

**MINUTES  
CITY OF FARMINGTON HILLS  
PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING  
FARMINGTON HILLS CITY HALL – COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
July 23, 2015, 7:30 P.M.**

Chair Topper called the Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. on July 23, 2015.

Commissioners Present: Blizman, Fleischhacker, McRae, Orr, Rae-O’Donnell, Stimson, Topper

Commissioners Absent: Mantey, Schwartz

Others Present: Staff Planner Stec, Fire Marshall Olszewski, Staff Engineer Gushard, City Attorney Schultz, Planning Consultants Arroyo and Stirling

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

**MOTION by Rae-O’Donnell, support by Orr, to approve the agenda as published.**

**Motion carried 7-0 (Mantey, Schwartz absent).**

**REGULAR MEETING**

**A. PUD PLAN 1, 2015**

**SITE AND LANDSCAPE PLAN 64-6-2015**

LOCATION:	28080, & 28100 Grand River Ave and 21347 Colwell.
PARCEL I.D.:	22-23-36-403-003, 004; 404-003, 010, 011; 430-013
PROPOSAL:	Planned Unit Development Plan, Site and Landscape Plan request for expansion of existing Hospital and support facilities in a B-3, General Business District, P-1, Parking District and SP-2, Special Purpose District
ACTION REQUESTED:	Set for Planning Commission Public Hearing
APPLICANT:	Michael Thompson for HKS Architects, PC
OWNER:	Botsford Equities, Botsford General Hospital and Zieger Osteopath Hospital dba Botsford General

Utilizing overhead slides and referring to the ClearZoning review letter dated July 15, 2015, Planning Consultant Arroyo gave the background for this application, which was a request for a public hearing on PUD 1-2015, an application seeking Planned Unit Development (PUD) on a request for expansion of an existing hospital and support facilities through a phased development project on property owned by Botsford General Hospital and Zieger Osteopathic Hospital dba Botsford General.

Planning Consultant Arroyo said that the Planning Commission was required as part of the proposed PUD plan to hold a public hearing. The applicant was requesting a public hearing in accordance with Section 34-6.2, and consideration of their site plan, landscape plan and tree removal permit.

On May 14, 2015, the Commission made a preliminary finding that P.U.D. No. 1, 2015 qualified for the Planned Unit Development Option. A full review of the proposed PUD project would take place at the public hearing. Tonight’s review would cover the information needed for the Planning Commission to come to a decision regarding setting a public hearing.

Planning Consultant Arroyo reviewed general information on the proposed project and explained its phased nature:

Phase 1 would include an access drive from Oxford Avenue, within the commercial frontage there. This drive would be permanent and provide a service entrance/exit for delivery trucks, thus helping relieve congestion at the Botsford Drive entrance.

Phase 2 included a new four-level parking structure proposed between the hospital and the professional office building. The structure would provide 460 parking spaces primarily designated for patient and visitor use. Phase 2 would also include storm water detention located beneath the parking structure.

In Phase 3 of the project a temporary ambulance canopy would be constructed for use during the construction of the East Pavilion addition.

Phase 4:

- The new East Pavilion Addition, which would be a new three-story plus partial basement containing 77,000 square feet of space that would allow the expansion of the Botsford Hospital's emergency and trauma center, construction of a critical care unit, creation of a dedicated observation unit and 9 additional operating rooms. In addition, a new helipad was proposed on top of the penthouse of the new East Pavilion addition.
- New 20,000 square foot central energy plant that would be constructed on the north end of the hospital campus to provide additional infrastructure capacity to support the new construction/expansion of the existing physical plant, as well as replacing the aging system.

Phase 5 included a new 81,000 square foot addition to the south tower, consisting of five stories and a partial basement that would accommodate inpatient care rooms. The hospital's current capacity of 330 beds would remain the same but many double and triple rooms would be replaced with private rooms along with additional ICU beds.

The project also identified a first floor connector linking the new building entrances with the existing main entrance/lobby for the hospital. Renovations to vacated areas included the creation of a new centralized observation unit and consolidation of patient rooms, expansion and reconfiguration of the central service dock and receiving area, and relocation and expansion of the imaging service area. In addition, other site improvements including but not limited to landscaping and pedestrian walkways were proposed.

Planning Consultant Arroyo briefly reviewed process for Planned Unit Development proposals. Part of the process was that the applicants demonstrate that they were able to provide community benefits by using the flexible planning permitted under a PUD. In their letter dated June 18, 2015, the applicant identified several site enhancements as community benefits. These were listed in the July 15, 2015 ClearZoning review letter on page 3. The applicant had also included sustainable design features in their June 18, 2015 letter.

Planning Consultant Arroyo explained that the majority of the community benefits identified by the applicant addressed sound planning, engineering and construction practices; however it should be noted that the majority of the benefits were also already required by ordinance or code. Tonight would be a good time for the Planning Commission to discuss the community benefits as proposed.

Planning Consultant Arroyo outlined the deviations/variances requested by the applicant as part of this PUD proposal:

- Signage.

- Parking structure height (34 feet height requested, 30 feet allowed by ordinance).
- The elevator shafts located at the northeast and southeast corner of the parking structure (internal to the campus) extended beyond the top of the parapet wall an additional 19.7 feet. The applicant should confirm that the provisions of Section 34-3.26 of the Zoning Ordinance had been met or include this extra height for consideration as deviation/variance.
- Parking structure west setback – a deviation of 19.58 feet was requested.
- Parking structure east setback – a deviation of 4.83 feet was requested.
- South tower south setback – a deviation of 175.83 feet was requested.

Planning Consultant Arroyo addressed information requirements that were necessary to qualify for a PUD. The July 15 review letter (pages 4-5) listed some areas where this information was still needed or needed further clarification. These should be submitted by the applicant and reviewed administratively prior to the public hearing.

Planning Consultant Arroyo said the Planning Commission should look at facility loads. The Commission might want to discuss the need for a traffic impact study. While the hospital was not expanding the number of beds on site, the applicant should address any expansion of use generally, including an increase in number of employees, activity levels, etc.

Planning Consultant Arroyo said that the Planning Commission would also be reviewing the site and landscape plan. Under paragraph 9 of the review letter (page 6) some additional information was requested to help with this review.

Planning Consultant Arroyo concluded his review.

