

**MINUTES
CITY OF FARMINGTON HILLS
PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBER
31555 11 MILE ROAD, FARMINGTON HILLS MI
October 16, 2014**

Chair Topper called the Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. on October 16, 2014.

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

Commissioners Absent: none

Others Present: Staff Planner Stec, Traffic Engineer Saksewski, Civil Engineer Darnall, Fire Marshall Olszewski, City Attorney Dovre, Planning Consultants Arroyo and Stirling

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Commissioner Rae-O'Donnell suggested amending item B to read:

PROPOSAL: *Building and* Parking lot addition to LI-1, Light Industrial District.

MOTION by Rae-O'Donnell, support by Orr, to approve the agenda as amended.

Motion carried unanimously.

REGULAR HEARING

A. SITE PLAN AND LANDSCAPE PLAN 60-6-2014

LOCATION:	34405, 34505, 34555 & 34605 Twelve Mile Road
PARCEL I.D.:	22-23-16-104-012, 013, 014, 017
PROPOSAL:	Parking lot addition in OS-4, Office Research District
ACTION REQUESTED:	Approval of Site and Landscape Plan by Planning Commission
APPLICANT:	Stan Finsilver/Brian Bass of Friedman Integrated Real Estate Solutions
OWNER:	Arboretum I, LLC, Arboretum II, LLC, Arboretum R, LLC & Arboretum III, LLC

Planning Consultant Arroyo referred to his review letter of October 6, 2014 as he described the location of this application for site plan and tree removal permit on a request to expand shared parking for the Arboretum Office Park. The 36.5 acre property was located between West 12 Mile Road and I-696 and Drake and Farmington Roads. The project area was identified as 1.36 acres within the Unit 2 (8.86 acres). The property was primarily zoned OS-4 Office Research District, with a small portion zoned OS-2 Planned Office District located in the northwest corner fronting West 12 Mile Road.

Planning Consultant Arroyo explained that the Planning Commission at their July 17, 2014 regular meeting postponed action on the site plan dated June 18, 2014 to allow the applicant time to submit a landscape plan for review concurrently with the site plan. The motion was approved as follows:

Motion by McRae, support by Orr, to adjourn Site Plan No. 60-6-2014, dated June 18, 2014, submitted by Stan Finsilver and Brian Bass of Friedman Integrated Real Estate Solutions, be adjourned to the August 21, 2014 meeting in order to give the Applicant time to document the existing gross and usable floor area of the office building, provide parking calculations based on the ordinance, and provide written justification for the new parking that is proposed along with submitting a landscape plan including a tree survey so that both the site plan and landscape plan can be reviewed concurrently.

General Site Plan Review

There were three regions of the site where the applicant was proposing to add parking, as shown on photos and maps provided this evening. In total, the plan proposed an additional 132 parking spaces. The regions included:

- Region A: An existing parking lot landscape area located in the southeast parking lot. The plan proposed to replace the landscaping and curb with 31 parking spaces.
- Region B: An existing landscaped area located directly east of Unit 2 and south of Unit 1. The plan proposed replacing this area with 68 parking spaces.
- Region C: An existing parking aisle and landscaped area located directly south of Unit 3 and west of Unit 2. In total, the applicant was proposing an additional 33 spaces. There were a total of 52 parking spaces in Region C (based on the existing 19 spaces being reconfigured).

The minimum off-street parking dimensions for 90-degree parking pattern were 9 by 20 feet (18 feet with 2 foot overhang) and a 20-foot aisle. The aisles appeared to meet the minimum width requirement. The parking spaces appeared to meet the minimum width and depth requirement per the Zoning Ordinance.

Business offices or professional offices required one parking space for each 220 square feet of usable floor area for the first 15,000 square feet and one parking space for each 250 square feet of usable floor area in excess of 15,000 square feet of usable floor area. The applicant had provided the following breakdown:

Unit	Address #	Gross Sq (GLA)	Usable SQ (USF)
Arboretum I	34405	134,257	110,330
Arboretum II	34505	131,935	117,140
Arboretum R	34555	22,057	17,708
Arboretum III	34605	158,640	142,215
Total		446,889	387,393

Based on the usable floor area, as provided by the applicant, a total of 1,558 parking spaces were required. The site was currently improved with 1,637 parking spaces. The applicant proposed an additional 132 parking spaces as part of this parking lot expansion, bringing the total parking spaces to 1,769. This was an excess of 211 parking spaces over the required spaces for business or professional offices.

Planning Consultant Arroyo expressed concern regarding the expansion of parking within an office park that appeared to have sufficient parking. Upon visiting the site at 9:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. on a weekday, there was an abundance of unused parking. Per the Planning Commission's request, the applicant had provided a justification for the additional parking; this justification related not to actual demand but to convenience and marketing. The Commissioners' packets included a letter addressed to the Planning Commission dated October 1, 2014 and a graphic and table of the proposed additional

parking.

Planning Consultant Arroyo noted that the totals provided for proposed parking and additional spaces did not appear to be accurate and should be revised or further described.

Planning Consultant Arroyo continued that the applicant, in his letter of October 1, 2014, expressed concern regarding marketing and securing a tenant with the current parking configuration, specifically noting the proximity of the parking spaces. The Planning Commission might wish to discuss with the applicant an alternative: modify the application by maintaining the landscape area (Unit A) to the east of Unit 2, which included a mix of evergreen and deciduous trees listed in "good" condition. This configuration would result in an additional 101 parking spaces while preserving a large landscaped area.

Planning Consultant Arroyo said that in accordance with Section 34-5.16, Exterior Lighting, a lighting plan should be submitted for review and approval of all lighting as part of the site plan approval process. Existing and proposed lighting must comply with current Ordinance requirements.

Landscape Plan/Tree Protection and Permit Review

Planning Consultant Arroyo said that the applicant had provided a landscape plan, tree survey and superimposed tree survey for consideration:

- Region A: Replace an existing landscape area (approximately 10,000 square foot) with a paved parking area (31 parking spaces) and four landscape islands. The plans showed 17 trees for removal and seven trees in the area's perimeter landscape islands.
- Region B: Replace an existing pedestrian walkway/courtyard and landscape area with a parking area containing 68 parking spaces and perimeter landscape islands. The plans showed 19 trees being removed and 17 trees being planted in the area's perimeter landscape islands. The note on L2 should be corrected to reflect the removal of 20 trees in this area. No change was required to the overall calculations.
- Region C: Replace an existing parking aisle and landscape area with a parking area containing 52 parking spaces. The plans showed two trees being removed and three trees being incorporated into the end cap islands.

