

**MINUTES  
CITY OF FARMINGTON HILLS  
PLANNING COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARING/REGULAR MEETING  
FARMINGTON HILLS CITY HALL – COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
March 24, 2016, 7:30 P.M.**

Chair Topper called the Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. on March 24, 2016. She explained that while there were five Commissioners present, thus constituting a quorum, all five would need to vote affirmatively on an action in order for a request to be granted. Applicants could adjourn their request until the next meeting, if they so desired.

Commissioners Present: Blizman, Mantey, Stimson, Topper, Schwartz

Commissioners Absent: Fleischhacker, Mantey, McRae, Orr

Others Present: Staff Planner Stec, Staff Engineer Darnall, City Attorney Gillam,  
Planning Consultant Arroyo

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

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

**Motion carried unanimously 5-0.**

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

**A. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PLAN 2016/2017 THROUGH 2021/2022**

**ACTION REQUESTED:** Adoption of Plan

Staff Planner Stec explained that tonight the Planning Commission was having a public hearing for the Capital Improvements Plan (CIP) from 2016/2017 through 2021/2022. The Capital Improvement Plan was not a budget. Rather the CIP was a strategic planning tool for the City's capital needs. It allowed prioritization of capital improvements within the City, and allowed different departments to coordinate projects so that all the various departments within the City know what the other departments had as priorities.

In order to make it into the Capital Improvements Plan as a single project, the project needed to have a cost of \$25,000 or more. If there were multiple projects such as sidewalk projects or smaller projects that were grouped together to equal \$25,000 as a total, those could also be included in the Capital Improvements Plan.

The Plan Goal was to plan for and guide needed capital improvements and expenditures in a fiscally sound manner and to ensure that those improvements were consistent with the goals and policies of the City of Farmington Hills and the expectations of its residents. The document was available to the public.

The Planning Commission was mandated by State law to annually adopt a Capital Improvement Plan after a public hearing, and then to forward the Plan to the City Manager to submit to City Council. The CIP assisted the City Council with capital improvement budgeting.

The schedule for the CIP included:

- December 2015/January 2106 various departments compiled data.
- Planning Commission study session January 22, 2016, where projects were reviewed and prioritized
- Tonight, March 24, 2016, there was a public hearing.
- April 2016 Planning Commission to forward CIP to City Council.

Staff Planner Stec highlighted accomplishments of the past year as follows:

Drainage Projects

- Minnow Pond Drain Crossing on Drake Road. Replace twin metal culverts with concrete box culvert.
- Rockdale Culvert Replacement – replace existing culvert with new concrete box culvert.
- Lamar Culvert Extension – extend existing twin culvert to allow better pedestrian access along road.
- Independence Commons Storm Sewer – Clean out, repair, replace, reline and rehabilitate (as needed) existing storm sewer.

Sanitary Sewer:

- Install sanitary sewer line on Drake Road, at Dewberry
- Sanitary sewer upgrades:
  - Lining –134 runs totaling 30,530 LF
  - Excavation repairs –3 totaling 79 LF
  - Spot liner repairs –38 totaling 205 LF
  - Manhole rehabilitation –78
  - Pump station repairs –6

Water Main

- Replace existing 4” and 6” water main in portions of Grand River Homes Subdivision (Phase 2).
- Install new 8” water main on Drake Road between Westwood and just north of Springhill.

Public Facilities:

- A three phase building renovation plan was developed for the Police Department’s aging facility. The last phase of this multi-year project was completed in 2015.
- Phase three revitalization plan included redesigning the basement space. The renovation impacted the men’s and women’s locker rooms, storage rooms, south stairwell, basement HVAC, exercise room, exterior stairs, second floor locker room, second floor restrooms, Evidence Technician Lab, fire alarm system and jail security access door.
- The Police Department’s Panasonic Toughbook 74s, purchased in 2009, were replaced with Dell Latitude 12” Rugged Extreme Notebooks. These Notebooks were used by police officers to access law enforcement databases.
- Body armor worn by police officers had a federally mandated five-year replacement schedule. In 2011 the Police Department replaced its entire inventory of body armor; the body armor currently issued to 88 sworn members reaches its “end of life” in 2016. In addition to the current body armor system, this replacement project included the acquisition of an exterior vest carrier system (vest will be worn over the officer’s uniform shirt) for all of the sworn members of the department. Partial funding was received from the Federal Bullet Proof Vest Grant Program.
- Phase One of Fire Station #4’s driveway/parking repairs and catch basins at Stations 1, 2, and 3 were completed.
- Fire Department completed the construction of the Battalion Chief’s office at Station 5.
- Fire Department completed the purchase of training room chairs and tables and continuing to purchase other furnishings for Stations 1, 2, 4, and 5.
- Brine Making System upgrade at DPW (completed in 2015).
- Replacement of 4 overhead garage doors including electric openers and fire alarm upgrades at the DPW facility.
- Storage, Winter Maintenance and Secondary Containment (completed in 2015).
- Currently working with Central Services to complete required HVAC upgrades.

