

**MINUTES
CITY OF FARMINGTON HILLS
PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING
VIA TELECONFERENCE
NOVEMBER 19, 2020, 7:30 P.M.**

CALL MEETING TO ORDER

Chair Stimson called the remote meeting of the Planning Commission to order at 7:31 pm and gave instructions regarding public participation in the meeting.

ROLL CALL

Per the Open Meetings Act MCL 15.261, *ET SEQ.*, AS AMENDED, Commissioners identified their location during roll call.

Commissioners Present: Brickner, City of Farmington Hills, Oakland County, Michigan
 Countegan, City of Farmington Hills, Oakland County, Michigan
 Mantey, City of Farmington Hills, Oakland County, Michigan
 Orr, City of Farmington Hills, Oakland County, Michigan
 Schwartz, Pleasantview Township, Emmett County, Michigan
 Stimson, City of Farmington Hills, Oakland County, Michigan
 Trafelet, City of Farmington Hills, Oakland County, Michigan
 Turner, City of Farmington Hills, Oakland County, Michigan

Commissioners Absent: None
 One vacancy

Others Present: City Planner Stec, City Attorney Schultz, Planning Consultant Tangari

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

Roll call vote:

Yeas: Brickner, Countegan, Mantey, Orr, Schwartz, Stimson, Trafelet, Turner
Nays: None
Absent: None
Abstentions: None

MOTION carried 8-0.

PUBLIC HEARING

A. CLUSTER OPTION 1, 2020

LOCATION: 38500 Nine Mile Rd.
PARCEL I.D.: 23-30-300-019
PROPOSAL: One Family Cluster Option in an RA-2, One-Family Residential District

ACTION REQUESTED: Preliminary Cluster Option qualification
APPLICANT: Pulte Homes of Michigan, LLC

already made some changes to the development based on neighbor concerns, especially regarding adding additional landscape buffering along the border of the single-family residential development.

Referring to his November 13, 2020 memorandum, Planning Consultant Tangari reviewed this application for cluster qualification. He explained that under traditional RA-2 development, a maximum of 26 units would be permitted on this 10 acre parcel.

Under Section 34-3.17 One Family Cluster Option, the Planning Commission may make a determination that the site qualifies for a One Family Cluster based on the following:

- i. First, the Planning Commission shall find that the parcel will qualify for the cluster development option as defined in Section 34-3.17.2.B.i-viii. Development would be at the single family densities permitted in subsection 34-3.17.3.A. This finding must be made in all cases.

Section 34-3.17.3.A permits 2.1 units per acre for a One Family Cluster in the RA-2 district under this item.

- ii. Second, the Planning Commission may additionally find that the parcel is located in a transition area or is impacted by nonresidential uses or traffic on major or secondary thoroughfares or other similar conditions. If the Planning Commission makes such a finding, it may permit an increase in density up to the maximum densities established in subsection 34-3.17.3.B.

Subsection 34-3.17.3.B. permits up to 3.1 units per acre in the RA-2 district under this item. The parcel is located adjacent to a multi-family development and a day care to the west, industrial development to the north, and single-family development to the east and south.

The applicant's conceptual plan shows 30 units, or 3 units per acre. The Planning Commission would have to make an affirmative finding on the second item above in order to permit this density. Given the parcel's location between multi-family and single-family uses, and the presence of industrial uses to the north, the argument that it is a transitional property appears to have some merit. The property is also affected at its northern end by the presence of a more intense use.

Planning Consultant Tangari said that under Section 34-3.17.2.B.i-viii:

The planning commission may approve the clustering or attaching of buildings on parcels of land under single ownership and control which, in the opinion of the planning commission, have characteristics that would make sound physical development under the normal subdivision approach impractical because of parcel size, shape or dimension or because the site is located in a transitional use area or the site has natural characteristics which are worth preserving or which make platting difficult. In approving a parcel for cluster development, the planning commission shall find at least one of the following conditions to exist:

Of the eight standards listed, two standards appeared to be met:

- ii. *The parcel has frontage on a major or secondary thoroughfare and is of a narrow width, as measured along the thoroughfare, which makes platting difficult.*

Regarding item ii, the site fronts on Nine Mile Road. It has a width of 330 feet. With a 60-foot right-of-way, lots on either side have an available depth of 135 feet. The RA-2 district typically requires 35-foot setbacks in both the front and rear, leaving 55 feet of depth for a building

envelope. The cluster option allows the applicant to request, and the Planning Commission and City Council to approve, flexibility in the setbacks to increase the size of the building envelopes on the lots.