Planning Consultant Arroyo continued that per Section 34-5.18.4., tree permits should be issued for only the following reasons:

- A. Trees pose a safety hazard to pedestrians or vehicular traffic or threaten to cause disruption to public utility service.
- B. Trees pose a safety hazard to buildings or structures.
- C. Trees completely prevent access to a lot or parcel.
- D. Trees unreasonably prevent development of a lot or parcel or the physical use thereof. It was the intent of this provision that a permit should not be granted for the removal of any tree where a reasonable alternative design solution existed consistent with the permitted use of the property.
- E. Diseased trees or trees so weakened by age, storm, fire, or other injury so as to pose a danger to persons, property, improvements, or other trees.
- F. Where a landmark tree was proposed for removal and there was no reasonable alternative that would allow preservation of the tree while still meeting other city requirements.

Planning Consultant Arroyo said that the Planning Commission should review this standard and

determine whether or not the applicant's proposal to increase parking in excess of the development's minimum parking requirement (per Section 34-5.2.13) was consistent with this provision.

Planning Consultant Arroyo said that the applicant had provided a landscape plan, tree survey and superimposed tree survey for consideration. The Zoning Ordinance, under Section 3-5.14.G.4., required that one canopy tree be planted in and around paved areas serving motor vehicles for every 2,800 sq. ft. of paved surface area. The project area consisted of 657,924 square feet of paved area which required a minimum of 235 trees. There were 209 existing trees within the project area (Unit 2). The applicant proposed 53 new canopy trees – 27 were noted as replacement trees and 26 were being added to comply with the minimum requirement. This did bring the total to 235 trees.

Planning Consultant Arroyo said that for compliance with Sections 34-5.14, Landscape Development and 34-5.18, Tree Protection, Removal and Replacement and their associated application checklists, it was recommended that the applicant revise the plans as follows:

- a) Include a note on the superimposed tree survey and landscape plan: "Tree Permit must be obtained from the Planning Office prior to all tree removal activity involving trees six inches (6") or more DBH in accordance with the City of Farmington Hills Zoning Ordinance."
- b) Include planting details on the landscape plan consistent with the City of Farmington Hills requirements.

Planning Consultant Arroyo continued that each tree planted in a parking lot island must be provided with an open area not less than 180 square feet with a minimum radius of 3 feet at the trunk of the tree. The applicant should provide confirmation that the minimum radius/dimensions shown on the parking lot landscape islands were sufficient to meet this requirement. Section 34-5.3 required a minimum width of clear planting area of four feet.

In response to a question from Commissioner Schwartz, Planning Consultant Arroyo confirmed that the parking standards were minimum standards; adding additional parking was not prohibited. Planning Consultant Arroyo added that environmental concerns did have to be addressed when additional parking was added.

Commissioner Schwartz suggested that when the original property had been developed, if 150 parking spots had been provided closer to the structure, thus providing 150 more parking spots at the time, it would not necessarily have been considered a bad plan. Discussion followed regarding this hypothetical situation.

Commissioner Orr noted a clerical error on Site Plan Drawing C2, in that the labels for the east parking lot and west parking lot were reversed.

In response to a question from Commissioner Blizman, City Planner Stec said the aerial photograph – which showed intensive parking on the site – was from 2010.

In response to a question from Commissioner Schwartz, City Engineer Saksewski explained that paving over areas A, B and C would probably not affect storm water management.

Commissioner Orr asked Planning Consultant Arroyo to expand on the comment in his review letter *The Planning Commission might wish to discuss with the Applicant an alternative: modify the application by maintaining the landscape area (Unit A) to the east of Unit 2, which includes a mix of evergreen and deciduous trees listed in "good" condition. This configuration would*

result in an additional 101 parking spaces while preserving a large landscaped area.

Planning Consultant Arroyo said that if the landscape area in A were to come out, landscaping could be added in a new landscaped area of a similar size more remote from the building, which would at least replace the landscaped area.

Commissioner Mantey asked City Engineer Saksewski to the October 7, 2014 Engineering Memo, item 3, which said:

The existing detention basins for this site have become filled with vegetation, especially an invasive plant called phragmites. This filling in reduces the designed volume of the basin. Since this site is increasing the impervious areas, we recommend that action be taken to remove the phragmites and restore the pond to designed volume capacity.

City Engineer Saksewski explained that the detention basins were designed according to Farmington Hills standards, and once cleaned out, would meet requirements.

In response to a question from Commissioner Rae-O'Donnell, Planning Consultant Arroyo said that the parking ordinance had been most recently amended (in the last 2-3 years) so that parking lots required fewer spaces, thus reducing large masses of asphalt/concrete.

Commissioner Stimson suggested that one alternative might be to add landscape islands toward 12 Mile Road, or toward the south and middle. This parking lot had very few landscape islands.

Applicant Stan Finsilver, Finsilver/Friedman Management Corporation, 34975 W Twelve Mile Road, Suite 100, Farmington Hills MI 48331, spoke on behalf of this application. He addressed the needs of this facility, and the purpose for appearing before the Planning Commission this evening. That is, he was not here to reduce landscaping or increase concrete. He was here to apply for a parking lot addition in order to better market the building and obtain tenants for the empty spaces. He addressed changes in office culture since this building was constructed, including the use of cubicles, thus increasing office staff. Current tenant expectations for buildings of 300,00 square feet were to fill the perimeters with offices and fill the interior spaces with cubicles, and tenants were therefore asking for 5-6 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet of office space. In the current case, that ratio could not be provided unless a parking structure was built. The applicants did not want to build a structure however, due to expense and also its obtrusive characteristics. However, they could market this space at 4 spaces per 1,000 if the tonight's application was approved. The actual ratio would be 3.962 parking spaces per 1,000.

Applicant Finsilver continued that it was important to remember that the Arboretum building had a park inside the building with trees and landscaping.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Schwartz, Applicant Finsilver said that current occupancy – including a new tenant moving in shortly – was at 19%. The current owners had purchased the property in November 2013 and had already spent \$1-3 million on interior renovations.

Commissioner McRae noted that the application was for an expansion that met Ordinance requirements; no variances were required. The justification given by Applicant Finsilver for the parking lot expansion seemed reasonable. He felt the Commission should allow this application to go forward.

Commissioner Orr requested that an approving motion reference part D. of the tree removal ordinance (Section 34-5.18.4) as referenced in the Consultant's letter, page 4:

Trees unreasonably prevent development of a lot or parcel or the physical use thereof.

Commissioner McRae confirmed that the ordinance was met requiring the number of trees required for this site.