- Recommend IT/Central Services pursue a scheduling software program for both Fire and Police Departments that allows time cards to be uploaded into InforumGold/Eden payroll system.
- ADA Funds were used to construct a new entryway at the Farmington Hills Ice Arena and to address trip hazards at various fire facilities.
- All exterior lights have been replaced with energy and operationally efficient LED light fixtures.

#### City Clerk's Office

The State Bureau of Elections (BOE) has distributed a statewide Request for Proposals (RFP) for new Election Equipment. Currently there is some funding available through the Help America Vote Act (HAVA) but not enough to cover a statewide purchase. Additional funding has been requested and the legislature is currently reviewing that request and has indicated that there may be more monies earmarked for this purpose. The BOE has suggested that communities plan on funding a portion of the equipment purchase in order to meet statewide needs and in light of no action to date from the legislature to dedicate additional funding.

The new equipment roll out will most likely occur in 2017. However, the State BOE is still going through the RFP process.

#### Sidewalks

- Gill Road east side, Colfax to Nine Mile Road.
- Fourteen Mile Roads, south side, Claymore to west of Farmington Road.
- Fourteen Mile Road, south side, from Inkster Road north to just east of Chatsworth.
- Drake Road, east side from Muer Cove to Dewberry and in front of 31000 Drake Road.

#### Transportation

##### Reconstruction:

- Thirteen Mile Road, Haggerty Road to Halsted Road.
- Thirteen Mile Road, Farmington Road to Orchard Lake Road.
- Gill Road, Eight Mile to Nine Mile Road.
- Colfax from Farmington Road to Gill Road.

##### Resurface:

- Drake Road from Twelve Mile Road to Howard Road.
- Gill from Nine Mile Road to Lytle.
- Lytle Road from Gill Road to Drake Road.

##### Road Improvement:

- Woodbrook Subdivision
- Orchard West Subdivision.
- Independence Commons Subdivision.
- Briarhill Subdivision.
- Hollywood, Westhill Woods
- Tarabusi Grand River Gardens Area Subdivisions.

##### Other:

- Fourteen Mile Road and Orchard Lake Road Roundabout.
- Resurface Inkster Road from Thirteen Mile Road to Fourteen Mile Road.
- Upgrade traffic signal of Thirteen Mile Road at Drake Road.

#### Equipment Purchases:

- Replaced the existing sewer vacuum truck.
- Replaced the existing front-end loader.



- Major Road Paving Projects 47,000,000\*
- Industrial/Commercial Roads 13,000,000
- 6 Preventative Maintenance Roads projects 5,625,000\*\*
- 6 DPW Equipment purchases 6,000,000
- 6 Fire Department Purchases 8,000,000
- 11 Parks & Recreation purchases 12,300,000

\*Much of the funding for Road Paving projects came from other sources. The total amount of the Paving Projects was actually about \$340 million; the City's portion was only \$47 million as listed.

\*\*The cost for preventative maintenance on roads was entirely borne by the City.

Staff Planner Stec thanked City Staff, City Departments, and the Planning Commission for their efforts in putting together this Capital Improvements Plan.

Chair Topper opened the public hearing. Seeing that no one came forward to speak, Chair Topper closed the public hearing. There was no correspondence.

**MOTION by Rae-O'Donnell, support by Stimson, that the Planning Commission adopt the City of Farmington Hills Capital Improvements Plan 2017/2018 – 2021/2022 as published.**

Commissioner Blizman said that the intersection of 12 Mile and Inkster was falling apart. He knew the County was responsible for 12 Mile Road, but the pavement deterioration there was egregious. On Inkster north of 12 Mile Road there was a giant pothole that could easily cause an accident. He had lost two tires on Tuesday morning when he hit that pothole. He had just driven through two states and there was nothing that was as bad as Michigan. This had to impact economic development and everything else and no one at the State level was doing anything.

Commissioner Blizman requested that body cameras for Police be moved forward. He understood that the Police Department was looking into this but it needed to be moved forward, so that these could be purchased and used before problems occurred.

Chair Topper called the motion.

