

**MINUTES
CITY OF FARMINGTON HILLS
PLANNING COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARING/REGULAR MEETING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
JULY 20, 2017, 7:30 P.M.**

Chair Rae-O'Donnell called the Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. on July 20, 2017.

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

Commissioners Absent: Stimson

Others Present: City Planner Stec, Staff Engineers Darnall and Kennedy, City Attorney Morita, Planning Consultants Arroyo and Tangari

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

MOTION carried unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARING

A. REZONING REQUEST 2-5-2017

LOCATION:	37000 Grand River Ave.
PARCEL I.D.:	22-23-20-300-029; 030
PROPOSAL:	Rezone part of a parcel currently zoned B-4, Planned General Business District to B-3, General Business District
ACTION REQUESTED:	Recommend to City Council
APPLICANT:	Thomas Duke
OWNER:	Duke & Duke LLP

Commissioner Mantey said that as when this case was first heard on June 15, 2017, he had a conflict of interest. Commissioner Mantey left the meeting.

Lonnie Zimmerman, Siegal/Tuomaala Associates, 29200 Northwestern Highway, Ste 160, Southfield MI, was present on behalf of this application.

Mr. Zimmerman explained that Mr. Duke could not be here this evening, and read comments prepared by Mr. Duke regarding this rezoning request. The comments highlighted:

- The history of this parcel, which Mr. Duke and his father had originally developed.
- Mr. Duke continued to beautify the property.
- Mr. Duke owned the old Kmart property across Grand River, which they were currently redeveloping.
- There was more than enough parking for this site.
- This corner was the entry into Farmington Hills for those coming from the expressway entrance.

- Traffic was quite reasonable on Grand River, with the only exception being the morning line of vehicles traveling from the west across the bridge and then moving into the left-turn lane.
- Rezoning was reasonable for the proposed use and was entirely reasonable from a traffic standpoint.
- The new proposed development was ideal for the site and the immediate area in general.
- Unequivocally, there would not be a gas station at this corner.

Mr. Zimmerman added that the owner of Independence Green Apartments approved of this development, although they did not have this in writing.

Mr. Zimmerman presented City staff with a copy of Mr. Duke's remarks, and also presented a drone aerial study of the traffic flow at various times of the morning: 6:30 a.m., 7:30 a.m., 8:30 a.m., 9:15 a.m., and 9:45 a.m.

Commissioner Orr said that there were comments at the June 15, 2017 meeting regarding the location of the exits of the proposed drive-thru. Had there been any further discussion regarding that?

Mr. Zimmerman said they hadn't looked any further into site plan development.

Commissioner Schwartz referred to page 6 of the review letter. While the applicant affirmed there would not be a gas station, page 6 of the report showed that a gas service station would be a use by right in the proposed zoning district.

Commissioner Brickner said he had waited in line at Grand River for 2-3 lights yesterday morning, so he knew the traffic didn't flow well at 8:30 a.m. He also saw drivers running the stop sign along the service drive. While he didn't mind the proposed use, he wondered if the applicant could control the traffic at the interior stop sign and along the service drive better than they were now.

Mr. Zimmerman said he would pass that comment on.

Seeing that discussion had ended, Chair Rae-O'Donnell invited the Planning Consultant to make his report.

Utilizing overhead slides and referring to the July 12, 2017 Giffels Webster review letter, Planning Consultant Tangari noted that the plan had changed somewhat since the June 15 meeting, most notably with the squared off shape of the proposed parcel as now presented. Outstanding issues included:

- Sheet SP.1 showed the service drive as a separate parcel, while sheet SP.2 did not. SP. 2 should be revised to show the correct parcel boundary configuration.
- The parcel was designated Large Office on the Future Land Use Map, with a designation of OS-4 District, which was not the current zoning.

Planning Consultant Tangari reviewed *items to consider for zoning map amendment*. The proposed B-3 zoning would allow different uses than the current B-4 district, and the Commission would need to decide whether this was an appropriate change for this parcel. He noted that there was B-3 zoning directly west across the street on Halsted Road.