MOTION by McRae, support by Schwartz, that Site Plan No. 60-6-2014, dated September 16, 2014, submitted by Stan Finsilver and Brian Bass of Friedman Integrated Real Estate Solutions, be approved because it appears to meet all applicable requirements of the Zoning Chapter, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. All typographical errors be corrected on the site plan.**
- 2. Lighting plan for new lights be submitted and approved administratively.**
- 3. Engineering Department approval.**

Additionally the motion recognizes that the tree removals meet the requirements of the Tree Protection, Removal and Replacement ordinance regarding tree permits for removal (Section 34-5.18.4) in that the trees being removed unreasonably prevent development of a lot or parcel or the physical use thereof.

Commissioner Blizman said that he would support the motion. He felt the request was justified and the parking was not visible from 12 Mile Road or the Freeway.

Motion carried unanimously.

MOTION by McRae, support by Blizman, that Landscape Plan No. 60-602014, dated September 16, 2014, submitted by Stan Finsilver and Brian Bass of Friedman Integrated Real Estate Solutions be approved because it appears to meet all applicable Zoning Chapter requirements.

Motion carried unanimously.

B. SITE PLAN 64-9-2014

LOCATION:	23000 Commerce and part of 23761 Research Dr.
PARCEL I.D.:	22-23-30-327-010 and part of 30-126-007
PROPOSAL:	Parking lot addition in LI-1, Light Industrial District
ACTION REQUESTED:	Site Plan approval by Planning Commission
APPLICANT:	Mike Shehadi of Americare Investment Service LLC
OWNER:	Americare Investment Services, LLC

Planning Consultant Arroyo referred to his review letter of October 6, 2014 as he described the location of this application, which was a request for site plan approval and a tree removal permit to permit a 4,130 sq. ft. building addition and 16 off-street parking spaces for a distribution business. The property was located between I-275 and Halsted Road and Ten Mile and Nine Mile Roads with access through the Farmington Freeway Industrial Park. The property, including the south 85 feet of the northerly property totaled approximately 43,325 square feet

Planning Consultant Arroyo said that the application was incomplete and should be revised before action by the Planning Commission.

General Site Plan Review

Planning Consultant Arroyo explained that the southerly property (23000 Commerce Drive) was owned by Americare Investments. According to the applicant, there was a purchase agreement with the property owner to the north at 23761 Research Drive to purchase the southerly 85 feet. A copy of the purchase agreement should be provided to the City prior to final site plan approval. In addition, the address for the northerly parcel (Lot 44) was shown on the plans as 23800 Commerce Drive. Assessing records identified this as 23761 Research Drive. This should be verified and corrected on future submittals. The southerly portion of the subject property was zoned RA-2, One Family Residential and was directed by Consent Judgment 89 entered into on July 31, 1978.

Planning Consultant Arroyo continued that Consent Judgment 89 allowed the subject parcel (contained within a 70 acre area identified in Exhibit 1-a of the Judgment) to be developed and used for those uses permitted and subject to the conditions and provisions applicable to the LI-1, Light Industrial District of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Farmington Hills. The following conditions of the Consent Judgment impacted the development of the subject property:

- a) No vehicular access was permitted except through the existing Farmington Freeway Industrial Park. No changes to the access from Commerce Drive were proposed.
- b) All outdoor lighting, including lighting of parking lots, must be so situated and shielded so as to not shine unreasonably upon adjacent residential properties. Freestanding lamp posts and similar outdoor lighting fixtures must not exceed 35 feet in height. A photometric plan and lighting fixture details had not been provided.
- c) Exhibit C-1 of the Consent Judgment required adherence to specific landscape, berming and an Open Space and Retention Basin Maintenance Agreement. The applicant should provide a copy of Exhibit C-1 and confirm that their plan was in compliance with the Consent Judgment.

Planning Consultant Arroyo said that the subject parcel consisted of 130 by 200 feet/205 feet, or 26,325 square feet. It was improved with a 10,074 square foot one story industrial building and 21 off-street parking spaces which were located to the north and west of the existing building. The adjacent property to the south had parking located along the adjoining property line. The aerial identified a north-south access drive between the properties.

Planning Consultant Arroyo continued that the applicant had indicated they had a purchase agreement for 85 by 200 feet, or 17,000 square feet, of the south portion of 23761 Research Drive. This land area was open space with a mix of deciduous trees. Overhead utility lines ran north-south along the westerly portion of the site and east-west along the southerly portion. The extent of the utility easements should be indicated on the site plan. The remainder of the northerly property should also be shown as part of this submittal to confirm setbacks and other ordinance provisions were met for the parent parcel after the property transfer.

Planning Consultant Arroyo explained that the applicant proposed to combine the 85 feet with the existing parcel, resulting in a 215 by 200 feet, or approximately 43,325 square foot parcel. A 4,130 square foot addition was proposed to the existing 10,074 square foot one story industrial/office building resulting in a 14,204 square foot building. The applicant had not provided building details as part of this submittal. The proposed building setbacks met ordinance standards.

Per Section 34-5.2, the parking requirements for industrial or research establishments were 3 plus one for every one and one-half employees in the largest working shift, or 3 plus one for each 550 sq. ft. of usable floor area, whichever was greater. As submitted, the plan exceeded the minimum parking

requirements by 15 parking spaces.

Off-street parking spaces may be located within a side or rear yard but could not be located within a minimum front yard setback, in accordance with Section 34-5.2. Per Section 34-3.5.S., off-street parking for visitors, over and above the number of spaces required under Section 34- 5.2, may be permitted within the required front yard provided that such off-street parking was not located within 20 feet of the front lot line and provided further that the number of such spaces did not equal more than 10% of the total number of spaces required.

Planning Consultant Arroyo pointed out that the site plan showed parking spaces within the required building front yard setback and within 20 feet from the front lot line. The spaces outside of the 20-foot setback may be justified by the applicant on a future submittal, but those located within the minimum 20-foot setback needed to be removed.

The applicant proposed 17 new parking spaces with the expansion and reconfiguration of the parking lot. The minimum off-street parking dimensions for 90-degree parking pattern were 9 by 20 feet (18 feet with 2 foot overhang) and a 20-foot aisle. The north-south access aisle located at the southwest corner of the site was less than 20 feet in width; this was an existing condition. Remaining access aisles appeared to meet the minimum width requirement. The parking spaces also appeared to meet the minimum depth and width requirements. However, the applicant should verify that all parking spaces and aisles complied with the dimensional requirements.

