MINUTES
CITY OF FARMINGTON HILLS
PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBER
31555 11 MILE ROAD, FARMINGTON HILLS MI
April 16, 2015

Chair Topper called the Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. on April 16, 2015.

Commissioners Present:	Blizman, Fleischhacker, Mantey, McRae, Orr, Schwartz, Stimson, Topper
Commissioners Absent:	Rae-O'Donnell
Others Present:	Staff Planner Stec, City Attorney Schultz, Planning Consultant Arroyo

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Item B, Site and Landscape Plan 56-3-2015, was removed from the agenda per the applicant's request.

MOTION by Orr, support McRae, to approve the agenda as amended.

Motion carried 8-0 (Rae-O'Donnell absent).

REGULAR MEETING:

A. LOT SPLIT 2, 2015 (Final)

LOCATION:	Northeast corner of Orchard Lake Rd. and Runnymede St.
PARCEL I.D.:	22-23-14-351-004
PROPOSAL:	Split existing parcel into two (2) parcels in RA-2, One-Family Residential
ACTION REQUESTED:	Approval of Final Land Division by Planning Commission
APPLICANT:	Roxana Gale Faha, Esq. from Butzel Long, PC
OWNER:	Traian and Maria Pop

Utilizing overhead slides, and referring to the ClearZoning review letter of April 7, 2015, Planning Consultant Arroyo gave the background for this proposed lot split (final), located at the northeast corner of Orchard Lake Road and Runnymede Street north of Eleven Mile Road and east of Orchard Lake Road. The property was zoned RA-2, One Family Residential (16,500 square feet) and consisted of 1.4 acres. The adjacent properties were also zoned RA-2.

Planning Consultant Arroyo explained that the applicant had applied for preliminary review of the lot split on October 14, 2014. The Planning Commission, at their regular meeting of November 20, 2014, denied the preliminary lot split application because the proposed lot split

> *"would result in land use relationships which could be injurious to adjoining property, as the resulting parcels B and C would be significantly smaller than the average lot area, width and width to depth ratio of the Springland No. 2 Subdivision and would not be compatible with the surrounding area."*

The Applicant submitted a revised application on March 17, 2015 for final review of the lot split. Included with the application was a revised survey and legal description with a revision date of 3/2/15 and a letter from the owner's representative, Roxana Gale Zaha of Butzel Long dated 3/17/15.

Planning Consultant Arroyo continued that the applicant was proposing to split a 61,730 square foot (1.4 acre) parcel into three separate parcels, identified as Parcel A, Parcel B and Parcel C.

Planning Consultant Arroyo referred to a chart on page 2 of the review letter, which showed frontage, lot width, depth and area for the proposed parcels. He reviewed these dimensional standards as follows:

Per Section 34-3.1.5.E, the front yard setback requirement was 35 feet, the side yard setback was 8 feet on one side with a 20-foot total setback for the two side yards, and rear yard setback was 35 feet. The proposed parcels were able to meet these development standards.

The proposed lot split would result in Parcel A containing 0.6578 acres (28,653.60 square feet), Parcel B containing 0.378 (16,500 square feet), and Parcel C containing 0.380 acres (16,576.59 square feet). The Zoning Ordinance, under Section 34-3.1.5 required a minimum lot area of 15,000 square feet and a minimum lot area average per subdivision of 16,500 sq. ft. This standard had been met.

Per Section 34-3.1.5, the lot size must meet the minimum lot size of the average per subdivision of 16,500 square feet with a minimum lot area of 15,000 square feet. Parcel B and Parcel C exceeded the minimum lot area of 15,000 square feet and met or exceeded the minimum average of 16,500 square feet for the subdivision, required under the RA-2, One Family Residential zone district.

Planning Consultant Arroyo pointed out that per the Farmington Hills Subdivision of Land Ordinance, compatibility with existing parcels regulations, in order to assure that the public health, safety, and welfare will be served by the permission of any partition or division of land, the planning commission's review must be in accordance with the following standards:

a. If any parcel does not meet zoning ordinance requirements, the request shall be denied by the planning commission.

   The resulting parcels met basic zoning ordinance requirements.

b. Any partition or division shall be of such location, size and character that, in general, it will be compatible with the existing development in the area in which it is situated.

