

**MINUTES  
CITY OF FARMINGTON HILLS  
PLANNING COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARING/REGULAR MEETING  
COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
July 19, 2018, 7:30 P.M.**

Chair Schwartz called the Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. on July 19, 2018.

Commissioners Present: Brickner, Countegan, Goerke, Mantey, Orr, Schwartz, Stimson, Turner

Commissioners Absent: McRae

Others Present: City Planner Stec, Staff Engineer Kennedy, Fire Marshal Olszewski, City Attorney Schultz, Planning Consultant Tangari

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Chair Schwartz suggested modifying the agenda as follows:

- Move Item 4D *PUD Plan 2, 2017, including Site and Landscape Plan 56-3-2018* to be heard first under the Public Hearing agenda, since the applicant had written to request that this item be postponed to the September meeting.
- Move Item 5C *8 Mile Boulevard Unifying Framework* to the 2<sup>nd</sup> item of the agenda.

It was the consensus of the Commission to move Item 4D to be heard first, but to leave 5C as scheduled.

**MOTION by Orr, support by Turner to modify the agenda so that Item 4D PUD Plan 2, 2017, including Site and Landscape Plan 56-3-2018 under the Public Hearing portion be heard first.**

**MOTION carried unanimously.**

**PUBLIC HEARING**

**D. PUD PLAN 2, 2017, INCLUDING SITE AND LANDSCAPE PLAN 56-3-2018**

LOCATION: 21500 & 21430 Haggerty Rd.  
PARCEL I.D.: 22-23-31-101-023 & 024  
PROPOSAL: New Office building in OS-4, Office Research District  
ACTION REQUESTED: Recommendation to City Council  
APPLICANT: Century Project LLC  
OWNER: Century Project, LLC

Chair Schwartz noted that the City had received correspondence indicating that the applicants wished to postpone this item to the September 20, 2018 meeting.

Chair Schwartz asked if anyone from the public was present this evening and wished to comment on this PUD plan. Seeing that no one came forward to speak, Chair Schwartz brought the matter back to the Commission for a motion.

**MOTION by Mantey, support by Countegan, to reschedule PUD Plan 2, 2017, including Site and Landscape Plan 56-3-2018, to the September 20, 2018 meeting.**

**Motion carried unanimously.\***

\*As noted below on page 24 of these minutes, later in the meeting the applicant asked that this request be heard at the August 16, 2018 meeting instead of in September. New motions were offered as follows:

**MOTION by Countegan, support by Mantey, to reconsider the motion for Item 4.D: PUD Plan 2, 2017, Including Site and Landscape Plan 56-3-2018.**

**Motion carried unanimously.**

**MOTION by Countegan, support by Mantey, to reschedule PUD Plan 2, 2017, including Site and Landscape Plan 56-3-2018, to the August 16, 2018 meeting.**

**Motion carried unanimously.**

**A. REZONING REQUEST 2-5-2018**

LOCATION:	33432 Bostwick Place
PARCEL I.D.:	22-23-33-227-026
PROPOSAL:	Rezone a parcel from B-3 Planned General Business District, to RA-4 One Family Residential District
ACTION REQUESTED:	Recommendation to City Council
APPLICANT:	D S Homes LLC
OWNER:	D S Homes LLC

Utilizing a PowerPoint presentation and referring to the May 31, 2018 Giffels Webster memorandum, Planning Consultant Tangari gave the review for this request to rezone a parcel at 33432 Bostwick Place from B-3 Planned General Business District to RA-4 One Family Residential District.

The parcel was located south of 9 Mile Road and west of Farmington Road. The site was vacant and mostly clear. There was a small stand of trees in the northern half. It also appeared that there was a utility easement on the eastern edge of the property that was not noted on the plan.

Properties to the north and south were zoned B-3/B-1, with RA-4/OS-1 to the south and RA-4 to the west. The property was designated Single Family on the Future Land Use Map, and the Residential Densities Map designated the parcel as medium density, and that density corresponded to the RA-4 District.

The applicant's stated intent for the rezoning request was to combine the lots and build a single-family home.

