

**MINUTES
CITY OF FARMINGTON HILLS
PLANNING COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARING/REGULAR MEETING
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBER
31555 11 MILE ROAD, FARMINGTON HILLS MI
JANUARY 16, 2014**

The Planning Commission meeting was called to order by Chair McRae at 7:35 p.m. on January 16, 2014 in the Council Chambers.

Commissioners Present: Blizman, Mantey (arrived 7:37 p.m.), McRae, Schwartz, Rae-O'Donnell (arrived at 7:37 p.m.), Stimson and Topper

Commissioners Absent: Fleischhacker and Orr

Others Present: Assistant to the City Manager Geinzer, Planner Mark Stec, Staff Engineer Tammy Gushard, Attorney Tom Schultz and Planning Consultant Rod Arroyo

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

Motion carried unanimously; 5-0.

PUBLIC HEARING

(Commissioners Mantey and Rae-O'Donnell arrive at 7:37 p.m.)

A. SITE CONDOMINIUM PLAN 1, 2013

SECTION:	22-23-17-176-024
LOCATION:	Northeast corner, Halsted and Howard Roads
PROPOSAL:	Site Condominium Plan (six (6) detached single-family homes) in RA-1A, One-Family Residential District
ACTION REQUESTED:	Tentative Approval of Preliminary Plan
APPLICANT:	John R. Pastor, President of Pastor 4G's
OWNER:	Pastor 4G's

Planning Consultant Arroyo referred to the summary of findings in the review letter dated January 7, 2014. He provided the following information:

1. The 6.7 acre subject property is located on the north side of Howard Road, east of Halsted and south of I-696. The Applicant is proposing to subdivide the parcel into six lots with an average size of 33,697 square feet. A one-family detached dwelling unit is proposed for each lot. The property is currently undeveloped.
2. The application received on December 18, 2013 and plans developed by George H. Pastor & Sons.
3. The property is zoned RA-1A One Family Residential District (minimum lot size is 33,000 sq. ft.) and abuts RA-1A zoned property to the east and south. The property to the west on the other side of Halsted Road is zoned OS-1 Office Service District and I-696 is located directly north.
4. The proposed lots meet the 33,000 sq. ft. minimum requirement and range between 33, 028 sq. ft. and 36,170 sq. ft. The average lot size is 33,697 sq. ft.
5. Site built, one-family detached dwelling units are a permitted use in the RA-1A District.
6. The dwelling units would all have frontage on Howard Road, which is a 66 ft. wide gravel road.
7. *The legal description of the property is now included on the preliminary site plan.*
8. *The site plan now notes the width of Halsted Road.*
9. *The site plan has been revised and four driveways will now service the six dwelling units*
10. There is a 2.02 acre open space area that extends the full length along the rear end of each lot.

11. Per Section 34-3.11, the setback standards for the RA-1A District are as follows: 50 ft. front yard setback; 15 ft. side yard setback; 35 ft. rear yard setback. *The site plan has been revised and the setback of Lot 1 from Halsted Road is now 50 feet, which meets the standards of Section 34-3.5.2.C.*

12. *Per Section 27-58 of the Subdivision Land Ordinance, the location of utility line easements should be provided along the rear or side lot lines of each lot as necessary for utility lines. This information is not noted on the site plan. This should be discussed with the Engineering Division.*

13. Per Section 34-3.1.1, each lot must have a minimum lot width of 140 feet. *This standard is met.*

14. The building envelope of each proposed condominium is the same size at 3,000 sq. ft. The dwelling on Lot 6 will have a walkout basement.

15. The Applicant is proposing to develop three rain gardens on the property. The gardens will be located in the following areas: 1) In the mid-to-rear yard between Lot 1 and Lot 2; 2) In the front yard between Lot 3 and Lot 4; 3) In the rear yard between Lot 5 and Lot 6. Each rain garden will be 1,500 square feet and have a volume of 1,564 cubic feet. We will defer to the Engineering Division's review of this proposed storm water system.

16. Per Section 27-59 of the Subdivision of Land ordinance, the lot size, width, depth, and shape in any subdivision proposed for residential uses shall be appropriate for the location and the type of development contemplated. Lot areas and widths shall conform to at least the minimum requirements of the zoning ordinance for the district in which the subdivision is proposed. *This standard is met.*

17. Building setback lines shall conform to at least the minimum requirements of the zoning ordinance. Corner lots in residential subdivisions shall be planned at least ten (10) feet wider than the minimum width permitted by the zoning ordinance. *Lots 2-6 meet the building setback requirement. Lot 1 is 150 feet and therefore satisfies the corner lot width requirement.*

18. Excessive lot depth in relation to width shall be avoided. A depth-to-width ratio of three to one (3:1) shall normally be considered a maximum. Lots intended for purposes other than residential use shall be specifically designed for such purposes, and shall have adequate provision for off-street parking, setbacks and other requirements in accordance with the zoning ordinance. *This condition is met.*