   The resulting parcels were smaller in lot size and depth than the majority of parcels within the subdivision. The requested lot split would result in significantly smaller lot sizes than those platted in Springland No. 2. Subdivision.

c. The Planning Commission shall give consideration to the following:

   1. The conformity of the resultant parcels with zoning ordinance standards and the creation of parcels compatible with surrounding lands as to area, width, and width-to-depth ratio.

Parcel B and Parcel C were smaller than the average lot area, width and width to depth ratio of Springland No. 2 Subdivision. The Springland No. 2 Subdivision consisted of 37 parcels. The average lot size within the subdivision was 33,322 square feet with the largest containing 54,499 square feet and the smallest containing 23,375 square feet (adjusted for exempt properties). The subdivision's lot widths and depths varied greatly. The majority of the lots had a width of 120 feet, which was consistent with the proposed lot split request. The narrowest width was 119 feet and the widest was 325 feet. The lot depths varied with a range of 145 feet (pie shaped lot) to 316 feet interior residential lot. (See Exhibit A and B.)

2. The orientation of the yards of proposed parcels in relationship to the yards of surrounding parcels in order to avoid incompatible relationships, such as but not limited to, front yards to rear yards.

   It did not appear that the proposed division would result in an incompatible relationship with surrounding parcels in relationship to the yards of surrounding parcels. However, depending upon the orientation of the structures placed on parcels B and C, there was a potential for conflict. Would the new corner lot have a home oriented toward Orchard Lake or toward Runnymede?

3. The impact of any existing flood plains, wetlands, topography, or other natural features and physical conditions on the resulting parcels so that such parcels are compatible with other surrounding lands in terms of buildable area.

   There did not appear to be any conditions on the site related to floor plains, wetlands, topography or other natural features and physical conditions that would be incompatible with surrounding lands in terms of buildable area.

4. The relationship of the front, side, and rear yards to the yards and orientation of buildings on other existing and potential parcels. This shall include the probable orientation of buildings on the parcels resulting from the proposed division or partition.

   The general setbacks had been provided and did not appear to be inconsistent with the orientation of adjacent buildings or that of the general subdivision. However, as mentioned above under (2), there was some question regarding orientation of any new structures on proposed parcels B and C.

Planning Consultant Arroyo concluded his review.

Commissioner Orr confirmed that the northern property line of proposed parcels B and C had been moved 17.5 feet to the north, as compared to the original lot split proposal, thus increasing the depth of those parcels since the last application.

Commissioner Orr noted that there were other vacant parcels on Orchard Lake Road north of this one. Were they in the same subdivision? Planning Consultant Arroyo said that they were in the same subdivision.

Commissioner Orr asked if the subdivision had any deed restrictions that would impact this proposed

lot split. Planning Consultant Arroyo said that any deed restrictions or subdivision bylaws would not be part of the City's review; he did not know if these existed or if they impacted this application.

Referring to the submitted survey, Commissioner McRae asked if the building envelope shown were rotated to face Runnymede, would it still fit on the proposed parcel? Staff Planner Stec said that the envelope might fit, but would result in a very small house, as both the front and rear yards would be required to have a 35-foot setback. Commissioner McRae noted that the Engineering Review letter had noted that *the west parcel should be restricted such that it will not be allowed access to Orchard Lake Road for curb cut purposes*.

Commissioner Schwartz suggested that proposed parcels B and C be combined with a single new home built on the resultant larger parcel.

Commissioner Schwartz noted that the parcel directly to the south of Runnymede was almost exactly the same size as combined proposed lots B and C. If the Commission granted this proposed lot split, could the homeowner to the south make an argument to also split his lot?

Staff Planner Stec explained that once lots were split, they became part of the compatibility standard, and the homeowner to the south could make an argument to split his lot, as the split would be compatible with the new lots across the street to the north.

Planning Consultant Arroyo advised that it was just this type of snowballing effect that the compatibility ordinance was intended to address.

Commissioner Stimson noted that proposed Parcel A was included in the lot split, as approximately 4,000 square feet were being removed from Parcel A.

Commissioner Mantey pointed out that the graphic on the overhead did not correctly show the location of the proposed northern lot line. The new lot line intersected with the driveway to the north; this was not shown on the graphic being displayed this evening.

