

**MINUTES
CITY OF FARMINGTON HILLS
PLANNING COMMISSION PUBLIC/REGULAR MEETING
FARMINGTON HILLS CITY HALL – COUNCIL CHAMBERS
MARCH 23, 2017, 7:30 P.M.**

Chair Rae-O'Donnell called the Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. on March 23, 2017.

Commissioners Present: Brickner, Countegan, Fleischhacker, Orr, Rae-O'Donnell, Schwartz, Stimson

Commissioners Absent: Mantey, McRae

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

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

Motion carried unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARING:

A. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PLAN 2017/2018 THROUGH 2022/2023

ACTION REQUESTED: Adoption of Plan

City Planner Stec gave the background for this agenda item, which was to request the adoption of the Capital Improvements Plan 2017/2018 – 2022/2023.

The Capital Improvements Plan (CIP) was a strategic planning tool for the City's capital needs. Included were projects and purchases generally in excess of \$25,000, and projects that were part of a larger network of improvements.

The goal of the CIP was to plan for and guide needed capital improvements and expenditures in a fiscally sound manner and to ensure that those improvements were consistent with the goals and policies of the City of Farmington Hills and the expectations of its residents.

The Planning Commission was mandated by State Act 33 of the Public Acts of 2008, Planning Enabling Act, to adopt a capital improvement plan after a public hearing. Per City Charter, Sections 3.07 and 6.08, after adoption by the Planning Commission, the City Manager submitted the CIP to City Council.

The CIP was not a budget, but assisted City Council with capital improvement budgeting.

This year's CIP was going through the mandated process, including the compilation of data from various departments, Planning Commission review and prioritization of projects, tonight's Planning Commission public hearing, and after tonight the Commission would forward the CIP to City Council.

City Planner Stec reviewed the CIP accomplishments by department, including public facilities improvements to buildings, digital infrastructure, voting equipment, parks and recreation equipment and facilities, Fire and Police Department equipment, city infrastructure including drainage, sanitary and sewer

lines, water main upgrades, sidewalks, road reconstructions and improvements, etc. This year's Capital Improvements Plan represented 199 projects totaling \$552,855,000, with the City's portion of costs after revenue sharing and grants, \$207,961,000.

City Planner Stec thanked the City Departments and the Planning Commission for their contributions in compiling the Capital Improvement Plan.

Chair Rae-O'Donnell opened the public hearing. Seeing that no one came forward to speak, she closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Schwartz said he would like to strongly urge the City Council to actually budget in its final 2017/2018 fiscal budget line item 2 under sidewalk projects, *\$100,000 for the non-motorized Master Plan*. Years ago he served on the City's committee for non-motorized transportation. At that time there was not a cohesive plan as to how the City wanted to develop sidewalks and other non-motorized transportation; this was still the case. There was no coherent, rational logic to sidewalk development. A few years ago the Public Works Department used an objective matrix for what they were doing going forward, but that did not seem to have happened this past year. Overall, this was inconsistent with how the City generally operated in terms of land use and strategic planning. A non-motorized Master Plan would guide the City over the next 10-15 years, in terms of prioritizing and filling in the gaps in sidewalk development.

MOTION by Schwartz, support by Orr, that the Planning Commission approve and recommend adoption of the City of Farmington Hills Capital Improvements Plan 2017/2018 – 2022/2023 to City Council. This motion also encourages City Council to approve the expenditure of funds for the Non-motorized Master Plan, Item #2 under sidewalk projects, in the 2017/2018 budget.

Motion carried unanimously.

REGULAR MEETING:

A. SITE AND LANDSCAPE PLAN 53-2-2017

LOCATION:	30785 Grand River Ave.
PARCEL I.D.:	22-23-35-105-002 & 003
PROPOSAL:	Parking lot addition to existing site in B-3, General Business District
ACTION REQUESTED:	Approval of site and landscape plan
APPLICANT:	Rick Arnold
OWNER:	Vantage Systems, Inc.