Commissioner Orr asked if the applicants decided to change the location of the restaurant and needed to change the location of the service drive, would that require a whole new set of property lines and cross

access agreements? Planning Consultant Tangari said this could be the case. However, the portion of the property that would be rezoned would not change.

Commissioner Orr said his concern was that the property line as currently proposed on the north side was directly adjacent the access point. Changing the access point and going around this piece of property would make the flow significantly better, and there wouldn't be a problem with the traffic pulling out of the drive-thru and directly into Grand River traffic.

Commissioner Schwartz asked if there were some way to use the existing building via a redesign process, adding more office space and leaving the zoning B-4. Mr. Zimmerman said there was no reason to do this; additionally even though the space had been 95% full since its initial construction, there was not a demand to expand this building as office space. Also, while there might be a way to expand the current building architecturally, it would be difficult to do that and end up with a structure that was visually pleasing or fully useful.

Commissioner Schwartz explained that the question was whether this parcel needed to be rezoned, whether the existing building could be expanded, and whether the Commission wanted to keep the asphalt lot that was there now.

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

MOTION by McRae, support by Orr, that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council that Rezoning Request 2-5-2017, petitioned by Thomas Duke of Duke & Duke, to rezone land from the B-4 Planned General Business District, to the B-3 General Business District, be approved for the following reasons:

- The change is a reasonable alternative to the Master Plan because it will promote the land use policies of the Master Plan and will not conflict with present policies.
- The rezoning will be compatible with the surrounding properties.

Motion carried 7-0-1 (Mantey recused).

Commissioner Mantey rejoined the Commission.

B. PUD PLAN 1, 2017

LOCATION:	22000 Haggerty Rd.
PARCEL I.D.:	22-23-31-101-020
PROPOSAL:	Planned Unit Development Plan including & Site and Landscape Plan for a new hotel on historic property HD#7 in OS-4, Office Research District
ACTION REQUESTED:	Recommend to City Council
APPLICANT:	M2B2, LLC
OWNER:	Estate of Vickie White

Mike Huzti, 555 Hill Street, Milford, MI, real estate broker representing M2B2, was present on behalf of this application. Brian Winkelmann, M2B2 principal, was also present.

Mr. Huzti said tonight's meeting was the culmination of a long process, but they were presenting a plan this evening that was ready for approval. There was only one unresolved detail, involving the pedestrian

connection from Haggerty Road to the park. They had worked with Deputy Director of Public Services Farmer as well as MDOT, and had come up with the solution for this connection as shown this evening. However, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) had to give final approval for this plan, and the FHWA did have a potential issue with the connection, in that they wanted to encourage bicycle traffic on Haggerty Road. The City's position was that Haggerty Road was not set up for bicycle traffic, and the City Attorney was in process of providing a written response to the FHWA; they expected to have an approval soon. Should the configuration not be approved, one option was to place a sidewalk along the northern property line, although this would wipe out all the landscaping there. The applicants were seeking approval tonight for the PUD, including landscape plan, and Mr. Huzti suggested that approval could be subject to a final resolution with the FHWA regarding the pedestrian connection to the trailhead park.

Utilizing overhead slides and referring to the July 12, 2017 Giffels Webster review letter, Planning Consultant Arroyo reviewed this application for PUD recommendation to City Council. This was a request for final determination including site plan and landscape plan review.

Planning Consultant Arroyo summarized the history of the site, the existing conditions there, and the Criteria for PUD final determination. He noted that under item E, 2 objectives for meeting PUD qualification were potentially met:

- The proposal, with its trailhead and preservation of a historic structure, appeared to meet standard v.
- Preserving an identified historically significant property – the Simmons house – appeared to meet standard vi.