Planning Consultant Tangari reviewed *Items to Consider for Zoning Map Amendment*. The request seemed to be consistent with the Master Plan, was a logical extension of an existing zoning district in the area, and the rezoning request would not grant a special benefit to the owner.

Chair Schwartz invited the applicant to speak.

Brian Duggan, D S Homes LLC, 14315 Denne, Livonia MI, was present on behalf of this application. The applicants were seeking to construct a single-family home on the property. They would either work with a prospective buyer to construct the home, or build a spec house on the property.

Chair Schwartz opened the public hearing. Seeing that no one came forward to speak, Chair Schwartz brought the matter back to the Commission.

**MOTION by Countegan, support by Stimson, that Rezoning Request 2-5-2018, petitioned by DS Homes, LLC, to rezone land from the B-3 General Business District, to the RA-4 One-Family Residential District is recommended for approval by City Council because the change is in accordance with the City's Master Plan.**

Chair Schwartz noted that in addition to the requested change being consistent with the Master Plan, it was unlikely that this property would ever be developed for a business use. Rezoning to RA-4 would be a benefit to the neighborhood.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

**B. CLUSTER OPTION 1, 2018**

LOCATION:	East side of Farmington Road, south of Thirteen Mile Rd.
PARCEL I.D.:	22-23-10-101-002
PROPOSAL:	Preliminary qualification for a detached single family Cluster Option in an RA-2, One-Family Residential District
ACTION REQUESTED:	Preliminary qualification
APPLICANT:	Isam Yaldo, Farmington 13, LLC
OWNER:	Farmington 13, LLC

City Planner Stec explained that this request was for a preliminary cluster option qualification. City Council was the final approving body for this request, and the applicant could move the request to City Council regardless of the determination made this evening.

In response to a question from Chair Schwartz, City Planner Stec said the property followed the line of a creek on the south side.

Utilizing a PowerPoint presentation and referring to the June 18, 2018 Giffels Webster memorandum, Planning Consultant Tangari gave the background to this request for a preliminary cluster qualification for 29150 Farmington Road, a 3.82 acre parcel currently zoned RA-2.

The existing site was developed with the former Kendalwood Swim Club, with a pool, clubhouse, tennis courts and parking lot present on the site. The adjacent properties were all residential, with RA-2 zoning to the north, east, and south, and RA-1 across Farmington Road to the west. A regional stormwater detention basin was located directly to the north.

Under Section 34-3.17 One Family Cluster Option, the Planning Commission may make a determination that the site qualified for a One-Family Cluster based on two findings. The first finding was required:

- i. *First, the planning commission shall find that the parcel will qualify for the cluster development option as defined in Section 34-3.17.2.B.i-viii. Development would be at the single family densities permitted in subsection 34-3.17.3.A. This finding must be made in all cases.*

Regarding this first finding, Section 34-3.17.2.B-i-viii would be addressed a little later. Section 34-3.17.3.A permitted 2.1 units per acre for a One Family Cluster in the RA-2 district. The second finding

was optional:

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

Subsection 34-3.17.3.B. permitted up to 3.1 units per acres in the RA-2 district under this item. The parcel was located adjacent to a regional stormwater management basin; it was otherwise surrounded by single-family development.

The applicant's conceptual plan showed 11 units, or 2.88 units per acre. The Planning Commission would have to make an affirmative finding on paragraph ii above in order to permit this density.

Section 34-3.17.2.B.i-viii listed 8 standards, at least one of which had to be met, in order for the qualification to move forward. The following 3 standards were the most relevant in this case:

- ii. *The parcel has frontage on a major or secondary thoroughfare and is of a narrow width, as measured along the thoroughfare, which makes platting difficult.*
- iii. *The parcel is shaped in such a way that the angles formed by its boundaries make a subdivision difficult to achieve and the parcel has frontage on a major or secondary thoroughfare.*
- vi. *The parcel contains a flood plain or poor soil conditions which result in a substantial portion of the total area of the parcel being unbuildable.*

Planning Consultant Tangari continued with his review:

Summary of concept plan. The applicant proposed 11 cluster lots arranged along a short cul-de-sac street. One item of potential concern was the alignment of the new road with Oak Point Drive across Farmington Road. The two roads were offset by just over 100 feet. This could create left turn conflicts, especially given that there was a southbound bypass lane for through traffic.