Commissioner Brickner disclosed that he had served as Rick Arnold's attorney on several matters, though not on this one, and he asked to be recused from discussion of this item.

Chair Rae O'Donnell called a vote on Commissioner Brickner's recusal request. The vote was unanimous in favor of recusal, and Commissioner Brickner left the meeting.

Chair Rae-O'Donnell asked if the applicant were present. It was thought the applicant was here, but had stepped away briefly.

Utilizing overhead slides, and referring to the March 16, 2017 Giffels Webster review letter, Planning Consultant Tangari gave the background for this proposal, which was to request approval of a site and landscape plan for a parking lot addition at 30785 Grand River Avenue.

There were 2 parcel ID numbers associated with this site. These should be combined.

There were several deficiencies regarding this site plan:

- The zoning was misrepresented as SP-1. The site was actually zoned B3 General Business.
- The site plan reflected changes that had already been made on the site. A second sheet showing existing conditions prior to the changes had not been submitted as required. This was needed in order to assess whether there were any existing nonconformities prior to the work being done, or whether nonconformities were increased or created by the work. The front parking lot did not appear to meet the required 10-foot setback from the right-of-way. Was this the case before work was undertaken? At the very least, an aerial photograph with an overlay of the current conditions on the site should be provided.
- Location for loading and unloading needed to be clarified.
- If lighting was planned, a photometric plan should be submitted.
- There was no existing pedestrian connection to the sidewalk on Grand River.
- Site visits and a review of Good Earth imagery indicated that two trees (each approximately 12 inches DBH) had already been removed as part of the proposed site improvements shown on the site plan.

At this time City Planner Stec announced that the applicant was not yet present after all. He had just received information that the applicant was about 10 minutes away.

MOTION by Schwartz, support by Fleischhacker, to table item 5A until after items 5B and 5C.

Motion carried 7-0.

Commissioner Brickner returned to the meeting.

B. SITE AND LANDSCAPE PLAN 54-2-2017

LOCATION:	31215 Fourteen Mile Road
PARCEL I.D.:	22-23-02-101-062
PROPOSAL:	Restaurant with drive through in B-3, General Business District
ACTION REQUESTED:	Approval of site and landscape plan
APPLICANT:	Roger Sherr, 14-Orchard Plaza, LLC
OWNER:	14-Orchard Plaza, LLC

Utilizing overhead slides, and referring to the March 22, 2017 Giffels Webster review letter, Planning Consultant Tangari gave the background for this proposal, which was for approval of a site and landscape plan for a drive-through restaurant at 31215 Fourteen Mile Road.

The site was developed as a shopping center. The existing center was proposed to remain, with one change: the westernmost tenant space was a former bank, which had a drive-through. This drive-through was proposed to be removed. The portion of the site where the new drive-through restaurant building was proposed was currently a parking lot, landscaped islands, and the lanes for the existing bank drive-through.

Issues included:

