

**MINUTES
CITY OF FARMINGTON HILLS
PLANNING COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARING/REGULAR MEETING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
February 21, 2019, 7:30 P.M.**

Chair Schwartz called the Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. on February 21, 2019.

Commissioners Present: Brickner, Countegan, Goerke, Mantey, McRae, Schwartz, Stimson,

Commissioners Absent: Orr, Turner

Others Present: City Planner Sec, City Attorney Schultz, Planning Consultant Tangari,

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

MOTION carried unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARING

A. CLUSTER OPTION 1, 2019

LOCATION:	24590 Orchard Lake Rd.
PARCEL I.D.:	23-23-351-006
PROPOSAL:	One Family Cluster Option in an RA-1, One-Family Residential District
ACTION REQUESTED:	Preliminary Cluster Option qualification
APPLICANT:	Roger Sherr
OWNER:	William Tucker

Chair Schwartz disclosed that Dan Blugerman, who was representing the applicant tonight, was the realtor for his Mason's Lodge, and Chair Schwartz had written a lease agreement (pro bono) with Mr. Blugerman's help. Chair Schwartz said he did not feel that connection affected his ability to be fair in this case.

The consensus of the Commission was that Chair Schwartz did not need to be recused in this instance.

Dan Blugerman, Thomas Duke Company, was present on behalf of this application for Preliminary Cluster Option qualification at 24590 Orchard Lake Road. Mr. Blugerman asked for approval of this request.

Planning Consultant Tangari explained that the request was to expand the previous cluster option qualification to include the subject parcel. City Planner Sec further explained that the applicant had previously received qualification for 24560 Orchard Lake Road as well as the 19-acre vacant parcel on the north side of 10 Mile Road, East of Orchard Lake Road.

Commissioner McRae asked if the intent was to have the access drive run along the current property line, and put a house on the other side of it.

Mr. Blugerman said that description was correct in concept. A site plan would be submitted once the property was qualified for the cluster option. The idea was to create a “grand entrance,” potentially with a welcoming boulevard.

City Planner Stec explained process.

For the current request, the Commission needed to answer two questions:

1. Did the parcel qualify for the cluster option by itself?
2. What density would be allowed? There were two density options available. The previous qualification qualified at the higher density level; the Commission would need to make a density determination for the parcel being discussed this evening.

If the qualification went forward, the developer would next bring a site plan to the Commission. After discussing the site plan at a regular meeting, the Commission would schedule a public hearing on the site plan. Following the public hearing the Commission would make a recommendation to City Council regarding the cluster plan. City Council would hold another public hearing, and City Council would be the final deciding body regarding whether the site plan was approved or not.

Chair Schwartz opened the public hearing.

Judy Miller, 24377 Ridgeview, Farmington Hills, said that she had seen a preliminary site plan for this proposal at the November 2018 Commission meeting. Everything said at that time alleviated many of her concerns. The new property directly behind hers did not line up with hers exactly, but it did only have one home. She encouraged the developer and the Commission to keep the homes single family detached, and keep the density low. She saw the development as a positive for the neighborhood.

Norm Howard, 24635 Ridgeview, asked if Paisley Street was going to be opened up. It appeared that this would be a high-quality project. He asked if someone could describe what a cluster option was.

City Planner Stec said that a cluster option was a development process, and did not refer to a home type. The cluster option presented opportunities for a difficult site to be developed by clustering homes closer together than normal, utilizing smaller lot sizes, while requiring other amenities such as open space on the site. In this instance, the northern portion of the original parcel, which was heavily wooded and had a flood plain and creek, would be designated as open space.

The cluster option allowed a maximum of 4 units to be attached to each other. In this case, the developer had consistently represented that they were not planning on attached homes, and that they would keep the homes single family detached. Nevertheless, if the property was qualified as cluster, attached units could be constructed. However, once the site was qualified, the Commission was not obligated to approve whatever plan was brought forward.

In response to further questions from Mr. Howard, City Planner Stec said the conceptual plan presented in November 2018 showed 42 units. The price point had been presented as \$250,000 – \$300,000. The City had not yet seen elevations of the homes. Planning Consultant Tangari added that the developer was likely to start in spring 2019 with infrastructure construction, after approvals had been granted.

Mr. Howard was concerned about traffic and cut-throughs. He did like the idea of the attractive entrance on Orchard Lake Road.

Nancy Howard, 24635 Ridgeview, asked if the developer had further options if the site plan was not approved by Council. City Planner Stec said that if Council denied the site plan, the developer would have a chance to revise the proposal, based on comments from Council as to why the plan was denied.

Seeing that no one else came forward to speak. Chair Schwartz closed the public hearing and invited Mr. Blugerman to comment on the issues raised.

Mr. Blugerman said the Fire Department was requiring that their development connect with Paisley Drive. Making that connection allowed emergency vehicles as well as residents – including those who lived on Ridgeview – to have two ways in and out of their subdivision.

Mr. Blugerman affirmed that the units would be detached single-family homes. The price point was correct as stated: \$250,000 - \$300,000. The subdivision would include a variety of home designs, including Cape Cod, ranch, colonial, etc.

Regarding construction schedule, Mr. Blugerman said infrastructure construction would probably start in 2019 as already stated, with homes constructed in 2020 as orders were received, although there would be a few homes constructed as models and spec homes.

Commissioner Brickner pointed out that the connection to Paisley Drive would likely not be a straight line. This community would be good for people who wanted to downsize into retirement homes, such as ranches, and for young people who were just starting out, and who wanted a 2nd story. It appeared that both styles would be provided.