Master Plan. The property was designated Private Recreation on the Future Land Use Map. The private recreation use of the site had ended.

Residential Densities Map. The Residential Densities Map designated the land as low-medium density. This category included the RA-2 District.

Chair Schwartz commented that if a developer constructed traditional single-family housing on this parcel, the same road offset issue would exist. Planning Consultant Tangari said it was possible the road issue would be the same. It was also possible that a couple of lots could be eliminated in order to shift the road there.

Chair Schwartz asked if a traditional home development occurred on this site, how many homes could be built? Planning Consultant Tangari said traditional development would be difficult because of the reduced lot width. One thing the City liked to see when a cluster option was proposed was an alternative layout which showed what could be done under conventional zoning; this had not been provided.

Commissioner Brickner asked the typical lot size in an RA-2 District. Also, could a building envelope be in a flood plain?

Planning Consultant Tangari said the average lot area in the adjoining subdivision was 16,500 square feet and the minimum lot area was 15,000 square feet. The open space provided by the cluster option allowed a developer to decrease the lot sizes. Typically homes could not be built in flood plains.

Commissioner Brickner asked if the square footage under the cluster option would be the same as traditional zoning, except that some of the square footage would be placed in the open space. Planning Consultant Tangari said for the most part that was true, with the caveat that the Commission could make the 2<sup>nd</sup> finding as described, which would allow a greater density.

Chair Schwartz invited the applicant to speak.

Sam Yaldo, 31000 Northwestern, Ste 110, Farmington Hills was present on behalf of this application. Planner and Landscape Architect Brian Devlin, Nagy Devlin Land Design, 31736 West Chicago Avenue, Livonia MI was also present.

Mr. Yaldo gave some of his history of developing properties in Farmington Hills, including a similarly challenged parcel on Freedom Road east of Drake Road.

The current parcel was challenging because of the way it narrowed to the east, and also because it abutted a huge detention basin to the north. They had to be careful to be competitive regarding the size and cost of the homes. They were therefore requesting a cluster option with the higher density. They believed they were avoiding the flood plain. However, if there was an issue there, they understood the process of working with the MDEQ.

Mr. Devlin said they believed they qualified for the density bonus under 34-3.17.2.B.v: *A substantial portion of the parcel's perimeter is bordered by land that is located in other than an RA district or is developed for a use other than single-family homes.* The detention basin to the north was an element that was considerably different than single-family homes.

Chair Schwartz asked how many traditional single-family homes could be constructed on the parcel under the existing zoning. What would a developer have to spend to demolish the clubhouse and other existing improvements on the property?

Mr. Yaldo said that under traditional zoning, they would be able to construct 5 homes, and the cost of demolition to prepare the property would be about \$400,000 plus the cost of the land. The resulting homes would need to be priced in the \$500,000 range in order to make the project economically feasible. Mr. Devlin said that such a development would most likely have a single loaded road across the north property line, with the homes all constructed to the south.

In response to a question from Commissioner Brickner, Mr. Yaldo said the proposed homes would be 2-story homes built over a garage, and would be about 2,200-2,400 square feet.

Referring to paragraph ii, where a positive finding that the parcel was located in a transition area or was impacted by a nonresidential use, in order to allow a higher density, Commissioner Orr said his impression was that this paragraph specifically addressed uses adjacent to the property that were more intense than the neighboring residential property. In this case, the detention area did not increase traffic;

rather it resulted in decreased traffic. Why should the Commission find that the detention basin was a reason to grant greater density?

Mr. Devlin said the ordinance stated that the requirement was that the property was impacted by a property that was developed for a use other than single-family homes. The regional detention basin met that qualification.

Commissioner Orr said in order for him to support the greater density, a reason other than abutting the regional stormwater detention basin would need to be given.

Mr. Yaldo said that he felt new home buyers would resist looking out at the detention basin, and they had minimized the number of homes along the north side for that reason.