- The proposed use was a drive-through restaurant. Under Section 34-4.35, “The zoning lot occupied by such use shall not abut an RA district unless the district is separated from the lot by a major or secondary thoroughfare.” A portion of the eastern boundary of this zoning lot did border an RA district. The RA-4 lot was occupied by a nonconforming commercial use – the parking lot for Langan’s Norwest Lanes, where temporary sales were often conducted. The entire shopping center was also located between the proposed drive-through use and the RA-4 lot. However, the language referred to a zoning lot, and this zoning lot did abut the RA-4 parcel. Though this drive-through would replace an existing drive-through, the existing use was a drive-through for a bank and the regulation was specific to a restaurant. As a result, a use variance might or might not be required.
- The proposed loading area was adequately sized. However, it projected into the maneuvering lane immediately to the north; if this loading zone were occupied during business hours, it would impede the two-way flow of traffic through the site. The loading zone could be moved to the south, thus eliminating this conflict, if one parking space were removed.
- 194 parking spaces were required and were provided. Removing one space as recommended above for the loading area would leave the site one parking space short. The applicant should investigate whether there was room to provide this space elsewhere on site.
- The plan provided ten spaces for stacking of vehicles awaiting drive-through service. This met the requirements of the ordinance. However, the ordinance prohibited stacking spaces in the front yard, and one full and one partial stacking space were located in the front yard. A variance would be required to permit this arrangement. While the drive-through lane was configured such that there were multiple opportunities to bypass other stacked vehicles, there was not a continuous drive-through bypass lane, which was required. It might be necessary to eliminate the four parking spaces near the drive-through lane, relocate them elsewhere on the site, and move the island to provide the required bypass.
- The photometric plan did not provide an average-to-minimum ratio by which to assess compliance with Section 5.16. The applicant must also include cut sheets and lumen values.
- No pedestrian connection to the sidewalk was proposed. The plans should be revised to address this issue.
- The tree survey inventory was incomplete, and needed required details. These could be submitted and reviewed administratively.
- The landscape plan also had some details that could be submitted and reviewed administratively. Of special interest was a Regal Prince Oak located in an area that did not provide enough square footage as required by the ordinance.
- 14 trees were required based on parking lot standards; only 13 proposed trees met the standards. One tree was shown as 2” caliper and was too small.
- A Columnar Norway Maple needed to be moved out of the corner clearance area.
- Hedge bushes were shown as being planted four feet on center; three feet on center was required.

Chair Rae-O’Donnell asked where a pedestrian connection could be made. Planning Consultant Tangari showed a possible location on the northwest portion of the site.

Commissioner Schwartz was concerned that drive-through traffic might back up to 14 Mile Road or Orchard Lake Road. Planning Consultant Tangari thought this unlikely, given the amount of maneuvering room on the site. In any event, the ordinance requirement of 10 stacking spaces was met.

Commissioner Brickner felt there was plenty of room for stacked cars on this site. Also, there were 4 curb cuts for this shopping center, which gave multiple ways to get in and out of the center.

Regarding the issue of the proximity of the RA zoning district, Planning Consultant Tangari said one possibility was to condition approval on a lot split. There was a 10-foot side yard setback for this district, which might prove problematic in terms of a lot split, and the applicants might need to seek a variance for that.

Commissioner Orr asked how the Commission could justify creating a requirement for a variance by approving a lot split.

City Attorney Schultz said of all the options available, the lot split was the simplest. This would not be the first time a developer would request a setback variance in order to accomplish a lot split at a shopping center, and such requests had been granted in the past. Such a solution would remove the issue of being adjacent to an RA District, although the entire parcel would still be treated as one zoning lot.

Commissioner Orr asked if the RA parcel could be rezoned. City Attorney Schultz pointed out that the applicant did not own that lot. Commissioner Fleischhacker was concerned that the ZBA might see a side yard setback variance request as a self-created hardship and deny the variance. He noted the Commission could initiate a rezoning request.

Planning Consultant Tangari thought there might be a way to configure the lot split to avoid the side yard setback issue.

City Attorney Schultz reiterated that commercial lots had been split in the past, where the lot split had triggered a variance request, which had then been granted.

Commissioner Orr asked if the Commission was being asked to approve changes in the bypass lane without having time to see the plan for this in advance. City Planner Stec said the applicants would be presenting more information regarding this tonight.

Chair Rae-O'Donnell invited the applicants to speak.

Roger and Stuart Sherr, 31300 Orchard Lake Road, Farmington Hills, were present on behalf of this application. They made the following points:

- In most respects, the site plan met the criteria for approval, and met the spirit and intent of the ordinance, which discouraged putting a drive-through restaurant next to a single-family community.
- The issue of having an RA district abutting this property was academic. It was a vacant parcel that was used as a commercial space on a temporary basis. The RA parcel was shown in the Master Plan as commercial. The RA district abutted the Center in a very small way, and was far away from the proposed use.
- The entire shopping center was recently rezoned from B-2 to B-3 specifically for the purpose of allowing this restaurant drive-through. Shouldn't this issue have been brought up during the rezoning process?
- It seemed illogical that the City would allow the parcel to be rezoned to B-3 specifically for this purpose, only to be prohibited by this technical rule.