- v. *A substantial portion of the parcel's perimeter is bordered by land that is located in other than an RA district or is developed for a use other than single-family homes.*

Regarding item v, two of the four property lines border single family uses, and two border other uses. The sites to the north are developed as industrial uses under a consent judgment. Sites to the west are primarily multi-family (65% of west property line), and the remainder is a non-residential day care use. To the east, all sites are developed as single family homes. The neighborhood along the northern half of this property line is developed at or near the permitted RA-2 density, while the southern half of this property line is a single, large-lot property. The Walnut Ridge development to the south across Nine Mile Road is developed with significant common areas, and appears to be at or near the permitted density of the RA-2 district.

Other considerations:

1. Master Plan. The property is designated Quasi-Public on the Future Land Use Map. The quasi-public use of the site has ended. It does not fall into any Special Residential Planning Areas, nor any other special study areas. Properties to the south and east are designated single family, while the property to the north is designated for industrial, reflecting its current use, and property to the west is primarily designated multi-family, with a single family designation along the Nine Mile frontage.
2. Residential Densities Map. The residential densities map designates this land as low-medium density. This category includes the RA-2 district.

Planning Commission discussion included:

- Minimum average lot size in the RA-2 District is 16,500 square feet. A property the size of the subject site would give 26 lots, or 2.5 du/acre under traditional zoning if it could be developed so that all the lots fit on the parcel.
- The subdivision to the east, with 23 homes on 13 acres, had approximately 1.8 units per acre, with lots ranging from 15,000 to 18,000 square feet.
- The allowed density rarely fit completely, because there had to be room for roads, storm water management, etc.
- Lana Court's cul-de-sac was 1,200 feet long. The proposed cul-de-sac was under 1,000 feet. If measured from the stub street, the proposed cul-de-sac was approximately 600 feet long. In any event, fire suppression would be included in each unit.
- The homes would range between 1,700 and 2,100 square feet, with price points from the low \$400,000 to \$450,000 range. The proposed development met a need for age-targeted housing in the City.
- Commissioner Schwartz gave some history of a Pulte development in Farmington Hills that was developed several years ago, where Pulte had worked with neighboring residents to meet concerns in an open, transparent way.

Chair Stimson opened the public hearing.

June Benninger, 38300 Nine Mile Road, was concerned regarding where residents and their guests would park, if there would be basements, how landscaping and tree replacement would be handled, and drainage issues.

Jim Campbell, 38336 Lana Court, was concerned regarding what kind of landscape buffer would be provided.

Todd Trombley, 38240 Lana Drive, President, Heritage Village Home Owner's Association, reviewed his letter dated November 18, 2020 which stated the collective concerns of the 23-home Heritage Village community.

- The neighborhood felt that the property could be developed under normal RA-2 zoning, without the cluster option, based on available lot sizes. The lot sizes proposed by Pulte were 55 feet wide, or approximately half the widths of the neighboring single family parcels.
- The transition was really from east to west, with the LI zoning to the north not much of a factor.
- Traffic was already very heavy on Nine Mile Road, and occasionally backed up eastbound from Haggerty to Halsted, especially during peak traffic times.
- Also, due to the slope of the property, it was difficult to exit onto Nine Mile Road. Regardless of the size of the development, a passing lane heading east and a turn-in lane from the west were imperative.
- Surrounding single family housing were on lots that were sized a little less than .5 acres. The proposed 0.16 acre lots represented a drastic change, and the small homes and lots will not conform to the area and are likely to detract from existing property values.
- The subject property is clearly desirable, as evidenced by its brief time for sale and pursuit by one of the leading home builders in the country. It does not stand out as a location that would need to resort to cluster homes. Heritage Village residents encouraged a development plan that meets existing RA-2 district standards. To settle for cluster development seems premature.

Eric Devore, 38348 Lana Court, agreed with comments already made. A wider aerial view of the site would show many single-family homes, with homes south of Nine Mile Road selling in the range of \$450,000-\$650,000. He was most concerned with property values being negatively impacted.

Ms. Benninger, speaking again, asked if the community would be age restricted to those 55 and older.