Outstanding issues included:

- The trailhead for the I-275 Trail was proposed at the rear of the site. This use was not expressly permitted in the district and was requested to be approved as part of the PUD process.
- The proposed hotel did not meet the south side setback. Also, the applicant did not appear to have used the formula in Section 34-3.5.2.P to determine the required setback.
- Due to a lot split that the applicant was indicating on the site plan, the location of the repurposed home did not appear to meet the front, rear, or south side setbacks of the OS-4 district.
- The height limit for the OS-4 district was 40 feet. The narrative reported a building height of 42 feet. Full sized elevations of the hotel and Simmons House should be provided, and should include the height of the building and colors of building materials.
- Regarding parking, the 117 spaces provided for the hotel fell short of the requirement for 127 spaces. Also, the front parking setback of 10 feet was not met, and the overhang of vehicles into the 3 spaces facing the hedgerow would protrude in the hedges, most likely damaging them. The parking lot should be shifted as much as possible to bring the parking lot setback as close as possible to 10 feet. This might eliminate space 117. Also one parking space at the northwest corner of the parking lot could be removed. The combination of removing those 2 spaces would leave 115 parking spaces, instead of 117.
- The photometric plan showed an average to minimum ratio of 6:13:1, which exceeded the 4:1 ratio required in Section 34-5.16.

Requested zoning ordinance deviations included:

- Include the trailhead as a permitted use in the PUD agreement.
- Hotel setback of 6.25 on the south side.

- Setbacks on the south side (12.7 feet), rear (40 feet), and the front (31.79 feet) of the Simmons house, should the Simmons house be split off from the main property.
- Neither the hotel nor the Simmons House met the 50% front yard open space requirement of the OS-4 District.
- Provide 115 instead of 127 parking spaces, as discussed.
- Allow a 42-foot height for the hotel.
- 14 fewer replacement trees were proposed than required.

Additionally there were outstanding tree and landscape details that could be handled administratively.

Commissioner Orr noted that parking for the Simmons House was calculated as an office use. He asked why the trailhead parking spaces were not included in the parking count. Planning Consultant Arroyo said those spaces were not included because they were not on the property. Commissioner Orr thought the trailhead would be used mostly during the day and the motel would be used at night; these were opposite uses. Planning Consultant Arroyo said shared parking calculations provided by the applicant were in the Commissioners' packets.

Commissioner Orr asked what would happen if the City approved the PUD and the Federal Highway Administration did not. Planning Consultant Arroyo said the request today was for approval, with flexibility allowed in the motion so the precise location of the pedestrian connection could move and be approved administratively, so long as there was some type of connection from Haggerty to the Trailhead. The City was supportive of this request.

Commissioner Schwartz asked if it made sense to approve the landscape plan after the final pedestrian connection was known. Planning Consultant Arroyo said as long as the Planning Commission was comfortable with the understanding that additional trees might have to be removed and what should happen in that case, he thought the application could move forward. For instance, would the requirement for the trees be waived or should the applicants be required to place money in the tree fund? City Planner Stec noted that language regarding the pedestrian connection, tree removal, etc., could be part of the actual PUD agreement.

City Attorney Morita advised that a condition to the motion for approval be added, such as: *the trailhead be provided as shown, unless MDOT or FHWA changes are required; in which case city staff is to have flexibility to accommodate outside agency requests regarding the placement of the safety path and landscaping, and tree fund payments and/or tree replacement.*

Commissioner Mantey asked how tree fund calculations were made. City Planner Stec said \$350.00 per regulated tree was required.

Commissioner McRae said the photometric plan showed a ratio that provided uncomfortable glare for the parking lot light. The City's standard was 4:1; what was shown was 6:1. Because the light poles were on the north landscaped area that could potentially lose its landscaping, depending on what the FHWA decided, additional poles or a rearrangement of poles might be necessary. Even light needed to be provided. Also, the path would need to be wider if the FHWA required the change as discussed.

Commissioner McRae continued that if the pedestrian connection did have to be changed, he would like to have the Commission take another look at the plan, especially regarding lighting and landscaping elements.

Planning Consultant Arroyo said the condition could refer to minor vs. major changes. A plan that became dramatically different needed to return to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Huzti noted that the lighting on properties to either side of them was very bright. Commissioner Mantey said that if the adjacent properties' lights were not meeting code, they would be subject to enforcement.

