

**MINUTES
CITY OF FARMINGTON HILLS
PLANNING COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARING
31555 W ELEVEN MILE ROAD
FARMINGTON HILLS, MICHIGAN
DECEMBER 16, 2021, 7:30 P.M.**

CALL MEETING TO ORDER

The Planning Commission Regular Meeting was called to order by Chair Stimson at 7:30 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present: Brickner, Countegan, Mantey, Schwartz, Stimson, Turner

Commissioners Absent: Trafelet, Varga
(one vacancy)

Others Present: Staff Planner Perdonik, City Attorney Schultz, Planning Consultant Arroyo, Staff Engineer Sonck

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

MOTION carried unanimously by voice vote.

PUBLIC HEARING

A. SITE PLAN 64-10-2021

LOCATION:	West side of Middlebelt Rd., south of Linden Avenue
PARCEL I.D.:	23-26-277-014
PROPOSAL:	Utilize the Major road frontage option, to build one two-unit Duplex in an RA-3, One Family Residential District
ACTION REQUESTED:	Site Plan approval by Planning Commission
APPLICANT:	Ramiz Naman
OWNER:	R.R. Naman Construction

Ramiz Naman was present on behalf of this application for site plan approval for a two-unit duplex. He had received approval from Oakland County for the two in and out approaches. The development would improve the area.

Referencing his November 9, 2021 report, Planning Consultant Arroyo gave the background and review for this application to construct a duplex in the RA-3 District. Duplexes were permitted on a major road in the RA-3 District after a public hearing, in accordance with the standards of Section 34-3.18.3.C. The duplex was designed with two garages, each with its own driveway.

All dimensional requirements were met.

Per the ordinance (34-3.18.3.C & C.18.4), the Planning Commission must make a finding regarding 3 standards:

- i. The objective of site plan review shall be to discourage rows of two-family dwellings along the major thoroughfares. To accomplish this end, the planning commission may require variety in dwelling unit orientation or access as they relate to existing and potential future uses of adjoining property and to the major thoroughfare. Site plans which require backing vehicles onto the major thoroughfare shall be permitted only if there is no alternative. Combining of driveways and easements to permit such combination may be required.

There is a duplex immediately to the south. It is designed in a different architectural style, with a similar layout, albeit with only one-car garages.

- ii. On a corner lot, no more than one dwelling entrance and/or garage shall face an existing one-family detached dwelling unit located across a separating minor residential street. *N/A.*
- iii. Notice of a public hearing shall be given in accordance with Section 34- 6.

Chair Stimson opened the public hearing. Seeing that no public indicated they wanted to speak Chair Stimson closed the public hearing and brought the matter back to the Commission.

Commissioner Schwartz noted that there was a large apartment complex directly across the street, and another more intense multi-family development on Middlebelt just a little bit to the north. The subject site was the only empty lot in an area where there were houses of worship or residential uses; none looked like they needed to be or were old enough to be torn down. Regardless of what happened on the subject site he did not believe there was any likelihood of spillover or a resulting ripple effect of rows of duplexes.

MOTION by Brickner, support by Countegan, that Site Plan 64-10-2021 to construct a two-family dwelling under the Major Road Frontage Option in an RA-3 Single-Family Residential District, dated October 6, 2021, submitted by Ramiz Naman of R.R. Naman Construction Inc., be approved because the plans adhere to duplex standards in the applicable provisions of the Zoning Ordinance.

Motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

B. AMENDMENT TO PUD PLAN 5, 1993 INCLUDING SITE PLAN 65-10-2021

LOCATION:	South side of Twelve Mile, west of Drake Rd.
PARCEL I.D.:	23-17-201-014
PROPOSAL:	Amend PUD Plan to permit retail & restaurant, in an OS-4 Office Research District
ACTION REQUESTED:	Recommendation to City Council
APPLICANT:	Michael Lawrence
OWNER:	Farmington Hills Corp. Inv., L.L.C.

Tony Antone, Kojaiian Company, was present on behalf of this application to amend PUD Plan 5, 1993 to permit retail and restaurant use. Kojaiian was the developer of the 134-acre Farmington Hills Corporate Campus. They were seeking a change in use for the 2.59-acre piece at 12 Mile Road and Investment Drive, in order to bring amenities into the Corporate Campus so the users of the campus would have more options at lunch hour, such as coffee, food, and services that might be sought during someone's free time. They were not seeking to add this use anywhere else in the PUD. This would be the first amendment to the PUD in the almost 20 years that they were the PUD developers, and they were almost "to the finish

line” in terms of final development, having only this piece and one headquarter-type parcel to the east of this piece left to develop, and they had a prospective tenant for the parcel to the east.