**Motion carried 5-0.**

**REGULAR MEETING:**

Chair Topper again explained that four Commissioners were absent. In order to receive an affirmative decision, all of the remaining Commissioners would need to vote affirmatively. If any of the applicants wanted to adjourn until more Commissioners were present, they could do so.

No applicant asked to adjourn, and the meeting proceeded.

**A. REVISED SITE AND LANDSCAPE PLAN 68-8-2015**

LOCATION: 28333 Grand River Ave.  
PARCEL I.D.: 22-23-36-377-112  
PROPOSAL: Automobile sales in B-3, General Business District  
ACTION REQUESTED: Approval of site and landscape plan  
APPLICANT: Behrouz Oskui

OWNER: Behrouz Oskui

Utilizing overhead slides and referring to his review letter of February 11, 2016, Planning Consultant Arroyo gave the background and review for this application, which was for site and landscape plan approval for site improvements for an automotive sales and repair facility with an outdoor display area.

Planning Consultant Arroyo explained that this was a further revision to a plan seen by the Planning Commission on September 17, 2015 and December 17, 2015, when deficiencies remained.

Planning Consultant Arroyo described the location of the property on the south side of Grand River Avenue between Pearl and Waldron Streets. The applicant was asking for an outdoor display area for automobile sales. The building was formerly a restaurant. Indoor auto sales was a permitted use in the zoning district (B-3), however Section 34-4.36 Outdoor Sales or Rental of New or Used Motor Vehicles was permitted under certain conditions. These conditions were mostly met, with the following still needed:

- The plans should be revised to show that the setback requirement from intersections was met.
- The applicant had indicated in the past that the shop area would be for “clean-up” only with no repair of vehicles. The applicant should confirm that this was still the case.

In terms of site plan requirements, there were some minor details that needed to be cleaned up. These could be approved administratively.

The existing building did have a nonconforming front yard setback. The applicant did not propose changes to the building so no additional action was required regarding the building.

Requirements regarding parking within the required front yard setback/open space appeared to be met.

Regarding screening between the public right-of way and parking, in order to meet the standard, the 24-inch screening wall should be continued down Waldron and included where practical along Pearl Street, or an alternate screening method as provided for in Section 34-5.14 could be provided.

In terms of off-street parking requirements, 25 spaces were required, but in Planning Consultant Arroyo’s experience, less than 50 percent of showroom space was generally usable floor area, due to the presence of automobiles. With this in mind, the Planning Commission should make a determination as to whether the parking might be calculated based on a lower square footage than 2,500 square feet.

Regarding screening between uses (item 14, page 3), this issue seemed to have been resolved due to research by the Planning Department, which showed a Zoning Board of Appeals case from 1976 where the screening provided to the residential RA-4 District was approved as a wooden fence. The City Attorney had also been consulted in this matter and he agreed that the ZBA variance was still in effect.

The only area of significant concern was the lighting plan. There was excess illumination beyond the ordinance standard of one-third (0.3) foot-candles at the property line next to residential. Installing extra backshielding on the fixture in the site’s southeast corner could help resolve this issue.

Regarding the landscape plan, Section 34-5.14 called for canopy trees. The plan showed a mix of ornamental, evergreen and columnar trees. The Planning Commission should make a determination as to whether the proposed plan materials were acceptable to meet the purpose of the ordinance.

Last, the required walls or hedges along Waldron and Pearl were not shown on the plan.

In response to a question from Commissioner Rae-O'Donnell, Planning Consultant Arroyo said either a hedge or 2-foot wall along Waldron was acceptable.

Rouzbeh Oskui, 41 Warner, Gross Pointe Farms MI, was present on behalf of this application. Ziad El-Baba, 674 Gauthier, Tecumseh, Ontario, engineer for this project, was also present, as was Brian Devlin, landscape architect, 31736 West Chicago, Livonia, MI.

Mr. Oskui said tonight's plan represented some significant changes from the previous submittals. He reiterated that their "clean-up" area was just that: there were no hoists, etc., in the area. He pointed out that there was a basement in this area from the restaurant that had previously occupied the site; they would not feel comfortable putting any sort of hoist there.

Commissioner Rae-O'Donnell asked if the applicants were willing to add extra shielding to the lighting to the fixture at the southeast corner. Mr. Oskui said they were willing to do this.

Mr. El-Baba said they had gone through the original submittal and addressed almost all the items except for a few things where they had to still get some clarification. They would address the screening and the lighting issues, as requested.