Planning Consultant Arroyo said that 3 different signs were included in the packet. The preferred design showed a sign for the hotel, for the Simmons House Office Building, and for the Trailhead. This sign was larger than normally allowed – 6'6" high and 10'2" wide. The maximum sign for this district was 32 square feet; the sign would be 53 square feet. The ordinance also allowed a maximum height of 6'; the sign would be 6" taller than that.

Commissioner Orr noted that since this was a PUD, no other signs other than those listed in the PUD agreement would be permitted.

Mr. Winkelmann said their intent was that the monument sign would be the only sign on the property, with the exception of the historic marker for the David Simmons house.

City Planner Stec noted that the Historic District Commission would also be involved if the applicants ever sought another sign on the property.

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

MOTION by Fleischhacker, support by Orr, that the Planning Commission recommend to City Council that P.U.D. Plan No. 1, 2017, including site and landscape plans dated June 29, 2017, submitted by M2B2, LLC, be approved because the plans are in accordance with the objectives, goals and policies of the Master Plan for future Land Use and are consistent with the objectives and applicable provisions of the Planned Unit Development Option as outlined in Section 34-3.20 of Chapter 34, Zoning Ordinance, subject to the following finds and conditions:

1. That this is a final determination, that the PUD criteria Items A, B, C, and D have been met, and that under item E, standards v and vi have been met.
2. That the trailhead be provided as shown, unless MDOT or FHWA changes are required; in which case city staff is to have flexibility to accommodate outside agency requests regarding the placement of the safety path and landscaping, and tree fund payments and /or tree replacement.
3. That the motion includes approval of the following zoning deviations:
 - Permit the bike path trailhead as a use in the OS-4 district
 - Permit a 6.25' southern side yard setback for the hotel
 - Permit the following setbacks as depicted on the site plan for the historic home should a lot split occur:
 - South side yard: 7.3'
 - Rear yard: 0'
 - Front yard: 8.21'

- 50% front yard open space requirements are not met for both the historic home and the hotel. The deficiency will be reduced, but not eliminated, based on suggested site plan revisions. The exact percentage will be identified from a revised plan.
 - Waiver of 12 required off street parking spaces from the required minimum for the hotel.
 - Permit a 2' height deviation from the maximum 40' allowed in the OS-4 district for the hotel.
 - A waiver of 14 replacement trees. If in order to accommodate a dedicated pedestrian path to the trailhead any additional trees are not able to be planted, monies for those trees will need to be paid into the City tree fund.
 - Landscaping requirements listed in the July 12, 2017 Giffels Webster review letter.
 - Permit freestanding sign Option 3 as presented with a maximum sign face area of 53 square feet and a max height of 6.5'
4. That a revised site plan addressing the following items be submitted:
- Removal of 2 parking spaces at the front of the lot to increase the amount of front yard open space provided
 - A revised photometric plan showing a reduced average to minimum lighting ratio over the site, meeting the City standard of 4:1.

Commissioner Mantey did not support waiving the 14 replacement trees, as the tree fund existed for this purpose, and he did not think the economic viability of the project would be impacted by requiring that funds for the replacement trees be placed in the tree fund. Commissioner Orr agreed, as did Chair Rae-O'Donnell.

Commissioner McRae wanted to see the plan should the location of the pedestrian connection be substantially changed due to FHWA requirements.

Based on the preceding discussion, Commissioner Orr offered the following motion to amend.

MOTION by Orr, support by Schwartz, to amend the motion so that the applicant will be required to contribute funds to the tree fund for the replacement deficiency of 14 trees.

Discussion followed. Commissioners Brickner and Countegan spoke against adding this requirement to the motion, as they felt the applicant was working very closely with the City, and contributing significant funds to provide a Trailhead to this property. This had been a cooperative effort throughout in order to integrate the Historic District with private development.

MOTION to amend failed 4-4 (Brickner, Countegan, Fleischhacker, McRae opposed.)

Chair Rae-O'Donnell called the original motion.