In response to questions from Commissioner Brickner, Mr. Antone said that no tenants were yet signed for the requested change in use.

Referencing his November 11, 2021 written comments, Planning Consultant Arroyo gave the background and review for this request for PUD amendment to permit retail and restaurant uses. Two buildings were proposed, with Building A including a 2,201 square foot drive-through restaurant and a 2,544 square foot retail space, and Building B being 5,088 square-foot retail space. There would be an outdoor dining area between the two buildings.

Outstanding issues included:

- Building height was not provided; maximum height permitted was 50 feet.
- No information was provided regarding rooftop equipment; any rooftop equipment needed to be screened.
- The location of the ordering station was unclear from the plans; 10 stacking spaces are required and 10 are provided.
- Tree replacement calculations needed to be corrected to show a total of 79 replacement trees per the PUD agreement (this is a correction from the total in the review letter). The applicant proposed to pay into the tree fund for all replacement trees.
- The hedgerow to screen vehicle lights should extend along the north side of the drive-through stacking area visible from 12 Mile road.
- Lighting information needed to be provided as outlined on pages 5-6 of the review letter; this could be approved administratively.

The Planning Commission should discuss the specific uses allowed, as the applicant had identified a category of uses only (B-2 uses).

Commission discussion:

- This request was being processed as a major change, as determined at the November 18 2021 Planning Commission meeting. The requested action was a recommendation to City Council.
- Per Fire Department review, there needed to be an adjustment in the turning radius; this could be approved administratively.
- In response to questions from Commissioner Schwartz, Mr. Antone gave the following information:
 - The rest of the PUD was office use. The 25-acre parcel to the east of the subject was still vacant; Mr. Antone thought they would be bringing plans to the Commission in February for office use of that site.
 - Given the current market for office space, having the 2.9 acres available for retail, restaurant and service uses will help keep the development more viable in terms of keeping tenants in the space.

Chair Stimson opened the meeting for public hearing. Seeing that no public indicated they wished to speak, Chair Stimson brought the matter back to the Commission for discussion and/or a motion.

MOTION by Countegan, support by Schwartz, that the Planning Commission recommend to City Council that the Amendment to PUD 5, 1993, concurrent with Site Plan 65-10-2021, both dated October

15, 2021, submitted by Michael Lawrence of Yamasaki Inc., be approved because the plans are in accordance with the objectives, goals, and policies of the Master Plan for Future Land Use, and the applicable provisions of the Zoning Ordinance, with the following conditions:

- 79 replacement trees be provided, or funds paid into the tree fund.
- Resolution of all outstanding issues identified in the November 11, 2021 Giffels Webster review letter.
- Resolution of all outstanding issues identified in the November 1, 2021 Fire Marshal memorandum, specifically including the correction of the turning radius as noted.

And with the determination that:

- This amendment includes all B-2 uses as listed in the Zoning Ordinance.

Discussion

Planning Consultant Arroyo read the list of all B-2 uses.

Motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

C. PUD PLAN 4, 2021

LOCATION:	South side of Northwestern Hw. Between Greening Street and Highview Avenue
PARCEL I.D.'s:	23-02-106-001, 002, 003, 005, 006, 007, 012, 013, 015, 016; 23-02-104-001, 004, 005; 23-02-102-002, 003, 004, 005, 013
PROPOSAL:	One 4-story, 250-unit apartment building and one 3-story 66-unit walk-up multiple family building in a B-3 General Business, in an RA-4 One Family Residential, OS-1 Office Service, and P-1 Vehicular Parking zoning districts
ACTION REQUESTED:	Recommendation to City Council
APPLICANT:	Farmington Hills Lofts, LLC, Matt Shiffman
OWNERS:	Ruch C. Langan, Trust and Ten Kids LLC

Applicant presentation

John Ackerman, Atwell, Southfield MI, was present on behalf of this request for positive recommendation to City Council for PUD Plan 4, 2021. Architect Jennifer Fritz, Humphreys & Associates, 121 W. Wacker, Chicago, was also present, as well as Matt Shiffman and other members of the development team, and members of the Langan family.