Commissioner Rae-O'Donnell asked which community benefit site enhancements exceeded ordinance requirements. Planning Consultant Arroyo said the applicants had indicated they were exceeding landscaping requirements. This would be further discussed when the full landscape plan review was presented at the public hearing. The question in general would be a good one to put to the applicant's architect.

Commissioner Orr referred to page 4, item 5 of the review letter regarding the south tower setback. Would Planning Consultant Arroyo further explain the formula of two times the height plus the length of the building for setback requirements?

Planning Consultant Arroyo said this formula took into consideration the bulk of the building, or visual massing.

Commissioner Blizman noted that the applicants were making a number of improvements to drainage and storm water detention, including the Clarenceville Drain. He asked the location on the map of the Clarenceville Drain. Planning Consultant Arroyo said that this drain was actually under the parking structure. Commissioner Blizman asked Staff Engineer Gushard if this was a significant community benefit. Staff Engineer Gushard said that she could not speak as to whether this was a significant improvement. However, any new location of that drain would require permitting through the Oakland County Water Resources Commission.

Commissioner Blizman asked City Attorney Schultz to explain the difference between a variance or deviation as used in the ClearZoning review letter. City Attorney Schultz said that these terms were actually interchangeable because through the PUD ordinance a developer was allowed to deviate from the ordinance. This could be called a deviation or a variance.

Commissioner Fleischhacker commented about process for this PUD proposal. It seemed unwieldy to go through the site plan at the same meeting when the public hearing was held on the PUD proposal generally. Traditionally the Planning Commission reviewed a site plan before the public hearing.

Chair Topper invited the applicants to speak on behalf of this proposal. Present for the applicants were David Walters, 28050 Grand River, Farmington Hills, Chief Medical Officer for the Beaumont Farmington Hills Botsford Campus; Michael A Thompson, HKS Architects, 235 East Main Street Suite 102C, Northville MI; Joe Siekirk, Plante Moran Cresa, 26300 Northwestern Highway, Southfield MI; and Andrew Parin, Grissim Metz Andriese Associates Landscapes, 300 E Cady Street, Northville MI.

Dr. Walters gave some introductory remarks regarding this proposal. He explained that they were modernizing a facility that had been built in 1964, 1972 and 1993. They were updating the facility to provide the standard of care demanded in the current environment. He gave examples of issues that were created because of the older facility, including too-short beds and bed spaces, multiple patients per room, etc. Private rooms were now the standard of care, not only for comfort but because healing was facilitated by providing spaces for families and providing isolation from infectious diseases, etc. The proposed development would result in about 193 private rooms, an updated and modernized emergency department, new larger operating rooms - 550 square feet – that would accommodate new and larger equipment including robots, modernized critical care units, etc. Dr. Walters said that they were proud to be part of the Beaumont Health System, and the proposed PUD would take the Botsford campus up to the to the standard of care which needed to be offered to the community.

Utilizing slides on the overhead projectors, Mike Thompson, architect, described the 5 phases of this development and the rationale for the phases as they moved forward. The access drive was first because it was needed for the construction equipment. The parking structure (Phase 2) and temporary emergency canopy (Phase 3) were next so that parking could be provided for hospital personnel and clients, and emergency needs handled, as the rest of the site was redeveloped. Phase 4 was the new central energy plant. At the same time they were building the energy plant they would construct the new east pavilion addition. Phase 5 would be the new south tower addition. Completion was targeted for August 2019. The number of beds would not be increased; rather the rooms would be almost all single-occupancy. Mr. Thompson said that a traffic impact study had been submitted to the Planning Department

Continuing to utilize the slide presentation, Mr. Parin, landscape architect, said that when planning site design, their vision was to provide a unified dynamic vision through improving vehicular and pedestrian circulation through upgraded landscape elements, focusing on safety and ease of use. They had provided a continuous promenade along the perimeter of the development that would connect to each entrance. Pedestrian circulation was improved by providing a consistent network of sidewalks from Grand River north to the main hospital. Because the site was landlocked, they had 3 distinct buffers they needed to address. Buffers on the north and south side of the site were adjacent to multi-family residential, and one on the west side that was adjacent to single family residential. The west side currently had a 6-foot tall wall, and the entire frontage along Oxford had mature landscaping that was currently thriving. This would be supplemented by adding an internal row of trees that would help provide greater screening for the single-family homes.

The south buffer currently had a carport along that frontage that provided an effective visual screen. They were proposing to add 2 new rows of canopy trees along the ring road that would help visually screen the southern property at a higher elevation. A third row of ornamental trees would help screen at a lower level as well.

The existing trees along the north buffer by the power plant would be preserved and supplemented with understory trees that would strengthen the screening from the north property line.

Regarding the rest of the landscaping, Mr. Parin said they were providing what they felt was very appropriate landscaping given the tight spatial constraints. Foundation planting would be around the entire perimeter of the new development. On the east side of the property there were 4 large landscape areas by the new emergency drop off and they had crowned those areas to provide a visual screen and a windscreen for the activities that took place at the emergency drop off. Continuous hedgerows were provided in front of all the parking in order to provide both internal screening and screening from the adjacent properties. Between the south and east tower would be an outdoor courtyard space, screened from the parking area by a low masonry landscape wall, and that would provide a large area of special paving and landscaping for patients, visitors and staff.

Mr. Parin said they were planting 100 additional trees on site, above and beyond what was required by ordinance and by replacement calculations.

By implementing these design features, they were helping to create a cohesive, complete campus environment that would benefit the entire community.

Mr. Thompson showed 3 slides/renderings of the campus, pointing out that:

- They were unifying the diverse architecture of the campus, including original and new buildings.
- They were committed to health care excellence with state of the art technology.
- They were providing a dramatic front along Grand River.

Mr. Thompson described materials for the new additions and structures, which included such materials as high performance glass and aluminum, and brick that matched/blended with existing structures.