MOTION carried 7-1 (McRae opposed).

REGULAR MEETING

A. SITE AND LANDSCAPE PLAN 59-6-2017

LOCATION: 34500 Grand River Ave.
PARCEL I.D.: 22-23-21-376-015
PROPOSAL: Addition to an existing building in LI-1,

ACTION REQUESTED:	Light Industrial District
APPLICANT:	Approval of Site and Landscape Plan
OWNER:	Steven Sorensen of PEA
	Hitachi Automotive Systems of Americas, Inc.

Utilizing overhead slides, and referencing the July 13, 2017 Giffels Webster review letter, Planning Consultant Tangari gave the review for this application, which was a request for approval for the site and landscape plan for an addition to an existing building in the LI-1 Zoning District. The applicant was proposing to add 39,850 square feet of office space in two stories to the east side of the existing Hitachi Automotive Systems office/research building and to reconfigure the parking lot accordingly.

Outstanding issues included:

- A revised photometric plan should be submitted that addressed the entire property. The cut sheets also needed to be clarified.
- Certain details of the tree removal and landscape plan needed to be clarified; these could be handled administratively.

Tom Phillips, Hobbs & Black Architects, Ann Arbor, MI, was present on behalf on behalf of this application. John Thompson, PEA, Inc., Troy MI, and Thomas Bieniek, Senior Manager Hitachi Systems were also present.

Mr. Phillips said the addition was straightforward. Hitachi's business was growing and the addition would accommodate that; additionally the expansion was envisioned in the Master Plan.

In response to questions from the Commission, Mr. Bieniek said that the first year about 35 people would be added. Over a period of the next 2-3 years over 200 people would be added. They had about 430 employees now in the building.

Commissioner McRae said they were talking about 5-600 employees but were only suggesting 504 parking spaces. Mr. Bieniek explained this was the initial phasing plan, and they may be before the Commission again when more parking was required.

Commissioner Brickner commented on the serenity and beauty of the site.

MOTION by Fleischhacker, support by Orr, that Site Plan 59-6-2017, dated June 29, 2017, submitted by Steven Sorensen of PEA be approved because it appears to meet all applicable requirements of the Zoning Chapter, subject to the following condition:

- A revised plan addressing the items of the July 14, 2017 Giffels Webster review report be submitted for administrative review.

Motion carried unanimously (8-0).

MOTION by Fleischhacker, support by Countegan, that Landscape Plan 59-6-2017, submitted by Steven Sorensen of PEA be approved because it appears to meet all applicable Zoning Chapter requirements, and applicable Design Principles, as adopted by the Planning Commission, subject to the following condition:

- A revised plan addressing the items of the July 14, 2017 Giffels Webster review report is submitted for administrative review.

Motion carried unanimously (8-0).

B. SITE AND LANDSCAPE PLAN 60-6-2017

LOCATION:	35700 Twelve Mile Rd.
PARCEL I.D.:	22-23-08-400-012
PROPOSAL:	Gymnasium addition and parking expansion at existing place of worship in RA-1, One-Family Residential District
ACTION REQUESTED:	Approval of Site and Landscape Plan
APPLICANT:	Ezziddin Albakkour
OWNER:	ICA Property

Utilizing overhead slides and referring to the Giffels Webster review letter dated July 13, 2017, and the additional Giffels Webster landscape plan review letter of July 20, 2017, Planning Consultant Arroyo gave the background to this application, which was to construct an 8,500 square foot addition with a proposed connection of 1,140 square feet to the Muslim Community Mosque, to be used as a gymnasium and other accessory uses, along with a parking expansion. The height of the addition was 30 feet.

Outstanding issues included:

- Since proposed parking spaces would have the closest proximity to the structures, the applicant should consider relocating or adding accessible parking spaces to the proposed parking spaces.
- The applicant should clarify the width of the parking spaces to ensure compliance with Section 34-5.3.
- The total parking area totaled 366 parking spaces. The applicant should provide details on how the multi-use addition would be used, as well as the maximum capacity of the structure, in order to determine if the number of spaces on the site would be adequate. Would this structure be used at the same time as the principal structure?
- Any rooftop equipment and screening should be shown on the elevation plans for the addition.
- The applicant should provide further lighting details, including other possible new installations of lighting, as well as a photometric plan, in accordance with Section 34-5.16.

