

MINUTES
CITY OF FARMINGTON HILLS
PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING
FARMINGTON HILLS CITY HALL – COUNCIL CHAMBERS
June 25, 2015, 7:30 P.M.

Chair Topper called the Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. on June 25, 2015.

Commissioners Present: Mantey, McRae, Orr, Schwartz, Stimson (7:32 p.m.), Topper

Commissioners Absent: Blizman, Rae-O'Donnell, Schwartz

Others Present: Staff Planner Stec, City Attorney Schultz, Planning Consultant Stirling

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION by Orr, support by Fleischhacker, to approve the agenda as published.

Motion carried 6-0 (Blizman, Rae-O'Donnell, Schwartz absent).

REGULAR MEETING

A. SITE AND LANDSCAPE PLAN 60-5-2015

LOCATION:	East side of Drake Rd., north of Grand River Ave.
PARCEL I.D.:	22-23-21-351-032
PROPOSAL:	Movie Theater in B-3, General Business District
ACTION REQUESTED:	Approval of Site and Landscape Plan
APPLICANT:	Lonny Zimmerman of Siegal-Tuomaala Associates
OWNER:	Box Office Theatres, LLC

Referring to the ClearZoning review letter dated June 17, 2015, Planning Consultant Stirling gave the background for this application, which was for a Site Plan, Tree Removal Permit and Landscape Plan to permit the construction of a movie theater – the Mirage Theater. The location address was 24300 Drake Road (22-23-21-351-032), located on the east side of Drake Road to the North of Grand River Avenue. The 2.72 acre property was zoned B-3, General Business District.

Planning Consultant Stirling described the zoning and uses of adjacent and nearby properties. She reviewed the site configuration and access, particularly emphasizing that there were a number of access easements and maintenance agreements associated with the subject property and adjacent properties. The Engineering Division would review and approve the easements and maintenance agreements for the retention pond located to the northeast of this site.

Access was through a shared access easement to the north (shared with Auto Zone and McDonalds) and an existing central two-way access drive. There was an additional access drive further north of the property; the applicant had indicated that this drive would not be used until it was approved by the City and improved to current engineering design standards. The plans should identify what type of structure would be installed to block access to the property to the north. Again, the appropriate city departments, including the Fire Department and Engineering Division, should review and approve any structures used to block access to the north.

Current landscaping existed along Drake Road; no other landscaping existed on the property.

Planning Consultant Stirling said that the applicant was proposing a 54,310 square foot, two-story building to house the proposed movie theater, a permitted use. The theater would have eight auditoriums, with 466 seats (seven auditoriums with 50 seats and one with 116 seats).

Planning Consultant Stirling reviewed the dimensional requirements for the site, and noted that all setback and building height standards for the principal building had been met. Rooftop mechanical equipment screening requirements were also met, and open space requirements were exceeded.

Planning Consultant Stirling said that the applicant had been asked to bring a sample board and they had done that; the applicant would speak to this later in the meeting, especially in terms of the color of the metal mechanical screen, labeled as “granite 1” in the plans.

Regarding the dumpster enclosure, the applicant should also address material type and color when reviewing the sample board, and should confirm that the enclosure was located outside of any easement for public utilities.

Planning Consultant Stirling reviewed plans for off-street parking (141 spaces with 5 accessible spaces), and noted that parking requirements, including setbacks/open space requirements, were met.

Planning Consultant Stirling said that the loading/unloading area was somewhat unique. The B-3 District required at least 10 square feet of loading space per front of the building, and that this be located within the rear yard. Therefore 2,790 square feet of loading area were required. However, the ordinance did allow the Planning Commission to allow the loading area in the interior side yard, provided that such location was necessitated by site conditions and provided that the area was screened from view from a public street. The plan showed a 10 x 57 foot loading/unloading area within the interior side yard and a 28 x 80 foot area within the rear yard, equaling the required 2,790 square feet. Twelve 5-foot arborvitae shrubs were proposed to the west of the side yard loading area. Auto Zone, to the south, had a loading/unloading area on the north side of their building, across the access drive/easement from this property’s proposed side yard loading/unloading area. Planning Consultant Stirling advised that the Planning Commission should determine whether the location of the loading area in the interior side yard was necessitated by the site conditions and whether the proposed screening met the intent of the ordinance; this should be part of any approving motion.