The site was serviced and drained. They had taken the recommendation of the Planning Commission to close an approach; they still had to get approval from other authorities. They had provided a greenbelt all around the property, on all 3 streets. They would provide whatever necessary fencing was required, especially for the area abutting residential. Other than that they would like to hear the Planning Commission's comments and hopefully receive approval.

Commissioner Schwartz said that since Commissioner Orr was absent, and Commissioner Orr always asked this question, he would ask if the trees being planted were native to Michigan.

Mr. Devlin said that the sweetgums and serviceberrys were native to Michigan; the European hornbeams were not though the hornbeams were hardy and could thrive here.

**MOTION by Schwartz, support by Blizman, that Site Plan No. 68-8-2015, dated January 19, 2016, submitted by Behrouz Oskui be approved because it appears to meet all applicable requirements of the Zoning Chapter. This approval is subject to the following conditions:**

- **A revised site plan be submitted for administrative review showing 2-foot shrubs between the parking lot and the Waldron and Pearl rights-of-way.**
- **A revised lighting plan be submitted showing illumination levels of no greater than .3 foot candles at the property line.**

**The motion also acknowledges that given the nature of the business, the parking as noted in the February 11, 2016 Clearzoning review letter is adequate.**

**Motion carried 5-0.**

**MOTION by Schwartz, support by Blizman, that Landscape Plan No. 68-8-2015, dated January 28, 2016 submitted by Behrouz Oskui be approved because it appears to meet all applicable Zoning Chapter requirements and applicable Design Principles as adopted by the Planning Commission. This approval is subject to the following condition:**

- **A revised plan be submitted showing the types of shrubs to be planted between the parking lot and the Waldron and Pearl rights-of-way.**

**Motion carried 5-0.**

**B. REVISED LOT SPLIT 5, 2015, (Final)**

LOCATION:	22588 Whittington St.
PARCEL I.D.:	22-23-25-376-013
PROPOSAL:	Split one (1) existing parcel into two (2) parcels in RA-1, One-Family Residential District
ACTION REQUESTED:	Approval of final land division plan
APPLICANT:	Dennis A. Park
OWNER:	Dennis A. Park

Utilizing overhead slides and referring to his review letter of March 17, 2016, Planning Consultant Arroyo gave the background and review for this application, which was for a Final Lot Split review to permit two lots. This application had been before the Commission for a preliminary review on November 19, 2015.

Planning Consultant Arroyo described the location of the property, on the east side of Whittington Street, north of Nine Mile Road. The property was zoned RA-1, One Family Residential and was approximately 2.286 acres.

The property was a triangular piece with a flood plain on the back portion. Planning Consultant Arroyo showed the proposed two parcels on the overhead, with a proposed cul-de-sac bulb at the end of Whittington. He showed a detail of where the homes would be placed – there was a line showing the flood plain as well. The improvements were all shown outside the flood plain, something that had been requested the last time this application was before the Commission.

This proposed lot split met the dimensional requirements for the RA-1 District.

Regarding access, the City's standards under Section 27-110 (2)h required that when a street was in excess of 330 feet in length, a turnaround of not less than 100 feet in diameter needed to be provided. The plans showed a turnaround 96 feet in diameter. This needed to be corrected.

Also, the western part of the cul-de-sac bulb was actually not on the subject property, but was on the property to the west, which had a different owner. There needed to be confirmation from that owner that they were willing to provide for that right of way so that this improvement could be made. This should be discussed with the applicant.

Saying that there were no other issues of note, Planning Consultant Arroyo concluded his review.

Commissioner Schwartz confirmed that all standards had been met except for the slight deficiency in the cul-de-sac radius. Planning Consultant Arroyo said this was correct, along with the issue of the applicant being able to use the property to the west for the cul-de-sac.

Commissioner Schwartz asked if the long thin parcel to the west was actually developable, or was it too wet for development. He had driven the area before tonight's meeting, and there seemed to be a lot of standing water there. Planning Consultant Arroyo said that as far as he knew, it was developable. The current situation was that Whittington was improved on half the normal right of way, so that there was a 30-foot right of way there. Normally it would be 60 feet. If that property were to be developed, the applicant would have to dedicate the

additional 30 feet along the frontage of Whittington, and then the parcels along Whittington could be split. While he had not studied the lot to the west in detail, it appeared that this could be done.

Commissioner Rae-O'Donnell asked what would happen if the Planning Commission approved the lot split and the applicant did not receive permission to use the property to the west for a cul-de-sac.

City Attorney Gillam explained that Planning Commission had 3 choices: (1) they could approve the lot split conditioned on the applicant obtaining concurrence from the property owner to the west to build the cul-de-sac as proposed, (2) the Commission could table the application until proof of such concurrence was received, or (3) they could deny the application.