Regarding the landscaping, replacement trees did not appear to have been addressed in the landscape plan. Additionally, the landscape plan did not show Farmington Hills planting details.

Ezziddin Albakkour, 35700 W 12 Mile Road, and Chester Stempion, Chester Stempion Associates, 29895 Greenfield Road, Southfield MI, were present on behalf of this application.

Mr. Albakkour said they purchased the building about 3 years ago and they needed a gym for their youth.

Mr. Stempion said the landscaping was now in compliance with the ordinance. Regarding site circulation, initially the previous user – a school – only needed one driveway approach. With this addition, the Mosque would like to have additional parking near the gymnasium and connect an existing approach that was seldom used as well as the one that was always used. This would provide better circulation for emergency vehicles and for people who used the gym, and would allow parking closer to the gym.

Mr. Stempion emphasized that they were improving the site.

Commissioner Orr asked if the cultural/recreation hall and the prayer hall would be occupied at the same time. Mr. Albakkour said they would not be used at the same time. There would be no increase in people resulting from this addition, and the two uses would not overlap.

In response to questions from Commissioners Orr, Rae-O'Donnell, and Fleischhacker, Mr. Stempien said any rooftop equipment would be screened per Ordinance requirements. Commissioner Orr emphasized that the ordinance required screening of any rooftop equipment from all sides to the height of the equipment. Commissioner Fleischhacker noted that screening was for noise abatement as well as visual screening.

MOTION by Orr, support by Brickner, that Site Plan 60-6-2017, dated June 1, 2017, submitted by Ezziddin Albakkour, be approved because it appears to meet all applicable requirements of the Zoning Chapter, with the condition that a revised plan addressing the following items be submitted for administrative review:

- Items identified in July 13, 2017 GW review report.
- Relocation of ADA accessible parking spaces.
- All rooftop units shall be screened per City ordinances.

Motion carried unanimously (8-0)

MOTION by Orr, support by Brickner, that Landscape Plan 60-6-2017, dated June 22, 2017, submitted by Ezziddin Albakkour be approved because it appears to meet all applicable Zoning Chapter requirements, and applicable Design Principles as adopted by the Planning Commission, subject to:

- A revised plan addressing the items of the July 13, 2017 and July 20, 2017 Giffels Webster review reports be submitted for administrative review.

Motion carried unanimously (8-0)

C. SITE PLAN 61-6-2017

LOCATION:	29200 Orchard Lake Rd.
PARCEL I.D.:	22-23-11-101-039
PROPOSAL:	Addition of outdoor seating for an existing restaurant in B-4, Planned General Business District
ACTION REQUESTED:	Approval of Site Plan
APPLICANT:	Amardeep Singa
OWNER:	DTA, LLC

Utilizing overhead slides and referring to the Giffels Webster review letter dated July 13, 2017, Planning Consultant Tangari gave the review for this request to add outdoor seating for an existing restaurant in the B-4 zoning District.

The applicant was proposing an outdoor dining area, located on the west side of the restaurant facing Orchard Lake Road. The space would be 48 feet in length and 12 feet in width. 133 square feet of this proposed area would be used as a service area. Plans showed 4 tables with 2 seats and 5 tables with 4 seats, thus seating a total of 28 customers. Outdoor space for seating areas accessory to a restaurant was a permitted use in this district and was subject to the regulations of 34-4.32.

Outstanding issues included:

- Outdoor space for seating could not be located within 200 feet of a residential district, unless separated by a major or secondary thoroughfare. It appeared the outdoor seating space fell short

of this requirement by 37 feet. Even though there was unlikely to be a conflict with the residential district in this case, a ZBA variance was required.