Additionally, the following applies:

a. Every lot shall front or abut on a street. *This standard is met.*

b. Generally, side lot lines shall be at right angles or radial to the street lines. *This standard is met.*

c. Residential lots abutting major thoroughfares or collector streets, where marginal access streets are to desirable or possible to attain, shall be planned with reverse frontage lots, or with side lot lines parallel to the major traffic streets, or shall be planned with extra depth to permit generous distance between building and such traffic way. *This standard is met.*

d. Generally, lots shall have a front-to-front relationship across all streets where possible. *This standard is met.*

e. Where lots border upon bodies of water, the front yard may be designated as the waterfront side of such lot provided the lot has sufficient depth to provide adequate setback on the street side to maintain a setback for all structures equal to the front setback on the street side as well as on the waterfront side. *This standard does not apply.*

19. Compliance with signs will be determined at a later review.

20. The removal of trees will be assessed during the individual permit review process.

Planning Consultant Arroyo said the site contained a substantial amount of landmarked trees, which provide a substantial buffer. He said the Applicant has now provided for some shared driveway access for some of the proposed lots; and a large open space area that provides a buffer from the freeway. Aerial views were provided, showing views during different seasons; as well as the elevation, a wetland area, and the important screening provided.

Mr. Arroyo said the proposed lots meet the 33,000 sq. ft. minimum requirement and range between 33,028 sq. ft. and 36,170 sq. ft. The average lot size is 33,697 sq. ft. and all front on Howard Road. He listed the adjustments made to the plan that included the removal of some trees deferring to the Engineering Department regarding the adequacy of the required utility line easements along the rear and side lots lines for each lot. He spoke about the three proposed rain gardens, and the need to preserve the significant trees in the area. He said the Applicant's plan proposes the removal of about ten trees associated with lot 6; and he suggested a discussion regarding the storm water management impact. He said it is within the Planning Commission's authority to approve the site plan condominium plan.

Ms. Gushard said the revised plan shows a shared rain gardens between the properties. She noted concerns regarding detention and maintenance requirements. The revised plan shows detention requirements relative to what the value would have been, but the issue remains regarding the detention requirement being provided on a separate out lot; and the Applicant proposes detention along the back property lines of the development. Ms. Gushard said the revised plan does not meet the engineering requirements regarding detention, but they would be willing to work with the Applicant.

Mr. Stec spoke about the submission requirements; the 90-day timeframe expires on February 13, 2014; and said the next Planning Commission meeting is on February 16, 2014. He said the Planning Commission could take action at this meeting or work toward a postponement to allow the Applicant to work with the Engineering Department; and return to the Planning Commission with a fully engineered plan.

Regarding the location of the rain garden, Ms. Gushard said the Engineering Department met with the Applicant's engineer and reviewed their revised plan that included the alternative of a bioswale along the common, and back, property lines; near where the development and open space were located.

Commissioner Blizman emphasized his concern to preserve trees wherever possible.

Discussion took place regarding storage volume in the detention area. Mr. Arroyo said all the lots meet the minimum required size; and there is perhaps an extra 10,000 square feet for detention.

Commissioner Mantey stated the requirement for the detention basin does not have to impact the number of trees preserved; and only the trees outside of the lot areas are to be protected, and the designated landmarked trees.

Discussion took place regarding the detention basin; the lowest point on the site; the slope to the east; the consideration by the Engineering Department regarding different options; and the possibility of giving credit if the Applicant can provide calculations showing the development might not have an increase in storm water run-off for hard surface area. It was noted that the properties were serviced by sewer and water.

Discussion ensued regarding the ability of trees to suppress noise; and the value of trees as a visual buffer.

Applicant John Pastor, 34018 Beacon, Livonia, President of Pastor 4G's, spoke about how they made the calculations for the storm water management. He said it was for the entire lot; however, the entire lot was not going to be covered; so it was over-designed to make the detention; and to ensure enough detention for other properties. He said it was important to limit the amount of large trees to be removed; and the larger the tree, the better visual and noise buffer. He said they wanted to work with the City in whatever way was necessary to facility the plan.

Discussion took place regarding the over-design for the detention. Ms. Gushard clarified that it was 1.65 for the entire residential area.

Chair McRae opened the public hearing.

Brian Holdwick, Howard Road, said he was glad to see the design change that included more open space. He suggested that lot 6 be designed to the minimum standards for more open space. He said he was in support of the rain gardens, and preferred them over a detention pond; he was opposed to a drainage pipe that would release into the wetland area behind his house. Regarding screening, he said he liked the spruces that would provide side screening. He said favored the use of brick for the homes to provide continuity in the neighborhood.

Chair McRae said the requirement for the use of brick may be an issue for the homeowner's association. It was confirmed that lot number 6 is indicated to be a walk-out design.

Rick Legg, Carson Street, expressed concern regarding changes to the traffic lanes on Halsted Road; whether any consideration had been given to the larger wildlife in the area; and whether the wildlife could be possibly diverted onto the freeway.

Chair McRae closed the public hearing as there were no further comments.

Mr. Pastor said they planned to use brick or masonry products; the minimum size house would be about 2,800 square feet. Regarding large wildlife, he said that was the intention of the open space area.

City Attorney Schultz stated that the open space area would probably be deeded as a separate parcel with the potential for a type of conservation easement.