City Attorney Schultz said there were many uses in the B-3 District that could use this property without a variance. The rezoning had not included a specific site plan review. The spirit of the ordinance was to apply technical standards that were called out in the ordinance.

Stuart Sherr said the City was aware of their plans for a drive-through restaurant when the parcel was rezoned.

Roger Sherr handed out a modified site plan to the Commission. The revised site plan showed the resolution of the car stacking issues. They had also provided a full separate by-pass lane adjacent to the stacking lane. None of the vehicles in the required 10-car stacking lane would be in the front yard. The design of the turn from 14 Mile had been enhanced.

Roger and Stuart Sherr concluded by asking for approval for their application, conditioned on approval of the modified plans submitted this evening. The stacking lane change was the only change made. They pointed out that time was of the essence in terms of the tenant that was interested in this space.

Chair Rae-O'Donnell commented that this evening was the first time the City had seen the revised plan. Stuart Sherr said they had spoken with city administration regarding the modifications.

Chair Rae-O'Donnell asked if the pedestrian walkway had been integrated into the plans.

Jim Butler, PEA Associates, 2430 Rochester Court, Ste 100, Troy MI said there was a challenge in putting in the pedestrian connection where Planning Consultant Tangari had suggested, in that there was a retaining wall there due to the approximately 2.5 foot grade change as the property sloped up toward the intersection of Orchard Lake Road and 14 Mile, making ADA compliance very difficult. They thought they could create the pedestrian connection elsewhere on the plan.

Commissioner Orr asked if the building size was being altered in order to make the stacking lane modifications. Roger Sherr said the building was a little narrower and longer than on the original plan. The site plan showed a 2300 square foot building, but the building would not be that large and would sit on a smaller pad.

Commissioner Orr asked about outside seating shown on the site plan. Roger Sherr said they were in discussion with the City regarding this.

Chair Rae-O'Donnell asked about process and timing if the applicants pursued the lot split option. City Planner Stec said the applicants would need to get a survey of the existing property, along with a new survey showing how the site would work after the lot split. If necessary, they could return to the Planning Commission on the May agenda.

Commissioner Countegan pointed out that if the RA property were rezoned, the property to the south of that – also zoned RA – would still be abutting the subject property at a corner connection. City Planner Stec said this would need to be evaluated. Commissioner Countegan cautioned that if the City encouraged a rezoning of the small RA parcel the applicants might still face the same issue with the southern parcel.

Commissioner Orr noted that the signs should be removed from the Site Plan, as the Commission did not approve signage.

Commissioner Brickner commented that there had been a drive through for the bank on this property for a long time. City Planner Stec said that drive throughs for banks and restaurants were treated differently, due to the different nature and times of those uses.

Chair Rae-O'Donnell asked how long a rezoning would take. City Planner Stec said this would take at least 3 months. City Attorney Schultz said a text amendment would make as much or more sense than pursuing a rezoning effort for a parcel not owned by the applicant, and could be accomplished within the same time frame.

Commissioner Fleischhacker asked if the applicants could seek a variance from the requirement that the property not abut an RA District. City Attorney Schultz said such a variance would need to be a use variance, as the request would not be dimensional in nature.

Commissioner Schwartz was opposed to pursuing a zoning change. He was also opposed to a text amendment, as there were good reasons for this zoning requirement. Were other outstanding issues met by the revised site plan? City Planner Stec said the revised plans did appear to meet other outstanding issues, though they still needed formal review.

