

**MINUTES
CITY OF FARMINGTON HILLS
PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBER
31555 11 MILE ROAD, FARMINGTON HILLS MI
March 19, 2015**

Chair Topper called the Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. on March 19, 2015.

Commissioners Present: Blizman, Mantey, Rae-O'Donnell, Stimson, Topper, Schwartz

Commissioners Absent: Fleischhacker, McRae, Orr

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

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION by Blizman, support by Rae-O'Donnell, to approve the agenda as published.

Motion carried 6-0 (Fleischhacker, McRae, Orr absent).

REGULAR HEARING:

A. SITE AND LANDSCAPE PLAN 52-2-2015

LOCATION:	36600 Corporate Dr.
PARCEL I.D.:	22-23-17-126-001
PROPOSAL:	Parking lot addition in an OS-4, Office Research District
ACTION REQUESTED:	Site and Landscape Plan approval by Planning Commission
APPLICANT:	Tom Holsbeke, Holsbeke Construction, Inc.
OWNER:	Orlando Storage 17 (FL) LLC

Staff Planner Stec explained that this proposal was for a parking lot addition at an existing office building at Corporate Office Park that had originally been developed as a PUD. The request was for an additional 40 parking spaces, including 19 previously land-banked parking spaces. The applicant could have added the previously land-banked spaces without Planning Commission approval. However because they wanted to add 21 more, and because this proposed change impacted the landscaping, they were before the Commission this evening with a site and landscape plan.

Utilizing overhead slides and referring to the ClearZoning review letter of March 10, 2015, Planning Consultant Stirling gave the consultant's review of this proposal. She described the location of this site as being 7.76 acres fronting on Corporate Drive and West 12 Mile Road between Investment and Executive Drives. The project area was identified as 2 acres. The property was zoned OS-4 Office Research District.

Planning Consultant Stirling reviewed existing conditions, including zoning, site configuration, site improvements, dimensional requirements, open space, and lighting. She explained that there were currently 228 off-street parking spaces on the site, and there were 19 land-banked spaces. Regarding open space, Planning Consultant Stirling said that a minimum of 50% open space was required; from the information provided she was unable to determine if this standard had been met. Therefore the applicant needed to confirm compliance with the open space provision.

Planning Consultant Stirling reviewed the proposed changes as follows:

Site Development Proposal: An additional 40 parking spaces were proposed. This would require the removal of trees and lighting currently within parking islands and perimeter landscaped areas. The project also included the installation of retaining walls along the east and west property lines, adjacent to the proposed perimeter parking spaces.

Parking Design and Ratio: The site plan proposed 268 parking spaces, compared to the 228 existing parking spaces. In accordance with Section 34-5.2.13, Minimum Off-Street Parking Spaces, and based on 80% of the gross floor area being usable, 248 parking spaces were required for the existing buildings/use. The proposed parking would exceed the estimated minimum parking spaces required for the site.

Planning Consultant Stirling suggested that the applicant consider relocating some of the island parking stalls to the perimeter parking areas to facilitate better internal traffic flow and reduce vehicular conflicts. Specifically, she recommended relocating or eliminating the single parking stall closest to the entrance, as that space was difficult to enter and also created a blind spot when pulling out. Additionally, cars in the three spaces within the first island would be backing out into the lane of traffic flow. Planning Consultant Stirling also pointed out a rear island parking space that abutted another perpendicular parking space, so that a car parking there would block another car in the abutting space.

In total, five parking spaces needed to be resolved, and changes to these parking spaces should be shown on a revised site plan and reflected on a revised landscape plan. This would also impact the tree removal permit.

Retaining Wall: The Applicant had proposed a retaining wall located adjacent to the proposed parking spaces along the east and west property lines. The majority of the exposed wall was to the side of the conservation area with approximately 8 to 12 inches exposed to the parking lot.

Drainage: Compliance with the City's storm water requirements required a review by the City's Engineering Department.

Accessory Buildings and Structures: Per Section 34-5.1.D., a dumpster was located at the southeast corner of the property (front yard). This should be reflected on the site plan.

Exterior Lighting: Per Section 34-5.3, all lighting used to illuminate any off-street parking area must be installed in accordance with Section 34-5.16, Exterior Lighting. The applicant proposed to relocate one pole-mounted parking lot light as part of the project but did not provide an alternate location. The height and type of fixtures had not been submitted. No building lighting was shown on the plans. If the applicant was proposing to relocate or install new lighting, a site plan showing the location and a photometric plan needed to be provided. The Planning Commission should review and determine if compliance with existing standards was necessary.