Planning Consultant Arroyo explained that per Section 34-5.4, off-street loading and unloading was required for this building size at a ratio of 1 space for 1,401-20,000 square feet of gross floor area. The site plan identified an overhead door located on the east building wall of the proposed building expansion. There were no other designated areas for loading and unloading. The applicant would need to provide a designated area in compliance with Section 34-5.4 on future submittals. Consideration should also be given to truck maneuvering and site access. Section 34-5.4.4. required that access to the loading/unloading area be designed in such a manner as to allow trucks to enter and leave the loading area without having to back from or onto the public street.

Regarding trees, canopy trees in parking lots and other paved areas were required per Section 34-5.14.4. Canopy trees should be planted in and around paved areas serving motor vehicles, such as, but not limited to, parking lots, loading area, display areas and waiting areas. The provisions required that one canopy tree be provided for each 2,800 square feet of the paved surface area on the zoning lot. It also required that trees be distributed evenly throughout the paved area with a minimum planting area of 180 square feet and a minimum 3-foot radius around the trees. There were no planter islands proposed. A landscape plan was required for review and approval by the Planning Commission.

Regarding retention, the site plan included a retention pond located on the acquired portion of property. Review of engineering design standards, landscape plans and the Consent Judgment (associated with 23000 Commerce Drive) should be included as part of the site plan review process.

Planning Consultant Arroyo continued that the applicant had submitted a site plan with topographic/tree survey overlay (C.2.0), site plan (C.1.0), and a topographic survey and tree survey (CS.1.0 – existing conditions). The plans did not include the detail necessary to complete a thorough review. Missing items from the site plan included:

- a) The location of all existing and proposed structures on the subject property and all existing structures within 50 feet of the subject property (as presented on the site plan).

- b) The location and right-of-way widths of all abutting streets and alleys and the location of driveways or intersecting streets within 100 feet of the zoning lot (as proposed) on either side of the abutting street.
- c) The location and detail of lighting structures, if applicable. A full photometric plan with lighting fixtures was required as part of the site plan review and must be in compliance with Consent Judgment 89.
- d) The legal description of the parcel. This should include a legal description of the property to be acquired.
- e) The off-street loading/unloading area should be shown on the plan and must comply with Section 34-5.4.
- f) Rooftop equipment should be screened in accordance with Section 34-5.17.15.

The applicant proposed to relocate the dumpster to the north.

Tree Protection Permit Review

Planning Consultant Arroyo noted that the applicant had provided a site plan with a tree survey overlay. The plans showed the two-foot intervals and spot grades. It identified the general location of the trees and an identifying number. However, the following information was lacking and should be provided:

- a) A list of all trees on site with their corresponding tree inventory number and disposition, including the common name, botanical name, size, and condition.
- b) Tree surveys were to be performed by a registered land surveyor and verified on site by a registered landscape architect, arborist or forester.
- c) A superimposed tree survey showing the total number of trees to be removed and the total number of replacement trees required to be planted on site indicated in table form.
- d) 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 how they are to be maintained after construction.
- e) A statement showing how trees to remain are to be protected.
- f) The location of protective materials, in accordance with the Tree Protection Ordinance provisions.
- g) A tree survey superimposed over the proposed improvements showing the extent of the development and the location of all removed trees in compliance with Section 34-5.18.
- h) Section 34-5.18.4.F. identified reasons for issuing a tree permit and suggested that a permit be granted where a landmark tree was proposed for removal and there was no reasonable alternative that would allow preservation of the tree while still meeting other city requirements or where trees unreasonably prevent development of a lot or parcel. The removal of the landmark tree and several trees located within the building's front yard was being proposed to support parking in excess of the City's off-street parking requirements. Consideration should be given to reducing the total number of parking spaces to allow for the preservation of existing canopy trees.
- i) A note needed to be included on the superimposed tree survey and landscape plan: "Tree Permit must be obtained from the Planning Office prior to all tree removal activity involving trees six inches (6") or more DBH in accordance with the City of Farmington Hills Zoning Ordinance."
- j) The existing grade at the base of each tree should be indicated on the tree survey using contour lines at two-foot intervals or spot grades.

- k) Tree survey and superimposed tree survey were to be performed by a registered land surveyor and verified on site by a registered landscape architect, arborist or forester. Signatures and seals were required from both.

City Planner Stec noted that the applicant had provided a purchase agreement with the owner of 23761 Research Drive as required.

Chair Topper recognized Fire Marshal Olszewski, who explained that the proposed plan did not meet the minimum Fire Department access and hydrant coverage requirements outlined in Chapter 12 of the Fire Prevention Code; therefore the Fire Department did not recommend approval under the Alternate Protection Provision of the Fire Prevention Code. In addition, the building might be required to have a fire alarm system and a fire suppression system based on occupancy use and potential occupant load as required by the Michigan Building Code.

Specifically, Fire Marshal Olszewski said that there was an approximate 130-foot dead end driveway on the west side of the property; there was no place for emergency vehicles to turn around.

In response to a question from Commissioner McRae, City Attorney Dovre said that the missing exhibit C-1 from the Consent Judgment did need to be included as it would show the boundary of the Consent Judgment. Without that exhibit, the application could not move forward.

Mike Shehadi of American Investment Services LLC was present on behalf of this application. Teon Sujak of Sujak Engineering PLC was also present.

Applicant Shehadi said that the Zoning Map did not show this property as part of the Consent Judgment. Commissioner McRae explained that the Planning Commission needed more formal documentation to show this.

Chair Topper encouraged the applicants to meet with Planning and Fire Department Staff to further work out the details of this proposal.

In response to a question from Commissioner Blizman, Applicant Shehadi said they had not received a copy of the Clear Zoning review letter prior to this meeting.

MOTION by Blizman, support by Fleischhacker, that consideration of Site Plan No. 64-9-2014, dated September 18, 2014, submitted by Mike Shehadi of Americare Investment Services LLC, be postponed to a date uncertain to allow deficiencies noted in the October 6, 2014 Clearzoning review letter and the October 7, 2014 Fire Marshall review letter to be addressed. Conformance with all aspects of Consent Judgment #89 regulating the property must also be clarified.

Motion carried unanimously.

C. SITE AND LANDSCAPE PLAN 65-9-2014

LOCATION:	36600 Grand River Ave
PARCEL I.D.:	22-23-20-300-010
PROPOSAL:	Addition to Place of Worship in a B-2, Community Business District
ACTION REQUESTED:	Site and Landscape Plan approval by

APPLICANT:	Planning Commission
OWNER:	Lindhout Associates architects Michigan Bhakti Center

Commissioner McRae revealed a conflict of interest in that his company had an interest in this proposal; therefore he would recuse himself. Chair Topper asked that the record show that Commissioner McRae left the room for this agenda item.

