocate funds. There was also a pickleball tournament.

Ms. Peterson noted the upcoming John E Lawrence summer jazz event.

- **ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS REPRESENTATIVE REPORT**

None to Report

- **TOWNSHIP ATTORNEY REPORT**

None to Report

- **PLANNING DEPARTMENT REPORT**

Planning Staff reported that a meeting would be held on Tuesday, June 23, 2026, at 6:30 p.m. He noted that one of the items was the extension of the Holiday Inn construction, as they had not been able to attend the May 26 meeting. A work session was scheduled to introduce a zoning text amendment. There were four categories of ordinances under work. There were no items scheduled for the July meetings, but there were many site plans and proposals in the queue.

The Planning Commission was requested to inform Staff in advance if they could not attend any meetings so that a quorum could be reached.

Planning Staff reported that the Township Board approved the year-long contract with Carlisle Wortman. The development agreement and final site plan for Urban Aire were approved, and a meeting will be held in the near future.

- **OTHER BUSINESS**

None to Report.

- **ADJOURNMENT**

MOTION: Ms. Peterson **MOVED** to adjourn at 8:30 pm. The **MOTION** was **SECONDED** by Mr. Kirby and **PASSED** by unanimous consent.

=====

Respectively Submitted by Minutes Services