Planning Consultant Stirling said that acceleration-deceleration passing lanes should be reviewed by the Engineering Division. Corner clearance from the access easements/internal drives should be reflected on the plans.

Regarding exterior lighting, Planning Consultant Stirling said that the 30-foot high pole met ordinance standards, and lighting appeared to meet requirements. However, the wall mounted lighting and canopy lighting did not have sufficient detail on the type of fixture in order to determine compliance. Additional details needed to be provided to verify that standards were met, including but not limited to the canopy lights being shielded to provide a cut-off angle of 85 degrees. Also, while the photometric plans showed that the ambient light levels met standards, the plans needed to verify that maximum ambient light levels met Section 34-5.16.3.C.

Planning Consultant Stirling said that while the applicant had provided pedestrian connections, they were recommending that the sidewalk be shifted to the north, allowing for better internal pedestrian flow. A revised plan should be submitted showing the pedestrian crossing extended to the entrance of the building across the internal drive aisle and the type of material proposed to delineate the walkway from the drive.

Regarding the tree removal permit, Planning Consultant Stirling said that one regulated tree was proposed to be removed and the replacement tree was reflected on the landscape plan. Protective tree fencing notes and graphic detail should be added to the information provided.

Regarding the landscape plan, Planning Consultant Stirling reviewed the 26 trees noted on the plan. The number and size of trees proposed satisfied the replacement tree requirements for the tree removal permit as well as the trees required for the parking lot area. A cost estimate needed to be provided.

Planning Consultant Stirling concluded her review.

In response to a question from Commissioner McRae, Planning Consultant Stirling said that they were recommending the pedestrian crossing be closer to the driveway, and not lined up directly with the bollard. The pedestrian crossing needed to be striped or of a different material than the driveway.

Commissioner Orr reviewed the rooftop screening requirement, noting that the screening was required to be no lower than the tallest part of any rooftop equipment.

Commissioner McRae asked Staff Planner Stec to address the issues in the Engineering review letter and in the email correspondence between the applicant and Senior Engineer Manager Cubera included in the Commissioners' packets.

Staff Planner Stec said that the Engineering Division was concerned with maintaining access to the detention pond northeast of the proposed building. Engineering would like to be able to access the pond via the Drake Road access and also via the Serra Toyota property. While the Engineering Division was not totally happy with the retention wall as proposed, they were not objecting to a conditional approval of the site plan this evening.

Commissioner McRae said that the Engineering Division was requiring access to the detention pond, yet nothing on the plans indicated this.

Planning Consultant Stirling said that there were several easements across the property. The Engineering Division wanted access midpoint into the detention area. Her impression of the email correspondence was that the Engineering Division did think suitable access was going to be provided. Also, there was an issue with the south water main adjacent to the building. The Engineering Division had been working with the applicant regarding reducing the size of the building in that area in order to accommodate the current location of the water main.

Staff Planner Stec reiterated that the Engineering Division would like to get access to the northeast corner via the Serra Toyota site. If this were provided, the applicants would lose one or two parking spaces. The required loading/unloading space was very large because of the length of the front of the building. Because of the nature of this use, the applicants would probably not need all that loading area. Potentially they could obtain a variance for a slight reduction in loading space requirement, and use the space freed from loading/unloading for parking.

Commissioner Orr said that these issues seemed to be a carry-over from unresolved issues of past owners. He reviewed the configuration of the current storm water flow from the catch basin north of the property into the retention pond, noting that this traveled diagonally across the property. However, the detention pond was not actually part of this parcel. The situation was unusual and presented unique challenges. He would like to have the access to the retention pond from Drake Road resolved before the project moved forward.

Commissioner Orr said that the delivery needs of a movie theater was much less than a strip mall or other business use that might be more often located in a B-3 District.

In response to a question from City Attorney Schultz, Commissioner Orr said that he could not see the northern property between Enterprise Rental and the proposed movie theater ever being developed. Again, he was concerned with permanent access to the detention pond. Commissioner Orr addressed the planning and development process for this entire area, and his belief that issues needed to be resolved because this was likely the last development that would occur here.

Brief discussion was had regarding developing the property to the north by dredging the detention pond deeper, thus increasing the amount of developable land. Commissioner Orr spoke to the difficulties of building on fill, and wondered again at any workable scenario that would develop that parcel and complete the driveway north of the theater.