Wynn Berry, 5285 South River Drive, Commerce Township, MI 48382 was present on behalf of this application. Matt Diffin, 53115 Grand River, New Hudson MI, and engineer for the project, was also present.

Mr. Berry said they had come in for a preliminary application on November 19, 2015, had received comments from staff and the Commission, and they had resolved all the items that they could. In regard to the acquisition of the property that was needed to provide for the turn-around, they had an agreement to acquire it and if the motion could list that as a condition they would be very satisfied with that.

Chair Topper asked Mr. Berry if they owned the property where the cul-de-sac was proposed. Mr. Berry replied that they did not own it but there was an agreement to purchase it.

Commissioner Schwartz asked if the agreement was to purchase or to just have the ability to put the cul-de-sac in. Mr. Berry said it would be dedicated to the roadway.

**MOTION by Rae-O'Donnell, support by Blizman, that Final Lot Split No. 5, 2015, submitted by Dennis A. Park, 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, subject to the following condition:**

- **The applicant obtain concurrence with the property owner to the west for the portion of the cul-de-sac shown on that property.**

**Motion carried 5-0.**

**C. AMENDMENT TO PUD PLAN 1, 2011 AND SITE PLAN 76-12-2015**

LOCATION:	28975, 29199, & 29221 Orchard Lake Rd.
PARCEL I.D.:	22-23-10-227-039, 041, 042
PROPOSAL:	Amend PUD Plan 1, 2011 to include 28975 Orchard Lake for the construction of a new self-storage and retail building in B-3 General Business District, LI-1 Light Industrial, and P-1 Vehicular Parking Districts
ACTION REQUESTED:	Approval of revised landscape plan
APPLICANT:	Nolan Real Estate Investments, LLC
OWNER:	U.S. Tool and Cutter Co.

Utilizing overhead slides and referring to his review memorandum of March 16, 2016, Staff Planner Stec gave the background and review for this application, which was for the approval of a revised landscape plan. Mr. Stec said that this plan had been before the Planning Commission on February 25, 2016. At that time the site plan

was approved with the condition that a revised plan be submitted for administrative review addressing the following items:

- The height of the wall along the western property line separating the site from the adjacent residential district be increased from six to seven feet.
- The dumpster enclosure be relocated from the rear yard to the interior side yard east of the vehicular entrance into the new self-storage building.

The above items had been satisfactorily addressed in the revised site plan.

Tonight the Planning Commission was being asked to approve the revised landscape plan. At the February 25 meeting, the proposed landscape plan was tabled to allow the applicant time to include additional trees and shrubs to obscure the view of the building from the adjacent residential subdivision to the west. To accomplish this, the following additions/revisions had been made to the landscape plan:

- A row of 8' – 10' arborvitae were shown to be planted along the non-residential side of the 7' wall at the western property line.
- One additional 12' – 15' Black Hills Spruce and one 3" caliper Red Maple had been included directly behind the new building.
- The heights of the Black Hills Spruce and White Pine trees shown on the previous plan directly behind the building and in the landscape area to the south of the building had been increased from 6' to either 10' – 12', or 12'-15'.

The proposed planting of the evergreen trees along the wall represented a deviation from Section 34-5.15.1.C., which required that whenever a wall or berm was required in a B-3 district, deciduous trees be planted in the ground adjacent to the wall on the nonresidential side with a minimum spacing of 20' and a maximum of 30'. Per Section 34-5.15.3.G., the required spacing for large evergreen trees ranged from a minimum of 10' to a maximum of 20'. The proposed spacing between the northernmost evergreen and the deciduous tree was approximately 16'. This spacing was acceptable.

The Planning Commission should review the new landscape plan to determine if the revisions would satisfactorily obscure the view of the back of the new building from the residential subdivision to the west and if the substitution of evergreens for deciduous trees was an acceptable deviation within the Planned Unit Development.

Commissioner Rae-O'Donnell asked if any letters had been received regarding this landscape plan revision. Staff Planner Stec said he did receive correspondence from one the residents to the west of the development stating that Applicant Bill Bowman had been in contact with him and the resident was in agreement with the changes that were made.

Bill Bowman, Great Northern Consulting Group, Nolan Real Estate Investments, 1785 W. Stadium, Suite 202, Ann Arbor, MI, was present on behalf of this application. He said that Staff Planner Stec had done a good job explaining the revised landscape plan. He explained that they were planting 59 8'-10' arborvitae along the back wall. This was a substantial planting, and resulted in 2 walls in the rear: the masonry wall and the landscape wall.