Noting that the landscape area abutting this project was heavily wooded, Planning Consultant Stirling explained that her landscape plan review was specific to the perimeter and end cap islands of the parking lot, as follows:

There appeared to be discrepancies between the site plan and the landscape plan and tree survey related to the species of material being removed and/or relocated. The notes should be removed from the site plan and/or revised on the landscape plan.

The proposed construction of 40 surface parking spaces would result in 23 trees removed from the site. The applicant proposed to plant 21 trees throughout the site. There was a note on the plan that some of the trees might be transplanted in lieu of new plantings.

However, the landscape plan did not call out the level of detail needed to determine compliance with ordinance standards. On Sheet LP-1, the applicant identified the average/range of tree caliper of cluster or rows of trees of the same species, e.g. 3-5". The caliper of the trees proposed for removal should be provided in order to determine how many were regulated trees and how many were required replacement trees. While it did not appear that any landmark trees were proposed for removal, this should be noted on the plan.

Per Section 34-5.14, *Landscape Development* the following standards applied and required further review and consideration:

- a) Section 34-5.14.3.B.iv. required a table that indicated the total number of trees on site, the total number of trees to be removed and the total number of replacement trees to be planted on site. The applicant should provide this information to confirm compliance.
- b) Section 34-5.14.3.B.vii. required that the plans include the proposed treatment of all ground surfaces other than paved surfaces. All areas should be planted with grass/sod or mulched. The applicant should provide this information to confirm compliance.
- c) Section 34-5.14.3.xi. required that existing and proposed utilities be shown. The applicant should include all utilities on the landscape plan in order to verify that no conflicts existed with the proposed plantings.
- d) Section 34-5.14.4.C, required one canopy tree for each 2,800 square feet of parking lot area. This information was not provided by the applicant for the existing property. The proposed parking area would require three additional trees. The existing site appeared to exceed the minimum number of trees required to meet this standard; the applicant should verify the total parking area to determine that the standard had been met.
- e) Section 34-5.14.4.C.iv. required that a tree planted in the parking lot island must be provided with an open area not less than 180 square feet with a minimum radius of three feet at the trunk of the tree. The applicant should verify that this standard had been met.
- f) Section 34-5.14.5, required that parking lots be separated from a public thoroughfare by a planted hedge of small shrubs or a two-foot high masonry wall or berm. There was a significant woodland area between Corporate Drive and the parking lot and therefore this standard had been met.
- g) A landscape cost estimate must be provided for administrative review.

Planning Consultant Stirling reviewed the tree removal permit, and noted the following information as being deficient:

- a) The total number of trees on site, the total number of trees to be removed, and the total number of replacement trees required to be planted on site needed to be indicated on the plan in table form.
- b) Per Section 34-5.18.7.A., as a condition of granting a tree permit the applicant was required to replace trees being removed having six inches or more DBH. The applicant had not provided a

- list of all trees on site with a corresponding tree inventory number and disposition. This list should include the common name, botanical name, size and condition. The applicant had provided general information on the tree survey; however, it did not contain the detail necessary to make a determination of regulated trees being removed as part the project.
- c) The proposed location of relocated trees should be indicated on the plan, together with a statement as to how such trees were to be protected and/or stored during land clearance and construction, and maintained following construction.
 - d) The applicant should modify the notes to show protective wood snow fence or similar sturdy stock material staked with metal stakes ten feet on center would shield and protect trees, no closer than six feet from the tree or at the drip line, whichever was greater, of all such trees or groups of trees. The current note on Sheet LP-2 indicated five feet on center. This needed to be corrected.

Planning Consultant Stirling completed her review.

In response to a question from Commissioner Stimson, Planning Consultant Stirling said that setback requirements on the east end had been exceeded.

Brian Devlin, 31736 West Chicago, Livonia MI, and Tom Ulrich, Holsbeke Construction, 325 North Avenue, Mt. Clemens, MI were present on behalf of this application.

Commissioner Schwartz asked why 40 more parking spaces were needed at this location. Mr. Ulrich explained that the business was growing and they needed the additional parking.