Discussion was held regarding the procedure of this matter going before the City Council.

MOTION by Blizman, support by Topper, that Site Condominium Plan No. 1, 2013, dated December 18, 2013, petitioned by John R. Pastor, President of Pastor 4G's, be tabled to the February 13, 2014 meeting to allow time for the Applicant to work out storm water detention measures with Engineering Department

Motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Mantey emphasized the importance that the development does not increase the overall flow into the Rouge system; and that it does not lead to increased water or wetness in the backyards of the nearby residential lots.

Ms. Gushard said that was why the Engineering Department requires that the water gets contained in a localized area, so it gets released at a slower rate and does not create additional hazards.

Chair McRae closed the Public Hearing portion of the meeting.

5. Regular Meeting

- A. **SITE PLAN AND LANDSCAPE PLAN 67-12-2013**
- | | |
|-------------------|---|
| SECTION: | 22-23-19-453-006 |
| LOCATION: | 38200 Ten Mile Road |
| PROPOSAL: | Proposed drive-in restaurant in a B-3,
General Business District |
| ACTION REQUESTED: | Approval of Site Plan and Landscape Plan
by Planning Commission |
| APPLICANT: | Mark Kellenberger of Tim Horton's |
| OWNER: | Shirley L. Collins Trust |

Planning Consultant Arroyo referred to the summary of findings in the review letter dated January 8, 2014. He provided information regarding the 1.09 acre subject property located on the north side of W. 10 Mile Road, directly south of Grand River Road, and east of I-275. The Applicant is proposing repurpose an existing 5,850 square foot partially occupied two-story building for a Tim Horton's drive thru restaurant and additional office space. The building is vacant except for an office space, which is leased by one tenant. The property is zoned B-3, General Business District. The property abuts B-3 zoned property on all sides.

Mr. Arroyo emphasized the following from his report:

4. The Applicant did not include a floor plan for the proposed Tim Horton's restaurant and office space. This information is required to confirm the parking calculations.

5. The Applicant has not provided the gross square footage of the building.

6. As previously stated, the two-story building was previously used primarily as a bank and office building. The bank no longer exists, but an office space is still being leased by a tenant. The existing drive-thru bank canopy will be removed. **The Applicant has not indicated where this office space is located within the building. This information should be provided by including floor plans for each level with each use designated on the plan.**

7. The property boundary lines on the site plan are not clear. This should be revised on future submissions.

8. A drive-thru restaurant is a principal permitted use in the B-3 district, subject to the following standards of Section 34-4.35:

a. Drive-in restaurants shall provide a building setback of at least sixty (60) feet from any street right-of-way. Signs and other structures shall provide setbacks required in Section 34-3.1. **The building is setback 42 feet from W. 10 Mile Road, which does not meet the standard. Even though the building is an existing condition, the change of use to a drive thru restaurant means that a variance is required. The building is setback 67 feet from Grand River, which meets the rear setback standard.**

b. No space set aside for the stacking of vehicles waiting to be served from a drive-in window shall be closer than thirty-five (35) feet to any adjacent residential zoning lot, except when such lot is occupied by use other than residential. **The subject site does not abut a residential zoned lot.**

c. The zoning lot occupied by such use shall not abut an RA district unless the district is separated from the lot by a major or secondary thoroughfare. *The subject site does not abut a residential zoned lot.*

d. Vehicular access drives to a drive-in restaurant shall be located at least sixty (60) feet from the right-of-way of any intersecting street. *This standard is met.*

9. Per the development standards of Section 34-3.1.25, front yard setback is 25 ft., side yard setback is 10 ft., and rear yard setback is 20 ft. ***The required setbacks for the General Business District noted in the Site Data Table are incorrect. This should be revised on future plan submissions. For the proposed plan, the front yard setback is 42 ft., the side yard setback is 47 ft. on the west side of the lot and 120 ft. on the east side of the lot, and the rear yard setback is 67 ft. All setback requirements have been met. As noted in 8.a., the building does not meet the front yard setback requirement stipulated by Section 34-4.35.A.***

10. ***The proposed parking and on-site traffic circulation poses several concerns. Generally, appropriate signage should be located at key locations on the site to allow for safe vehicular access and circulation. The following was recommended to be addressed:***

a. The proposed one-way maneuvering lane on the east side of the property is 20 feet wide. The ordinance requires a 15 foot maneuvering lane for 60 degree parking. Also, the 5 foot turning radius of the island directly south of this parking aisle should be increased to 10-15 feet.

b. There are circulation issues with having a drive-thru lane next to a two-way aisle. The two-way driveway located to the east of the building and between the drive thru lane and the parking aisle could be modified to allow for one way traffic to the north. In this case, the proposed 90 degree angled parking spaces should be changed to 60 degrees. Other alternatives may also address these concerns.

c. The end island in the northeast section of the property should be either expanded toward the north to allow additional landscaping or shifted to the north to allow additional parking. In general, the aisle north of the island is too wide, particularly since the parking aisle on the east side of the property only permits one-way traffic.

d. The striped area on the north side of the drive thru should be extended at least 30 feet to the south to prohibit vehicles entering the site from Grand River from turning into the drive thru lane. This would be more effective as a curbed landscaped island.