City Planner Stec emphasized that the ordinance stated that *the parcel is located in a transition area or is impacted by nonresidential uses*. . . The ordinance did not require a nonresidential development, but rather a nonresidential impact.

Commissioner Turner asked if the street would be a public or private street. Staff Engineer Kennedy said the proposal was for a private road, but the road would still have to meet certain standards.

Commissioner Turner pointed out the proximity of the property to heavy traffic generated by the intersection of 13 Mile/Farmington Roads and North Farmington High School. He asked for a right turn only exit from the development's access road.

Mr. Yaldo said traffic issues would be addressed during the site plan approval process.

Chair Schwartz asked if there was there a way to put a road through the detention area to 13 mile Road? He also recognized that heavy traffic situation on Farmington Road could make left turns difficult. City Planner Stec said he could not speak for the County, who owned the detention facility. However, constructing a road across the detention area appeared difficult.

Commissioner Turner felt the developer should be committed to a right turn only exit from the development.

Commissioner Goerke asked the developer to address the far eastern part of the site labeled *Open Space*, where lots did not connect together. Was the open space going to be developed?

Mr. Yaldo said the intent was to retain the far eastern tennis court for the benefit of the residents, and there would be a path to the court along the northeast border of the cul-de-sac.

In response to a further question from Commissioner Goerke, Mr. Yaldo said there was an existing county-owned chain link fence along the northern property line. They were going to heavily landscape along the northern boundary.

Chair Schwartz opened the public hearing.

George Patak, 28405 Brandywine, spoke in support of this development. His only question was what the homes themselves would look like.

Kevin Brown, 32450 Bonnet Hill, Farmington Hills, said he was thankful someone was interested in developing the property. However, he was concerned that the application was for a cluster plan, which would result in a lot as small as 6,650 square feet per the conceptual plan and which was less than 50% of the required lot size for standard RA-2 zoning. His concern was what the development would like adjacent to the existing zoning south of the site. He felt the cluster option would result in a too-dense development.

Christy Dunnigan, 29090 Kendallwood, explained that she lived directly south of the proposed development. She was opposed to a cluster development because it was too different than what was there. She did not think 11 houses (cluster) vs. 6 houses (traditional development) would make a difference in traffic, but she did think a cluster development was out of character with the existing residential neighborhood. She agreed that a left-hand turn would be very difficult.

Ms. Duker, 29068 Kendallwood, said she lived next door to Ms. Dunnigan. She supported residential development on the site. She also was concerned with left-hand turns and additional traffic.

Seeing that no one else came forward to speak, Chair Schwartz closed the public hearing and invited the applicant to address the public comments.

Using his electronic device, Mr. Devlin showed an elevation of homes they were building in Northville Township; the homes constructed on the subject site would be similar.

Commissioner Countegan said he liked the idea of using the cluster option. The example cited earlier by Mr. Yaldo also involved an irregular piece of property. The cluster option was developed for just such circumstances in order to help residential development, and the cluster option had been a good tool for the City generally. The cluster option would help insure protection of residential development on this property as opposed to some other use. He did find the regional detention facility to the north provided a compelling reason to support the cluster option and allow the greater density. The economics of removing a building, demolishing a pool, constructing the necessary infrastructure, etc., bore on this case, and without the cluster option the City was in danger of forcing a development that would not sell.

Commissioner Countegan continued that he lived across Farmington Road to the west, in the Colony Park subdivision. He was familiar with the traffic in the area. When the swim club was active and there were events there, cars parked along Farmington Road and hundreds of cars came in and out, so the impact of traffic from 11 homes did not trouble him. He liked the idea of protecting residential development, the greater density made sense in terms of helping this development to occur, and he supported the cluster option qualification.

Commissioner Brickner agreed with Commissioner Countegan. He thought constructing homes under the traditional zoning would be difficult. Also, clustering the homes a little to the west and closer to the access road protected the home sites during a 100-year rain event and moved the actual building envelopes away from the houses and the 100-year floodplain to the south. He supported the cluster option as presented.

Chair Schwartz noted that after the parcel was qualified for the cluster option, the applicant would need to come back to the Commission for site plan approval.