Mr. Ackerman gave the following information:

- The approximately 7-acre site on the south side of Northwestern is in a gateway location for the City, that provides a good transition between commercial uses, and from the highway to the north and existing development to the south. The project would also provide circulation through the property to the existing southern residential neighborhoods.
- The site contained 4 different zoning districts. None of the underlying zoning districts allowed for multi-family use. However, about 2/3 of the site is allocated on the Map for Future Land Use as multi-family, with the northern portion being non-center type business.
- The development included 250 1-3 bedroom units in a 4-story wrap style loft building to the north, with amenities that included courtyards, pool, and a fitness center. The proposed 3-story building to the south included 66 1-3 bedroom townhome/flats, with covered garages and surface parking. The buildings offered high quality architectural features. The southern building tenants

would have use of all the loft building amenities. There would be a dog park on the southwest corner of the Greening Street area.

- Regarding parking, 645 spaces were required; they were providing 533 spaces. 416 spaces would be garage parking, and 23 spaces would be tuck-under parking. The remaining 71 spaces would be surface parking, including 23 parallel parking spaces along Greening Street. The parallel parking spaces would not impede the Greening Street traffic.
- There were 506 bedrooms on the property, or more than one car per unit. Overall they were at 1.7 spaces per unit. In today's market, 2 parking spaces per unit was excessive. Other developments in the area had similar parking spaces per unit. For instance, Town Court in West Bloomfield had 1.67 spaces per unit, and was highly successful with no parking issues. The Bond development in Novi was approved to have 1.7 spaces per unit; this development was not yet constructed.
- Development benefits of this urban infill development included a high quality building on a gateway site. The project did a good job of unifying the various zoning districts, and the resulting residential density will benefit all the nearby commercial services. The Northwestern Highway curb cut had been eliminated. 20 feet of their property on Greening Street was being dedicated to the City so that Greening would have a full traffic corridor, with urban streetscape amenities included – pedestrian benches, dog bark, bike racks, etc. Road improvements and utility extension will help other commercial and residential uses in the area. The targeted demographic will be young professionals, adding to the diversity of population as well as spending in the City.
- The proposed building height was 52 feet, compatible with the nearby Holiday Inn Express and Hampton Inn, both of which were also 4 stories.

Ms. Fritz overviewed the buildings as follows:

- The northern loft building was a wrap style building, with 3 courtyards. Pitched roofs and a variety of materials increased the residential feel. The parking garage was minimally visible on two sides, and care was taken for the garage to reflect the same character as the building.
- High quality materials were used throughout the buildings, including several types of masonry, cementitious panels, and wood tone look products. A materials palette was part of tonight's submission.
- The 3-story U-shaped southern walk-up building with tuck-under garages provided a good transition to the neighboring residential neighborhood. Elevations showed a similar character and materials palette as the loft building.
- High quality amenities were provided both inside and outside the buildings.
- An inviting pedestrian plaza will spill out into the upgraded streetscape on Greening Street. The main amenities were located off of Greening Street.

Mr. Ackerman again addressed density on the site. The proposal was for a high end high-quality building, with significant amenities and improvements included, and the density was needed to provide economic viability for this project.

Referencing his November 11, 2021 review letter, Planning Consultant Arroyo gave the background and review for this request for recommendation of Final PUD Qualification to City Council for PUD 4, 2021. As the applicant had mentioned, there were a variety of zoning districts on the 6.2 acre site, with the addition of roughly 1.1 acres of right-of-way.

At its June 17, 2021 meeting the Planning Commission granted preliminary PUD qualification to the proposal, citing its adherence to the qualification criteria, and objectives iv, v and vii of Section 34-3.20.2.E. Planning Commissioners voting no at the time generally cited density and the scale of the

northern building as their biggest concerns. There were also calls to consider incorporating sustainability elements (electric car charging, and bicycle-friendly amenities among them). The applicant had addressed some of those issues.

Planning Consultant Arroyo summarized the PUD approval process. City Council would ultimately make the decision to approve the PUD. If approved by Council, a site plan would be submitted for review by the Planning Commission. Criteria for PUD approval were listed on pages 2-3 of the review letter; those had been discussed in detail at the June 17 meeting.

The qualification criteria cited by the applicant under Section 34-3.20.2.E. were:

- iv. To provide alternative uses for parcels which can provide transition buffers to residential areas.
The applicant notes that this use provides a transition from the Northwestern Highway corridor to uses to the south.
- v. To guarantee the provision of a public improvement which could not otherwise be required that would further the public health, safety, or welfare, protect existing or future uses from the impact of a proposed use, or alleviate an existing or potential problem relating to public facilities.
The applicant's narrative cites improvements to Greening Street, including the dedication of additional right-of-way as a public improvement. As noted above, Highview Avenue is not addressed in discussion of the qualification criteria.
- vii. To foster the aesthetic appearance of the city through quality building design and site development, the provision of trees and landscaping beyond minimum requirements; the preservation of unique and/or historic sites or structures; and the provision of open space or other desirable features of a site beyond minimum requirements.
The applicant cites high-quality architecture as meeting this criterion; examples of the type of materials and design are not provided.