11. Per Section 34-3.5.J, parking may be permitted in the required front yard setback (25 feet), provided that the parking setback is not less than 10 feet. Also, an area within the front yard, including the 10 feet, shall remain as lawn or landscaped area, which is equal to the specified percentage of the area of the required front yard setback (50%). ***The front yard parking setback has been met. The front yard parking setback is met. Although it appears that the front yard landscape % standard is met with the existing and proposed landscaping, the Applicant did not provide calculations to confirm. These calculations should be provided on future plan submissions.***

12. Per Section 34-5.2.13, drive-in restaurants require one parking space for each 30 square feet of usable floor area. Since the Applicant has not submitted a floor plan, we are unable to confirm the usable floor area of the restaurant and office space. The site plan notes that the restaurant has a usable floor area of 960 square feet, which would require 32 spaces. The parking requirement for an office use is one (1) parking space for each 220 square feet of usable floor area. The site plan notes that the office space has a usable floor area of 5,720 square feet, which means 26 parking spaces are required. Therefore, 58 total parking spaces are required for the proposed uses within the building. ***The plan only provides 43 parking spaces, which does not meet the parking requirement. As noted on the site plan, the Applicant will require a variance for the proposed plan.***

13. Per Section 34-5.2.14, a drive-through lane must comply with the following regulations:

a. Drive-through lanes shall be separate from the circulation roads and lanes necessary for ingress to and egress from the property. *This standard is met subject to resolution of issues in #10 above.*

b. Drive-through lanes and stacking spaces shall be setback from all property lines a distance equivalent to the minimum setback for parking lots in the respective zoning district. *This standard is met.*

c. Drive-through lanes shall not use any space that is necessary for adequate access to parking spaces. *This standard is met although see #10 for other issues.*

d. Drive-through lanes shall provide one (1) by-pass lane to allow unobstructed travel for vehicles to pass those waiting to be served. ***This standard is not met. Changing the adjacent aisle to one-way northbound would substantially address this issue.***

e. Drive-through lanes shall have a minimum width of nine (9) feet. *This standard is met.*

f. Drive-through lanes shall have a minimum centerline turning radius of twenty-five (25) feet. ***The plan does not note the centerline turning radius. This should be included on future plan submissions.***

g. Drive-through lanes shall be striped, marked or otherwise distinctly delineated. ***The plan***

does not delineate the drive-thru lane. This should be included on future plan submissions.

h. Drive-through lanes shall have a minimum length of twenty (20) feet per vehicle. *This standard is met.*

i. Drive-through lanes shall have a minimum stacking space in accordance with the following standards:

i. Restaurant (fast food with indoor seating and drive-thru) – Six (6) vehicles. *This standard is met. The site plan does not show the location of the drive-thru service window. This should be included on future plan submissions.*

14. *The plan does not show a loading zone, which is a requirement of Section 34-5.4. The loading zone should be located in the rear yard and in the ratio of at least ten (10) square feet per front foot of the building.*

15. The trash receptacle is located in the rear yard. Details regarding the screening of the trash receptacle have not been provided by the Applicant. *A wooded fence exists on the site; a wall is required.*

16. The building height is 23.8 ft. *The Applicant has not provided any details regarding the exterior of the building. The Applicant should confirm that besides the removal of the drive-thru canopy, no other physical changes will be made to the building.*

17. Compliance with exterior lighting requirements (Sections 34-555 and 17-106) will be determined at a later review.

18. Compliance with signs (Section 34-543) will be determined at a later review.

Landscape Plan

Existing plant material consists of a locust trees and foundation plantings. The site is almost completely impervious. The applicant is proposing additional landscape areas and plantings. These plantings consist of spirea, burning bush and deciduous trees. We offer the following comments:

19. Existing and proposed utilities are shown.

20. *The plan must be sealed by a registered landscape Architect.*

21. *Section 34-5.14.4.C requires 1 canopy tree be planted for each 2,800 square feet of parking lot area. The existing site condition and layout may make meeting this requirement difficult but there are areas where additional trees can be added.*

22. *Section 34-5.14.5 requires a 2 foot high masonry wall or hedge to screen the parking areas from the public right-of-way. This is a highly visible double frontage site. It appears additional landscape areas can be added adjacent to the right-of-ways. Approximately 10 feet exists between the sidewalk and the right-of-way along W. 10 Mile. This area can be utilized for the required screening. The proposed hedge along Grand River should be extended to better screen the parking lot.*

23. *The plan should include a note indicating all landscape areas with an automatic underground irrigation system. This includes the existing lawn within right-of-way areas.*

24. *A landscape cost estimate must be provided.*

25. *A plant schedule must be added to the plans indicating required and provided trees.*

26. *We suggest that the shrubs proposed adjacent to the dumpster enclosure should be substituted with a tall upright evergreen hedge to screen the enclosure from Grand River. The hedge should be a minimum 5 feet in height (see #15 above). Taller shrubs may not be necessary if the required dumpster screen wall is constructed.*

Tree Survey

27. *The survey notes two existing trees located in a landscape bed south of the existing building. Tree protection is required and must be shown to ensure the trees are not damaged during construction.*

Commissioner Schwartz suggested that in the future, the Planning Commission review parking requirements for fast food restaurants and coffee shops; particularly those with drive-through features. He said he felt parking was being over-required. He said in his experience, he has never seen the subject restaurant exceed 40+ customers, even combined with their staff.