Mr. Thompson said that the whole Botsford campus was 23.24 acres, and the last major addition was to the East Pavilion 23 years ago, in 1992. He reviewed the four major variances that were being requested as part of this PUD, and which had been reviewed earlier in the meeting by Planning Consultant Arroyo:

- Parking structure slightly over 30 feet tall and slightly into the side setback. Tabulations regarding the elevators and stairs would be submitted prior to the next meeting.
- South Tower height setback, which was positioned to abut the south end of the existing South Tower. The addition was positioned in this manner due to the hospital's planning, adjacency and staffing requirements, and could only be positioned to the south side due to the existing constraints of adjacent existing construction on each side.
- The East Pavilion, three stories with a penthouse, would also require ordinance relief.
- They were proposing larger signage for wayfinding. They would be working with the City to provide signage that was consistent with Farmington Hills standards.

Mr. Thompson showed some additional slides (Slide 8 and 9) that illustrated some profiles of the site. He affirmed that a traffic impact study especially regarding the proposed access drive had been submitted to the Planning Department this evening.

In response to a question from Chair Topper, Mr. Thompson said that Mr. Siekirk would address the particulars of the traffic study a little later in the meeting.

Mr. Thompson mentioned the storm water detention improvements that would result from this proposal. He also noted that while the entire Botsford site was 23 acres, the PUD area was slightly less than 50% of that. There would be no increase in parking or traffic. Right now there were 1660 parking spaces. When the work was done they would have 1634 parking spaces.

The temporary canopy for the temporary emergency service would not be screened up to ordinance standards because it would be later demolished.

Regarding documenting precisely the variances requested, they were in process of finalizing their engineering plans and a full report would be submitted before the next meeting. They would meet with City Departments and ClearZoning consultants hopefully within the next week, and at that time they would have a full response to all concerns.

Mr. Thompson reviewed the criteria for qualifying as a PUD optioned development. The Ordinance required that they meet one of the criteria, but they felt they met 5 criteria of Section 34.3.20:

- *To permanently establish land use patterns which are compatible or which will protect existing or planned use.*
- *To provide alternative uses for parcels which can provide transition buffers to residential areas.*
- *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.*
- *To promote the goals and objectives of the Master Plan for Land Use.*
- *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.*

Mr. Thompson referred to their April 20, 2015 for “Qualification for a PUD option” regarding the ways they were meeting the above requirements.

Joe Siekirk, Plante Moran Cresa, said that they had hosted an open house for residents on June 9. They had invited everyone within 300 feet of the campus, and spent time listening to and reacting to the concerns of local residents. The concerns included the access road on Oxford Street and the impact of construction noise on their neighborhood.

Mr. Siekirk said the access road was being designed so that a truck could not make the turn to go into the residential area of Oxford Street. Their construction partner was at the neighborhood meeting and had affirmed to the residents that they would adhere to the time limits for construction noise in the ordinance (7AM to 7PM). On a permanent basis the site had about 30 trucks per day. Oxford Avenue already had about 474 cars per day. The 30 trucks would have a minimal impact on Oxford and also on Grand River. They would be repaving Oxford from Grand River to the access drive to make it truck compatible.

The applicants concluded their presentation.

Commissioner McRae asked if the access drive would have a traffic signal. What was to keep non-truck traffic from using that access as well? Mr. Siekirk said they had discussed this and were open to suggestions. The access drive would be signed for “truck traffic only,” and security cameras would be there to help deal with enforcement. Regarding drivers using the access in order to get quickly onto Grand River, Mr. Siekirk said the hospital did have a traffic light at its main entrance, which helped with ease of entry and exit. If other

drivers did use the access drive they would be using it to go southbound to Grand River, which still should not impact the residential neighborhood. In response to a further question from Commissioner McRae, Mr. Siekirk said the access drive would be flagged during construction.

Mr. Siekirk said that a member of the construction team could be present for the August 20 meeting.

Commissioner Orr asked if they had thought about making the access a one-way in for trucks only. Mr. Siekirk said they were trying to keep truck traffic out of the other areas of the campus, and by making this two-way for trucks it would keep trucks away from the main drive.

Commissioner Orr asked what the residents were told regarding the parking structure. Was the variance requirement explained? Were the renderings shown from the perspective of a person about 150 feet away? Mr. Siekirk said they had not emphasized the need for a variance. Their renderings would have shown the correct perspectives from a standing person about 150 feet away. With the mature landscaping that was there along with the new landscaping, the parking structure would be well buffered from the surrounding community. Commissioner Orr addressed the nature of a public hearing, and encouraged the applicants to be proactive in terms of anticipating questions from the public at that meeting.

Regarding sound attenuation, Commissioner Orr asked that studies regarding claims for sound attenuation be submitted.

Regarding the landscaping plan, Commissioner Orr said that narrow islands that were bermed up high made it difficult for trees to thrive. He encouraged the use of native trees, including trees that had tap roots that did not require surface water.

Regarding the anticipated energy use, Commissioner Orr asked if energy use would decrease per square foot due to upgrading the energy plant. Mr. Thompson said that all the new energy equipment would be approximately 40% more efficient than that being used currently. Their energy consultant could generate a study showing a comparison and he would be prepared for this question at the public hearing. Commissioner Orr said that it was a community benefit if the hospital minimized its energy use.

In response to a question from Commissioner Rae-O'Donnell, Mr. Thompson said that the proposed parking structure would act as a physical barrier for sound and light from the campus. Its location across the street from Oxford, with the greenbelt, a wall, then a double-loaded drive and another row of trees, then a single-loaded parking lane, and then the parking structure itself, all combined to provide an excellent sound and light barrier for the residential neighborhood.

Commissioner Rae-O'Donnell asked what the predominant concerns of the neighbors were, as expressed at the June 9 community meeting. Mr. Siekirk said they had a good question and answer session and took detailed notes of the Q & A which they could supply to the Commission. The concerns included:

- Would they be purchasing land in residential neighborhoods?
- Parking structure height.
- Landscaping.
- Patient tower height.
- Construction schedule.
- Any off site construction?
- Any adverse impact on residents' utilities?
- Traffic on Oxford Street.

- Why was the project necessary?
- Truck access signage and enforcement.
- Increased traffic through the neighborhoods.
- Information regarding the helipad.
- Additional cars on site?

In response to questions from Chair Topper, Mr. Siekirk said that about 50 people attended the June 9 meeting, representing approximately 30 households. 1500 residents were invited.

Commissioner McRae asked for more information regarding the energy utility building, which would include cooling towers. Wouldn't these have noise issues?

Mr. Siekirk said the new cooling towers would be far less noisy than those used currently and would be totally screened. They would bring information regarding the energy equipment generally including efficiencies and noise levels to the next meeting.