In response to a question from Chair Topper, Staff Planner Stec said he thought Enterprise owned the northern parcel.

Lonny Zimmerman, Siegal-Tuomaala Associates, 29200 Northwestern, Southfield MI and architect for this project, was present on behalf of this application. James Klinkenberger, Civil Engineer/Project Manager, Nowak & Fraus Engineers, 46777 Woodward Avenue, Pontiac, MI was also present, as well as the theater owner, Dinesh Potluri, 19181 Levan Court, Livonia MI.

Mr. Zimmerman said they were very familiar with this area, having designed Muirwood Shopping Center and its later renovations, Busch Shopping Center, Drakeshire Shopping Center renovations, the Thomas Duke site on Grand River, and they were in process of redeveloping the old Kmart site in the City of Farmington. They had been working in this neighborhood for many years.

Mr. Zimmerman said the site was challenging, with many cross-easements. They had done a lot of preliminary work in order to make sure the theater would actually fit on the site. Bad soil had limited their ability to economically excavate. Therefore they planned to excavate minimally and have a second story entry to the auditoriums. Parking was provided underneath a part of the second floor. The first floor would house concessions and ticketing. There would be elevators and stairs to take customers to the second floor to enter the various auditoriums.

Mr. Zimmerman said the goal was to open the theater in about a year, to coincide with the opening of the 2016 Superman/Batman blockbuster. This would be possible if they could get approvals in a timely way.

Mr. Zimmerman addressed the issues discussed as follows:

- Sanitary easement south of the building: They were out of the sanitary easement. However, the pipe was not in the center of the easement but was off to one side. In order to comply with Engineering requirements, they were willing to reduce the size of the south end of the building by 7 feet. That would result in a 10-foot clearance from the pipe.
- Loading/unloading area: They did not need the loading space that was required in the B-3 District, which was set up for retail. They would very easily have their loading/unloading needs met by the space provided on the south side of the building facing toward the Auto Zone loading area. In fact, their original plans had just included the southern area. They had added the rear yard loading simply to meet ordinance requirements. They would prefer to put parking spaces in the area now designated for loading in the rear. Additionally, when the building was shortened by 7 feet as mentioned above,

the south side loading area was increased by another 7 feet, increasing the overall area from 10 x 65 feet to 17 x 65 feet.

- Access to the northeast corner: Providing this access would result in the loss of some parking spaces. One solution to this loss was to reduce the amount of theater seats, since parking requirements were based on the number of seats in the theater. They were willing to provide access to the detention area in the northeast corner, and they were willing to talk to Serra Toyota regarding this, though they could not guarantee Serra Toyota's willingness to also provide access. So, even if the loading/unloading requirement was not changed, they could still provide required parking by reducing the number of theater seats, if necessary.
- Connection with the Enterprise site: The detention pond officially went all the way to Drake Road – it included about 95 feet frontage along Drake Road. Regarding developing the northern parcel with a dead end stub, another scenario that had not been mentioned was that at some future time the theater might purchase the vacant parcel along with the Enterprise site, though this could not be guaranteed. In order to facilitate the connection to the Enterprise parcel, they would be willing – if it would answer the needs of the City and avoid a denial – to extend the driveway across the vacant parcel. There were already cross easements in place. That solution would leave the City with a connected frontage system there, plus this would provide access into the pond from Drake Road, in addition to what they would be putting in on the northeast corner.

Commissioner Orr addressed the increased traffic that would be generated from this proposed theater. With 8 auditoriums, there could potentially be 15 cars leaving every 10 minutes. The area was already congested. Had the increased traffic been discussed with Engineering?

Mr. Zimmerman said this issue had not been called out. Theater occupancy was generally at 35%.

Commissioner Orr pointed out that the theater hoped to open concurrent with a nationwide blockbuster opening. He would like to have some discussion regarding the added traffic the theater would bring. Since everything north of this shopping center was residential, perhaps all traffic should be directed south.

In response to a question from Chair Topper, Staff Planner Stec said that the Engineering Division would have looked at traffic as part of their review.

Commissioner McRae initiated a brief discussion regarding the business model for this theater. Commissioner Mantey pointed out that the viability of the business model could not impact the Planning Commission's decision. Mr. Potluri, owner, gave some background to the plans and development of this theater and described the finished theater as it was proposed.