Utilizing overhead slides and referring to his February 12, 2019 review letter, Planning Consultant Tangari gave the review for this application for preliminary cluster option qualification. This request would result in an expansion of the previous approval by one acre, from 20 acres to 21 acres.

Planning Consultant Tangari reiterated that the Commission would need to make a determination regarding density. The finding for the previous qualification allowed Option 2, as described in Section 34-3.17.2.A.ii:

Second, the planning commission may additionally find that the parcel is located in a transition area or is impacted by nonresidential uses or traffic on major or secondary thoroughfares or other similar conditions. If the planning commission makes such a finding, it may permit an increase in density up to the maximum densities established in subsection 34-3.17.3.B.

Subsection 34-3.17.3.B. permitted up to 3.1 units per acre in the RA-1 district under this item. The parcel was located adjacent to developed commercial and office properties along its southern and a portion of its western boundaries (27% of the total boundary); it was otherwise surrounded by single family development.

The applicant's previous conceptual plan for the entire development showed 42 units, or 2.2 units per net acre. The Commission would have to make an affirmative finding to permit that density on the subject site. The applicant should identify the increase, if any, in units that might result from the addition of the third lot.

In summary, Planning Consultant Tangari said that the original two parcels were granted the cluster option, with the finding that the 2nd option applied.

Planning Commissioner Mantey said that the applicant had indicated that approving this application would facilitate a nicer entrance and exit to the new subdivision. If the Commission approved this request, was there potential for increasing the density of the remaining parcels?

Planning Consultant Tangari explained that the density itself would not increase. What was being increased was the area to which the density applied. Approving this application would affect the total of the absolute number of units on the combined sites.

Commissioner Schwartz pointed out that most of the homes on the greater site would be constructed south of the flood plain and north of 10 Mile Road. City Planner Stec added that the concept plan showed a detention pond close to 10 Mile Road.

In response to a question from Commissioner Brickner, City Planner Stec said the applicants had indicated that they wanted the extra lot in order to develop a nicer entryway, as well as eliminate the older home on the subject site. The applicants had wanted to include this property from the beginning, but had only recently been able to work out a purchase of the property.

Chair Schwartz indicated he was ready for a motion.

MOTION by McRae, support by Countegan, that the Planning Commission makes a preliminary determination that Cluster Option 1, 2019, submitted by SDC Ventures LLC, meets the following qualification standards as set forth in Section 34-3.17.2.B. of the zoning ordinance, specifically standards ii, v, and vi, permitting a maximum density of 1.8 units per acre, and that it be made clear to the petitioner that final granting of the Cluster Option is dependent upon a site plan to be approved by the City Council after review and recommendation by the Planning Commission, with the following condition:

- **The site be developed in co-ordination with Cluster Option 2, 2018, as approved at the November 15, 2018 Planning Commission meeting.**

Motion carried unanimously.

MOTION by McRae, support by Goerke, in the matter of Cluster Option 1, 2019, submitted by SDC Ventures LLC, that the Planning Commission finds that the site meets the following standards of Section 34-3.17.2.A.ii.: 1) the parcel is located in a transition area, 2) is impacted by nonresidential uses, with 27% of the total boundary adjacent to developed commercial and office properties 3) is impacted by traffic on a major or secondary thoroughfare, namely Orchard Lake Road, 4) other similar conditions, including significant wetlands and elevation difficulties on the property, and qualifies for a maximum density of 3.1 units per acre permitted under Section 34-3.17.2.A.ii, and that it be made clear to the Petitioner that final granting of the Cluster Option is dependent upon a site plan to be approved by the City Council after review and recommendation by the Planning Commission, with the following condition:

- **The site plan be developed in co-ordination with Cluster Option 2, 2018 and be substantially similar in layout and density to the document presented for Cluster Option 2, 2018, as approved at the November 15, 2018 Planning Commission meeting, showing approximately 2.2 units per acre.**

In response to a question from Commissioner Mantey, City Attorney Schultz said the Commission could require the final site plan to be substantially similar to the concept plan provided, at 2.2 units per acre.

Motion carried unanimously.

Chair Schwartz suggested that the applicants meet with their neighbors regarding the proposed site plan prior to the next Planning Commission meeting on this proposal.

REGULAR MEETING

A. Presentation of 2018 Planning Commission Annual Report

City Planner Stec presented the 2018 Planning Commission Annual Report for review and discussion. He pointed out the new chart *Timeframe of site and landscape approvals for 2018*, which showed that the majority of approvals were completed in one month.

City Planner Stec noted that the 8 Mile Boulevard Association was temporarily suspended in order to give time for restructuring.

Chair Schwartz suggested sharing the timeframe information with the Economic Development Director, as well as the Economic Development Corporation.

City Planner Stec said that once the Annual Report was approved by the Commission, it would be presented to City Council by the Planning Commission Chair.

After brief discussion and review, with minor corrections noted, Chair Schwartz indicated he was ready to entertain a motion.

MOTION by Mantey, support by Stimson, that the Planning Commission adopt the Planning Commission 2018 Annual Report.

Motion carried unanimously.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: January 17, 2019 and January 24, 2019

MOTION by Countegan, support by Stimson, to approve the January 17, 2019 meeting minutes as published.

Motion carried unanimously.

MOTION by Mantey, support by Brickner, to approved the January 24, 2019 meeting minutes as published.

Motion carried unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENT None.

COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS

A training meeting/study session would be held next week on February 28, 2019 at 6:30 p.m. The next regular meeting would be March 21, 2019.

Commissioner Stimson suggested a review of Roberts Rules of Order as part of commissioner training.

ADJOURNMENT:

Seeing that there was no further discussion, Chair Schwartz adjourned the meeting at 8:18 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,
Dale Countegan
Planning Commission Secretary

/cem