Commissioner McRae asked for a rendering that would show the height of the parking deck including parapets in comparison to the buildings nearest this.

In response to a question from Commissioner McRae, Staff Engineer Gushard said all the plans identifying the Clarenceville Drain showed that would be relocated. Mr. Thompson added that the drain relocation was occurring at significant expense and did provide a public benefit. They would share more information regarding this at the next meeting and explain the public benefit more completely at that time.

Chair Topper confirmed that there would be no new employees added. Were there any projections on increased activity level as a result of this development?

Mr. Siekirk said that while there were 9 OR rooms being added, six of these were actually replacements of older rooms. In terms of increased activity or increased employees, the impact would be minimal. The expansion was being done to provide greater and more modern space, not to increase activity.

In response to a question from Commissioner Blizman, Mr. Siekirk said the total budget for this project was \$160 million.

Commissioner Blizman indicated he was ready to make a motion. As preamble, he noted that the City had spent significant time and resources on the Grand River Corridor area and the hospital was a huge part of that. As well, the City wanted to protect property values in the area; the Planning Commission had a charge to help those residents especially on Oxford Street. This project – which was a good one – should move forward.

**MOTION by Blizman, support by Fleischhacker, that the Planning Commission set P.U.D. Plan No. 1, 2015, including Site and Landscape Plan 64-6-2015, submitted on June 18, 2015 by Michael Thompson of HKS Architects, for Public Hearing on August 20, 2015.**

**Motion carried 7-0 (Mantey, Schwartz absent).**

**B. SITE AND LANDSCAPE PLAN 61-6-2015**

LOCATION: 35080 Grand River Ave.

PARCEL I.D.:	22-23-21-351-031
PROPOSAL:	Auto Dealership improvements in a B-3, General Business District
ACTION REQUESTED:	Approval of Site and Landscape Plan
APPLICANT:	Serra Works of Farmington, LLC
OWNER:	Serra Works of Farmington, LLC

Referring to the ClearZoning review letter dated July 15, 2015, and utilizing overhead slides, Planning Consultant Stirling gave the background for this application, which was for a Site Plan, Tree Removal Permit and Landscape Plan to permit a building removal and expansion and site improvements for an automotive dealership and service business, Serra Toyota Scion Dealership.

Planning Consultant Stirling said this was a 6.3 acre site, zoned B-3, General Business, located on the north side of Grand River. Recently the Planning Commission had seen a proposal for the Mirage Theater, which was directly west of the site.

The existing site currently had 3 buildings, a parking lot for inventory, and a cell tower located along the east property line at the north quadrant of the site. Adjacent land uses were a shared detention pond to the north, industrial land uses that fronted on Indoplex Circle, a bowling alley to the east, and a McDonalds and Autozone to the west. Just to the north of the Autozone was the proposed Mirage Theater.

Site access was from Grand River, with a median that had approximately 3 trees. There was 423.32 feet of frontage along Grand River.

Planning Consultant Stirling said that tonight's proposal included a 747 square foot addition to Building A, resulting in a 37,602 square foot building for automotive sales and service, removal of 5,396 square feet from Building B, resulting in an 8,260 square foot service building, and removal of Building C, a 31,150 square foot building.

The applicant would retain the existing use, including automobile service and sales, a permitted use within the B-3 Zoning District. Ordinance qualifiers that were added to the plan included a note regarding no outdoor storage of scrap, junk or dismantled cars or spare parts on the lot, and the facility did not offer auto body repair.

Planning Consultant Stirling reviewed the dimensional requirements for the site, and explained that these requirements were met.

Regarding rooftop equipment, proposed new rooftop mechanical equipment did meet zoning ordinance requirements. However rooftop plans were not submitted for the existing buildings, including the remainder of Building A or Building B. During tonight's discussion with the applicant, rooftop screening should be addressed.

Regarding accessory buildings, dumpster enclosure requirements were met. The applicant should, however, provide additional information on the type of storage being proposed behind Building B.

Parking requirements were met, and size and setbacks for parking spaces were in compliance. Loading/unloading areas exceeded ordinance requirements.

Review of acceleration-deceleration passing lanes should be performed by the Engineering Department. The applicant was removing the center island in the approach, thereby widening the access drive.

There were several easements including utility easements on the site. The applicant might need to relocate these improvements, vacate the easement and/or secure approval from the city's Engineering Division for encroachment. Some modifications to landscaping along the northwest property line might also be necessary, and these would be discussed under Landscape Review. The corner clearance needed to be shown on the landscape plan.

Regarding exterior lighting, the applicant should provide additional plan details that verified that the lighting fixtures met minimum standards. Also the ordinance standard was that maximum illumination at the property line should not exceed 0.3 foot candles. However, the Planning Commission could modify that level if such modifications were deemed necessary and appropriate to protect public safety. There were areas along Grand River Avenue where the lighting rose to 45 foot candles; the Planning Commission needed to review this situation as part of the site plan review. The applicant should also provide additional plan details that verified that the ambient lighting levels complied with ordinance standards.

Requirements for pedestrian connections, including clearly marked pavement for pedestrian crossings, etc., were met.

Planning Consultant Stirling concluded the site plan review.

Commissioner McRae said that the Commission had not received the photometric plans. He confirmed with Planning Consultant Stirling that the exterior lighting requirements were not met, especially along Grand River Avenue, where the illumination at the property line rose as high as 45 foot candles.

Commissioner Orr addressed the cross access agreement between McDonalds and Autozone to the west, and with the new theater that had been recently approved to the northwest. Should there a "stop for pedestrians" sign or some other traffic control mechanism?

Staff Planner Stec said the access to this property was a little further east than the shared access drive.

Commissioner Orr remained concern about the cross access drive, especially as it might be utilized by pedestrians at night.

Lisa Easterwood, Fleis & Vandenbrink Engineering, 9475 Holly Rd., Suite 201, Grand Blanc MI 48439 was present on behalf of this application. Jim Touhy, General Manager of Serra Toyota, 35080 Grand River, Farmington Hills MI, Jason Fochtman, Architect, Nudell Architects, 31690 W 12 Mile Rd., Farmington Hills MI 48334, and Pat Barker, Attorney, Simen, Figura & Parker, P.L.C., 5206 Gateway, Flint MI, were also present.