Commissioner Goerke was also in support of cluster option qualification. She suggested eliminating lot 5 in order to widen the other lots on the southern portion. She did not feel that 10-11 homes would create

any additional traffic issues. With her background in construction, she was not entirely concerned about building in a flood plain. Construction in a 100-year flood plain could be done correctly.

Mr. Yaldo said that after receiving the consultant's review letter, they had already come up with a 10-home concept, but there had not been time to submit it for review.

Commissioner Mantey noted that the ordinance regarding criteria i. and ii. might need to be revised. The intent of criteria ii might be to address an area going from a higher density to a lower density. Given the ordinance as it was currently written, he also supported the cluster option and the granting of the higher density as requested.

Chair Schwartz asked City Planner Stec to follow up on clarifying the density criteria at a future study session.

**MOTION by Goerke, support by Mantey, that the Planning Commission make a preliminary determination that Cluster Option 1, 2018, submitted by Isam Yaldo, meets at least one of the cluster option qualification standards as set forth in Section 34-3.17.2.B.i through viii. of the zoning ordinance, specifically standards ii, iii, and vi as follows:**

- ii. The parcel is located on a secondary thoroughfare and is of narrow width along the thoroughfare**
- iii. The parcel is shaped in such a way that the angles formed by its boundaries make a subdivision difficult to achieve**
- vi. The parcel contains a floodplain along its southern property line**

**Further, the proposed cluster option qualifies for a maximum density of 3.1 units per acre permitted under Section 34-3.17.2.A.ii, because the parcel represents a transitional buffer between the subdivision to the south and the regional stormwater detention basin to the north, and that it be made clear to the petitioner that final granting of the Cluster Option is dependent upon a site plan with a topographic layout be approved by City Council after review and recommendation by the Planning Commission.**

**Motion carried 7-1 (Orr opposed).**

Chair Schwartz commented that when the applicants returned with a site plan, they should address the left turn issue, the screening of the detention basin as well as screening to the south, and also suggested that the applicants speak with the neighbors who were present this evening.

**C. AMENDMENT TO SITE AND LANDSCAPE PLAN 66-7-2016 (PUD PLAN 1, 2015)**

LOCATION:	21347 Colwell St., 28080 and 28100 Grand River Ave.
PARCEL I.D.:	22-23-36-403-003, and 004; 22-23-36-404-003, 010, and 011; 22-23-36-430-013
PROPOSAL:	Amend PUD site and landscape plans to demolish the existing apartment building in the northeast section of the Beaumont Hospital campus for the purpose of expanding on-site parking
ACTION REQUESTED:	Recommendation to City Council
APPLICANT:	Michael Thompson of HKS Architects, PC
OWNER:	Botsford General Hospital and Zieger Osteopath Hospital

Utilizing overhead slides and referencing his review letter dated June 22, 2018, Planning Consultant Tangari gave the background for this proposal to amend site and landscape plan 66-7-2016 (PUD Plan 1, 2015) in order to remove the apartment building on the far northeast corner of the site and replace it with a parking lot. No other part of the PUD area was being impacted.

The surrounding property was zoned RA-4, except for the RC-3 parcel to the north, which was developed with small apartment buildings.

Parking. The redevelopment of this area would remove 6 parking spaces and develop 93 new spaces, for a net gain of 87 spaces. Total parking on the site would be 1,695 spaces. The applicant's narrative explained that the need for this parking stemmed from a plan to establish parking zones within the hospital campus, identifying specific areas for staff and reserving the rest for guests and visitors. Those zones were illustrated in the narrative.

Site circulation. Changes to site circulation were minor. The new parking lot would eliminate a dead end parking area, which was generally discouraged in the ordinance.

Fences, walls and berms. The plan proposed a 6-foot masonry screen wall along the Colwell Street right-of-way to screen the adjacent single-family residential uses. The applicant had revised the plans to continue the wall along Colwell 14 feet further south to provide additional screening, noting that the wall was not carried further south due to the presence of an existing berm and mature trees in that area. The screening effect south of the wall had been enhanced with the addition of 3 green spruce trees. The plan proposed an extension of the existing wooden fence along the northern property line to complete the screen (the existing fence stopped flush with the apartment building). This fence separated the new parking area from a parking area to the north.