Planning Consultant Stirling referred to the Clearzoning review letter of October 6, 2014 (amended on October 16, 2014) as she described the location of this request for site plan and landscape plan approval to permit a 9,600 square foot building addition and 112 parking spaces for a religious institution, located on the north side of Grand River Avenue between Halsted and Drake Roads. The property consisted of 1.9 acres.

Planning Consultant Stirling said that the application was incomplete at the time of review and should be revised before action by the Planning Commission.

Planning Consultant Stirling explained that the 1.9-acre parcel was most recently used as a restaurant. To the south of the property was the City of Farmington which was developed with multiple-family residential. The land uses to the east and west were commercial/office and to the north was multiple-family and senior living facility. The subject property and the property to the west were zoned B2, Community Business District. The property to the east was zoned OS-1, Office Service District. The B2 and OS-1 zone districts were split by a north-south access drive leading to multiple family residential which was zoned RC-3, Multiple Family Residential District.

Planning Consultant Stirling explained that the applicant proposed to convert the existing restaurant to a religious institution; churches were a principal permitted use in the B-2 Community Business District. The floor plan identified areas within the existing/proposed building for use as a prayer hall, classrooms, kitchen and multipurpose areas, priest living quarters (5 rooms) and other accessory and supporting rooms.

The subject parcel was 256.71 by 330 feet or 84,714 square feet or 1.93 acres. It was improved with a commercial building with approximately 11,000 square feet of floor area. To the west of the building was an outdoor/covered sitting area, previously used for outdoor dining. There were 88 parking spaces located to the north and west of the building.

Planning Consultant Stirling noted that the site had access from Grand River Avenue at the southwest corner and Lochdale Drive which was a loop road between the multiple-family development to the north and the commercial properties fronting Grand River Avenue. Lochdale Drive ran east-west and connected to Grand River Avenue via Independence Office Drive, which was constructed as a boulevard and ran along the easterly property line.

Planning Consultant Stirling continued that the applicant proposed to expand to the west of the existing building and remove the outdoor seating area. The approximately 72.3 feet by 76.8 feet two-story proposed building expansion would cover approximately 5,168 square feet with 9,600 square feet of floor area. The existing and proposed building setbacks were as follows:

	B-2 Zone Requirements	Existing Building	Proposed Expansion
Yards	Required	Existing Condition	Proposed
South – Front Yard	75 feet	52 feet	75.1 feet
East – Side Street/Residential	75 feet	32 feet	108.4 feet
North – Side Street/Residential	75 feet	152 feet	128 feet
West – Side Yard	20 feet	139.9 feet	67.6 feet

The existing building did not comply with current Ordinance setback requirements. The proposed expansion exceeded the minimum setback requirements. Per Section 34-3.1.24, a 20% front yard open space was required. This also appeared to be met, but should be verified by the applicant providing appropriate documentation.

Planning Consultant Stirling said that the applicant proposed expanding the number of off-street parking spaces from the existing 88 to 112, an increase of 24 spaces. Per Section 34-5.2.13, places of worship or religious assembly such as a church, synagogue or mosque required one for each three fixed seats, one for each six feet of pews or benches and one for each 30 square feet of assembly floor area without fixed seats, including all areas used for worship services at any one time. The applicant noted that the lower level of the building was not used simultaneously with the upper level. The assembly area without fixed seating was documented as 3,035 square feet. The areas included in the calculations included a prayer hall (1,985 square feet) and three classrooms (1,050 square feet). Based on the assembly floor area, 101 parking spaces were required. There were also 5 one-room living quarters shown on the lower level. The residential use required two parking spaces per dwelling unit. An additional ten parking spaces were required which brings the total required parking to 112 spaces. In order to verify that these totals were sufficient, the applicant should provide information regarding worship service days/times, use of the classrooms and expected number of parishioners expected at the worship service and in the classroom.

Planning Consultant Stirling further explained that the proposed layout had been modified to include 90 degree parking stalls with a reduction in landscape areas and internal drive aisles. The westerly bank of parking stalls currently had an internal access drive to the east. This proposed site plan showed the internal access drive removed so that vehicles would be required to use Lochdale Drive to access the easterly parking stalls and building entrance. A gate would close that access when the temple was not in use.

The applicant proposed an additional 17 parking spaces with the expansion and reconfiguration of the parking lot. The minimum off-street parking dimensions for the 90-degree parking pattern were 9 by 20 feet (18 feet with 2 foot overhang) and a 20-foot aisle. In the existing condition, the north-south access aisle located at the southwest corner of the site was less than 20 feet in width. Remaining access aisles appeared to meet the minimum width requirement. The parking spaces appeared to meet the minimum depth and width requirements of the Ordinance.

Per Section 34-3.52.J., parking may be permitted within the required front yard setback, provided that the parking setback was not less than 10 feet and an area within the front yard, including the ten feet, remain as lawn or landscaped area which was equal to the specified percentage of the area of the required front yard setback. The site plan, as scaled, showed parking spaces within the required setback from the Lochdale right-of-way line and from the 10 foot easement taken for the expansion of

Grand River Avenue (110 foot road right-of-way).

Planning Consultant Stirling pointed out that off-street loading and unloading was required for the B Zoning District, and an off-street loading space should be provided in the rear yard only and in the ratio of at least 10 square feet per front foot of building. The applicant did not show a designated off-street loading and unloading facility; this needed to be done along with a description of anticipated need.

Planning Consultant Stirling noted that this site included significant grade changes. Canopy trees in parking lots and other paved areas were required per Section 34-5.14.4. and should be planted in and around paved areas serving motor vehicles, such as, but not limited to, parking lots, loading areas, display areas and waiting areas. One canopy tree was required for each 2,800 square feet of the paved surface area on the zoning lot. It was also required that trees be distributed evenly throughout the paved area with a minimum planting area of 180 square feet and a minimum 3 foot radius around the trees. In the current instance, there were no planter islands proposed.

Planning Consultant Stirling went on to explain that currently, the total paved area was shown at 35,632 square feet. Based on one tree for each 2,800 square feet of paved surface, 13 trees were required. The landscape plan showed 10 additional trees on the perimeter landscape islands and front yard (adjacent to the parking lot). There were three existing trees located adjacent to the parking area. Additional trees were located along the east property line, adjacent to Independence Drive.

Planning Consultant Stirling noted that all parking lots were required to be separated from a public thoroughfare by a planted hedge of small shrubs as defined by subsection 34-5.14.3.F.c., or by a masonry wall or berm a minimum of 2 feet high. The landscape plan did not contain any hedges located adjacent to the parking lots; the plans should be revised to include a planted hedge or screening wall/berm on future submittals.