Discussion took place regarding the required parking requirements; the recent changes in this type of application and use; and the timeframes that often exist in terms of the development.

Commissioner Mantey said the minutes should reflect that this was a pre-existing condition where the standards do not apply with the rooftop screening; and that when the Applicant applies for a variance, that they only request the parking based on their needs.

Commissioner Blizman said based on the number of variances and issues in this particular project, he would support a tentative approval, until they met the existing standards.

Mr. Arroyo said this seemed like an opportunity for the Applicant to revise the plan to come closer into compliance; and to see the minimum requests to the Zoning Board of Appeals. It was clarified that there was the building setback variance for drive-through restaurants; and the number of parking spaces; and the other question is do they pursue a variance or do they accept some as existing or pre-existing conditions.

Chair McRae spoke about whether the setback issue would change if the address was on the Grand River Avenue side. He said he was concerned about having the Grand River Avenue entrance be the only entrance; and that a vehicle would be prevented from exiting to the north.

Mr. Arroyo said Grand River Avenue would remain two-way; and it is the eastern lane at 10 Mile Road that would be one-way to the north.

Applicant Mark Kellenberger said Tim Horton's was looking to relocate from Brighton to Farmington Hills. He said they have reviewed the items mentioned by Mr. Arroyo, and they would concur with many; including the circulation layout. He apologized for the floor plan and elevation; that they were seeking a balance regarding how they deal with restaurant and office uses; and keep variances to a minimum. He said it was a small operation and existing tenant upstairs with a small amount of employees and parking needs. He said they intend to take entire lower level and mix it between the office and the restaurant. He said they applied to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a setback and parking variance.

Mr. Kellenberger said calculations were obtained from one of their popular restaurants. The usable floor area was about 960 square feet; and the same for the office use, with an assumed 40-60% ratio on second floor. He said they want the ability to accommodate a tenant for general office use. He mentioned their preliminary take at the elevation for the brick building; and their desire to include their recent café bake shop design. He explained the elevation from 10 Mile Road, with the drive-through and kitchen in the back. He spoke about the appearance from the parking lot area. He said next week they would provide a floor plan for both the first and second floors.

Mr. Arroyo confirmed that the setbacks would be taken from the future right-of-way. He said currently the right-of-way is 43 feet from the centerline to the edge, which is the 86 foot right-of-way. He said the City's thoroughfare plan calls for 120 feet right-of-way; and the sidewalk is set one foot inside the future right-of-way already; so the footprint of the road and sidewalk would not expand more than it already is. He said at that point it is exactly 25 feet; but it needs to be 60 feet because it is a driveway.

Mr. Kellenberger said they would accommodate the circulation and the east drive could be converted to a one-way drive. The eastern-most aisle was a 19 foot aisle and it is too tight. He inquired about the desire for this layout.

Mr. Arroyo said there would be too much width if they used a one way aisle (northbound and angled parking); and it should be reduced to 15 feet; with a separation from the drive-through lane and landscaping. He said they could meet to discuss those details.

Chair McRae expressed that the plan design had partially angled areas mixed with straight areas.

Mr. Kellenberger said with bringing people in from two roads, their concern was signage, and that a 'do not enter' sign would cause confusion; thus the subject design. He said the suggestion was not objectionable, and they would only lose one parking space and make it up in the landscaped island. He expressed concern with the southern point of the landscaped island, but there was room to widen it.

Discussion took place regarding the timeframe involved if the matter was tabled to provide more time to work through the details of the plan.

Mr. Kellenberger said expressed concern regarding the Engineering Department comments regarding the relocation of the Grand River Avenue drive to the west to line up with the other drive. He said circulation would be more cumbersome to guide patrons to the left or the right. He spoke about the circulation and easements on the site.

Mr. Stec spoke about the consolidation of the curb cuts on 10 Mile Road. He said he thought it was mentioned that if the Applicant was agreeable to make it a one-way northbound entrance on the east bound side, that would satisfy the Engineering Department and allow the two curb cuts to remain.

Ms. Gushard said that was agreeable. Mr. Kellenberger said it was a fair compromise.

Mr. Kellenberger said they were not prepared for the requirement of a traffic study; and he requested some direction in that regard. Regarding detention, he said no plan exists for this site; there is no detention on the site; they were not prepared to create an underground detention system; and they have not witnessed any flood or back up. Regarding item 7 in the Engineering Department review, they would be willing to review the issue of water quality.

City Attorney Schultz said the issue of storm water was significant; and it is a significant question for the Engineering Department.

Ms. Gushard explained that it is a current engineering design standard that any new sites provide on-site storm water quality. Regarding the detention, she said the City Engineer thought there was on-site detention; and if there was not, and the new owner was going to use the site as-is, that they require the maintenance of whatever was currently on the site. The Applicant stated that was fair.