MOTION by Schwartz, support by Countegan, that Site Plan 54-2-2017, dated February 23, 2017, submitted by Roger Sherr of 14-Orchard Plaza, LLC be approved because it appears to meet all applicable requirements of the Zoning Chapter, subject to the following conditions:

1. **A revised site plan be submitted for administrative review addressing the following items:**
 - **The configuration of the drive through bypass lane and stacking spaces as shown on the plans provided this evening**
 - **A pedestrian connection from the public sidewalk be added**
 - **Signs be removed from the plans**
2. **A lot split be required to address the issue of adjacency to the abutting RA zoning district. Any zoning deficiencies that may result from the split will require ZBA approval.**

Motion carried 6-1 (Orr opposed)

MOTION by Schwartz, support by Brickner, that Landscape Plan 54-2-2017, dated February 23, 2017, submitted by Roger Sherr of 14-Orchard Plaza, LLC, be approved because it appears to meet all applicable Zoning Chapter requirements, and applicable Design Principles as adopted by the Planning Commission, subject to the following conditions:

1. **A revised plan be submitted for administrative review addressing the following items:**
 - **The items identified in the March 22, 2017 Giffels Webster review report**
 - **Any revisions resulting from changes to the site plan**
2. **Approval of the lot split be required as a condition of the site plan approval**

Motion carried 6-1 (Orr opposed)

C. PUD QUALIFICATION 1, 2017

LOCATION:	22000 Haggerty Rd.
PARCEL I.D.:	22-23-31-101-020
PROPOSAL:	New hotel on historic property in OS-4, Office

ACTION REQUESTED:	Research District
APPLICANT:	Approval of Planned Unit Development Qualification
OWNER:	Brian Winkleman, M2B2, LLC
	Estate of Vickie White

Utilizing overhead slides, and referring to the March 10, 2017 Giffels Webster review letter, Planning Consultant Tangari gave the background for this proposal, which was for approval of a Planned Unit Development (PUD) Qualification in order to construct a new hotel on a historic property.

Planning Consultant Tangari reviewed the PUD Process. After receiving PUD Qualification, the request would be scheduled at a Planning Commission public hearing, where the Commission would make a recommendation to City Council.

The property was the site of the David Simmons House, which was on the Historic Register for the State of Michigan. The site was accessible from Haggerty Road, and the I-275 trail ran directly behind the property.

The applicants were proposing to integrate a new 4-story hotel with a historic resource and an active use of open space – a trailhead for the I-275 trail.

Planning Consultant Tangari reviewed the standards for PUD qualification, as well as how the PUD proposal related to those standards, as outlined on pages 2-4 of his review letter. Planning Consultant Tangari felt that PUD qualification standards had been met by this proposal.

The Planning Commission's charge was to discuss whether the benefits associated with this request were sufficient to warrant the small deviations from the dimensional standards of the district that were likely to occur. The south side yard setback appeared to be the only dimensional standard likely not to be met.

Commissioner Orr asked about the speckled area in the rear shown on the site plan. Was this water storage? City Planner Stec said the applicant was planning underground water storage, but the applicants would need to address what the speckled area signified.

Commissioner Orr suggested placing the dumpster between the 2 buildings.

Mike Huszti, 555 Hill Street, Milford MI, real estate broker representing M2B2, was present on behalf of this application. He spoke to the unique and exciting nature of this project, including the trailhead and park at the rear that had been suggested by Deputy Director of Special Services Bryan Farmer. MDOT was actively seeking approval for this project. Preserving the historic house was also an important benefit. They were requesting a deviation from the ordinance regarding the south side yard setback. To the south was a large office building with a very large parking lot, which was not used at night. The setback deviation would not affect anyone negatively, and the public benefits outweighed that small deviation.

Commissioner Stimson asked about parking. Mr. Huszti said that 124 parking spaces were planned. Peak demand would be in the evening and night. Shared parking with the trailhead made sense, as well as shared parking with the historic home, which would be used as a professional office.

Commissioner Schwartz asked who would maintain the trailhead and the public park. Mr. Huszti said they believed the City would own and maintain the park. A permanent easement would be granted for the

public to go through hotel property to access the park. Parking spaces adjacent to the park would be provided.