Regarding tonight's submission, not enough detail was provided to allow a thorough review of the topographic/landscape plan. Information still needed included:

- a) Proposed treatment of all ground surfaces other than paved surfaces
- b) Treatment of front yard landscaping.

Planning Consultant Stirling noted that rooftop equipment should be screened in accordance with Section 34-5.17. Height requirements were met.

Last, in accordance with Section 34-5.16, Exterior Lighting, a lighting plan was required for review and approval of all lighting as part of the site plan approval process. Existing and proposed lighting was required to comply with current Ordinance requirements.

Commissioner Blizman said that the Ordinance should include language that more accurately described various places of worship. In this instance a temple was being constructed; that term should be included in the Ordinance.

David A. Richardson, Lindhout Associates, Brighton MI, was present on behalf of this application as was Allan W. Pruss, Monument Engineering Group Associates, Inc., Fowlerville, MI. Members of the Michigan Bhakti Center were also present.

Mr. Richardson said that all outstanding items could be resolved. The property owners were working

at clearing the Lochdale side of the property, and were planning on adding ground cover there in the spring. The existing turf grass in the front of the site would remain. The trees on the Lochdale side would remain; small scrub trees were being removed.

Mr. Richardson noted that originally this property was a bank; the proposed addition would remove the old bank drive-through.

Mr. Richardson said that they would provide the required landscape buffer on Grand River Avenue and Lochdale. Mr. Pruss noted that there was not a lot of room along Grand River Avenue; they would work with City Staff to resolve this issue.

In response to a question from Chair Topper, Mr. Richardson described the existing and proposed lighting on the site. A lighting plan would be provided.

Regarding Items 5 and 6 in the Engineering Review memo dated September 25, 2014, Mr. Richardson said they were hoping to provide some combination of green roof, bio swale, permeable concrete walk, and/or a detention pond. There were several good options for storm water control.

MOTION by Rae-O'Donnell, support by Blizman, that Site Plan No. 65-9-2014, dated September 18, 2014, submitted by Lindhout Associates be approved because it appears to meet all applicable requirements of the Zoning Chapter, subject to the following conditions:

- 1) All deficiencies identified in the October 6, 2014 Clearzoning report be addressed in a revised site plan.**
- 2) A lighting plan be submitted for administrative review.**
- 3) A planted hedge or screening wall/berm be included to separate parking from Grand River Avenue.**

In response to a question from Commissioner Fleischhacker, Planning Consultant Arroyo said that it was not necessary to require changes in the parking in the required setback from the Lochdale right-of-way line and from the 10 foot easement taken for the expansion of Grand River Avenue as this was an existing condition.

Motion carried unanimously.

MOTION by Orr, support by Blizman, that Landscape Plan No. 65-9-2014, dated September 18, 2014, submitted by Lindhout Associates be approved because it appears to meet all applicable Zoning Chapter requirements, subject to:

- All deficiencies identified in the October 6, 2014 Clearzoning report be resolved.**

Commissioner Fleischhacker said that the Clearzoning report stated in item #18 that the landscape plan was incomplete and had not yet been reviewed by staff or by the consultants. He did not think the landscape plan should be approved.

Commissioners Orr and Blizman withdrew the motion on the floor and a new motion was offered.

MOTION by Orr, support by Blizman, to postpone review of Landscape Plan No. 65-9-2014, dated September 18, 2014, submitted by Lindhout Associates, to a date uncertain in order to give the applicant an opportunity to address the issues called out in the October

6, 2014 Clearzoning report.

Motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner McRae returned to the meeting.

D. SITE PLAN 66-9-2014

LOCATION:	38700 Country Club Dr..
PARCEL I.D.:	22-23-18-126-008
PROPOSAL:	Parking lot addition in IRO, Industrial Research Office District
ACTION REQUESTED:	Site Plan approval by Planning Commission
APPLICANT:	Douglas Falzon-Ventura & Associates
OWNER:	Nissan North America

Planning Consultant Arroyo referred to the Clearzoning review letter of October 6, 2014 as he described the location of this request, which was for preliminary site plan approval and a tree removal permit to allow for the expansion of a surface parking lot for program parking to support an existing engineering center. The 5.97 acre property was located on the north side of Country Club Drive between Twelve Mile Road and Hills Tech Drive and Haggerty and Halsted Roads. The project area was identified as 1.5 acres.

Planning Consultant Arroyo noted that the property was zoned IRO, Industrial Research Office District with FRW-3, Freeway Overlay District, as were the properties to the south, east and west. The northerly property was zoned OS-4, Office Service District. The location map on the Existing Site Plan showed the Nissan Technical Center North America (NTCNA) property on the south side of Country Club Drive; this was incorrect and should be revised prior to future submittals.

The Planning Commission at their September 18, 2014 regular meeting approved with conditions two applications submitted by Nissan North America for two building additions, an outdoor storage structure and two areas of program parking (211 spaces). The applicant was directed to submit a revised site plan for administrative review and the required landscape and lighting plan for consideration by the Planning Commission.

Planning Consultant Arroyo continued that the property was improved with a 35,700 square foot one-story industrial building and 178 surface parking spaces. The parking spaces were located to the north, east and south of the existing building. There was a loading zone and service area to the north of the building along with a paved area that appeared from aerials to be used for additional parking. There were two vehicular access drives; one at the northeast property corner and the other at the southwest property corner. The Proposed Site Plan, Sheet A2, showed all existing improvements to remain.

Planning Consultant Arroyo explained that the applicant was proposing an expansion of the existing surface parking lots to the north and west. The parking spaces were identified as “program area parking” – parking for complete program vehicles – and would be used to support the operations of Nissan North American. According to the applicant, the building contained 29,876 square feet of professional office space which required 127 parking spaces per Section 34- 5.2.13. The existing 178 surface parking spaces exceeded this requirement by 51 spaces. However, according to the City’s assessing records the building contained 15,821 square feet of professional office and 19,858 square

feet of warehouse space. The Planning Commission might wish to verify the existing use of the building to determine the parking requirements for the subject property in order to effectively evaluate the need for the applicant's request for additional surface parking spaces.

The applicant proposed an additional 225 parking spaces, bringing the total to 276 excess parking spaces. The Existing Site Plan, Sheet A1, noted 209 additional program vehicle parking spaces. There was an inconsistency in the proposed number of parking spaces shown on the submitted Proposed and Existing Site Plan sheets. This should be corrected in future submittals.