Mr. Arroyo spoke about the traffic study, and said a one-way aisle would be helpful; if it was not a substantial increase in the traffic pattern. He said it becomes an issue if new or additional curb cuts were being requested.

Mr. Kellenberger said he would appreciate meeting with the City to work out the details.

Discussion took place regarding the plan, the possible variances that might be necessary or requested; and procedure.

MOTION by Blizman, support by Schwartz, that Site Plan 67-12-2013, dated December 18, 2013, petitioned by Mark Kellenberger, for Tim Horton's, be denied because the plan must be revised to address deficiencies identified in Clearzoning review letter dated January 8, 2014, to reduce deficiencies to the greatest degree possible. Applicant will need to seek any necessary variances from ZBA.

Motion carried unanimously.

MOTION by Blizman, support by Stimson, that Landscape Plan 67-12-2013, dated December 18, 2013, petitioned by Mark Kellenberger, for Tim Horton's, be denied because the plan must be revised to address deficiencies identified in Clearzoning review letter dated January 8, 2014, and any revisions made to the site plan. Applicant will need to seek any necessary variances from ZBA.

Motion carried unanimously.

B. LANDSCAPE PLAN 61-8-2013

LOCATION:	29024 Grand River Ave.
PARCEL I.D.:	22-23-36-304-022
PROPOSAL:	Addition to an existing gas station in a B-3, General Business District
ACTION REQUESTED:	Approval of Landscape Plan by Planning Commission
APPLICANT:	Mohammed Nassar
OWNER:	Mohammed Nassar

Planning Consultant Arroyo referred to the summary of findings in the review letter dated January 8, 2014. He said the existing plant material consists of a lindens, maples, crabs and shrub plantings. The Applicant is proposing additional landscape areas and plantings. These plantings consist of yews, burning bush and a maple. He offered the following comments:

1. The subject property contains 0.33 acres and is located north of Grand River between Middlebelt Road and Inkster Road. The Applicant is proposing to remove the existing mini-mart and construct a new, one-story, 1,459 square foot building.
2. Existing and proposed utilities are shown.
3. *The plan must be sealed by a registered landscape architect.*

4. Section 34-5.14.4.C requires one canopy tree be planted for each 2,800 s.f. of parking lot area. The four deciduous trees near the parking lot perimeter satisfy this requirement.

5. *Section 5.14.5 requires a masonry wall or hedge to screen the parking areas from the public right-of-way. This requirement cannot be met adjacent to Grand River since the existing paving abuts the sidewalk. The existing everlow yews under the canopy sign should be substituted with a taller shrub (2-2.5 feet high at maturity) to better screen the parking lot. Additional shrubs to create a hedge should be planted along Jacksonville Street from the drive to the existing screen wall.*

6. *A note indicating all landscape areas shall be provided with an automatic underground irrigation system must be added to the plans. This includes the existing lawn within right-of-way areas.*

7. *A landscape cost estimate must be provided.*

8. *A plant schedule must be added to the plans indicating required and provided trees (include parking lot trees from #4 above).*

9. *The Farmington Hills tree planting detail must be added to the plan.*

Mr. Arroyo said there were some compliance issues with the front yard landscaping because the area is already paved; but there are some opportunities to enhance the landscaping. He discussed the suggested landscaping as noted in items 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 in the review letter.

Applicant Nassar said there was an irrigation system all around the property and it can tie into the new building. He said they have no objections to the consultant's comments, including the addition of more landscaping.

Mr. Arroyo said the lighting is usually reviewed at the final site plan review.

Chair McRae said the light on the building, shown at the bottom of the drawing, was noted as a type 1, but it was a type 2 in the distribution pattern. He said it shows light going to the north, but it would not comply with the candle-wattage for the property; and should be a 50 watt fixture.

Chair McRae noted that the sidewalk shown on the plan is continuous and the new black top is broken up. He said the one on the plan is a better promotion of walkability on the site; which is a design philosophy that the sidewalk should be continuous.

MOTION by Topper, support by Rae-O'Donnell, that that Landscape Plan No. SP 61-8-2013 dated December 19, 2013, submitted by Mohammed Nassar be approved because it appears to meet all applicable Zoning Chapter requirements and applicable Design Principles as adopted by the Planning Commission; subject to the following conditions:

- **Revise plan to address Clearzoning review deficiencies**
- **Revise plan to address Engineering review deficiencies**
- **Revise lighting to comply with City requirements**

Commissioner Blizman inquired about whether the Planning Commission indicates that an Applicant must comply with Engineering Department requirements.

City Attorney Schultz said that was often included in motions; and that Applicants must always comply with Engineering Department requirements.

Motion carried, 6-1, with Blizman opposed.

A brief recess was taken from 9:07 to 9:14 p.m.

C. Discussion Grand River Corridor Vision Plan

Assistant to the City Manager Geinzer was present with Spencer Brown.