Commissioner Schwartz asked if the applicants would be willing to move the parking spaces as suggested by Planning Consultant Stirling. Mr. Devlin explained the justification for the location of the additional parking spaces. He said that they were running out of perimeter parking options. They had gone as far as they could along the east boundary. Incoming cars had three left-turn options and they were trying not to conflict with those. They were trying to provide the additional spaces within the parking lot itself.

In response to a question from Chair Topper, Planning Consultant Stirling reiterated that she suggested using perimeter parking for the 5 spaces that appeared to be in conflict with traffic flow or other parking on the site. She pointed out gaps in the west perimeter area that might provide possibilities. There was also space on the eastern perimeter.

After further discussion, Commissioner Schwartz asked City Attorney Schultz to comment on this issue. City Attorney Schultz advised that the Planning Commission as part of its review needed to review pedestrian and vehicle safety and layout. The Planning Commission could approve this site plan conditioned on (1) further administrative review with the direction that staff resolve the issue of the 5 spaces, with a possible removal of some of those spaces or (2) a simple removal of the 5 spaces being discussed.

Commissioner Blizman said that the 5 spaces in question should be removed from the plan as currently configured or another location found for them. With that direction, he thought the resolution of this issue could be handled administratively.

Mr. Devlin said that they could probably add four spaces to the east where the land-banked spaces were already planned and could resolve the 5th space also.

Commissioner Stimson reminded the applicants that as they added new spaces on the east perimeter, the landscape plan could be affected. Mr. Ulrich noted that the trees at that location were proposed and could be moved to another location, if necessary.

MOTION by Rae-O'Donnell, support by Schwartz, that Site Plan No. 52-2-2015, dated February 17, 2015, submitted by Tom Holsbeke of Holsbeke Construction Inc., be approved because it appears to meet all application requirements of the Zoning Chapter, subject to:

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

- 1. Five of the proposed new parking spaces be relocated per the ClearZoning letter of March 10, 2015 and Planning Commission recommendations as discussed this evening.**
- 2. The dumpster be shown on the plan.**
- 3. 50% front yard open space requirement calculations be provided.**
- 4. Engineering and Fire Department approval.**
- 5. All other issues called out in the ClearZoning letter of March 10, 2015 be resolved.**

Motion carried 6-0 (Fleischhacker, McRae, Orr absent).

Regarding the landscape plan, Commissioner Blizman noted that there were several items called out in the landscape plan review. He asked Planning Consultant Stirling if these could be handled administratively or would it be better for the applicants to return to the Planning Commission for further review. Ms. Stirling said that she felt the items could be reviewed administratively; ultimately she felt the landscape plan would be in conformance with the ordinance.

MOTION by Blizman, support by Stimson, that Landscape Plan No. 52-2-2015, dated February 17, 2015, submitted by Tom Holsbeke of Holsbeke Construction Inc., 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 condition:

- 1. Revised landscape plan addressing the items identified in the 3/10/15 ClearZoning review be submitted for administrative review.**

Motion carried 6-0 (Fleischhacker, McRae, Orr absent).

B. SITE AND LANDSCAPE PLAN 54-2-2015

LOCATION:	30500 Thirteen Mile Rd.
PARCEL I.D.:	22-23-02-376-001
PROPOSAL:	Parking lot addition for golf course (Glen Oaks) in a RA-1, One-Family Residential District
ACTION REQUESTED:	Site and Landscape Plan approval by Planning Commission
APPLICANT:	Zack Crane for Oakland County Parks & Recreation Commission
OWNER:	Oakland County Parks & Recreation Commission

Staff Planner Stec explained that this application represented a reconfiguration and improvement of Glen Oaks Oakland County Parks Golf Course. The plan was to change the available curb cuts in order to enhance traffic flow and better utilize the overflow parking area, and to enhance landscaping to make the site more desirable, especially the banquet hall facility.

Utilizing overhead slides and referring to the ClearZoning review letter of March 10, 2015, Planning Consultant Stirling gave the consultant's review of this proposal. She described the location of this site as being 111 acres fronting on West 13 Mile Road, east of Orchard Lake Road. The project area was identified as 4 acres. The property was zoned RA-1 One Family Residential.

Planning Consultant Stirling reviewed existing conditions, including zoning, site improvements, dimensional requirements, and lighting.