Frank Adams, 38300 Lana Court, agreed with previous comments. He was also concerned that with a 35-foot setback, residents on Lana Court would lose their privacy, and their property values would be lowered. If the proposed development did not have sidewalks, homes could be moved closer to the street and the rear setbacks increased. He was concerned about trees planted as a buffer dropping their leaves in the fall, causing further property maintenance and cleanup on his property. He thought that seniors might have a difficult time affording homes in this community. Last, what would happen with the fence on the rear property line?

City Planner Stec read three letters into the record:

- Jillian Hukill, owner and operator of the Little Tree Huggers Child Care Center, 38620 Nine Mile Road, listed concerns about negative impacts to her business, and safety of the children in the daycare during the construction period, specifically regarding standing water in the detention area, mosquitoes, and workers potentially walking on her property.

- James and Kathy Ciolfi, 38276 Lana Court, were concerned about the higher density and smaller lot sizes, inadequate setback, drainage, landscape buffer, and any two-story structures facing the existing single-family development, causing a loss of privacy.
- Mari and John McElroy, 38250 Nine Mile Road, asked for a better plan that would serve the long term neighbors as well as the City. They did not feel the proposed plan was well thought out, with a dangerous exit onto Nine Mile Road, and a layout that did not fit with surrounding development. They were also concerned that construction traffic would damage Nine Mile Road, which had been recently paved.

Seeing that no other public indicated they wished to speak, Chair Stimson closed the public hearing and invited the applicant to address public comments.

Mr. Noles gave the following information:

- Parking would be provided per ordinance. Each unit would have a two-car garage and the capability of parking two more cars in the driveway. There would be public parking on one side of the street only.
- Both a basement and slab option would be offered. Typically 80% of the homes would have basements.
- The development would improve drainage in the area. Rear yard storm water plans and storm water detention would meet current standards and provide for a 100-year flood event.
- The development would be “targeted” but not “restricted” to older buyers, by providing features such as single floor living, wider hallways, no steps, and other features that appeal to senior living. This demographic would also affect traffic less, as they were less likely to have multiple cars such as owned by families with teenagers, and less likely to engage with rush hour traffic.
- Pulte would be happy to meet with the Home Owners’ Association. Pulte’s policy was to meet with and be transparent with the neighbors.
- The cluster option ordinance does not require the property be in a transitional zone, but rather that the property be adjacent to a transitional use – an important distinction. Being adjacent to industrial and multi-family uses qualifies the property for cluster development.
- The ordinance does not require the developer to demonstrate difficulty, but rather to meet specific criteria for the cluster option.
- The typical buyer for this development would be seeking a low maintenance home that fits their life-stage. Snow and lawn maintenance would be part of the condominium documents, and would be an ongoing perpetual requirement.
- They would work with the City Engineer to provide a safe entrance to Nine Mile Road.
- Recent real estate comps showed that homes ranged from \$300,000 - \$375,000 on Lana Court. This development will increase, and not decrease home values in the area, especially as new construction has many new qualities people are looking for.
- Regarding lot size, the 41-foot wide homes will be to scale with the lot sizes being offered.
- Mr. Noles had already been in contact with some of the neighbors regarding green belt and buffers, and Pulte had already added additional landscaping along the buffer in response to neighbor concerns. The proposed buffer trees would be conifers, pine trees and evergreens, providing a year-round opaque screen, and would not drop leaves.
- The large single home to the west of this development is a commercial day care center. Pulte also cares about the safety of the children and they will make sure no workers trespass on the day care property, and reinforce that with signage, temporary fencing, etc.

- Site condos are very similar to single family homes. This development would offer detached condominiums, and there would be no apartments or townhomes.

Commissioner Brickner noted that under traditional RA-2 zoning – and in all residential districts – the setback requirement was 35 feet, and this development met that standard. He focused on whether this property qualified for a cluster development, and the higher density option within that. The lower density of 2.1 would be closer to the single family development to the east.

Commissioner Schwartz pointed out that a cluster option gave the City some control over the type of development. A traditional development that met zoning standards did not offer that. He thought there should be conversation about adding a traffic light at an appropriate location on Nine Mile Road. He also explained that the Commission would pay a lot of attention to greenbelt landscaping, grading, and drainage.