Regarding density, per ordinance standards, there were 316 units, with a total of 819 rooms. The applicant supplied an incorrect total of 503 rooms; this was the number of actual bedrooms, which was different from the ordinance's density standard. The greatest density allowed under the ordinance in any zoning district – RC-3 – would be 300 rooms.

When a PUD was brought forward that departed from the underlying zoning, it was important to look to the Master Plan. In this instance, the Master Plan called the area out as a Special Planning Area, with the following specific goals and policies:

- A. Take into account the approved PUD Plan for this area. *This has been provided by the applicant.*
- B. Encourage redevelopment of the entire Farmington Heights Subdivision as a mixed-use development that could be similar to a central business district. Include the major road business frontages in the redevelopment as much as possible.
- C. Provide significant transition/buffer adjacent to existing condominiums to the south and group care facility if they remain.
- D. Encourage non-motorized access alternatives with connections to the east.
- E. Promote mixed-use development, including increased height limit, for the entire area under a unified plan, provided that:
 - Changes would be permitted only if most properties are involved and that no isolated one-family residential uses remain. Include the two existing multiple-family developments if possible.

- Intensity of uses allowed by increasing heights is in proportion to the amount of land included in the development.
- Bike paths and/or sidewalks are installed to provide non-motorized access throughout the area.
- Pedestrian friendly environments are created including landscaping, walks, trees, shrubs and street furniture .

Planning Consultant Arroyo said that the proposal provided elements of the Master Plan vision, consistent with what the Special Planning Area described.

Regarding parking, this type of development typically generated a little less parking demand. Not every one of the one-bedroom units will need two parking spaces, for example. The 1.7 parking spaces per unit was not especially troubling. If the Master Plan vision was for this type of urban development, sometimes parking needed to be reduced so that there was not a sea of parking that was never used. The PUD agreement could state that if a parking problem became apparent the applicant would need to provide appropriate remedies, such as off-site parking, but Consultant Arroyo's experience was this would probably not be an issue. If this type of development were going to happen anywhere in the City, based on the Master Plan this location and pattern might make sense. Also, businesses and restaurants in this corridor would benefit by more residential rooftops.

The plan proposed the following exceptions to Zoning Standards:

1. Use. Multi-family housing is not permitted in the underlying districts.
2. Density. The maximum density in the RC-3 district on a parcel this size would be 300 rooms. The applicant is requesting 819 rooms.
3. Height. The 52-foot height of the northern building exceeds the height limit of all underlying districts, and is closest to that of the underlying B-3 district, which is 50 feet.
4. Street side setbacks. In the underlying non-RA districts, the required street side setback is 25 feet; 13 feet and 20 feet are proposed.
5. Rear setback. In the underlying RA-4 district, the required rear setback is 35 feet, and 25 feet is proposed in one area.
6. Parking. 645 parking spaces are required, the applicant proposes 533 spaces.

Commission discussion and questions

Commissioner Brickner noted that a PUD could not be used to avoid zoning compliance.

Planning Consultant Arroyo said that since some areas planned for commercial were being incorporated into less intense residential use, justification could be made to allow greater residential density. It was not uncommon for greater densities to be requested in a PUD development, especially when tied to a Mater Plan vision.

City Attorney Schultz advised that while an applicant can't use a PUD to "go around" the required density, the Planning Commission could determine that given the constraints and multi-use districts of the site, the application was not being used to avoid zoning standards. In any event, City Council would make the final determination.

Commissioner Schwartz said that in his opinion this was the least walkable portion of the City. If the development was constructed and it became apparent there was a significant shortage of parking spaces, how would the applicants remedy this situation other than using nearby commercial property for parking?

Commissioner Mantey suggested that people who needed 2 parking spaces and couldn't obtain them would not rent at this development. The developers had proposed a large number of on-bedroom units, of which many would not require more than one parking space.

Commissioner Mantey said that he looked forward to the Master Planning Update process in terms of potentially looking at reducing parking requirements.