Mr. Arroyo summarized the key points of his memo dated January 9, 2014. He said his memo was not a comprehensive overview of the Vision Plan, but served to highlight key differences with the adopted Master Plan and assist in establishing a direction for implementation. He recommended that the Planning Commission review the Vision Plan and Master Plan documents as well as the overview provided in his memo. He noted that the Planning Commission is required to review its Master Plan in detail in 2014-15 because it is approaching 5 years in age, so the timing of this exercise is excellent.

Overview

The Vision Plan has several focus areas that are within the boundaries of the City of Farmington Hills. The following summarizes these key areas for initial study:

- Botsford Focus Area – This area has a western boundary of Rockwell and ends at the intersection of Grand River and Eight Mile. Key recommendations include multiple-family residential on the south side of Grand River between Rockwell and Waldron. Medical office is planned on the north side of Grand River. The Botsford Drive / Grand River intersection is planned to be a Bus Rapid Transit station, and mixed use buildings and a hotel are planned near this area.
- The Farmington Hills Master Plan also includes a Botsford Special Planning Area and Business Redevelopment and Mixed Use Redevelopment areas in this same general area. Many of the common themes of bike lanes or paths, LEED certification for buildings, mixed use development, use of overlay zoning, best management practices for storm water are found in both documents. The Planned Mixed Use area in the Master Plan is designated for mixed use and medical office in the Vision Plan. A significant departure from the Master Plan is the large multiple family area that is envisioned on the south side of Grand River. Buildings are proposed to have little to no setbacks from Grand River in this area.

The Vision Plan suggests providing for significant design flexibility in the regulatory process.

- Grand River North Focus Area – This area east of Tuck Road includes the sites of the existing Target store and Steppingstone School on the north side of Grand River, which would be retained in the Vision Plan. The Target would be modified to add liner restaurant / retail uses to the south and west of the building. Other mixed use buildings are proposed east and west of Target. There are existing large retail/big box buildings to the north of Target that are proposed to be redeveloped as multiple family residential (e.g., clusters of townhouse units). An existing multiple family development (Nantucket Townhomes) already exists to the west (southeast corner of Tuck and Nine Mile). The Master Plan designates the majority of this area as Shopping Center Type Business. The most significant departure from the Master Plan is the new multiple family area north of Target, which would be an expansion of an existing multiple family district to the west. This area is also a planned Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) stop.
- Grand River South Focus Area – This area is west of Tuck Road, south of Grand River and north of M-5. Two options are presented in the Vision Plan. Option A is a community park / recreation use with a walking and biking trail. Option B is a mixed use and general office area that would take advantage of the excellent freeway and road visibility of this area. A BRT stop is also planned here. The Master Plan designates this area for Non-Center Type Business. Non-Center uses are those not suitable for shopping centers – those with outdoor components or heavily automobile orientation that might have a negative impact on nearby residential. However, this is a designated Mixed Use Redevelopment area in the Master Plan (No. 2). This suggests increased building height, a mix of uses, and an orientation for pedestrians and automobiles. Buildings would be placed close to the road in a manner not unlike a downtown area.

The Vision Plan is a marked departure from the Master Plan because the primary focus is either high profile/signature office buildings (Option B) or recreation / open space (Option A).

Alternative Approaches

The implementation of the Vision Plan involves many layers that range from land use to infrastructure. The focus of this memo is on land use and zoning issues. The Vision Plan highlights options for zoning implementation. One approach is to rezone affected areas to match the Vision Plan recommendations should the City of Farmington Hills choose to fully endorse all of the land use recommendations in the document. This would require drafting new zoning districts to match the land use and building form recommendations. Another approach is to use overlay zoning districts to establish a framework for the impacted areas without changing the underlying zoning classifications. This has been used by the City for other focus areas. One or more overlay zoning districts would be established. There could be layers within the overlay districts that allow some development by right and other more intensive development through a PUD process. The overlay process is identified in the Vision Plan as being preferred approach.

Chair McRae noted that the Master Plan was completed in 2009; and the Planning Commission was obligated to review it this year. He said that was an important factor in how the subject plan is addressed. He pointed out that in the last several years, the Planning Commission has completed three overlay districts; and set aside a fourth overlay district. He said whatever development has come in those areas had nothing to do with the overlay district.

Mr. Stec said he had not seen any interest in the three years he had been with the City.

Commissioner Schwartz said the two focus areas with the greatest likelihood of generating a building permit application were around Botsford Hospital and the Target/ movie area. He said spoke about

Botsford Hospital's potential major renovation plans, with the possible planning for intern housing in that area. He suggested staff meet with the Hospital's planner regarding their planning ideas. He said the Target/movie area being in bankruptcy creates an opportunity; and he suggested an 'anything goes' zoning situation to help promote the area and put out the idea of lots of options; i.e. multiple-family being allowed, etc. to help stimulate development.

Chair McRae referred to the two options; and noted that option one implied a purchase by the City for a park. He said if the budget did not include funding for said park, there was no reason to consider that option. He said there was no point in putting in Ordinances to make something possible if the City wanted to put in a park; and in that case, the Planning Commission should focus on the other option.

Discussion took place regarding the Parks and Recreation bond issue and the City's priority for future expansion; and parkland acquisition.