Jim Touhy, Serra Toyota General Manager, said that they had just finished their 10<sup>th</sup> year at this location, and gave some history of the dealership, including its continued growth over time, demonstrated by a move to a larger building, a doubling of sales and tripling of the employee work force. They looked forward to a successful completion of this project.

Jason Fochtman, architect, distributed further drawings regarding the visibility of the rooftop equipment on Building B. The area behind Building B was a storage area for used oil, completely enclosed. A service company came in and disposed of the used oil.

Regarding the acceleration/deceleration lanes, they did want to remove the boulevard from the entrance. Currently car haulers had difficulty maneuvering around the Toyota building. With the removal of the old office building as proposed, and the removal of the boulevard, access for the car haulers would be much improved. The applicants would add corner clearance information to the plan.

Ms. Easterbrook said that they had discussed the lighting situation with their lighting consultant. Regarding the 0.3 foot candles at the property line, they actually did meet this requirement, until they understood that the right of way line was the property line. While the foot candles were higher at the property line, lighting was still below the maximum 50 foot candles that were allowed on site.

Regarding the ambient light, there was a prep sheet attached to the photometric plan that listed the lighting fixtures at 1738 lumens, below the 2,000 lumen maximum.

In response to a question from Chair Topper, Planning Consultant Stirling said the applicants had not interpreted the property line correctly. Ms. Easterwood said the photometric plan showed the numbers at the edge of the parking lot, and not at the property line. Lights would be shielded and directed into the parking lot.

Commissioner McRae asked to see the photometric plans. What was the distinction between the property line and the right of way line?

Commissioner Orr wondered if the current or future right of way line was used for this calculation.

Commissioner Orr confirmed with Mr. Fochtman that there would be a parapet wall on Building B. Commissioner Orr explained that the ordinance required that all rooftop equipment be screened to the height of the equipment.

In response to a question from Mr. Fochtman, Commissioner Orr explained that since the building was being modified, ordinance standards had to be applied. Any rooftop equipment on the other buildings would also have to be screened.

In response to a question from Chair Topper, City Planner Stec said he would recommend the applicants review and modify their lighting plan so that the lighting conformed to the ordinance. This could be handled administratively.

Commissioner Orr asked the applicants about access to the retention pond to the north.

Pat Parker, attorney, addressed the easement situation on this site. When the land was divided and Serra Toyota purchased the property in 2012, they noted existing easements and also entered in to some additional easements with the properties where the McDonalds and Autozone businesses were now located. They also had the benefit of easements at the rear of the property for the detention facilities. There apparently was a water line that didn't appear to be under an easement on the west side of the property line; they did not have a problem with cooperating and getting an easement in place for that existing water line. There was also a question about a cross access easement running from Serra Toyota's entranceway to the west. Mr. Parker showed where cross-access agreements existed and said they had no problem cooperating with the City's request for further cross-access agreements with the businesses to the west, if necessary. The remainder of the site had extra easements that needed to be consolidated or removed. He didn't think they encroached on any existing easements.

Commissioner Orr said there had been conversation when the theater was approved to the northwest if there could be a combined access to the detention area. From the drawings presented this evening, it looked like there was quite a bit of access to the detention area through the Serra Toyota property, and it looked like they were not developing the very back end of the property. Commissioner Orr asked Staff Engineer Gushard if Engineering was satisfied with the access to the detention area as now constituted.

Staff Engineer Gushard said that this was an extremely large pond/detention area that served several different properties. They were asking for access on each property. For instance, if there was ever a maintenance issue and it was along the west side of the pond could access be gained there?

In response to further questions from Commissioner Orr, Staff Engineer Gushard said that one access being requested was across the Serra Toyota site and the new Mirage Theater in order to allow for on-site access from this site off to the Drake Road approach. Secondly, they were asking for a standard access easement to the pond from this site and a separate one from the Mirage Theater.

Commissioner Orr asked Staff Engineer Gushard if the Planning Commission approved tonight's application, would this keep the Engineering Division from getting what was needed in terms of cross access to the detention pond? Staff Engineer Gushard said that the access agreements could be resolved administratively during engineering review.

Mr. Parker said there were some easements from 1980, and there might already be legal access back to the detention area. They would cooperate one way or the other with the City in this regard.

Commissioner McRae followed up with comments regarding the lighting situation. According to the plans presented, the future right of way was right at the edge of the concrete sidewalk. This was 20 feet or so from the parking lot line. The foot candles had been measured at the parking lot line. There was no way the foot candles could come into conformance within that short distance. He wondered if they could come up with a photometric plan that would show .3 foot candles at the property line.

Fire Marshall Olszewski asked that safeguards be put in place regarding the used oil stored in the northwest corner behind the service area.

**MOTION by Fleischhacker, support by Stimson, that Site Plan No. 61-6-2015, dated July 13, 2015, submitted by Serra Works of Farmington, LLC, be approved because it appears to meet all applicable requirements of the Zoning Chapter. This approval is subject to the following conditions:**

- **All necessary easements are finalized with the engineering division**
- **All storage of oil is done in accordance with Fire Marshal requirements**
- **A revised site plan is submitted addressing the following items is submitted for administrative review:**
  - **Roof-top screening requirements be met.**
  - **Items in the July 15, 2015 ClearZoning review report be addressed.**
  - **A revised photometric plan showing that the maximum illumination levels per Section 34-5.16 are not exceeded.**

**Motion carried 7-0 (Mantey, Schwartz absent).**

Landscape Plan Review

Referring to the ClearZoning review letter dated July 15, 2015, and utilizing overhead slides, Planning Consultant Stirling now gave the tree removal permit and landscape plan review for this application.

Regarding the tree removal permit, 19 trees were surveyed on site. Three regulated trees, located within the drive island at the entrance to the site, were proposed for removal. A one-to-one replacement was required. This standard had been met through the proposed landscape plans. However, protective tree fencing notes and graphic detail must conform to City standards; this could be approved administratively.

Regarding the landscape plan, the open space standard had been met.

In addition to the trees shown on the tree survey, there were two dead trees in the right-of-way. The applicant had agreed to work with the Oakland County Road Commission to remove those trees and meet any Oakland County requirements.