MOTION by Stimson, support by Orr, that the Planning Commission make a preliminary finding that P.U.D. No. 1, 2017, submitted by Brian Winkleman of M2B2, LLC qualifies for the Planned Unit Development Option under Section 34-3.20.2A through E. It is further determined that the proposal meets at least one of the objectives as outlined in Section 34-3.20.2.E.i. through viii., specifically paragraph i) *to permanently preserve open space or natural features because of their exceptional characteristics or because they can provide a permanent transition or buffer between land uses, specifically in the use of the trailhead, and that it be made clear to the petitioner that final granting of the P.U.D. Plan and Contract requires approval by the City Council, after recommendation by the Planning Commission.*

Motion carried 7-0.

Chair Rae-O'Donnell recalled case 5A.

Commissioner Brickner was again recused from discussion due to a professional relationship with the applicant, as noted earlier.

A. SITE AND LANDSCAPE PLAN 53-2-2017

LOCATION:	30785 Grand River Ave.
PARCEL I.D.:	22-23-35-105-002 & 003
PROPOSAL:	Parking lot addition to existing site in B-3, General Business District
ACTION REQUESTED:	Approval of site and landscape plan
APPLICANT:	Rick Arnold
OWNER:	Vantage Systems, Inc.

Continuing his review from earlier in the meeting, Planning Consultant Tangari summarized that there were significant site plan issues. Principally the applicant needed to provide a sheet showing existing conditions before work commenced. He reviewed outstanding issues as already discussed when the case had been called earlier, and then moved on to the landscape plan.

Trees that were already removed were not shown on the landscape plan. Parking lot trees did not appear in all cases to be close enough to the parking lot. The 8 parking lot trees should be of a large deciduous type unless the Planning Commission permitted large evergreen trees as shown.

Commissioner Orr asked if the applicant would be required to pave the driveway to the dumpster. Planning Consultant Tangari said this would have to be paved.

Chair Rae-O'Donnell invited the applicant to speak.

Joe Arnold was representing his father Rick Arnold, who was in Florida. Engineer Jawad Defouni, J.A.D. Services, 5119 Highland Road, Waterford MI, was also present.

Mr. Arnold said his father purchased the property about a year ago. His father had clearly changed the layout, and while Mr. Arnold could speak about those changes in general terms, he could not offer specifics as to how the property was laid out previously. His father owned the business to the east, the

Go-Cart and batting cage facilities, and wanted to improve the parking lot for the subject site. He had hired Mr. Defouni to draw a site plan without receiving any letters from City Engineer Cubera, and now was taken aback by the list of requirements there.

Mr. Arnold spoke to conflicts his father had with the City, including tickets being issued. His father was 84 years old, and only wanted to improve his property. Now it was difficult to know what the pre-existing grade levels were, etc. It was hard to see a way forward. They did not really think they had affected anything to any material degree, though they had brought in some dirt and gravel.

Commissioner Schwartz asked how many parking spaces were on the property before the construction activity. Mr. Arnold said he thought both rows of parking along Grand River had been expanded by one space, totaling two additional spaces in front of the building. From what he could see from the aerial view, it looked like the parking had not been striped, but it was hard to know how many spaces were there originally. Mr. Arnold said his father had put a new roof on the building and done some things to improve the exterior. The building was currently unoccupied. The City would not issue a certificate of occupancy to anyone for any use until this issue was resolved.

Commissioner Schwartz asked about the trees that were removed. Mr. Arnold said two dead trees were removed; he was unsure as to their location. He thought they were along the western part of the parking lot.

Commissioner Schwartz asked about the dumpster location. Mr. Arnold said he thought the dumpster was in the same location as before the site had been altered, though his dad had somehow created a lane going down to the dumpster. The idea was to have the parking closer to the building.

Commissioner Schwartz asked about areas that were semi-gravel and/or semi-dirt, including one that had a significant slope. Did the applicant plan to plant grass there? Mr. Arnold said this was the plan.

Chair Rae-O'Donnell asked about the tickets that had been issued. Mr. Arnold said he did not know the details or why they were issued. Mr. Arnold's father did have an attorney who had appeared in court, and the judge had postponed making a decision on the tickets until the issues with the City were resolved.