Noting that the applicant had not proposed any changes to the building, setbacks, building height, lot coverage or lighting, Planning Consultant Stirling reviewed the proposed changes as follows:

Site Development Proposal: The applicant proposed a combination of resurfacing and reconfiguration of the existing parking lot and the construction of a grass surfaced overflow parking lot. This would include construction of a new approach and removal of an existing approach. It also included the removal of several landscape islands and the installation of an internal "traffic-circle" at the main entrance of the building. The new approach would be aligned with an access on the south side of 13 Mile Road, which was good access management.

Parking Design and Ratio: There were 325 parking spaces existing on the site with 9 barrier-free spaces. The proposed parking would be for 288 hard surfaced parking spaces (minus 3 when the overflow was used), with 40 spaces provided in the grassed overflow parking area. This gave a total of 325 parking spaces (9 barrier free).

In other words, the proposed plan would result in the same number of spaces being available for peak times. The grass-surfaced overflow parking area was designed to support intermittent vehicular movements and parking. The overflow parking should not be included in the calculation for required parking.

In accordance with Section 34-5.2.13, Minimum Off-Street Parking Spaces, four parking spaces were required for each golf hole and one for each employee, plus spaces required for each accessory use, such as a restaurant or bar. The clubhouse use required one parking space for each 85 square feet of usable floor. Therefore a total of 283 parking spaces were required for the site. The proposed hard surfaced parking exceeded the minimum required and thus this standard had been met.

The traffic movements around the "traffic circle" were not clearly defined, e.g. one-way or two-way movements. The large expanse of pavement at the entrance could result in irregular vehicle movements. Consultants and staff had been working with the applicant to improve this area, and Planning Consultant Stirling recommended that consideration be given to reducing the size of the drive aisles, reconfiguring the islands, and making the traffic movements one-way around the north side of the traffic circle, incorporating stop signs at key internal intersections, and realigning the parking aisle closest to West 13 Mile Road. The intent was to separate the banquet facility from the golf facility; the suggested configuration would meet that goal.

Another suggestion was to extend or better define the area next to the kidney-shaped island on the

west, using a mountable type curb or simply a change in materials that led up to the front door.

Parking Lot Screening: Section 34-5.14.5. required that all parking lots shall be separated from a public thoroughfare by a planted hedge of small shrubs or by a masonry wall or berm a minimum of two feet high. The parking area was separated by a white fence that extended the length of the parking lot. The existing parking lot did not allow sufficient planting area. The Planning Commission should review the existing screening material and determine whether it provided sufficient screening; if it was sufficient this should be noted.

Overflow Parking: Section 34-5.11 required that the entire off-street parking lot, including parking spaces and maneuvering lanes required under this section be surfaced with asphaltic or concrete paving and striped to delineate parking spaces and lanes prior to issuance of an occupancy permit. The proposed hard surfaced parking lot satisfied the requirements for parking. The overflow parking (40 spaces) was shown with some compaction with grass on top. The City's Engineering Department would review the design of the parking area to determine compliance with City standards, including but not limited to storm water detention and construction.

Loading and Unloading: There were no specific loading and unloading requirements within the RA-1 district. The applicant provided a truck route showing the conflicts with parking spaces and method for accessing the clubhouse entrance. The applicant should address the timing of deliveries, size of trucks used, and procedures to reduce conflict with parked vehicles. There were no conflicts identified within the public rights-of-way.

The Engineering Department had noted some drainage requirements and had reviewed some of the elements of the traffic circle just discussed.

Parking Islands: Sheet L-1, Landscape Plan identified 4,710 square feet of parking lot landscape islands. The proposed reconfiguration suggested a large grass island that functioned as a traffic circle, allowing pick-up and drop-off at the front door. With the traffic circle, the parking lot landscape islands covered approximately 7,600 square feet of area. Section 34-5.14.4.C., required that one canopy tree be provided for each 2,800 square feet of paved surface area on the zoning lot. The parking lot surface was 97,736 square feet. Based on the standards, 35 canopy trees were required. The applicant was proposing a total of 47 trees, with 15 new trees, 2 transplanted/relocated trees, and 30 existing trees. Therefore this standard had been met.

Exterior Lighting: Per Section 34-5.3, all lighting used to illuminate any off-street parking area shall be installed in accordance with Section 34-5.16, Exterior Lighting. The applicant proposed to relocate one pole-mounted parking lot light as part of the project but did not provide an alternate location. The height and type of fixtures had not been submitted. No building lighting was shown on the plans. It was recommended that the applicant show existing fixture locations and provide a description of existing lighting. The Planning Commission should review and determine if additional compliance with existing standards was necessary.