As proposed the applicant was required to plant 44 trees. However, they had included 16 existing canopy trees into their calculation as part of that number. Therefore, they would need to provide an additional 16 trees over and above what was listed on the landscape plan.

Planning Consultant Stirling reviewed the location of the new trees. Sheet C5.0 showed eleven trees planted along the north property line, within the access easement. This would need to be resolved, though trees were permitted in the area around the detention pond. One suggestion was to consider putting some of the trees along the west property line that would eventually be shared with the theater, in order to provide separation between the two businesses.

Along the front property line at Grand River, the ordinance required landscaping separation between a public thoroughfare and a parking area. The plans showed a green space between the northerly right-of-way line of Grand River Avenue and the parking green space. The ordinance required a planted hedge of small shrubs or a masonry wall or berm a minimum of 2 feet high. However, the Planning Commission could accept existing vegetation to meet this requirement. The Planning Commission should discuss this with the applicant.

Commissioner Orr asked if trees could be put on the north end of the site that was currently graveled. Planning Consultant Stirling said trees could be placed here.

Mr. Touhy said that they would prefer not to place trees on the west side of the parking lot because trees were not a friend of cars generally. There was plenty of area in the rear for the necessary trees.

Commissioner McRae asked about providing some sort of visual separation between the parking lots of this business and the new Mirage Theater.

Planning Consultant Arroyo said that they had received the plans from the theater and it looked like they were putting a portion of a landscaped area along that shared property edge. If Serra Toyota would put some landscaping in the width of one parking space there would be a nice delineation between the two properties and provide some green space in the area. However, this could be worked out administratively.

Commissioner Orr asked about adding understory vegetation along Grand River. Mr. Touhy said that he would prefer another option. Planning Consultant Stirling said the Commission could accept the existing vegetation, consisting mainly of honey locust trees along Grand River.

Commissioner Orr pointed out that the dealership wanted to show its cars, and not have them blocked by landscaping. Commissioner McRae confirmed with Mr. Touhy that the cars parked along Grand River were display vehicles.

Planning Consultant Arroyo further explained that because this was an existing site that was being modified, the Commission needed to determine how far they would go to bring the site into full compliance with the Ordinance. The Commission could make a determination that the applicant had made substantial compliance in a number of areas, and the front landscaping could be allowed to remain as is. City Attorney Schultz agreed.

Commissioner Blizman said they should support those things that would help this business remain successful, and he supported accepting the front landscaping as it currently existed.

**MOTION by Orr, support by Blizman, that Landscape Plan No. 61-6-2015, dated July 13, 2015, submitted by Serra Works of Farmington, LLC, be approved with the determination that the existing landscaping along Grand River may remain as an existing condition, because it appears to meet all applicable Zoning Chapter requirements and applicable Design Principles as adopted by the Planning Commission. This approval is conditioned upon a revised plan addressing the following:**

- **Additional required parking lot trees be planted along the property line shared with the parcel to the west to delineate the transition from the vehicle display parking area and the parking lot of any future development on the site adjacent to the west. Alternatively, a hedged landscape island may be installed and the additional parking lot trees may be installed at the far north end of the site.**

**Motion carried 7-0 (Mantey, Schwartz absent).**

**C. SITE AND LANDSCAPE PLAN 62-6-2015**

LOCATION:	34918 Eight Mile Rd.
PARCEL I.D.:	22-23-33-376-024
PROPOSAL:	Convalescent Home in a RC-2, Multiple Family Residential District
ACTION REQUESTED:	Approval of Site and Landscape Plan
APPLICANT:	John Maniaci of Property Management Services of MI
OWNER:	Sterling Land Ventures, LLC

Utilizing overhead slides and referring to the revised ClearZoning review letter dated July 17, 2015, Planning Consultant Stirling gave the review for this application, which was to request approval of site and landscape plan, including tree removal permit, in order to permit construction of a senior/convalescent facility, Farmington Hills Assisted Living.

Planning Consultant Stirling gave the location for this application and reviewed surrounding zoning and uses. The existing site was vacant with significant tree cover. The 4.65 acre property had 273 feet of frontage on west 8 Mile Road and a depth of 744 feet along the west property line, to 743 feet along the east property line. There was an existing access on the east corner of the site. Access should be reviewed by the Engineering Division.

The proposed development was for a 92-bed convalescent home/assisted living facility with a total of 70 efficiency units, 22 of which would have double beds. The 59,885 square foot building would include residential efficiency units, common dining and day use areas, a commercial kitchen and housekeeping area. The project as identified on Sheet C-3 was being phased with the north and south buildings occurring as part of phase two.

Planning Consultant Stirling reviewed the differences and definitions of an *elderly housing-dependent* residence as compared to *convalescent or nursing home*. The applicant had provided a letter dated July 10 describing the type of facility and how the facility would function. There would be no cooking facilities within the individual units, and there would be a congregant dining room where all meals would be served. The Planning Commission would need to determine that the use was similar to a convalescent facility in order to apply the standards as outlined the ClearZoning review.

Planning Consultant Stirling reviewed the dimensional requirements as listed on page 3 of the review letter, pointing out that minimum side yards – both east and west – were deficient, as was the open space provided. Variances would need to be sought from the Zoning Board of Appeals.

The deficiencies were:

- Minimum east side yard was **98.33 feet** formula  $(L+2H)/6$ . **36 feet were proposed.**
- Minimum west side yard was **58 feet** formula  $(L+2H)/6$ . **29 feet were proposed.**
- Open space, 1,000 square feet per bed, **92,000 square feet required. 78,154 square feet proposed.**

There were some inconsistencies in the plan noted in italics on page 3 of the review letter that could be handled administratively.

The applicant had proposed two accessory structures – a garage and dumpster enclosure. Ordinance standards for these structures were met, including the dumpster enclosure standard.

Regarding off-street parking requirements, the Planning Commission should discuss with the applicant the parking needs for the proposed residential use, and make a determination that the same standards would apply here as for a convalescent home. The parking standard for a convalescent home was one parking space for each four beds. Based on this the applicant would need 23 parking spaces. 44 spaces were provided, so this standard had been met. However, upon request the applicant had provided in their letter date July 10, 2015, a statement that they felt they needed a ratio of 1 parking space for every two rooms. This was standard throughout the industry, and based on this standard, 35 parking spaces would meet their needs. This standard was also met.

Off-street parking space layout standards had been met.