Planning Consultant Arroyo agreed that the availability of parking would impact who would choose to rent at the proposed development. Perhaps the applicants could relate their experience in building this type of density with this type of reduced parking. Have they ever had to provide additional parking, and if so, what options did they use?

Chair Stimson opened the public hearing.

John Clarahan, 31918 Highview, said he lived about 90 yards from the southeast corner of the proposed development. Their neighborhood acted as a small community and he was concerned that the proposed development would severely damage that. He described the state of the nearby commercial development including Home Depot and the closed Sam's Club, and also described cut through traffic that avoided the 14 Mile intersection by speeding through his neighborhood, and noise that often came from the nearby hookah lounge. Specifically, his concerns included: 1) Cut through traffic on their dirt road as already noted. 2) Elimination of the cut-through of Mulfordton Street, making Highview more attractive as a cut-through route. 3) Stagnant water breeding mosquitoes in the proposed detention pond. 4) Potential crime. 5) Noise. 6) Litter along Ludden Street being exacerbated.

Seeing that no other public indicated they wished to speak, Chair Stimson closed the public hearing and asked the applicant to address questions and concerns raised by the Commission and by Mr. Clarahan.

Regarding parking, Mr. Ackerman said they were very confident there would be no parking issues. They had never experienced an under parked project. More often, they had the opposite problem with parking fields not used. Based on current ITE (Institute of Traffic Engineers) studies and through discussion with other developers they were comfortable with 1.7 spaces per unit.

Regarding other concerns, the detention basin will not hold stagnant water; it was designed as a dry basin. Regarding cut-through and noise issues, the hope was if Rexford and Mulfordton were expanded out to Orchard Lake Road as paved corridors, drivers would choose those streets over Highview. There had been discussion regarding paving Highview, but the applicants were reluctant to do that because Highview was the primary access for the residential to the south, and the applicants were trying to direct the majority of the vehicular traffic to Northwestern or on one of the improved roads to Orchard Lake Road.

Commissioner Countegan felt the two examples provided regarding similar developments with similar parking spaces represented due diligence on behalf of the developer. If the developer was going to make the investment to construct this project, they would make sure they had enough parking, and it did not appear the developer felt compelled to provide more spaces than the 1.7 spaces per unit.

Mr. Ackerman reiterated that they were comfortable with the number of parking spaces provided. Additionally, Humphreys Architects had significant experience nation-wide with this type and size of development, with similar parking space numbers.

Commissioner Countegan emphasized that the developer, who was making this investment and had performed due diligence research, believed there was adequate parking.

Commissioner Countegan said he liked what was proposed. The Master Plan contemplated this area as a Special Planning Area; the proposed project was somewhat unique in terms of the look, the offer of parallel parking, and its density. He was not concerned with the height: 2 feet would not be discernable. Regarding density, there was a tradeoff between commercial and residential use in terms of parking and what kind of impact there would be on the infrastructure and the road system. Additionally, the parking issue had been addressed with due diligence and research, looking at similar types of developments. Other issues regarding setbacks, etc., could be addressed through a PUD amendment and plan. He liked the off-site improvements that were proposed, and the aesthetics of the overall development. The density would provide synergy and support businesses in the area. Regarding Mr. Carahan's concerns, the City needed to make sure traffic would not worsen on his street, and nuisance issues such as noise, dust and litter be handled through enforcement. The developer, traffic engineer, police department and City should work together to ensure that current residents were not harmed. Stagnant water was not allowed in retention ponds. He hoped the project did not bring additional crime to the neighborhoods; if that did occur there were resources in place to deal with it.

Chair Stimson said that 2 examples had been given of similar developments, but one of them had not been built, so there was no experience with the proposed parking. How long had the Town Court been open? Were there other examples? He'd prefer to have more than one data point.

Mr. Ackerman said the project in Novi had not been constructed; they were going to break ground shortly. They had proposed another similar development in Northville Township at Beck and 5 Mile that would be under 2 spaces per unit as well; hopefully that would be constructed in 2022. The Town Court had been operating less than a year. Another example might be The Griffin, located across from the zoo in Royal Oak, which was about a year old as well.

Chair Stimson said The Griffin offered other alternatives for parking, including street parking, and he did not think the Griffin had full occupancy yet. He was looking for something that could tell him the 1.7 spaces per unit parking worked.

Ms. Fritz said that when they planned wrap type units they always tried for 1.7 spaces per unit, and sometimes ended up with 1.6. They had developments in Ohio, Florida and Texas.

Chair Stimson said he was looking for comparable examples in this area.