- 49 parking spaces were required; 47 were provided. Different information was provided in writing regarding parking calculations. The applicant should confirm the number of spaces provided. If 49 spaces were not provided, a ZBA variance would be needed.
- It was unclear whether any exterior lighting fixtures would be installed with the outdoor seating area. The applicant should confirm if lighting fixtures would be used, and if so provide lighting specifications as well as a photometric plan.

Commissioner Mantey asked about the Fire Marshal requiring vehicle impact protection posts for the exterior seating area. Planning Consultant Tangari said that the seating area was at the end of a drive, and the posts were most likely needed to protect the diners in that area.

Commissioner Orr asked about shifting the landscaping island in order to accommodate 2 more parking spaces. City Planner Stec said the island held the primary landscaping for the site. Planning Consultant Arroyo noted that the entire parking lot actually flowed into a neighboring lot; this informal shared parking impacted the parking for the properties there.

Amardeep Singh, 29200 Orchard Lake Road, was present on behalf of this application. He explained that they needed outdoor seating as other restaurants did on Orchard Lake Road. They were also going to open up the front of the building with a window; currently that area of the restaurant was dark and closed in.

MOTION by Orr, support by McRae, that Site Plan 61-6-2017, dated June 14, 2017, submitted by Amardeep Singh, be approved because it appears to meet all applicable requirements of the Zoning Chapter, subject to the following conditions:

- ZBA variances are granted for the following two items:
 - Permit an accessory outdoor seating area for a restaurant within 163' of a residential district when the minimum required distance from a residential district is 200'
 - The waiver of two required off street parking spaces
- A revised plan be submitted for administrative review addressing the items identified in the July 13, 2017 GW review report.

Commissioner Brickner noted that a restaurant just south of this location also had outdoor dining.

MOTION carried unanimously (8-0).

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

June 8, 2017 & June 15, 2017

It was noted that on page 6 of the June 8, 2017 minutes, 5th paragraph, ~~BZA~~ should be ZBA. This correction was made.

MOTION by Orr, support by Brickner, to approve the June 8 and June 15, 2017 minutes as published.

MOTION carried unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS

Commissioner Mantey suggested that the outdoor seating ordinance be cleaned up to accommodate situations such as the one presented this evening.

Commissioner Brickner said that he was happy to see Hitachi expanding in Farmington Hills.

Commissioner Schwartz noted that several years ago the cyclone fence along 13 Mile Road in front of the daycare center at 13 Mile Road and Greening Street was given a variance, conditioned on the fence being screened with landscaping. The screening bushes had mostly died and had been pulled out.

Commissioner Schwartz noted that the northwest corner at 12 Mile Road and Drake was serving as a staging area for utility trucks. This had destroyed the grass on the property. Trucks were parked there on the weekend and at night.

Commissioner Orr also was happy to see Hitachi expand. Hitachi's property was well kept and they had proved to be a great citizen of Farmington Hills.

Commissioner Countegan expressed pleasure at being able to serve on the Commission.

Chair Rae-O'Donnell suggested that the ordinance be reviewed for possible inclusion of drive-thru restaurants in other B Districts.

The next Planning Commission meetings were set for August 10 (study session) and August 17 (regular meeting).

City Planner Stec said the Target area/Grand River focus area had an active purchaser looking at the site. The buyer was interested in discussing mixed use for the property and was meeting with the City to see what could be accomplished there. Therefore, City Planner Stec suggested that the Commission might want to move away from focusing on that area at this time. He was hopeful that the buyer would bring a development plan forward that would meet the goals of the Corridor Improvement Authority, without the Commission and the City going through the process of prequalifying the area for a PUD.

Several current road construction projects were discussed.

City Planner Stec said that Staff Engineer Darnall was leaving City employment. New Staff Engineer Kennedy was also present this evening.

The Commission thanked Staff Engineer Darnall for his service to the Commission and the City.

ADJOURNMENT

Seeing that there was no further comment, Chair Rae-O'Donnell adjourned the meeting at 9:40 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,
Steven Stimson
Planning Commission Secretary

/cem