Planning Consultant Stirling reviewed the landscape plan as follows:

As noted above, the plans identified a total of 47 trees within the project area. A total of 15 new trees were proposed including Skyline Honey Locust (4), Red Oak (4), Ginkgo (2), and Greenspire Linden (5). A variety of deciduous and evergreen shrubs were also proposed within the parking lot islands, perimeter planting areas, and adjacent to the building.

Per Section 34-5.14, *Landscape Development* the following standards applied and required further review and consideration:

- Section 34-5.14.4.C required one canopy tree for each 2,800 sq. ft. of parking lot area. If the site plan was modified as proposed, a revised landscape plan should be submitted for review.
- Section 34-5.14.4.C.iv. required that a tree planted in the parking lot island must be provided with an open area not less than 180 square feet, with a minimum radius of three feet at the trunk of the tree. The applicant should verify that this standard had been met.

Planning Consultant Stirling reviewed the tree removal permit as follows:

The applicant had provided a tree survey for the project area. Section 34-5.3.B.viii. allowed a tree survey to be waived by the department for areas 50 feet or more outside the construction zone. If waived, a statement indicating predominant species and estimated number and size of trees in this area would be required. The applicant should submit a statement to the City. The plans identified trees that were adjacent to the project area as “outside of project limits.” Should the City waive the requirement, all trees within 50 feet of the construction zone were to be included and estimates should be provided for the remaining trees.

The tree survey was required to include a list of all trees on site with their corresponding tree inventory number and disposition. This should indicate the common name, botanical name, size and condition. The list should include all trees on the site with the required information and its disposition. The applicant had provided notes on the plan of trees that were being preserved and removed but it did not include the information specific to each unit/tree. The plans should be revised and a table incorporated or provided as a separate reference sheet.

According to the plans, the applicant was preserving all regulated trees and no landmark trees were being removed. A tree inventory summary was included in the review letter, which showed 12 existing regulated trees to remain, and 36 unregulated trees: 16 to be saved, 2 to be moved, and 18 to be removed. No replacement trees were required, but as already mentioned, more information was required in order to ensure compliance.

Planning Consultant Stirling concluded her review.

Staff Planner Stec noted that the property was a designated Historic District, and the Historic District Commission (HDC) reviewed any work done within 100 feet of a historic structure. Typically work would be approved by the HDC before coming to the Planning Commission. However, in this instance no structural changes were being made. Additionally the applicant had communicated that the proposed landscaping, with the grass island in front, etc. was enhancing the historic character of the site. Research showed that traditionally this type of architecture did not have many trees in front of the entranceway, but rather utilized an open vista so that the building became the most prominent feature. The new landscaping was trying to recapture that historic feel. This proposal would go before the Historic District Commission for approval before it could move forward.

In response to a question from Commissioner Simpson, Staff Planner Stec said that from the City’s point of view the proposed curb cut was a more desirable configuration than what was there presently.

Zach Crane, Oakland County Parks and Recreation Commission, 2800 Watkins Lake Road, Waterford, MI, and Kevin Staley, Professional Engineering Associates, 2900 East Grand Avenue, Howell, MI were present on behalf of this application.

Mr. Staley said that they had been working with city staff and consultants on this project. They were not proposing to change the lighting. They had to pull one light out while work was being done, but the same light would then be reinstalled. They were going to request a waiver on the tree survey as described this evening.

Commissioner Blizman asked if the purpose of changing the curb cuts on 13 Mile Road was to separate the Glen Oaks banquet facility from the golf course traffic. Mr. Staley said this was correct. The two current drives were past the clubhouse; the intent was to provide a more formal entrance to the banquet hall.

Chair Topper brought the item back to the Commission.

MOTION by Rae-O'Donnell, support by Stimson, that Site Plan No. 54-2-2015, dated February 18, 2015, submitted by Zack Crane for Oakland County Parks & Recreation Commission be approved because it appears to meet all applicable requirements of the Zoning Chapter, subject to:

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

- 1. The plan be revised to reflect the revised parking lot circulation patterns presented this evening.**
- 2. All deficiencies identified in the March 10, 2015 ClearZoning review letter be addressed.**

And that it also be noted that the tree survey and protective fence requirement is waived for trees outside of 50 feet of the work area.