Mr. Arroyo said the Planning Commission's Master Plan calls for two almost a-z concepts; and there is almost four possibilities for this area. He said perhaps the Planning Commission should focus on a blend.

Commissioner Stimson referred to the area by Orchard Lake Road and said it looked out on the river, with no residential in the back to oppose it; and there could be upper residential, restaurants, and it could have back terraces on river.

Chair McRae stated that there were three areas and three issues. He said Botsford Hospital needed to be engaged in a more informative way; there is the Target center, and Ms. Cappola, the Economic Development Director needed to be engaged regarding that; and he said he thought more direction was needed from City Council regarding what they were looking for in the Grand River North Focus Area, and one of the four options needed to be chosen.

Commissioner Blizman concurred with Commissioner Schwartz regarding the changing types of businesses that were coming to town, i.e. fast food restaurants, drive-throughs, and coffee shop types of businesses. He said these were not substantial retail investments. He said he thought it was because Farmington Hills does not have an abundance of young families with kids and money to spend—which tend to generate demand for more lucrative retail developments that are more desirable than fast food businesses. He said if Botsford Hospital was to expand, but needed housing for their residents and interns, those people would be consumers, and the City needs to attract that population that will support development in the area.

Commissioner Mantey concurred, and noted that sidewalks and walkability also attract younger people. He added that there was an abundance of retail in the metro area, many shop on-line, and he did not see a tremendous growth in retail.

Chair McRae said the concept at the Target center reduces the amount of retail; and what retail is left should be taken to a higher level of quality—not more, but better retail.

Assistant to the City Manager Geinzer gave feedback on the Grand River Avenue south area. He concurred with Commissioner Mantey's comments and said they were trying to de-commission the retail down to the appropriate level and reinvent what exists. He concurred with Commissioner Blizman regarding the need for more housing options near Botsford Hospital.

Mr. Geinzer spoke about the Grand River south area. He said the area was a significant draw and there were amenities there if the Target was redeveloped. He said they were trying to look at a longer term, beyond the next five to ten years. He said the vision is what the community is looking for, with the guidance of the Planning Commission and the City Council.

Chair McRae said the plan was long-range, but the City must show some deliverables, or those involved in the process will ask why go through the process if it does not happen for a decade or more. He said opportunities need to be found to make this work sooner than later. He said the plans of Botsford Hospital must be determined; as well as the economic status of the Target center.

Commissioner Rae-O'Donnell said the goal was to re-look at the Master Plan; and a lot of focus on this is developing more multiple family use, mixed in with business use.

Discussion took place regarding the economic status of the Target center area and the potential for use for that area. The Planning Commission agreed that the Master Plan can address the connecting areas.

Mr. Arroyo said the big picture is the land use question. He said it would be helpful to review the recommendations in the entire Master Plan, and adjust the PUD Ordinance, as it could apply to the subject areas.

The Planning Commission concurred and directed the Planning Consultant to draft proposed revisions to PUD ordinance to include provisions allowing special considerations for use in the CIA area. The provisions discussed were:

1. Specific qualification criteria for the use of PUD option in the CIA areas
2. Allowing the PUD option to apply to residential areas within the CIA areas

The draft revisions are to be ready for discussion at one of the March meetings.

D. Seasonal Outdoor Sales Ordinance Amendment

MOTION by Topper, support by Rae-O'Donnell, to set the Seasonal Outdoor Sales Ordinance Amendment for Public Hearing on February 20, 2014.

Motion carried unanimously.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Regarding the indoor sports training business, Chair McRae requested his comment be added to the minutes relative to his reason for opposing the motion.

Chair McRae commented that he opposed the motion not because he did not want the Applicant to open the proposed business, but because he did not think the Applicant should be held responsible for the rest of the building; nor should the Applicant to be delayed by the landlord.

MOTION by Blizman, support by Stimson, to approve the meeting minutes of December 12, 2013 as amended.

Motion carried unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Two residents commented on the Howard Road site condominium plan.

COMMISSIONER'S COMMENTS

Commissioner Schwartz said he wanted to review the Capital Improvement Plan process and take another look at the statute. He said many communities do not take that before their Planning Commission. He felt it could be eliminated or reduced in terms of Planning Commission involvement.

City Attorney Schultz said with the CIP, the Planning Commission is fulfilling a statutory obligation.

Discussion took place regarding the suggestion; and whether the obligation can be fulfilled while reducing the traditional process.

Commissioner Blizman said that as a resident, a tax payer, and a Planning Commissioner, he liked the fact that Department heads discuss the CIP need with the Planning Commission. He said he learns a lot from these meetings, and over the years Planning Commissioners have asked pointed questions. He said he thought they should continue.

Chair McRae said after the upcoming CIP meeting, the Planning Commission should have a candid discussion to determine what is useful, yet still provides the necessary input.

Commissioner Blizman asked staff to look at the potentially excessive lighting at the Vineyards at Northwestern Highway.

Discussion took place regarding items for discussion at future Study Session.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further comments, Chair McRae adjourned the meeting at 10:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Rae-O'Donnell, Planning Commission Secretary