Mr. Bowman said the two neighbors most concerned (Mr. Shortt and Mr. Silverstein) had agreed that the applicants would clear out the overgrowth and the old wooden fence that were along the property line, thus giving those neighbors a clean slate. They had increased the height of the evergreens as noted. There would be three honey locusts also on the property. The result would be a very attractive landscaped site.

Commissioner Blizman asked if the rear area would be sprinklered. Mr. Bowman said it would be.

Chair Topper thanked Mr. Bowman for working with the neighbors.

**MOTION by Blizman, support by Schwartz, that Landscape Plan No. 76-12-2015, dated March 9, 2016, submitted by Nolan Real Estate Investments LLC as part of the amendment to PUD Plan 1, 2011 be approved because it appears to meet all applicable Zoning Chapter requirements and applicable Design Principles as adopted by the Planning Commission.**

**Motion carried 5-0.**

**D. REZONING REQUEST 1-2-2016**

LOCATION:	27835 Shiawassee Rd.
PARCEL I.D.:	22-23-36-254-001
PROPOSAL:	Rezone parcel currently zoned RA-4, One-Family Residential District to RC-3, Multiple Family Residential District or SP-1, Special Purpose District
ACTION REQUESTED:	Set for Planning Commission Public Hearing
APPLICANT:	Jacob Bacall
OWNER:	Archdiocese of Detroit

Utilizing overhead slides and referring to his review letter of March 17, 2016, Planning Consultant Arroyo gave the background and review for this application, which was to set for public hearing at the next regular meeting a request to rezone a parcel currently zoned RA-4, One-Family Residential District to RC-3, Multiple Family Residential District or SP-1, Special Purpose District.

Planning Consultant Arroyo described the location of the subject parcel, south of Shiawassee Road between Verdun and Colwell Streets. There was multiple-family zoning directly to the south of this parcel, with single family zoning (RA-4) to the east, west and north.

The Master Plan designation was Quasi-Public because of the use historically as a place of worship.

The applicant's request was unusual in that it requested *either* SP-1 or RC-3 zoning, and this should be discussed. Planning Consultant Arroyo's recommendation would be that one choice be selected. It seemed like the SP-1 District provided for the most direct rezoning in terms of the proposed use. This was for a senior care facility, which was the only use permitted in the SP-1 District. If the property were rezoned to RC-3, any use that was permitted in the RC-3 District could come forward, such as multiple-family apartment complex, even though there was single-family on three sides of this parcel and this was not an area that was considered Master Planned for multiple family. The zoning ordinance did recognize that the uses in SP-1, senior care, were compatible with single-family districts, whereas multiple family use was not compatible. It seemed to him that SP-1 provided zoning that was in closer alignment to the Master Plan and would be more compatible with the areas to the north, east, and west. Also SP-1 would not open the area to other uses that would have more of an impact to the surrounding area. Again, this should be discussed with the applicant.

Planning Consultant Arroyo concluding by noting that his review letter had listed *Items to Consider for Zoning Map Amendment*. These would be discussed in more detail at the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Schwartz asked for clarification regarding what the Master Plan called for in this area. Did it call for multi-family? Planning Consultant Arroyo reiterated that the Master Plan showed the area as Quasi-Public,

and not multi-family development. The Master Plan called for single family to north, east, and west, and multiple-family to the south.

Chair Topper invited the applicant to speak.

Jacob Bacall said he was the applicant for this proposal. His idea was to build an independent senior living facility. He was not quite clear between the two zoning districts RC-3 and SP-1, except that he did know he was trying to get a 3-story building on the parcel, as was considered normal in the modern day. Some of the future residents would drive, or would participate in daily activities within the facility. They planned on demolishing the closed and abandoned rectory and church. Multi-family on this parcel would be complementary with what was to the south and would be a great service to those in need, especially if future residents needed to go to the hospital next door.

Mr. Bacall said he realized there was single family to the east and west but in his 22 years of experience of owning and operating facilities, this would be something that would fit in the community and in a residential area. From driving the area he saw that many residents were candidates or would be future candidates for living in this building. Residents didn't like to move beyond 5 miles where they had spent most of their lives. The applicants hoped to construct a 3-story building, with 85 units (depending on the height) with many amenities that residents needed, including a library, activity area, salon, exercise room, dining room, kitchen, gazebo, barbecue area, movie theater, and an area for cats and dogs.

Chair Topper asked if this was an assisted living facility. Mr. Bacall said it would not be assisted living, but would be an independent senior living facility.