Motion carried 6-0 (Fleischhacker, McRae, Orr absent).

MOTION by Rae-O'Donnell, support by Stimson, that Landscape Plan No. 54-2-2015, dated February 18, 2015, submitted by Zack Crane for Oakland County Parks & Recreation Commission be approved because it appears to meet all applicable Zoning Chapter requirements, and applicable Design Principles as adopted by the Planning Commission, subject to:

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

- 1. All deficiencies identified in the March 10, 2015 ClearZoning review letter be addressed.**
- 2. Any revisions necessary as a result of the incorporation of the modified circulation patterns required as a condition of site plan approval above.**

Motion carried 6-0 (Fleischhacker, McRae, Orr absent).

C. SITE PLAN 55-2-2015

LOCATION: 29325 Orchard Lake Rd.
PARCEL I.D.: 22-23-10-228-003

PROPOSAL: Addition of loading dock to an existing building in B-2,
Community Business District
ACTION REQUESTED: Site Plan approval by Planning Commission
APPLICANT: Eric Phelan, FRCH Architecture, Inc.
OWNER: Farmington Pointe II, LLC

Staff Planner Stec explained that this application was for the adapted use of the old Family Buggy Restaurant building south of the CVS drugstore at 13 Mile and Orchard Lake Road. The proposed use was for Petco Inc. The applicant was in the middle of renovations – both internal and external – that were being made with full knowledge that they had to come before the Planning Commission for an addition to the rear for a loading zone area, which was what was before the Commission this evening.

Planning Consultant Stirling said that while this was a fairly small physical change to the site, several access issues were raised. She reviewed existing conditions as follows:

Zoning: The properties to the north and south were also zoned B-2. The adjacent property to the northwest (with frontage on W 13 Mile Road) was zoned B-3, General Business District with an area to the south zoned P-1, Vehicular Parking District. Properties on the east side of Orchard Lake Road were zoned B-4, Planned General Business District. Surrounding properties were used for commercial purposes. This property shared a common wall with a retail tenant to the south, Direct Optical.

Site Configuration and Access: The property included 139.31 feet of frontage on Orchard Lake Road with a depth of approximately 270 feet. According to an easement sketch from Alpine Engineering (dated 10-18-07), there was a 20-foot wide easement for ingress/egress located along the west property line. No additional information was provided related to easement restrictions.

The property was accessed from Orchard Lake Road through shared shopping center ingress/egress drives. As noted, there was a 20-foot wide ingress/egress easement that ran from W. 13 Mile Road to the south property line of Parcel 23-10-227-034 which was currently improved with a stand-alone commercial building, Party City. To the west of Party City, within the 20-foot wide easement, were surface parking spaces. Based on the striping of the parking lots, the four sites identified in the easement sketch appeared to share ingress/egress drives and offer cross access for internal vehicular traffic movements.

Building: The property was improved with a one-story commercial building containing approximately 13,558 square feet of gross floor area.

Dimensional Requirements: The applicant had limited the dimensional information to an area of the proposed improvement, west of the building. Per Section 34-6.1, Site Plan Review, submission of a site plan to the Planning Commission shall be submitted in accordance with article III of chapter 21. The following were deficient:

- Note regarding installation or modification of outdoor lighting.
- The dimensions of all lot and property lines, showing the relationship of the subject property to abutting properties.
- The location and right-of-way widths of all abutting streets and alleys and the location of driveways or intersecting streets within one hundred feet of the zoning lot on either side of the abutting street.

- Location map and major cross streets.
- The plans did not contain dimensional requirements, including setbacks, parking lot dimensions, lot coverage, and other standard site plan requirements included under this Section.

Parking: Parking was located to the east and north of the building. There were no parking spaces reflected in the area where the truck dock was being proposed.

Service Area (West or rear building wall): Service improvements along the west building wall included a masonry dumpster enclosure, utilities pad/transformer, two rear access doors and an overhead door for deliveries. The plans identified that the existing structures were outside the 20-foot wide fire lane.

Accessory Buildings and Structures: Per Section 34-5.1.D. a 9-foot wide by 6-foot deep dumpster was required for the zone and should be located in the rear yard and screened using material consistent with the permanent building wall. A dumpster was located at the southwest corner of the property. The Zoning Ordinance required that the screening material be consistent with the permanent building materials. In order to comply with this standard, the applicant should construct a masonry enclosure to match the building and replace the existing gate. This should be shown on a revised site plan and reflected on a revised landscape plan.