Roxana Gale Zaha, of Butzel Long, Attorneys and Counselors, 41000 Woodward Avenue, Bloomfield Hills MI, and attorney for the property owners, was present on behalf of this final lot split application. Acknowledging that two of the proposed lots resulting from the requested lot split were smaller than others in the subdivision, Ms. Zaha made the following points:

- The compatibility ordinance specifically addressed the public health, safety and welfare of the community. The Engineering and Fire Departments had reviewed this proposal, and had no objection to it moving forward. Zoning Ordinance dimensional requirements were met. It was difficult to see how the proposed lot split would be injurious to the public health, safety and welfare.
- The compatibility ordinance allowed for a broad interpretation:

  Any partition or division shall be of such location, size and character that, in general, it will be compatible with the existing development in the area in which it is situated.

  Ms. Zaha emphasized that the ordinance said *area*, and did not specifically call out, for instance, the subdivision in which a proposed lot split was situated. In the current instance, the proposed split was compatible with the general area. While the lots were larger in the subdivision, right across the street on Orchard Lake Road there was a residential vacant lot

that was 16,500 square feet. Two other examples were close (in the general area) to the subject parcel, but were to the south of the subdivision. Also, the largest lot in the subdivision (lots 113 and 114) existed because they were combined. To compare the current application to this very large lot did not seem reasonable. If that lot combination had come before the Planning Commission, a similar conversation would have to have occurred in terms of compatibility – the resultant combination caused an incompatibly large lot to exist. There was always going to be a smallest and a largest lot. The key issue was: did the proposed lot split comply with the dimensional requirements of the zoning ordinance? In this case, it did.

Ms. Zaha concluded her presentation.

Commissioner Orr said that he did not think the proposed lots were compatible – they were two much smaller lots that were not compatible with the rest of the parcels in the subdivision. Nothing in the zoning ordinance precluded homeowners from combining properties into larger lots.

Commissioner McRae noted that a house on the eastern parcel (proposed Parcel C), which would be required to have a 35-foot rear yard setback, would of necessity be placed almost entirely in the front yard view of the neighbor to the east. The house on the western parcel (proposed Parcel B) would also be pushed closer to Runnymede. How could a back yard view of someone's front door be compatible with the existing development? The orientation of the homes on the properties was at least as important as the size of the lots.

Ms. Zaha said that at this point her clients did not intend to build to the maximum building envelope. Also, her clients were willing to accept conditions that might be imposed by the Planning Commission.

Discussion followed regarding possible orientation of any future homes on the proposed parcels. Commissioner McRae emphasized that any possible orientation of the structures was problematic.

Ms. Zaha said the intention was to have both houses front on Runnymede.

In response to a question about the survey, Staff Planner Stec said that an address could be on Orchard Lake Road with the entrance to the house on Runnymede.

Commissioner Blizman said that he would rather have a house facing Runnymede than Orchard Lake Road. He did not find the compatibility issue compelling. The proposed lot split did meet dimensional ordinance standards.

MOTION by Blizman, support by McRae, that Lot Split No. 2, 2015, submitted by Roxana Gale Zaha from Butzel Long PC be approved because it appears to meet applicable provisions of the Zoning Chapter and of Chapter 27, Subdivision of Land, of the City Code and will result in land parcels which are generally compatible with surrounding lots in the area; and that the City Assessor be so notified.

Commissioner Mantey said the applicant had presented the survey. Now the applicant was saying that the orientation of the home on Parcel B would be different than that shown on the survey. Additionally, the graphic for the lot split had not shown the north lot line accurately. It was difficult to make a decision based on inaccurate representations.

Commissioner McRae said that perhaps a stipulation of the motion be that the house face Runnymede.

City Attorney Schultz said that the Commission did not have statutory authority to impose conditions on a lot split. However, as the applicant had made a representation that the home on proposed Parcel B would front Runnymede, the motion could be amended to state that the finding of compatibility was conditioned upon the representation that the house on proposed Parcel B would front on Runnymede, and the entrance would be from Runnymede. Without this configuration, compatibility would not be found.

Commissioner Blizman asked Ms. Zaha if the finding for compatibility just stated was acceptable to her clients. Ms. Zaha asked that the question be repeated. City Attorney Schultz asked if the finding of compatibility was conditioned upon the house on proposed Parcel B having access on Runnymede, was she prepared to represent her clients as being agreeable? Ms. Zaha said, "That is correct."

Commissioner Mantey said that he agreed with this finding more than just in terms of "legal speak." Properties that faced Orchard Lake Road looked like Parcel A; nothing looked like Parcel B.