Commissioner Mantey asked why providing access to the detention area would result in a loss of parking spaces.

Staff Planner Stec explained that the parking loss would result in granting access to and from the Serra Toyota site. Only a couple of spaces would be lost.

In response to a question from Commissioner Orr regarding access to the building from the parking lot, Mr. Zimmerman pointed out the entry doors to the building as shown on sheet P2. All areas of the parking lot had ease of entry to the building.

Commissioner Fleischhacker clarified that the southern portion of the building would be reduced by 7 feet, thus increasing loading space in that area. If the loading requirement were removed from the east side of the

building, additional parking could be added there, more than making up for losing a couple of spaces near the detention area.

Commissioner Orr asked about process. Should the motion be for adjournment until the applicant could appear before the ZBA? The building size would be reduced on the south side. The applicants were offering to complete the stub drive on the north. Access to the northeast part of the detention area needed to be resolved. The issue of reducing loading/unloading spaces could only be resolved by the ZBA. These seemed like significant changes. He would like to move this through as quickly as possible, but was not willing to vote for approval with so many issues outstanding. Perhaps the applicant and the City could work on the other issues while the ZBA heard the variance request, and then the application could return to the Planning Commission.

Staff Planner Stec pointed out that the Engineering Division did comment that they were comfortable with a conditional approval. If substantial changes resulted, then the plan could return to the Planning Commission. One of the conditions could be that a change in overall configuration would trigger a return to the Commission.

Mr. Zimmerman reiterated that they would be willing to accept fewer seats and keep the loading/unloading area as it was, if that meant the difference between being approved or not.

Commissioner Orr expressed concern about approving a site plan that contained a building that would not be the same size as that shown on the plans.

In response to a question from Commissioner Orr, Commissioner Fleischhacker said that while he was unsure of past history regarding similar site plan approvals, he would consider voting for approval this evening because the building size was going to be reduced by 7 feet to accommodate Engineering concerns; it would not be shifted or otherwise moved. He felt a conditional approval would be appropriate.

Discussion was held regarding process, and wording of a possible motion including conditions.

In response to a question from Commissioner McRae, Mr. Klinkenberger said that they had to have the retaining wall in order to make the site work. He emphasized that the email correspondence provided to the Commission showed Engineering Manager Cubera's statement that "*Our Engineering Division has no objection to the consideration of a conditional approval by the Planning Commission for the concept you offer provided that the access is at the east end of the site . . .*"

Mr. Klinkenberger said Engineer Cubera's main concern was access to the detention pond and they were providing ways to achieve this.

In response to a further question from Commissioner McRae, Mr. Klinkenberger described the configuration of the retaining walls. He said the height of the retaining walls varied from 0 to 4-5 feet. The northeast corner would have the most height.

In response to a question from Commissioner Orr, Mr. Klinkenberger showed the attachments to the email correspondence between himself and Engineer Cubera. They were not impacting the detention volume.

Commissioner Mantey noted that the Engineering review letter dated June 9, paragraph 5, said in regard to the retaining walls along the east and north property lines: *These need to be eliminated or minimized if*

possible. Also paragraph 1 said: “Also, our review notes that a retaining wall is proposed in the area of the east water main. This is not acceptable and the plan must be revised according.”

Mr. Klinkenberger again addressed these concerns, affirming that engineering issues could be resolved, and they were in contact with the Engineering Division, as noted in the email correspondence. He explained that this actually had nothing to do with site plan approval or ordinance standards. They could work out the Engineering division issues after receiving conditional site plan approval.

Commissioner Fleischhacker said that the application before the Planning Commission was for preliminary site plan approval. If the site plan did dramatically change in order to meet Engineering Division approval, the site plan would have to return to the Planning Commission for further review and approval.

In response to a question from Chair Topper, Mr. Zimmerman reviewed the sample board he had brought this evening. Referring the Commissioners to the Perspective in their packets, he showed samples of the orange granite and black granite materials, with the top fascia being black granite. These were the two primary exterior building materials. He showed a south elevation, describing how the same materials would be used. He noted that this theater would have insulated windows, not common for movie theaters. All the lobby areas would face toward windows. They wanted to bring the natural light into the building, while making sure the insulation would keep most of the sound outside of the building outside. Some of the glass would be clear, some darker.