Chair Topper asked Planning Consultant Arroyo to explain the differences between the RC-3 and SP-1 Zoning Districts.

Planning Consultant Arroyo said that SP-1 had a consistent front, rear and side yard setback of 50 feet. In the RC-3 District there was a 50 foot front yard but 20-foot rear and side yards. The other difference between the two was that SP-1 had a maximum building height of 25 feet; RC-3 had 30 feet. Both of these height limitations would allow two stories. Those were the primary differences except for permitted uses. In the RC-3 District, principal permitted uses included multi-family, two-family, convalescent senior homes, and other potential uses such as nursery schools, day care, special approval uses, non-commercial recreational centers, non-profit swimming clubs, colleges, and universities. RC-3 allowed a wide variety of uses. In the SP-1 District only the senior housing use was permitted.

Mr. Bacall said the height in modern buildings was three stories. There was a reason behind this. The longer the hallways, the farther the residents and aged community had to travel. The hardship would be that the residents, which would be seniors, would have to travel further in a two-story building. Some of them could have walkers or wheelchairs.

Planning Consultant Arroyo asked if it was the applicant's intent to build a 3-story structure. Mr. Bacall said it was. Planning Consultant Arroyo asked if the applicant could do this within the limitation of 30 feet. Mr. Bacall said the intent was the use would serve that community better if it had 3 stories. To the south was a six-story building visible from the site. Three stories was no more than 10 feet above what was already permitted.

Chair Topper asked what was to the south of this site. Planning Consultant Arroyo said that to the south was a multi-family complex. Mr. Bacall said the building to the immediate south was a two-story building. He was referring to the six-story hospital structure. Planning Consultant Arroyo confirmed that to the immediate south was a two-story standard apartment building. This was likely to be 25 feet, as it had a fairly flat roof.

Chair Topper said that she appreciated Mr. Bacall's point. However, still on three sides was single-family residential housing. She noted that tonight's request was strictly to set the rezoning request for a public hearing and the Planning Commission could not determine height this evening. If it was SP-1, the height limit was 25 feet.

Her inclination was to move toward the SP-1 zoning, if the Planning Commission was inclined to rezone the property. Then the zoning would be tailored to do what the applicant was looking to do there specifically and would maintain that use instead of something else going later.

Commissioner Schwartz said that all the Commission was doing was setting a public hearing. Tonight's discussion was helpful for the applicant to get feedback in order to think about the Commission's concerns. He felt the applicant should get a public hearing. He had not made his mind up. He had driven the area and would drive it again. He was going to have to be convinced that what the applicant was trying to do was compatible with the entire neighborhood. The applicant had argued about the multi-family use to the south and the taller building at the Hospital. However, this property was surrounded on three sides by single-family. He thought the applicant should have a public hearing on both rezoning options as requested, but he also thought the Commission would have a stronger objection to the RC-3 because at some point the applicant would no longer be the owner. Maybe the building would get torn down or re-used, and there was a lot more possibility to change it into other things other than senior housing. The public hearing should include both zoning districts as requested; he suspected the applicant would have a better shot at SP-1. But the applicant was going to have to convince the Commission as a whole that this use and this location made sense. He would try to keep an open mind but he was not sure this was the best site.

Planning Consultant Arroyo said there was one other possibility that could be on the table, however only the applicant could propose it. That would be a conditional rezoning if the applicant chose to ask for the RC-3 where, in order to get the extra 5 feet in height, he would limit the use to senior housing and no other use. This would need to be voluntarily offered by the applicant. It would be a way for the applicant to get a kind of hybrid zoning – senior use with a 30-foot height. But again, only the applicant could propose this; the Commission could not require it.

Commissioner Blizman asked City Attorney Gillam if the applicant had requested rezoning to SP-1 or RC-3, did the Commission have the option to go forward with only SP-1, or did the Commission have to go forward with both zoning districts for the public hearing.

City Attorney Gillam said the Commission had the option to have a public hearing on either of the zoning districts, or they could move forward with both as requested.

Noting that this site had 10 acres, Commissioner Blizman asked if the site could be developed as single family residential. Planning Consultant Arroyo said it could be developed as single family.

Commissioner Stimson asked if a PUD could be utilized on this site. Staff Planner Stec said a PUD was not appropriate just to avoid compliance with the zoning ordinance, such as the height requirement.

Chair Topper asked Mr. Bacall if he had anything to add.

Mr. Bacall said the 10-12 feet additional height they were requesting would do more good than bad. This would not harm anyone as they had a good distance from the neighbors, especially to the west.