Mr. Defouni said the landscape plan was prepared by someone else.

Mr. Arnold reiterated that the interoffice memorandum from the engineering department had never been supplied to his father or to Mr. Defouni. Yet the requirements listed there were extensive.

Commissioner Schwartz asked if the applicant had any issues in meeting the requirements of the January 26 Engineering memo. Mr. Arnold said they did have issues with meeting the requirements, which required storm water detention and improvements, MDEQ approvals, along with providing a sidewalk along Orchard Lake Road. It seemed a lot to do to improve a parking lot.

Commissioner Schwartz summarized that the Commission had the January 26 memo from the Engineering Department. The applicant did not agree with the requirements of the memo, specifically items 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9. Could the Commission even approve the site plan?

City Attorney Schultz said that the standards existed before work commenced on the parking lot, and it appeared there was significant enforcement action. Once work had commenced on a site without appropriate approvals, it made things more difficult.

Commissioner Schwartz felt the Commission was not in a position to approve this application. Separately, there was a lot of wood debris and rubbish in the rear of the lot.

Commissioner Schwartz said that more information could be brought at a future meeting regarding engineering standards and enforcement action.

Regarding the sidewalk, Commissioner Orr noted that in a previous instance an applicant did not move forward with an application because of the sidewalk requirement. However, in this instance the applicant had already commenced the work. There were definite deficiencies in the plan. He supported tabling this application to a date uncertain.

MOTION by Orr, Support by Schwartz, to table Site Plan 53-2-2017, dated February 14, 2017, submitted by Rick Arnold, to date uncertain in order to allow the applicant time to revise the plans to address the items included in the departmental review reports.

Motion carried 6-0-1 (Brickner recused).

Commissioner Brickner rejoined the meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

There was no public comment.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: February 16, 2017

MOTION by Countegan, support by Fleischhacker, to approve the meeting minutes of February 16, 2017 as published.

MOTION carried unanimously.

COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS:

Commissioner Orr noted that the proposed drive-through on tonight's agenda had a 20-foot height to the parapet. This was too tall. Could that height be shortened at all? City Planner Stec said that there was no standard in the zoning ordinance regarding this.

Commissioner Orr noted that new signage had been installed at Drake and Grand River at the Muirwood Shopping Center, and trees had been removed underneath the wires along Drake Road. Was there anything being done about replacing those trees? City Planner Stec said he would follow up on this.

Commissioner Stimson asked if sidewalks would be installed as part of the PUD project at the old Hamilton Insurance site. City Planner Stec said sidewalks would be installed. A conditional certificate of occupancy allowed a business to open prior to installing all the amenities.

Commissioner Brickner noted that his father had recently passed away. He thanked the City for the acknowledgements he received at this time.

Commissioner Fleischhacker asked if there were any active plans to construct the outlot building at the 12

Mile and Orchard Lake shopping center. Tonight there was not an empty parking space in that Center. City Planner Stec said there were no current plans for that building.

Commissioner Schwartz gave an update on the Grand River Corridor Improvement Authority. They were having trouble getting a quorum for meetings, and several meetings had been cancelled due to this problem. They also did not have a lot of money. In 2018 about \$11,000 would be captured. Until there was more development and values rose, there wouldn't be money for projects. About \$50,000 of seed money remained, with a projected \$8,000 annual revenue. They had talked about doing a loan or grant program, and perhaps hire an intern to help with the idea of a trail along the river there. Any active streetscape improvements would wait for MDOT to make their final plans for the area. Everything was moving slowly.

Chair Rae-O'Donnell thanked City Planner Stec for his recent presentation to the City Council of the Planning Commission's Annual Report.

The next meeting was set for April 20, 2017.

ADJOURNMENT:

Seeing that there was no further discussion, Chair Rae-O'Donnell adjourned the meeting at 9:27 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Steven J. Stimson
Planning Commission Secretary
/cem