Planning Consultant Arroyo reviewed Off-Street Parking Requirements (Section 34-5.3) and Landscape Development (34-5.14) as follows:

- a) The minimum off-street parking dimensions for a 90 degree parking pattern were 9 by 20 feet (18 feet with 2 foot overhang) and a 20 foot aisle. The aisles appeared to meet the minimum width requirement. The parking spaces appeared to meet the minimum depth requirement but there were some spaces that did not appear to comply with the minimum width. The applicant should verify that all parking spaces complied with the dimensional requirements or remove them and install landscaping, where appropriate.
- b) The minimum width of clear planting area within a planter island must be four (4) feet. There were no planter islands proposed within the proposed parking areas.
- c) Canopy trees in parking lots and other paved areas were required per Section 34-5.14.4. Canopy trees were required in and around paved areas serving motor vehicles, such as, but not limited to, parking lots, loading area, display areas and waiting areas. The provisions required that one canopy tree be provided for each 2,800 square feet of paved surface area. It also required that trees be distributed evenly throughout the paved area with a minimum planting area of 180 sq. ft. and a minimum of a 3 foot radius around the trees. This provision had not been met. There were no planter islands proposed. Planning Consultant Arroyo recommended that, where existing planter islands existed, the landscape areas be extended to integrate the proposed and existing spaces. Also, larger striped areas should be considered for landscaped islands.

Planning Consultant Arroyo further explained that the excess number of surface parking spaces being proposed as part of this site plan application and the prior application No. 63-8-2014 were being proposed to support the automotive engineering center's operations. However, the number of excess parking spaces and increase in impervious surface was a planning concern. The permanent removal of landscaping, trees and open space for the construction of surface parking spaces and infrastructure that exceeded any off-street parking requirement for permitted or special uses within the zoning district should be carefully weighed against generally accepted and sound planning practices. Should the Planning Commission wish to approve the site plan with the excess parking spaces, they might wish to consider differentiating program parking areas from employee/required parking areas. The parking areas designated for employee parking should be generally located to the east and south of the building in the existing parking spaces and along the road frontage. Program vehicle parking, which might involve vehicles being parked for over 24 hours, should be located in the rear yard.

Specific design/layout concerns for parking areas included:

- a) The 13 parking spaces located at the southwest corner of the site were partially located within the front yard and adjacent to the retention pond. In order to avoid the retention pond, the parking lot and aisles had an irregular configuration and required the construction of a retaining wall. Could some of these spaces be removed, with the access aisle reconfigured to serve side and rear yard parking areas?

- b) The parking area adjacent to the existing bank of parking spaces along the north property line should be reconfigured so that the existing and proposed spaces were cohesive. Proposed spaces should align with existing parking spaces and landscape islands installed consistent with the existing design.
- c) A landmark tree tagged for removal was listed in good condition; this tree was located in the northeast corner of the site. The 34" tree could be preserved with some minor reconfiguration of the parking area.

Planning Consultant Arroyo noted that the scope of proposed work did not include any new site lighting. In accordance with Section 34-5.16, Exterior Lighting, a lighting plan must be submitted for review and approval of all lighting as part of the site plan approval process. Existing and proposed lighting shall comply with current Ordinance requirements. Consideration should be given to ensuring that the project area complied with current standards.

Regarding the Tree Protection Permit, the applicant had applied for a Tree Protection Permit and submitted a site plan with a tree survey overlay.

Planning Consultant Arroyo said that according to the plans there were 35 trees located on the property. Ten trees had been tagged to remain, 14 trees were to be transplanted and 11 trees were to be removed including the one landmark tree. A total of 17 replacement trees were required (11 at a 1:1 ratio for standard trees and 7 trees for the removal of the landmark tree).

Comments regarding the tree survey plan included:

- a) The requirement for a tree survey superimposed over the proposed improvements showing the extent of the development and the location of all removed trees in compliance with Section 34-5.18 had not been met.
- b) Section 34-5.18.4.F. identified reasons for issuing a tree permit and suggested that a permit be granted where a landmark tree was proposed for removal and there was no reasonable alternative that would allow preservation of the tree while still meeting other city requirements or where trees unreasonably prevented development of a lot or parcel. The removal of the landmark tree and several trees located within the building's front yard were being proposed to support parking in excess of the City's off-street parking requirements. Consideration should be given to reducing the total number of parking spaces to allow for the preservation of existing canopy trees.
- c) A required note needed to be included on the superimposed tree survey and landscape plan: "Tree Permit must be obtained from the Planning Office prior to all tree removal activity involving trees six inches (6") or more DBH in accordance with the City of Farmington Hills Zoning Ordinance."
- d) The existing grade at the base of each tree should be indicated on the tree survey using contour lines at two-foot intervals or spot grades; this requirement has not been met.
- e) The tree survey and superimposed tree survey were to be performed by a registered land surveyor and verified on site by a registered landscape architect, arborist or forester. Signatures and seals are required from both. This requirement had not been met.

Commissioner Orr noted that the Commissioners had not received the tree removal survey in their packets. Commissioner Blizman suggested that perhaps the landscape plan should be postponed until the next hearing.

Douglas Falzon, Ventura & Associates, Incorporated, 411 W. Thirteen Mile Road, Suite 100,

Madison Heights, Michigan 48071, was present to speak on behalf of this site plan approval request. He affirmed that a tree survey had been submitted. They had worked to correct deficiencies on the tree survey and he was somewhat dismayed that the Commission did not have a copy of this.

Chair Topper asked Mr. Falzon to proceed with his comments.

Mr. Falzon gave some background to this proposal. The subject property operated as an engineering office and warehousing facility that operated in conjunction with the Nissan facility across the street. Signage indicated a JACKO facility; JACKO was a wholly owned Nissan subsidiary. A large part of what this facility did was develop vehicles.

At the September 2014 Planning Commission meeting, Mr. Falzon had presented long-range plans for these facilities. These plans included maximizing parking in order to support programs that Nissan was looking to consolidate in this area. Very few visitors visited this site.

Mr. Falzon said that Nissan looked very carefully at their needs – present and future. The elimination of 13 spaces as suggested by Planning Consultant Arroyo constituted a 5% reduction of Nissan's required spaces – this was not insignificant to them. He pointed out that they had met with Planning Staff and City Manager Brock. Tonight's proposal met ordinance standards; suggestions for changes to the proposal were subjective in nature.

Mr. Falzon explained the proposed configuration of parking spaces. Parking islands had been reduced in order to maximize parking. Required trees would be planted along the perimeter of the lot and would form a dense screen. Currently employee parking and program parking were defined by the color of the striping on the lot. Something similar to this could continue to be provided.