Commissioner Schwartz said that this is a very difficult site because of its narrowness. Additionally, there is clearly a market for the type of housing being discussed. Farmington Hills needs this type of housing because 1) as residents get older they want to stay in the City, and 2) the City needs empty nesters to move out of larger family homes in order to open them up for young families.

MOTION by Schwartz, support by Mantey, that the Planning Commission makes a preliminary determination that Cluster Option 1, 2020, submitted by Pulte Homes of Michigan, LLC, qualifies for development under the cluster option per Section 34-3.17.2.B.ii, because the parcel has frontage on a secondary thoroughfare and is of a narrow width, as measured along the thoroughfare, which makes platting difficult, and further meets the standards as set forth in Section 34-3.17.17.2.A.ii of the zoning ordinance, permitting a maximum density of up to 3.1 units per acre, because the parcel is located in a transition area, based on the northern property line abutting LI-1 uses and the western property line abutting multiple family and a day care, and that it be made clear to the petitioner that final granting of the Cluster Option is dependent upon a site plan to be approved by the City Council after review and recommendation by the Planning Commission.

Chair Stimson opened the motion to discussion.

Commissioner Schwartz encouraged the petitioners to reduce the density below the maximum permitted.

In response to a question from Commissioner Countegan, Planning Consultant Tangari said the reference on page 5 of his review letter to RA-2A zoning was a typographic error; there was no RA-2A zoning district.

Chair Stimson would also like to see a lower density of 2.5 or 2.6 units per acre, closer to the RA-2 standard. He also asked if there were safety concerns regarding having the detention pond so close to the neighboring day care. Mr. Noles said they would address this issue at the site plan approval stage.

Commissioner Brickner said that the Engineering Department would ensure that all water from this site stayed on the site, and did not run off onto neighbor's property.

Chair Stimson called the vote.

Roll call vote:

Yeas: Brickner, Countegan, Mantey, Orr, Schwartz, Trafelet, Stimson
Nays: Turner
Absent: None
Abstentions: None

MOTION carried 7-1.

REGULAR HEARING

A. SITE PLAN 59-10-2020

LOCATION: 31519 Twelve Mile Rd.
PARCEL I.D.: 23-15-201-271
PROPOSAL: Renovations to existing parking lot for a restaurant in an ES
Expressway District
ACTION REQUESTED: Approval of site plan
APPLICANT: Xinhua Yu
OWNER: HHC International Properties, LLC

Referencing his November 11, 2020 memorandum, and utilizing a PowerPoint presentation shown on the Zoom screen, Planning Consultant Tangari gave the review for this request for site plan approval, for renovations to an existing parking lot for a restaurant on an approximately .5 acre lot in an ES Expressway District.

Comments and issues included:

Site Plan and Use:

There is no change proposed to the building location or size at this time. The plan proposes to extend the exterior limits of the parking lot pavement; no reason for the expansion is given. There is no change to the total number of parking spaces available on the site. The proposed additional pavement raises a number of concerns, as listed below. The applicant should revise the plan or provide a response letter to address all the items listed.

Use and Parking. There is no change to the total number of parking spaces available on the site. No use is proposed at this time, and no usable square footage for the building is provided to determine whether the current parking count met the standard for the previous use.

The applicant noted in the response letter that there is no change of use from existing restaurant use, so there will be no change in available parking. The applicant should still provide parking calculations on the site plan. A minimum of 1 space for each 85 square feet of usable floor area is required.

Parking setback. Per Section 3.5.2.J., a minimum setback of ten feet is required to the edge of the parking lot. The setback shown on the plan is 8.8 feet with the expanded pavement. The parking lot currently meets the required setback; the proposed work would result in a noncompliant setback. The setback must be increased by 1.2 feet. There appears to be adequate width in the maneuvering lane to accomplish this.

Parking dimensions: Per Section 34-5.3, a minimum of 20 feet of depth is required for a parking space. It may include a maximum two-foot unobstructed vehicle overhang area at the front of the parking space. Two regular parking spaces in the northwest corner are only 18 feet.

The applicant noted in the response letter that 2 feet overhang is available. This dimension needs to be provided on the site plan.

Dead-end off-street parking Per Section 34-5.4.15, dead-end off-street parking aisles are discouraged, especially in connection with business uses. Such aisles should be no more than eight (8) spaces deep and should, in any case, be used only when there is no reasonable alternative. If more than eight (8) spaces deep, the layout shall provide a means for vehicles to turn around if all spaces are occupied. The aisles have a maximum of 12 parking spaces, though this is an existing condition and there is a small amount of space that can aid turning around.