Maker of the motion Blizman asked that the comments by Attorney Schultz be incorporated into the motion; supporter McRae agreed. Therefore the motion now included:

> **Further, that the finding of compatibility for this lot split approval is conditioned upon the representation that the access for Parcel B would front on Runnymede.**

Regarding Parcel B, Commissioner Orr said that the question posed to Ms. Zaha only applied to the access. Was it the intent to also have the house facing south toward Runnymede, so that the side yard was to the east? It was unclear whether the side yard would be to the east or to the north.

Commissioner Blizman said that he was most concerned with the curb cut being off Runnymede. There were two side yards. If the house was oriented toward Orchard Lake Road but the access was off Runnymede, the actual side yards would still be the same. He was fine with orienting the house toward either street.

Chair Topper said that she had understood that the finding of compatibility was based on both the house and the access facing Runnymede.

Commissioner Stimson said he did not see how two homes on the two lots would look in place with the subdivision. Putting two houses up close to the street was not compatible, in his opinion. He would not support the motion.

In response to comments from Commissioner Mantey regarding health and safety, Planning Consultant Arroyo said that the ordinance referred to health, safety and welfare, with *welfare* being the lynchpin in this case and with neighborhood compatibility in general. He quoted from Berman v. Parker: *The concept of public welfare is broad and inclusive. The values it represents are spiritual as well as physical, aesthetic as well as monetary*.

Commissioner Mantey said that in terms of the safety issue, the orientation of the drive toward Runnymede was a safety issue.

Commissioner Fleischhacker said that he was struggling with this application. This property was proposed to be split into 3 single-family lots. Just a little bit south of Runnymede was a cluster development with 4 attached homes. He thought the Master Plan showed the whole area along Orchard Lake Road having the cluster option in order to try and preserve residential for that area. The 4-house cluster was in the same size lot as the original parcel being discussed this evening. Because the property was sitting on Orchard Lake Road, perhaps this was a good alternative. It gave three single-family homes instead of four clusters and still protected the inside of the subdivision. If it was any deeper into the subdivision, Commissioner Fleischhacker could not support compatibility. But in this case, with a cluster development already to the south, and with the goal of the Master Plan being to protect residential south of the freeway, with acknowledgement that a cluster option could be considered for this property, and with vacant property along Orchard Lake Road that would likely be developed with the cluster option which would appear very different than what the rest of the subdivision looked like, he was going to support the motion.

Commissioner Blizman said that requiring the home's front entrance as well as the driveway having to be off Runnymede seemed unnecessary. He did not see a problem if the homeowner wanted a side entrance garage, with the house itself facing Orchard Lake Road.

Commissioner Schwartz said that while he had voted to support the original request for a lot split, he was now concerned about the house to the south of Runnymede. If that house was ever destroyed by fire, etc., that homeowner would also have a good case for splitting his lot, should tonight's application be granted. Additionally, there was a lot of open land behind many of the homes in this subdivision, which contained large lots, and approving this lot split opened the door to someone putting in a long driveway and creating smaller lots as a result. He did not see the proposed lot split as compatible with the general area or the specific subdivision.

At Chair Topper's request, Commissioner Blizman clarified that his motion was to approve the lot split, based upon the proponent's representation that the orientation of the driveway on proposed Parcel B would be toward Runnymede.

Commissioner McRae said that the market would actually determine which way the house was oriented.

Chair Topper said she would vote against the motion as she did not find the proposed lot split met the compatibility standard, and would create an unfortunate domino affect.

Chair Topper called the motion.

Motion failed 4-4 (Orr, Schwartz, Stimson, Topper opposed).

Chair Topper asked for another motion.

MOTION by Mantey, support Schwartz, to postpone this matter to a future meeting.

Motion carried 5-3 (Blizman, Stimson, Topper).

Discussion was had as to whether a full board would be possible at the next meeting. Commissioner Mantey said his motion was not based on having a full board present. He thought the application was complicated and precedent-setting, and deserved extra time and study.

After further discussion, it was decided to set the application for the June 11 meeting. Attorney Schultz noted that the ordinance required action within 45 days of the original application. Would the applicant state on the record her agreement to postpone action until June 11?

Ms. Zaha said she agreed to have the case heard on June 11, 2015.

Commissioner Mantey asked that all graphics be correct for the June 11, 2015 meeting.

Commissioner Fleischhacker asked that staff report on the properties on Orchard Lake Road from 11 Mile Road to Spring Valley. He believed that quite a few of those properties were vacant. Would staff also confirm that these were master planned for the cluster option? If it was planned for cluster option, this meant the City was planning for smaller homes for the area to protect it from going to office use.