Planning Consultant Arroyo said that in the event more parking was needed for this project, more parallel spaces could be added to the west side of Greening. Subject to permitting, stormwater detention could be put underground and surface parking constructed there. He tended to agree that 1.7 spaces per unit represented the actual demand.

Commissioner Mantey objected to imposing any parking minimums.

Commissioner Brickner said the detention area would help the neighbors by keeping the water on site. His concern had been with the high density, but based on the City Attorney's comments he felt the Commission could move forward with this proposal, and eventually Council would make the final decision regarding density. This property had been sitting vacant for decades; this project appeared to be a

good use for the site. However, there was no transportation in this area other than people having their own cars. There was no mass transit system on Northwestern Highway. The bike lanes on Northwestern Highway were not used. Still, if there were not enough parking spaces, that was the developer's problem.

MOTION by Countegan, support by Mantey, that the Planning Commission recommend to City Council that PUD 4, 2021, dated October 18, 2021, submitted by Matt Shiffman of Farmington Hills Lofts, LLC, be approved because the plans are in accordance with the objectives, goals, and policies of the Master Plan for Future Land Use, and the applicable provision of the Zoning Ordinance,

With the following findings:

- The proposed PUD is consistent with the Special Planning Area of the Master Plan, which envisions a unique development. The applicant has demonstrated through their latest calculations and due diligence that they have sufficient parking for a higher-density, new type of development in this area. The applicant's research may be more current than that which informed the City's older existing standards.
- The consolidation of multiple zoning districts in the area into multi-family is consistent with the Master Plan for the entire area.
- With this development, commercial is removed from this portion of Northwestern Highway.
- The multi-family use is not contrary to the Master Plan.
- The height is not an issue in the context of the whole area and surrounding properties. There are other nearby buildings that are four stories high, and the 52 foot height is insignificant in comparison to the allowed height of 50 feet in the B-3 District.
- The setback issues can be addressed within the PUD process and agreement.
- Given the on-street parking to the west, if the developers found they did not have sufficient parking after the substantial investment made to bring people into these units, a solution could be found that might include parallel parking on the east side of Greening and/or using underground retention in order to provide more surface parking.
- The applicants had met the provisions of objectives iv, v and vii of Section 34-3.20.2.E. of the zoning ordinance:
 - iv. To provide alternative uses for parcels which can provide transition buffers to residential areas.
 - v. To guarantee the provision of a public improvement which could not otherwise be required that would further the public health, safety, or welfare, protect existing or future uses from the impact of a proposed use, or alleviate an existing or potential problem relating to public facilities.
 - vii. To foster the aesthetic appearance of the city through quality building design and site development, the provision of trees and landscaping beyond minimum requirements; the preservation of unique and/or historic sites or structures; and the provision of open space or other desirable features of a site beyond minimum requirements.
- The proposed development will provide economic investment in the community, supporting city services and schools.

Motion discussion:

Commissioner Schwartz said he thought the density was too high, and the parking was still a problem, although Planning Consultant Arroyo had given solutions if parking became an issue. He did not see The Griffin in Royal Oak being comparable to this development. All the comparables were either under construction or less than a year old. He recognized that if ultimately a less dense development were

constructed, perhaps some of the amenities would not be included. He felt the proposal was too dense, there was already a traffic issue in this area, partly due to a roundabout that did not work well. He would not be voting for this motion, though as a concept the development made sense. It was just squeezing too many units in too small a space.

Commissioner Mantey said that the mass transit in this area was the worst in the world. He understood why some on the Commission might hesitate to support this development, but he believed that couples would not rent one-bedroom apartments, especially with the need for a home office. The internet, with its accompanying home offices, was not available when the parking minimums were originally approved.

Commissioner Brickner said he supported moving this PUD request to City Council. He felt that the proposed development would be better than having nothing on this site, and he supported residential development in terms of an apartment building in this area.

Chair Stimson said he still believed the density was too high, and he remained concerned about the lack of experience with 1.7 parking spaces per unit. This was a tough call.

Motion carried 4-2 (Schwartz, Turner opposed).

APPROVAL OF MINUTES November 18, 2021

MOTION by Brickner, support by Turner, to approve the November 18, 2021 Planning Commission meeting minutes as presented.

Motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS

None.

January meetings will be January 20 (regular meeting) and January 27 (CIP)

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION by Brickner, support by Countegan, to adjourn the meeting at 9:04 p.m.

MOTION carried unanimously by voice vote.

Respectfully Submitted,
John Trafelet
Planning Commission Secretary

/cem