Loading. The site's existing nonconformities include a lack of dedicated loading areas. The following concerns should be addressed:

- **Location:** Off-street loading space shall be provided in the rear yard only. The plan proposes the loading area in the side yard. Approval of loading area in the side yard is subject to the zoning inspector or of the planning commission when the commission reviews the site plan, provided that such location is necessitated by the site conditions and provided that the area is screened from view from any public street. The applicant should indicate how the loading area is screened from view from any public street.
- **Square footage:** Off-street loading shall be provided in the ratio of at least ten (10) square feet per front foot of building. The length of building along the front is approximately 112 feet which would require about 1,120 square feet of loading area. The plan shows a 300-square-foot loading area in the interior side yard. The proposed loading area does not meet the minimum requirements for ES zoning. The applicant should indicate how the proposed square footage would meet the needs of the proposed use. For example, indicate the largest truck that would access the site.
- **Conflict with parking circulation:** The proposed location would block the access to several parking spots and possible fire access to the building. The applicant should indicate the hours of operation for loading and unloading to avoid conflicts during business hours. The applicant can also consider reserving the parking spaces in conflict for employee parking only.

Trash Enclosure. The existing trash enclosure is relocated to the eastern side yard. It appears that a zero setback is proposed from the adjacent property line. The following should be addressed on the plan:

- The enclosure is located 2.5 feet from the property line.
- The site plan includes a truck circulation diagram. We note the following concerns.
 - It does not indicate how the truck would leave the site. It only shows how the truck enters the site to access the dumpster.
 - It appears that the wheel line is going over the property line into a green area where there is an existing row of trees.

Pedestrian Connection. There is not a direct pedestrian connection to the sidewalk on 12 Mile Road. The applicant indicated in the response letter that it is an existing condition that is not intended to be changed. The Planning Commission should consider if a connection should be provided with the current improvements.

Lighting (Section 34-5.16).

The plan proposes relocating some of the existing pole lights. All lighting used to illuminate any off-street parking area shall be installed in accordance with Section 34-5.16. A lighting and photometric plan

are provided. The plan should provide additional information to verify compliance with ordinance requirements as follows.

1. The maximum permitted mounting height is 30 feet. The proposed mounting height of all fixtures must be labeled on the plan.
2. Maximum illumination at the property line is 0.3-foot candles. The foot candle values exceed the ordinance maximum in multiple places. Some of these overages are a result of existing zero setbacks for the parking lot. However, they still do not comply with the requirement.
3. All fixtures mounted within 50 feet of the public right-of-way shall be fitted with a shielding reflector. Specifications sheets showing these shields are not provided. The plans should provide information to verify compliance with this requirement.
4. Hours of operation and information about the sensor for reduced light levels must be provided on the plan to verify compliance with Sec. 34-5.16.3.B.v listed below.

Exterior lighting shall not operate during daylight hours. Building façade and landscape lighting shall be turned off between midnight or one hour after close of business, whichever is later, and 6:00am or opening, whichever is earlier. All other exterior lighting shall be reduced to no greater than 70% of maximum from midnight or one hour after close of business, whichever is later, and 6:00am or opening, whichever is earlier. Use of occupancy sensors to turn off or reduce lighting within 15 minutes of zero occupancy is recommended.

Tree Removal & Landscaping

- **Parking Lot Landscaping.** The off-street parking lot shall be provided with trees as required by Section 34-5.15. One such tree shall be provided for each two thousand eight hundred (2,800) square feet of the paved surface area on the zoning lot. There are eight existing trees along the parking lot perimeter. The square footage of pavement on the site must be provided to verify compliance.
- **Parking Lot Screening.** The existing screening knee wall adjacent to the right-of-way is proposed to remain. The proposed pavement expansion eliminates the open area between the wall and the existing edge of parking. In the event the wall is removed during construction, it should be replaced by a wall with the same dimensions and materials or by an evergreen hedge.

Planning Consultant Tangari concluded his review.

Commissioner Orr said that he did not think this plan was approvable this evening, given the lack of information and outstanding issues, especially regarding the square footage of the pavement, and he offered the following motion:

MOTION by Orr, support by Trafelet, to postpone Site Plan 59-10-2020 to the December meeting, in order to allow the applicant time to submit revised plans addressing the items in the zoning review report.