Chair Topper asked that a vote be taken on a revised motion naming the June 11 date. Commissioners Mantey and Schwartz agreed.

MOTION by Mantey, support Schwartz, to revise the previous motion so that this matter is postponed to the June 11, 2015 meeting.

Motion carried 6-2 (Stimson, Topper).

Commissioner McRae noted how important it was to have discussion on motions before the vote was taken. The discussion on the preceding motion had changed his mind as to his original vote.

B. SITE AND LANDSCAPE PLAN 56-3-2015

LOCATION:	21017 Middlebelt Rd.
PARCEL I.D.:	22-23-35-478-001, 012
PROPOSAL:	Addition to existing building (The Manor of Farmington Hills) in SP-1, Special Purpose District
ACTION REQUESTED:	Approval of Site and Landscape Plan by Planning Commission
APPLICANT:	Farmington Hills Senior Leasing
OWNER:	Farmington Hills Senior Leasing

As noted above, this application was withdrawn at the request of the applicant.

C. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Commissioner Blizman proposed that the officers be elected as a slate, and made the following motion:

MOTION by Blizman, support by Fleischhacker, that Mara Topper be elected as Planning Commission Chair, Beth Rae-O'Donnell as Vice-Chair, and Steven Schwartz as Secretary.

Motion carried 8-0 (Rae-O'Donnell absent).

D. DISCUSSION OF CITY SIDEWALK SNOW REMOVAL

City Planner Stec said that several commissioners had requested this discussion item, especially as there had been some recent reinterpretations of the laws regarding liability from sidewalk snow removal. City Attorney Schultz would present some history and discussion would follow.

City Attorney Schultz explained the history of liability laws regarding snow removal as follows:

- For approximately 100 years, Michigan operated under a *natural accumulation doctrine*, which included:
  1. There was no duty on the part of any Michigan municipality to clear snow and ice from any sidewalk.
  2. If snow and ice were cleared, and this was done in a way that made the sidewalks less safe than they were, the municipality then had liability.

  As a result, many municipalities and cities did not want to increase their liability by requiring sidewalk snow removal, or clearing sidewalks themselves.

- In the mid to late 2000s, the appellate courts expanded the concept of governmental immunity by limiting the ability of people who were injured under certain circumstances to hold their local governments responsible. A 2008 case reinterpreted the natural accumulation doctrine to mean that "makes things worse" only applied to the physical sidewalk itself, not the snow and ice on top of it. (Estate of Buckner v. City of Lansing, 4-3 decision)

- In 2012, the legislature instituted the *2-inch rule*, which assumed a disparity between sidewalk sections greater than 2 inches was unsafe. Language was also added defining liability to be limited to *a defect in the sidewalk itself.*

As a result of changes outlined above, just clearing the snow and ice from sidewalks no longer exposed the City to the same liability it had previously.

City Attorney Schultz cautioned that discussions regarding a change in policy for Farmington Hills had to take not only liability into consideration, but also the cost of implementing a clear sidewalk policy.

Commissioner Schwartz said that he thought a majority of communities in Oakland County required property owners – residential and commercial – to remove snow within a set period of time. Regarding Farmington Hills, in the winter just passed when the snow did not thaw for a long period of time, he had seen people walking on 12 and 13 Mile Roads, an unsafe situation. Twice he had run in the City of Farmington and felt that that city had about 98% compliance with their snow removal regulations.

Commissioner Schwartz asked Staff Planner Stec to research the average practice regarding snow removal in communities in southern Oakland County. He emphasized that the City for a long time had tried to make its sidewalks more walkable. He also felt it was appropriate for commercial property owners to remove snow and ice from their sidewalks.

Commissioner Blizman said it was unreasonable to require anyone to removal all snow and ice. Freezing could occur very quickly and was a natural occurrence. On the other hand, when the City was smaller and less populated, and the roads were less traveled, people walking on the side of the road was acceptable. This situation was no longer true. People walking along busy roads and getting sprayed by slush in the middle of winter was unacceptable.

Commissioner McRae said that philosophically he agreed that sidewalks should be cleared. However, there were many homes who faced interior subdivision roads, and whose rear yards backed up to mile roads. It seemed unreasonable to expect those homeowners to clear huge lengths of sidewalk along major roads. Who would be responsible for these sidewalks? Homeowners? Homeowner associations? The City? 95% of sidewalks along the major mile roads were in the right-of-way.