Mr. Zimmerman said the mechanical screen would be black metal, in order to blend in with the black granite, and thus disappear visually.

Commissioner Orr indicated he was ready to make a motion.

MOTION by Orr, support by Stimson, that Site Plan No. 60-5-2015, dated June 8, 2015, submitted by Lonny Zimmerman of Siegal-Tuomaala Associates, be approved because it appears to meet all applicable requirements of the Zoning Chapter. This approval is subject to the following conditions:

A revised plan be submitted for administrative review addressing the following items:

- **Compliance with items identified by Engineering Division, including but not limited to:**
 - **Access to the retention pond to the northeast.**
 - **Applicant to contact Serra Toyota regarding the provision of a cross-access easement from the Serra Toyota site to Drake Road. Applicant agrees to provide their half of the access to accomplish this.**
 - **All necessary access easements to the retention pond for maintenance are provided. Extension of the driveway along the north property line.**
 - **The southern side of the building is reduced by 7 feet.**
- **Deficiencies in the ClearZoning review letter dated June 17, 2015 are resolved, including but not limited to lighting requirements.**
- **The pedestrian connection from Grand River is shifted several feet to the north and designed to be in compliance with Section 34-5.19.**
- **Compliance with corner clearance standards be shown.**
- **Compliance with items identified by the Fire Marshal.**

MOTION carried 6-0 (Blizman, Rae-O'Donnell, Stimson absent).

MOTION by Mantey, support by Orr, to adjourn Landscape Plan No. 60-5-2015, dated June 8, 2015, submitted by Lonny Zimmerman of Siegal-Tuomaala Associates, to date uncertain in order to allow for any modifications that may be necessary as a result of compliance with Engineering requirements.

Motion carried 5-1 (Fleischhacker opposed; Blizman, Rae-O'Donnell, Stimson absent).

B. SITE CONDOMINIUM LANDSCAPE PLAN 1, 2013

LOCATION:	Northeast corner of Halsted and Howard Roads
PARCEL I.D.:	22-23-17-176-024
PROPOSAL:	Tentative Approval of Landscape Plan for Site Condominium Plan (six (6) detached single-family homes) in RA-1A, One-Family Residential District
ACTION REQUESTED:	Tentative Approval of Preliminary Plan
APPLICANT:	John R. Pastor, of Pastor 4G's, LLC
OWNER:	Pastor 4G's, LLC

Referring to the ClearZoning review letter dated June 18, 2015, Planning Consultant Stirling gave the background for this application, which was for a Tree Removal Permit and Landscape Plan for the detention area associated with Whispering Meadows Estates, 26940 Halsted Road. The property was located on the north side of Howard Road, east of Halsted and south of the I-696 right-of-way. The property was zoned RA-1A, One-Family Residential.

The June 18 letter noted that they were actually unable to complete a review because the trees identified on the landscape plan were inconsistent with the trees shown on the tree inventory list submitted on April 20, 2015. Yesterday the applicant submitted a revised landscape plan.

The scenario being presented included the detention pond to the north of the units, along with a conservation easement along the back of the units, and also swales being added to the development. The trees that were being removed were shown on the plan dated June 2, 2015. Based on this plan 99 inches of tree were being removed; 100 inches were being planted. 21 trees were being removed; 52 trees were being added. Planning Consultant Stirling reviewed the replacement trees in terms of type and location. The applicant was proposing to use lesser caliper trees but to increase the number of plantings. The Ordinance allowed the Planning Commission to consider this under the *Wooded Area Woodlot Provision* (34-5-18.7.A.iii.).

Commissioner Mantey addressed the issue of only receiving the revised landscape plan one day before this meeting. Was this a dramatic change from the original submission?

Planning Consultant Stirling reviewed the types of trees being proposed, including Service Berry, Sugar Maples, Tulip Trees, and American Basswood. In each case the applicant was proposing about one inch less in circumference than normally required. In total number of inches, the applicant was proposing to add one more inch than was required.

Commissioner Mantey asked how many trees were originally required, and how many were now being planted. Chair Topper said that 33 trees were required. Under the *Wooded Area Woodlot Provision*, 52 smaller trees were being planted.

In response to further questions from Commissioner Mantey Planning Consultant Sterling said that while she was not an arborist, smaller trees sometimes had a greater chance of survival. Also, the trees would be required to be maintained, including replacing if they died, into perpetuity.