Discussion followed.

- This building had been vacant for some time, and the Commission did not want to discourage a new use. However, there were too many items missing to approve this site plan.
- Why was the applicant asking for the changes in the parking lot?
- Commissioner Countegan said he was not in favor of this motion, and would like to hear from the applicant.

Chair Stimson invited the applicant to speak.

Xinhua Yu, owner, said he had purchased this property earlier this year; it had been empty for three years. The new clients were concerned about traffic flow in the parking lot, which was small and old. The change in the parking lot was part of over-all renovations to the building.

Yadong Dong, DLZ Engineers, explained that the purpose of the parking lot expansion was to improve the accessibility of this parking lot, to making easier for customers to enter and exit. The applicants had submitted a response letter and revised plans two days ago, based on the consultant's comments. They were proposing a new dumpster location on the east side of the building, and were requesting a waiver of the screening requirements for the loading area. They would comply with the parking setback. Regarding the parking, based on the useable floor area of about 2,840 square feet, the minimum required parking was 44 spaces; 59 spaces were provided for customers and 6 spaces for employees. Currently the owner rents 30 parking spaces from the neighboring hotel.

The square footage was revised on the site plan to provide 1,100 square feet of loading area, with the anticipation that the largest truck that would access the site would not be bigger than a 30 foot single unit truck. The truck could either enter the front parking lot first and back up to loading area in the front parking lot, or enter the loading area first and back up to the front parking lot to leave the site.

Loading/unloading will mostly be done in the early morning and typically before the restaurant opens, and will last about 15 minutes. Any potential conflict can be avoided by simple coordination. Regarding the trash enclosure, a truck circulation diagram had been added to show how the truck would leave the site.

Regarding the pedestrian connection, the owner would like to keep the existing condition unchanged.

Mr. Dong concluded his remarks.

The Commission discussed whether they could move this application forward this evening. There were potential noncompliant factors that might have to be heard by the ZBA, although the Planning Commission could decide whether to accept existing conditions.

Commissioner Countegan pointed out that while the submittal was in some ways deficient, the applicants were dealing with an existing site, and he had a good sense of what they wanted to do. Nothing here was earth shattering; the applicants simply wanted to tweak the paving. He was sympathetic to what restaurateurs had gone through over the last 8 months of the Covid-19 pandemic. He thought the Commission should act on this proposal, on the assumption that staff could approve some things administratively. If that was not possible, or if a variance was needed, the applicants would simply have to return to the Commission. If the revised plans that had been submitted two days ago were not drastically different than what had been proposed, he supported moving forward.

Commissioner Orr did not think the Commission had enough information to act this evening. Things submitted two days ago had not had a chance to be reviewed.

City Planner Stec thought it might be a good idea for the Planning Commission to see the revised plan. However, if the Commission wanted him to deal with this administratively, he could do that, and bring it back to the Commission if variances were required. Still, he would feel more comfortable if the Planning Commission reviewed this plan.

Commissioner Orr said he would keep his motion to postpone on the table. Support Trafelet agreed, and said he would like to hear more about the 30 spaces being rented from the neighboring hotel. Also, the restaurant used to have seating in the lower level in front of the kitchen; if that changed the square footage might be affected. He agreed the plan should come back to the Planning Commission.

City Planner Stec pointed out that shared parking was under the purview of the Commission, and should be approved by them.

Commissioner Countegan said he would oppose the motion, and if it failed, he would be willing to make an approving motion with conditions.

The Chair called the vote.

Roll call vote:

| | |
|--------------|--|
| Yeas: | Brickner, Mantey, Orr, Schwartz, Trafelet, Turner, Stimson |
| Nays: | Countegan |
| Absent: | None |
| Abstentions: | None |

Motion carried 7-1.

B. REVISIONS TO SITE PLAN 72-11-2019

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| LOCATION: | 38215 Ten Mile Road |
| PARCEL I.D.: | 23-30-127-038 |
| PROPOSAL: | Vehicle parking and display for auto dealer in a B-3, General Business District |
| ACTION REQUESTED: | Approval of site plan |
| APPLICANT: | Gulliver USA, Inc. |
| OWNER: | Manhattan Manor, LLC |

Referencing his November 11, 2020 memorandum, and utilizing a PowerPoint presentation shown on the Zoom screen, Planning Consultant Tangari gave the review for this request for site plan approval for vehicle parking and display for an auto dealer in a B-3 General Business District.