City Attorney Schwartz said the City had the ability to require homeowners to clear sidewalks that fronted on their property, even if the sidewalks were in the right of way. However, the homeowner would never have liability for injury on the sidewalk – that would always be the City's liability. Regarding long stretches along main or mile roads, some cities cleared the sidewalks on the major streets.

Commissioner McRae said that the costs of requiring snow removal and involving the City's staff and equipment in sidewalk snow removal could be significant. How would this be funded? Nothing had been included in the Capital Improvements Program for snow removal on sidewalks.

City Attorney Schultz said that cost had to be factored in to a new snow removal requirement. Also, how, for instance, would the City enforce against older citizens who had a difficult time clearing their snow?

City Attorney Schultz summarized by saying this was a three-legged stool:

1. liability
2. regulations
3. enforcement

Commissioner Orr said he was glad to have this discussion as for years he had been concerned about having sidewalks that were only useable when the weather was clear. However, he was opposed to requiring homeowners to clear the sidewalks on mile roads when their own home faced away from the mile road.

Commissioner Orr spoke to memories he had of walking to school on cleared sidewalks in Detroit.

Commissioner Stimson wondered if community organizations could volunteer to clear snow along sections of main mile roads, much like the adopt-a-highway program?

Commissioner Schwartz said that the City did not have to reinvent the wheel in this regard. Many communities had been requiring clear sidewalks for decades. These could be researched. Obstacles could be dealt with. This was a doable policy change.

Commissioner Orr wondered if MDOT/Smart Bus could be required to clear the snow from the road to their waiting areas.

Commissioner Blizman said that requiring subdivisions to be responsible for sidewalks along mile roads was a distraction. The cities put the sidewalks in. To allow residents access to those sidewalks in the winter was the City's responsibility.

Commissioner McRae agreed that the City needed to take responsibility for the mile roads in the residential neighborhoods.

City Attorney Schwartz asked how the Commission wanted to go forward with this discussion. The cost of sidewalk snow removal was not in the Capital Improvements Plan, and no time had been scheduled for police or other inspectors to enforce.

Commissioner Schwartz gave general examples of other cities' snow removal requirements and policies. The Commission needed to know specifics regarding how other cities addressed the issue.

Commissioner Schwartz thought the Planning Commission could recommend action to the City Council, based on well thought out research and discussion, and based upon the City's desire to make the City more walkable.

Discussion followed. City Attorney Schultz said that a resolution stating support for sidewalk snow removal and asking the City Council to address this could be done fairly easily. More than that could take significant time and research.

Commissioner Schwartz thought that a resolution would be easy to ignore. Certainly studying the issue of sidewalk snow removal was as much the Planning Commission's role as the adoption of the Capital Improvements Plan.

Chair Topper said they needed to be realistic as to which cities were used for comparison.

Commissioner Mantey agreed with Commissioner Schwartz that just adopting a resolution without any research would carry very little weight. The only research thus far requested was for Staff to discover what other communities were doing regarding sidewalk snow removal, as stated earlier. The Michigan Municipal League might already have this information compiled. As sidewalk snow removal fell under health, safety and welfare of the community, Commissioner Mantey thought this did fall under the purview of the Planning Commission.

Staff Planner Stec cautioned that he took direction from his department director, and would only be able to devote time to this issue as so directed. This was problematic insofar as this issue was not a Zoning Ordinance issue.

Chair Topper strongly suggested that this topic be brought up during a joint meeting with City Council, which needed to be scheduled.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: March 19 and 26, 2015

MOTION Fleischhacker, support by McRae, to approve the March 19 and March 26, 2015 minutes as published.

Motion carried 8-0 (Rae-O'Donnell absent).

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

COMMISSIONER'S COMMENTS:

May meetings were set for May 14 (regular) and May 21 (study session regarding the 12 Mile/Farmington Road area), 2015.

Commissioner McRae reminded the Commission of the election on May 5.

In response to a question from Commissioner Schwartz, City Attorney Schultz said various actions by the Planning Commission regarding lot splits, PUDs, zoning requests, etc., could not be linked to whether or not the applicant had paid their taxes.

Commissioner Stimson noted the closing of Jean's Hardware, a long-time business in the City.

ADJOURNMENT:

Hearing no further comment, Chair Topper adjourned the meeting at 9:02 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Steven Schwartz
Planning Commission Secretary

cem