Regarding off-street loading and unloading, the site had a single two-way drive leading into the site, with a hatched area along the east property line, and with a grass paver access drive around the exterior of the building. The paver driveway was added to address concerns raised by staff with regard to emergency vehicle access and also with regard to loading and unloading and deliveries within the site. City staff was concerned that the grass pavers were more difficult to maintain and using it for emergency vehicle access resulted in further concerns. There were also concerns with maneuverability on the site, including the ability of truck or ambulance ability to turn around within the site.

Planning Consultant Stirling said that the Engineering Division and Wayne County Department of Roads would need to review the acceleration/deceleration lanes.

Corner clearance needed to be shown on site. There appeared to be evergreen trees planted within the corner clearance area. These should be replaced with a planting that met requirements.

Exterior lighting standards regarding the combination of wall and pole mounted light fixtures had been met. All fixtures were shielded. A note should be added to the plan that no direct light source should be visible at the property line at ground level, and additional information was required to verify compliance for ambient lighting levels at the building entrance.

Pedestrian connection standards had been met. A walkway was provided from the public sidewalk to the internal sidewalk which created a walking path around the entire building.

Regarding the Tree Removal Permit and the Landscape Plan, Planning Consultant Stirling said that this was a heavily treed undeveloped site. There were 189 trees surveyed, of which 161 were regulated. 140 regulated trees were being removed. 107 replacement trees were being provided and replacement funds for 33 trees were being paid into the tree fund. The applicant needed to provide a column in the Tree Inventory List indicating individual trees to be removed or saved, and a more legible tree survey needed to be submitted. Protective tree fencing notes and graphic detail needed to conform to City standards.

Regarding the landscape plan, several items needed to be addressed as part of a landscape plan resubmittal, as noted on page 6 of the review letter. The applicant needed to note on the plans which trees were being used to satisfy the replacement tree requirements and which trees were being used to satisfy the standard for one canopy tree for each 2,800 square feet of paved surface. Also, the applicant should submit the screening/understory plantings on a revised landscape plan.

Regarding the buffer yard requirements, a buffer yard was required between an RC district where it abutted an RA district. The RA district was located to the north. Existing vegetation could serve as the buffer. The preserved woodland was approximately 75 feet deep and met the intent of the buffer. The applicant was showing additional plantings within the preserved wooded area. A note should be added stating that the plantings were field located and may or may not be installed depending on field conditions. The Planning Commission should determine whether it would accept all or a portion of the existing vegetation. Should the Commission determine that additional buffer plantings were required, the chart on Sheet C-8 should be revised to include the additional required planting.

Planning Consultant Stirling concluded her review.

Commissioner Orr asked if HVAC units would be placed on the ground. Planning Consultant Stirling said she had not noted any on the roof and did not see any placed on the ground. Commissioner Orr said the applicants were already short of open space, and now all the HVAC units appeared to be ground-placed. These should be shown on the plan and deducted from available open space.

Commissioner Fleischhacker noted that the 24 evergreens were shown at 8 feet high. The ordinance required these to be 10 feet high. The plans should be revised to show this correction.

Commissioner Rae-O'Donnell asked about Fire Department concerns for this site.

Referring to the July 2, 2015 Fire Department memo, Fire Marshal Olszewski said that hydrant coverage could be worked out, but the access for emergency vehicles was still a very strong concern. This type of facility was usually visited 200 –300 times a year by EMS vehicles, not all of which were small. They were going to have trouble turning around on this site. They had had many discussions regarding this site, and they still did not have adequate turn around space. Grass pavers being used 200 – 300 times a year would be problematic.

Tom Ponton, Stonefield Engineering & Design, LLC, 2350 Franklin Rd., Bloomfield Hills MI, was present on behalf of this application. He explained that Leisure Living had been operating facilities such as the one proposed since 1995, and was currently operating approximately 40 such facilities in Michigan.

Mr. Ponton addressed issues as they had been presented this evening:

- Regarding open space area, they were utilizing the grass paver areas as open space. They were willing to change this to pavement, but they had used pavers at other facilities throughout the northeast and found this use to be successful as long as it was maintained correctly. It did support 25 ton equipment as required by the Fire Department. They believed an ambulance could make the turnaround to the east of the building. They would run a truck turning analysis for the site as well.
- If the areas with pavers were removed from paved area, they would meet the open space requirement and not need to seek a variance.
- They could add the necessary lighting information.
- They had submitted to and received initial positive feedback from Wayne County.
- They were not changing the rear 75 feet of the property.
- Regarding side yard setbacks, they had tried to break up the massing of the building as much as they could. They had added pedestrian access all the way around the building.
- They would meet requirements for fire hydrants.
- They would change the planned evergreen trees to 10 feet.
- They were proposing 131 trees and 200 shrubs. They were adding native trees wherever they could and would be adding money to the tree fund.
- Leisure Living did have beautiful facilities with well-appointed landscaping. The building would have cultured stone and shake style siding, a gable roof, along with a cupola at the drop-off area, and a unique interior floor plan. It would be a beautiful building overall.

In response to a question from Chair Topper, Mr. Ponton said they provided care for independent living and also memory care. Chair Topper clarified that this would then not be a skilled nursing facility.

Mr. Ponton said this was a low-intensity user, especially compared to other similar facilities.

Mr. Ponton said they were able to take the ClearZoning recommendations into account and resubmit their drawings. They had reduced the number of beds and proposed the driveway all the way around the building.

In response to a question from Chair Topper, Fire Marshal Olszewski said that an overhang on the building might impair loading and unloading their largest EMS trucks. They needed 13'6" height clearance for a turnaround; the applicants would need to prove that this was provided. However, the plan as presented this evening was a little more feasible for him to be able to recommend approval.

Commissioner McRae asked about the points raised in the Environmental Review by Karen Mondora dated 7/1/2015. The first point said that the proposed size of the storm water basin appeared to be undersized. Porous pavers were also recommended. Could the applicants address these points?

Mr. Ponton said that they were considering a site feature for storm water detention that would also beautify the site. They understood the issues addressed in the Environmental Review and were planning on meeting all engineering requirements. The grass pavers were a pre-cast block with a pattern that allowed grass to grow through. These could be plowed in winter and would be maintained to standard.