Commissioner Orr said he assumed the detention pond would need to be regraded since most of the trees there were being removed. Trees 386 and 387 appeared to be within grade, and would need to be removed as shown. However, three smaller trees were also in that area and they were not included in the tree removal permit. More information was needed regarding these trees.

Commissioner McRae noted that the Commission had not received sheet LP-2. Staff Planner Stec passed around sheet LP-2 to the Commission.

Joe Neville, George H. Pastor and Associates, 1102 Arden, Livonia MI was present on behalf of this application. Brian Devlin, landscape architect, 31736 West Chicago Ave., Livonia MI was also present.

Commissioner Orr asked about seven trees in the shaded part of the detention area. Why weren't those trees listed as trees to be removed?

Mr. Devlin explained that originally they had only included detention pond planting on the plan. They learned late that they were also supposed to include replacement trees. The information about the replacement trees came from the engineering plan, for which they had a short list of trees to be removed that he thought was complete. After receiving a call from Planning Consultant Stirling, he discovered that there were more trees to be removed that were not indicated on the plans. They had now provided a complete list of trees to be removed. These were indicated on the engineering plan in a darker color. Trees to remain were in a lighter color. The engineer felt that the trees on the side slope could be saved. If the trees could not be saved they would be included in replacement totals.

Commissioner Orr said it appeared that the plans might be inaccurate, or not notated correctly. For instance there was a tree at the 6-foot elevation line. How could you remove six feet around the roots and still save the tree?

Mr. Devlin said he believed there was already a slope in that location.

Commissioner Orr addressed how the contour lines were labeled in terms of elevation levels. He believed that more information was needed regarding the seven trees already discussed. It was unclear whether the trees needed to be removed or not.

Mr. Devlin said that he didn't have any further information tonight.

Commissioner Fleischhacker asked that City staff visit the site to confirm whether or not the seven trees were regulated. City Planner Stec said that he would visit the site before any tree permits were issued.

MOTION by Mantey, support by Orr, to adjourn this application to the next available meeting because the drawings came in late and contained errors, and in order to give the applicant time to present more information on the seven trees discussed and to make sure the drawings are accurate.

Mr. Devlin said that he felt these issues could be worked out administratively. Further, when he had called the City, no mention of replacement trees had been made.

Staff Planner Stec said that replacement trees were required by ordinance.

Chair Topper called the motion.

Motion failed on a tie vote 3-3 (Fleischhacker, McRae, Stimson opposed; Blizman, Rae-O'Donnell, Schwartz absent).

Chair Topper asked for another motion.

MOTION by Fleischhacker, support by McRae, that Site Condominium Landscape Plan No. 1-2013, dated June 9, 2015, submitted by G. H. Pastor, be approved because it appears to meet all applicable Zoning Chapter requirements and applicable Design Principles as adopted by the Planning Commission, subject to the following conditions:

- **Staff to field verify that trees around the detention pond area are correctly identified.**
- **Staff to verify that the proposed application of the wood area wood lot tree replacement option meets zoning requirements.**
- **Administrative approval of any revisions that may be necessary from the first two conditions.**

Commissioner Mantey asked if utilizing the wood area wood lot tree replacement option would save the applicants money. Mr. Devlin explained that they would actually be spending a little bit more money on the trees. The objective was to ameliorate the effects of the freeway for those parcels closest to the freeway.

Mr. Mantey said that he felt this application had presented materials too late to be thoroughly reviewed.

In response to a question from Commissioner Orr, Staff Planner Stec said the required measurements were caliper, not circumference.

Motion carried 5-1 (Mantey opposed; Blizman, Rae-O'Donnell, Schwartz absent).

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

COMMISSIONER'S COMMENTS:

The next meeting was scheduled for July 23, 2015.

On behalf of the Planning Commission, Commissioner McRae asked staff to present their best wishes to Samantha Steckloff as she battled cancer.

Commissioner McRae also asked that commissioners be notified when an event was held for retiring City Manager Brock.

ADJOURNMENT

Seeing that there was no further discussion, Chair Topper adjourned the meeting at 9:39 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

City of Farmington Hills
Planning Commission Regular Meeting
June 25, 2015
Page 11

APPROVED 7/23/15

Steven Schwartz
Planning Commission Secretary

/cem