Commissioner Schwartz said that he felt the Commission should err on the side of caution and on due process, so he offered the following motion:

**MOTION by Schwartz, support by Blizman, that Zoning Request No. 1-2-2016, petitioned by Jacob Bacall, be set for Public Hearing on April 21, 2016.**

Chair Topper confirmed with Staff Planner Stec that there would be a presentation on both zoning districts at the public hearing.

**Motion carried 5-0.**

**E. SUBDIVISION OPEN SPACE PLAN 1, 2016**

LOCATION:	North of Eight Mile Rd. between Halsted Rd. and Goldsmith St.
PARCEL I.D.:	22-23-32-301-005 & 014
PROPOSAL:	Subdivision open space site Condominium plan containing seventeen (17) detached single family homes in RA-1, One-Family Residential District
ACTION REQUESTED:	Set for Planning Commission Public Hearing
APPLICANT:	Paul Elkow
OWNER:	Gary H. and Pearl Burton, Linda K. Grisham

Utilizing overhead slides and referring to his review letter of March 17, 2016, Planning Consultant Arroyo gave the background and review for this application, which was to set for public hearing at the next regular meeting a request for a Subdivision Open Space Site Plan, including a site plan, tree removal permit, and landscaping plan for Halsted Hollow, a single-family detached condominium project with an open space option.

This property had been before the Commission previously with an application for senior housing that was ultimately not approved. The site was located north of 8 Mile Road on the east side of Halsted Road. There were existing stub streets to the north and south. To the east was Goldsmith Street, an excessively long, dead-end street that effectively came off 8 Mile Road. This proposal would provide access to Goldsmith and also access to the stub streets, thus providing an emergency access outlet to serve Goldsmith, a benefit to the residents there.

Planning Consultant Arroyo pointed out that this was a special study area in the Master Plan and in fact the Master Plan envisioned the stub connections and a subdivision open space type development with open space, similar to the type of plan being presented this evening.

In terms of the sizes of the lots and dimensions, dimensional standards were met with the exception of Lot 7, which scaled to a lot width of 85 feet. The applicant should provide a detail to document that the required 90-foot lot width was met for this lot. It appeared that the appropriate amount of open space was provided.

Regarding the location of the proposed open space, if lot #1 was flipped on the north side of Burton Court, the open space area on the south side of Burton Court could connect to the open space in Halsted Hollow to the south. This should be considered.

Regarding the remaining items in the review letter, most items were met and the requirements of the open space ordinance appeared to be met. There were a few things with the open space and landscaping areas that needed cleanup on the plan but these items could be resolved administratively.

Planning Consultant Arroyo concluded his review.

Paul Elkow, 28701 Wintergreen Drive, Farmington Hills, was present on behalf of this application. Mr. Elkow gave a copy of the deed to the property to Staff Planner Stec. They owned the property outright, and it would be Halsted Hollow North.

Mr. Elkow said that Halsted Hollow was his development. About 12 years ago they had tried to buy this property, but were unsuccessful. They had now been able to purchase the property with different partners. The proposal was basically a carbon copy of the current Halsted Hollow development, hence its name: Halsted Hollow North.

Regarding the open space, Mr. Elkow was not sure the current residents would agree to have the new open space adjoin with the existing Halsted Hollow open space.

Mr. Elkow said they had met extensively with Engineer Manager Cubera, whom Mr. Elkow said approved of this project.

Chair Topper asked how large the homes would be. Mr. Elkow said they were planning some 2,000 –2,400 square foot ranch homes and some 2,400-3,000 colonials, with first floor master suites. He said the era of McMansions had probably passed. Now there was a greater emphasis on amenities and details on the interior of homes.

**MOTION by Stimson, support by Schwartz, that Preliminary Subdivision Open Space Plan No. 1, 2016, dated February 18, 2106, submitted by Paul Elkow, be set for Public Hearing on April 21, 2016.**

Commissioner Blizman asked Staff Planner Stec to research any issues regarding connecting the two open spaces as described by Planning Consultant Arroyo this evening.

**Motion carried 5-0.**

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** February 18, 2016 and February 25, 2016

**MOTION by Blizman, support by Rae-O'Donnell, to approve the minutes of February 18, 2106 and February 25, 2016 as submitted.**

**Motion carried 5-0.**

**COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS:**

April meetings were tentatively set for April 14 (study session) and April 21 (regular hearing).

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Seeing that there was no further discussion, Chair Topper adjourned the meeting at 8:53 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Steven Schwartz  
Planning Commission Secretary

/cem