Commissioner Orr confirmed that the site plan before the Commission represented changes to the plan made in response to the consultant and staff review letters. He noted that setback requirements were still not met and would still need variances from the Zoning Board of Appeals.

In response to a further question from Commissioner Orr, Mr. Ponton said the HVAC units would be ground mounted in the individual courtyards. They would not be in direct contact with residents' bedrooms, would be placed in spaces already shown as paved area and would not reduce the available open space.

In response to a question from Commissioner Blizman, Mr. Ponton said they were still considering a site feature that would be part of the storm water detention. They would attempt to design this as storm water control was finalized with Wayne County and with the City. There would be large pipes fitted under the parking lot.

Commissioner Blizman said that as some of the residents were receiving memory care, would such a pond be a hazard for people with memory challenges potentially wandering on site and falling in? Mr. Ponton said that if the area were planned and constructed as discussed, it would have a fence around it.

Chair Topper asked what percentage of the 92 residents would be memory care? Mr. Ponton said he thought about 21 units would be committed to memory care patients.

Samantha Thelen, Regional Director of Operations for Leisure Living Management, 3196 Kraft Avenue, Suite 200, Grand Rapids, MI 49512, spoke to the needs of assisted living and memory residents. Phase 1 included the two assisted living memory units, which had 7 residents per unit, or 14 residents. There would be another 7 added on as part of Phase 2, but only if there was need. 14 apartments would be assisted living. While it looked like they had a lot of beds, those were the amount of beds the facility was licensed to have. The number of apartments was actually very small.

Chair Topper addressed parking issues for the site. Ms. Thelen said that in their largest facility in Michigan that had 80 beds, only 2 residents had cars. Their average age was 84-86 years and the residents were reasonably frail. They would mostly not be driving.

Commissioner McRae asked if the pavers counted as paved area or open space. Planning Consultant Stirling said these counted as open space. It was possible that the project as presented this evening actually met open space requirements.

Commissioner McRae asked if the entire project would be built, or if phases 2 and 3 would be added only if necessary. Ms. Thelen said that 100% of what they had built to this day had added within a year the completing phases of the facility.

Commissioner Orr asked where elder housing-dependent and convalescent homes were distinguished within the zoning chapter. Were these mutually exclusive in the ordinance? The motion could indicate that the Commission saw this as similar to a convalescent home.

Mr. Ponton pointed out that if this were an elder housing-dependent facility, it would require about 80 parking spaces, which they did not need. They were asking to be determined to be a convalescent facility.

Chair Topper indicated she was ready to entertain a motion.

**MOTION by McRae, support by Orr, that Site Plan No. 62-6-2015, dated July 13, 2015 submitted by John Maniaci of Property Management Services of MI be approved as a convalescent home because it appears to meet all applicable requirements of the Zoning Chapter. This approval is subject to the following conditions:**

- **Necessary variances for side yard setbacks and potential required open space deficiencies are granted by the ZBA**
- **Final engineering approval of storm water detention area**
- **Final approval by the Fire Department of emergency vehicle accessibility including but not limited to the access route around the building and turning radii within the site.**

**Motion carried 7-0 (Mantey, Schwartz absent).**

Commissioner McRae asked that the motion for approval for the landscape plan reflect the possibility of planting larger trees on site as an alternative to placing money in the tree fund.

**MOTION by Rae-O'Donnell, support by Stimson, that Landscape Plan No. 62-6-2015, dated July 13, 2015, submitted by John Maniaci of Property Management Services of MI be approved because it appears to meet all applicable Zoning Chapter requirements and applicable Design Principles as adopted by the Planning Commission. This approval is subject to the following condition:**

- **A revised plan is submitted addressing the items identified in the July 17, 2015 ClearZoning review report.**

**Also, the motion reflects that the planting of larger trees should be explored to reduce the overall number of replacement trees needed, with the possible reduction of funds needed to be paid into the city's tree fund.**

**Motion carried 7-0 (Mantey, Schwartz absent).**

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** June 11 and June 25, 2015

**MOTION by McRae, support by Fleischhacker, to approve the June 11 and June 25, 2015 minutes as submitted.**

**Motion carried 7-0 (Mantey, Schwartz absent).**

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** None

**COMMISSIONER'S COMMENTS:**

The next meeting was scheduled for August 20, 2015.

Commissioner Orr asked about asphalt trucks parked along Drake Road, and the parking of cars on grass surfaces. Staff Planner Stec said he would follow up on these items.

Commissioner McRae asked about road construction activity as a result of the road millage passed by voters. Staff Engineering Gushard said they were having a pre-construction meeting tomorrow, and several large areas were going to be included in road construction work. She would get a summary of these projects to the Commission.

Commissioner Blizman asked about process. Were landscape and site plan reviews now being presented together? Staff Planner Stec said this was the process going forward. Deadlines for submissions had also been changed so that there was plenty of time for reviews, thus increasing the quality of the plans brought before the Planning Commission.

Discussion was had regarding site plan review for the Beaumont/Botsford PUD. Chair Topper suggested that perhaps a study session might be appropriate.

Commissioner Blizman asked about new residential developments within old Farmington Public Schools properties. Staff Planner Stec said the only one he knew about was a plan for 17 units at the Woodale School Property. Commissioner Blizman said it was shortsighted to sell off school properties when the population trend might reverse, with seniors moving out and young families moving back in. The City should be proactive regarding this situation.

Commissioner Stimson asked if there had been a traffic study done on the Farmington Road/12 Mile area regarding the new parking structure that was going in there. One of the property owners in the Quakertown area had approached Commissioner Stimson regarding this issue, especially regarding people making a left turn on Farmington Road during rush hour. Staff Planner Stec said that the Engineering Division would make their evaluation regarding this issue, and make recommendations/enforce any necessary changes for traffic safety.

Commissioner Fleischhacker said he used the new round-about at 14 Mile and Orchard Lake Road on Sunday before noon, and the traffic was backed up at that time.

Commissioner Rae-O'Donnell asked about the timetable for demolishing the Alexander Hamilton building. Staff Planner Stec said the developers had signed the PUD documents today. The documents then went to City Clerk for some further housekeeping details, and then the project could begin to move forward.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

Seeing that there was no further discussion, Chair Topper adjourned the meeting at 10:32 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Steven Schwartz  
Planning Commission Secretary

/cem