Landscaping: Existing landscaping was noted on the plan with no details related to the type or size. There was an approximately 10-foot wide front yard landscaped area that served as screening between the parking lot and Orchard Lake Road. The applicant had not provided the size of the plantings. The Planning Commission should determine if the landscaping was sufficient to meet the intent of the ordinance.

Lighting: The existing lighting consisted of a combination of pole and wall mounted fixtures. The plans did not identify any changes to the existing lighting.

Planning Consultant Stirling reviewed the proposed changes as follows:

Proposed Use: The applicant proposed to reuse the existing one-story commercial building for a pet supply and service business, Petco. The floor plan showed a large retail area, office space, and restroom and service areas. The applicant proposed to construct a truck dock at the northwest corner of the site. Trucks would have to access the truck dock from the south (not their property) and would need to back into the area and then exit north via the 20-foot wide easement to W. 13 Mile Road. The applicant should identify the proposed truck route to and from the loading area and include the turning radii for the largest delivery truck used by the tenant. Without this, compliance could not be determined; this information should be shown on a revised site plan. Upon determining the truck route, the applicant should provide documentation of a shared access agreement with all affected properties. Additionally, the applicant should address the standing of delivery vehicles within the designated fire lane with the Fire Marshall.

Proposed Truck Dock: The applicant proposed to add a pre-fabricated aluminum canopy, overhead door, surface mounted speed lift, and a concrete slab. No additional improvements were noted on the site plan. The applicant should provide additional details for the truck dock, including an elevation of the loading area. This should be shown on a revised site plan.

In conversation with Farmington Hills staff, the applicant had indicated that the surface mounted speed lift may be removable or may be a permanent structure. If it were a permanent structure it could be considered outdoor storage and this would have to be addressed. Additional information needed to be provided.

Per Section 34-5.4, Off Street Loading and Unloading: Within any B or ES district, off-street loading space shall be provided in the rear yard only and in the ratio of at least ten (10) square feet per front foot of building. In exceptional instances, such space may be permitted in an interior side yard with approval of the zoning inspector or of the planning commission when the commission reviewed the site plan, provided that such location was necessitated by the site conditions and provided that the area was screened from view from any public street. The building measured approximately 108 feet in width; this would require a loading area of 1,080 square feet. There appeared to be a 10-foot wide service area that ran the length of the building that was outside of the 20-foot wide access easement. The Planning Commission should make a determination that this area met minimum standard for the off-street loading space.

The applicant should provide all easements of record, shared access or parking agreements with adjacent properties, and utilities, including but not limited to overhead lines.

Landscape Development: There were no plans for removal or installation of new trees on the site.

Exterior Lighting: Per Section 34-5.3, all lighting used to illuminate any off-street parking area shall be installed in accordance with Section 34-5.16, Exterior Lighting. The applicant had not shown any new or existing lighting on the plans and had not submitted a photometric plan. If the applicant was proposing new lighting for the site, a site plan showing the location and a photometric plan needed to be provided. The Planning Commission should review and determine if additional compliance with existing standards was necessary.

Planning Consultant Stirling concluded her review.

In response to a question from Chair Topper, Planning Consultant Stirling said that at this point it would be helpful to give the applicant some direction so that they could return to the Planning Commission with needed information.

In response to a question from Commissioner Schwartz, City Attorney Schultz said that while the proposed change was physically small, it was potentially significant because the applicants were proposing to add a loading area that required work to the exterior of the building. Additionally the change required the use of a neighbor's property, with no proof that the applicants had a right to use that property.

In a side comment, Commissioner Schwartz suggested that at some point the Commission have a discussion about which changes needed to be brought before the Planning Commission. This proposed change seemed very small. City Attorney Schultz said this could be discussed at a future study session. There were communities that said, for instance, if an applicant was doing minor improvements of less than 1,000 square feet this could be approved administratively. In the current case City Attorney Schultz emphasized that the applicants were showing a truck loading and unloading route with no proof that they had a right to use that route.