At its meeting on December 10, 2019, the Planning Commission granted approval for the establishment of a used automobile dealer in an existing shopping center, specifically approving the reservation of 50 inventory spaces and 4 display spaces, all of which were in excess of the total required parking spaces for the shopping center under current ordinances.

The applicant was now proposing to revise the originally approved site plan. Whereas the previous plan included no physical changes to the site, this plan proposes to fence the area of the parking lot containing the inventory spaces. The display spaces are not proposed to change.

The site has 338 parking spaces. The applicant proposes to assign 51 of them to the dealership, including the 4 display spaces. The 47 inventory spaces are located in the rear yard. 15 other spaces will be eliminated. The applicant has provided a breakdown of uses on the site by square footage.

The reservation and elimination of the spaces affected by this plan does not affect the overall site's compliance with parking requirements.

Planning Consultant Tangari suggested any approval should be conditioned on:

- Where the chains cross the drive aisles, there should be a reflective coating on them, so if someone comes through in the middle of the night, the chains would be obvious.
- The chains and posts should be removed should the car dealership vacate the property.

In response to questions from Chair Stimson, Planning Consultant Tangari said as far as he knew there was no shared parking agreement between this property and the neighboring office building. There might, however, be a cross access agreement.

MOTION by Orr, support by Trafelet, that Revised Site Plan 72-11-2019, dated Oct. 13 2020 , submitted by Gulliver USA, Inc., be approved because it appears to meet all applicable requirements of the Zoning Chapter, subject to the following conditions.

- 1) Reflectors or a reflective coating be provided on the chain fence where it crosses over parking lot drive aisles.
- 2) Post and chains be removed if the car dealership no longer occupies the location.

Chair Stimson invited the applicant to speak.

Applicant Arthur Kaljian, architect, said the posts would be 3.5" in diameter, go down 3-4 feet, and were designed so as to be easily removeable. They estimated the post and chains could be removed and the pavement patched within about 5 hours. They would provide reflective chains, as requested.

This change to the site plan was being required by their insurance company.

Chair Stimson called the motion.

Roll call vote:

| | |
|--------------|---|
| Yeas: | Brickner, Countegan, Mantey, Orr, Schwartz, Stimson, Trafelet, Turner |
| Nays: | None |
| Absent: | None |
| Abstentions: | None |

MOTION carried 8-0.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES October 15, 2020

MOTION by Brickner, support by Turner, to approve the October 15, 2020 meeting minutes as published.

Roll call vote:

| | |
|--------------|---|
| Yeas: | Brickner, Countegan, Mantey, Orr, Schwartz, Stimson, Trafelet, Turner |
| Nays: | None |
| Absent: | None |
| Abstentions: | None |

MOTION carried 8-0.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public indicated that they wanted to speak.

COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS

Commissioner Orr asked for enforcement on the landscaping at the BP gas station at Grand River and Halsted.

Commissioner Orr referred to the discussion held on November 5 regarding developing a zoning district for smaller lots. He pointed out that typically the City used dwelling units per acre. However, perhaps a standard could be developed around "living spaces per site." This evening the Pulte representative had used the term: lot size to scale, which was a good way to describe such a standard.

Commissioner Schwartz asked for follow-up regarding the amount of funds in the tree fund and how that was being used. Perhaps the Planning Commission could be involved in the thought process as to how tree fund monies were used, and he suggested some of the funds might be used to plant trees to screen houses near I-275. Commissioner Trafelet pointed out that tree fund monies were used to plant trees in the boulevards.

Chair Stimson noted that the Ginopolis site often had semi-trucks parking in its vacant space, sometimes for long periods, so that it was resembling a semi-truck parking lot. City Planner Stec said he would pass this on to enforcement.

The next meeting will be December 17.

ADJOURNMENT:

MOTION by Brickner, support by Trafelet, to adjourn the meeting at 9:57 pm.

Roll call vote:

| | |
|--------------|---|
| Yeas: | Brickner, Countegan, Mantey, Orr, Schwartz, Stimson, Trafelet, Turner |
| Nays: | None |
| Absent: | None |
| Abstentions: | None |

MOTION carried 8-0.

Respectfully Submitted,
John Trafelet
Planning Commission Secretary

/cem