Mr. Falzon affirmed that the program vehicles to be parked on the lot would be full, complete vehicles that were road ready.

Commissioner McRae called Mr. Falzon's attention to the comments in the consultant's report that indicated the parking spots in the north section did not line up correctly and might not be the required width. Mr. Falzon said it was their intention to meeting the 9 x 20 foot requirement for all parking spaces.

In response to further questions from Commissioner McRae, Mr. Falzon said that he didn't know if the existing parking spaces on the southern portion were wider than 9 feet. Nissan did not intend to cordon off any entry areas. The open unstriped blacktop on the north side was for vehicle deliveries.

Commissioner Orr suggested reconfiguring the large open blacktop space at the north of the building, and "turn the spaces in the other direction." By doing this, more than 13 parking spaces could be added, and thus the landmark tree could be saved. It appeared from the plans that there was extra space for loading and unloading. Commissioner Orr thought that the applicant was asking for a lot of pavement and changes including tree removals when they weren't using all the pavement they had now.

Mr. Falzon said that the large unstriped area was necessary for car carriers and staging vehicles. Commissioner Orr still believed that part of that area could be used for parking.

In response to a question from Commissioner Schwartz, Mr. Falzon said that the main entrance to the

building was in the southeast corner. There was another entrance near the center of the east façade. The parking lot as currently striped was divided north and south. He described the current use of the lot – where employees parked, where loading and unloading occurred and where cars were staged.

Commissioner Schwartz discussed employee parking in terms of its proximity to the building entrances. He felt that employees would park close to the doors in any event.

Commissioner Schwartz said that he drove through this property before tonight's meeting. The rear unstriped area was not a huge space. Chair Topper added that her office was close to this location and she had walked this area. She agreed with Commissioner Schwartz regarding the unstriped area; she also felt that the property did not give the appearance of a sea of parking.

In response to a question from Commissioner McRae, Planning Consultant Arroyo said that the parking close to the retention area was awkward, though it did meet Ordinance standards. A bigger concern was the proposed removal of the landmark tree. Mr. Arroyo said that the superimposed tree survey showed that it would not be difficult to save that tree.

Commissioner Schwartz indicated that he was ready to make a motion.

MOTION by Schwartz, support by Mantey, that Site Plan No. 66-9-2014, dated September 22, 2014, submitted by Douglas Falzon-Ventura & Associates be approved because it appears to meet all applicable requirements of the Zoning Chapter, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. The plan be revised to preserve landmark tree #2296 located in the northeast corner of the site.**
- 2. Deficiencies identified in the October 6, 2014 Clearzoning report be addressed in a revised site plan.**
- 3. Lighting plan be submitted and approved administratively.**
- 4. Engineering Department approval.**

Commissioner Fleischhacker said he would not support the motion. He felt the plan needed to be amended and was not ready for approval. Canopy trees were being removed but the Commission did not know where the replacement trees would be planted. He did not feel the plan could be approved without a landscape plan showing the placement of required trees.

Commissioner Blizman also felt the application was incomplete and he would not support the motion.

Commissioner McRae said that he also felt the Commission needed to see the tree survey and a landscape plan.

City Planner Stec said that the tree survey had been submitted. They were proposing the required canopy trees around the perimeter of the parking lot rather than in interior parking lot islands. This would be shown on the landscape plan, which plan was required.

Commissioner Blizman said that he could support the motion if the landscape issues called out in the Clearzoning report could be resolved during the landscape plan review.

Commissioner Schwartz amended his motion, and Commissioner Mantey agreed, to add the following condition to the motion:

5. Landscape plan be submitted for review and approval by the Planning Commission.

Mr. Falzon noted that a lighting plan had been submitted to the City, albeit too late for review at tonight's meeting.

Chair Topper called the motion.

Motion carried 7-2 (Fleischhacker, Orr opposed).

E. REZONING REQUEST 3-9-2014

LOCATION:	Northwest corner of Eldred St. and Kenwood St.
PARCEL I.D.:	22-23-35-478-001
PROPOSAL:	Rezone parcels currently zoned RA-3, One-Family Residential District to SP-1, Special Purpose District
ACTION REQUESTED:	Set for Planning Commission Public Hearing
APPLICANT:	Farmington Hills Senior Leasing
OWNER:	Farmington Hills Senior Leasing

Planning Consultant Arroyo referred to the Clearzoning review letter of October 6, 2014 as he explained that this was an application to set this request for rezoning for a public hearing. He gave brief comments regarding this application, saying that an expansion of SP-1 Zoning was being requested.

In response to a question from Commissioner McRae, Planning Consultant Arroyo affirmed that this application was ready to be set for a public hearing.

MOTION by McRae, support by Schwartz, that Zoning Request No. 3-9-2014, petitioned by Tami Hunt from Farmington Hills Senior Leasing, be set for Public Hearing on November 20, 2014.

Motion carried unanimously.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES September 18, 2014

MOTION by Fleischhacker, support by Stimson, to approve the September 18, 2014 minutes as published.

Motion carried unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENT: none

COMMISSIONER'S COMMENTS:

Commissioner Orr asked Traffic Engineer Saksewski to follow up on the dirt and mud in the Drake and Grand River intersection that was a result of the new Auto Zone construction at that location.

Commissioner Blizman commented on his recent positive experience in France, especially in the urban environments there.

Commissioner Schwartz complimented Fire Marshall Olszewski on his knowledge of City Code and on his excellent reports.

In response to a question from Commissioner Schwartz, City Planner Stec said he would follow up regarding why the applicant for Site Plan 64-9-2014 did not have a copy of the Clearzoning report before this evening. Commissioner Schwartz wondered why that applicant had not had a pre-meeting with City staff. City Planner Stec explained this was not required. Commissioner Schwartz suggested the City be proactive and push for pre-meetings with applicants.

Chair Topper commented on the brightness of the new LED lights at the Liquor Store on the southwest corner of 13 Mile and Orchard Lake Roads. City Planner Stec said these lights were supposed to be brighter during the day and dimmer at night, though this was not an ordinance requirement. He would follow up on this.

Chair Topper also asked City Planner Stec to follow up on the very bright and horizontally directed nighttime construction lights at the new Starbucks construction site at 12 Mile and Orchard Lake.

City Planner Stec reminded the Commission they had a study session on October 20.

Future hearing dates were set as follows:

November 13: Study Session
November 20: Public Hearing.
December 18: Public Hearing

There was also the possibility of another meeting in December.

ADJOURNMENT:

Hearing no further comment, Chair Topper adjourned the meeting at 9:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Steven Schwartz
Planning Commission Secretary

cem