Commissioner Rae O'Donnell asked if the lack of documentation showing right of access was fatal to the plan as presented this evening. If documentation were provided, could the plan then be approved administratively? City Attorney Schultz said the lack of legal documentation showing right of access was fatal to any approval, whether by the Planning Commission or by administrative staff. He also hesitated to recommend administrative approval once appropriate documentation was submitted.

Commissioner Mantey asked for clarification regarding (2.) of the Engineering review memo of February 23, 2015:

An 8 inch public sanitary sewer exists in close proximity to the building in the alley where the proposed truck well is shown. The exact location of the public sanitary sewer and its easement must be substantiated. It appears to be in conflict. Any footing must be offset 10 feet from the existing sanitary sewer pipe and outside the easement.

Staff Engineer Darnell said the utilities and easements needed to be shown on the plan, along with the type of footing arrangements proposed and whether or not this was going to be a permanent structure. Could repairs to the infrastructure be made with the loading dock in place?

Commissioner Mantey clarified that there was a water main, a sanitary sewer, and a storm sewer in the area under consideration, and none of this was shown on the plan. It would be difficult to approve this plan without this information.

Commissioner Blizman addressed the issue of the proposed trespass/use of the CVS Pharmacy property. Allowing this use would diminish the value of the CVS property. He spoke to the decision the applicants had made to go ahead with the renovations thus far without having site plan approval for the loading area as presented. Commissioner Blizman also wondered if lighting met ordinance standards on this site.

Discussion followed regarding the nature of the speed lift requested, the proposed ingress and egress, and what the applicants would need to have access to their loading/unloading area. Staff Planner Stec said that the applicants required access for a full 18-wheel semi truck. There was an easement that anyone could use behind the building, but the issue was whether the applicants could use someone else's property for a large truck, which would then block traffic in the easement area.

Eric Phelan, FRCH Architecture, Inc., 311 Elm Street, Suite 600, Cincinnati, OH was present to speak on behalf of this application. He explained that the property owner for the subject site also owned the CVS property. Easement reports had been submitted showing the alley in the rear. They had had their trucking companies do drive-by trial runs. It was tight but they were able to access the loading area.

Mr. Phelan said the speed lift was a piece of equipment that was left outdoors. No actual footings would be involved. Rather a thickened slab would be installed that would bring the speed lift to the level of the interior slab.

Commissioner Schwartz noted that while currently the same owner might own the CVS site, if that site were ever sold the same easement issues would exist.

In response to a question from City Attorney Schultz regarding how the truck actually got to the loading area, Mr. Phelan said he had been unable to confirm the route that a truck would take to get there.

MOTION by Schwartz, support by Blizman, to postpone Site Plan No. 55-2-2015, dated February 18, 2015, submitted by Eric Phelan, FRCH Architecture, Inc., to the April 16, 2015 meeting to allow the applicants time to provide more information on the following items:

- 1. Provide and verify the terms of cross access easements with surrounding properties**
- 2. Show all public utility easements on site plan**
- 3. Provide a truck route plan**

Commissioner Blizman instructed the applicant to meet with the Engineering Department and resolve all issues.

Commissioner Stimson said that he had driven the area. If there were no cars parked behind the buildings in question, a truck could get through, but if cars were parked there, truck access would be difficult, if not impossible. In addition to the turning radii, the Commission needed confirmation that the route, with vehicles parked in the rear, would work. In the winter when snow was present the difficulty would also be acerbated.

Motion carried 6-0 (Fleischhacker, McRae, Orr absent).

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: February 12 & 26, 2015

Motion by Mantey, support by Stimson, to approve the minutes of February 12 and 26, 2015 as published.

Motion carried 6-0 (Fleischhacker, McRae, Orr absent).

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

COMMISSIONER'S COMMENTS:

Commissioner Schwartz asked that a discussion regarding snow removal from sidewalks be placed on the April agenda. Either he or Commissioner Mantey was prepared to make a motion regarding this issue.

The next meeting of the Planning Commission was March 26, 2015. The April meeting was set for April 16.

It was noted that the Village of Franklin 2015 Master Plan Update was in the Commissioners' packets. Under the Michigan Planning Enabling Act of September 1, 2008, the Village of Franklin was required to send a copy of the draft plan to Oakland County and neighboring communities for comment prior to adoption.

Chair Topper said she had read the plan and supported it.

ADJOURNMENT:

Hearing no further comment, Chair Topper adjourned the meeting at 8:49 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Steven Schwartz
Planning Commission Secretary

cem