Exterior lighting. The plans showed seven new light fixtures on four new poles, each mounted at a height of 20 feet. The chosen fixtures appeared to be full cut-offs. Lighting levels at the property line and the average-to minimum ratio met the standards of Section 5.16.

PUD. The PUD Agreement included a provision permitting the accessory uses of the hospital to continue. The Planning Commission determined at its June 2018 meeting that the proposal constituted a material change to the PUD requiring an amendment to the PUD agreement. The applicant had provided a written narrative explaining the necessity of the expanded parking and also illustrating the proposed parking zones within the hospital campus. The new site plan showing the removal of the building and the new parking area should replace the previous version of the site plan as an exhibit to the PUD agreement.

Tree removal and landscape plan. 13 trees were proposed to be removed. All removed trees were regulated, and two were landmark trees with a total dbh of 42 inches. Eight replacement trees were required for the regulated trees.

Eleven parking lot and 19 total trees were required. The plan had been revised to add 12 trees in the right-of-way between the wall and Colwell Street, for a new total of 33 trees. Replacement and parking lot tree standards were met. The intent of the new trees was to improve the screening for the residences to the east.

Planning Consultant Tangari concluded his review. Chair Schwartz invited the applicant to speak.

Narendra Kumar, Beaumont Hospital, Mike Thompson, HKS Architects PC, and Joe Siekirk, Plante Moran Cressa, were present on behalf of this application.

Utilizing a PowerPoint presentation, Mr. Thompson gave an overview of this major investment project that had been approved in 2015. They would have 330 beds as they did now. The project would result in better services and more space for their patients.

They wanted to segregate the parking on site, with visitors and patients using the 4-story parking garage, which had space for 407 cars. Employees would use the new parking lot in the northeast corner. They were asking to demolish an obsolete building in order to have room for the employee parking lot, which would have 87 spaces. The parking lot would be screened from the residential neighbors to the north and east.

There were 1608 parking spaces currently; they were proposing a total of 1695 spaces.

Mr. Thompson showed a schematic of *Proposed Campus Parking Zones*. This schematic would be part of the PUD documents. Also, after working with the City, their landscaping now exceeded ordinance requirements.

Mr. Thompson also showed the *Proposed Amended PUD Landscape Plan* and explained the screening proposed for the northeast corner. They would extend the masonry fence 14 feet south, where it would end because of the 3-foot high existing berm, the mature trees, utility poles and guide wires. He showed a rendering of where the fence would end and where additional trees would be planted to enhance the berm area, and a schematic of the landscaping for the impacted area. 12 additional trees would be planted in the right-of-way to enhance the screening there.

Commissioner Orr said sheet CAP-2.10 showed that an existing sanity sewer lead and cap would be removed, and the guy wires were going to be removed. Were the applicants excavating down to the depth of the sewer?

Mr. Thompson said the intent was to cap the utilities but not disrupt the plantings that included the mature trees. By the time they went for final engineering approval, the plans would be scaled back to protect the cluster of trees.

Commissioner Orr noted for the record that the plans as shown on CAP-2.10 were not accurate. Mr. Thompson agreed, specifically noting that the disruption would be minimized to protect the trees as stated.

Commissioner Orr asked if the utility pole was on the property line. Mr. Thompson said it was either on the property line or within inches of it. Even if the pole were not on the property line, running the wall further south would destroy the berm and the mature plantings there.

Commissioner Orr said that CAP-4.10 showed the wall extending past the parking lot. Mr. Thompson said the wall would extend 14 feet south as shown.

Commissioner Orr said when he visited the site earlier today he discovered the landscaping on the west property line was not being maintained, with wild growth throughout. The area needed pruning and cleaning; there were piles of debris. In the original PUD the Hospital agreed to maintain that area. Mr. Thompson said he would follow up and make sure that area was maintained.

Commissioner Mantey said that when the heliport was moved it was noted that the existing apartment building helped mitigate the noise nuisance of the helicopter.

Commissioner Mantey asked about the agreement in the original PUD to provide a bus shelter on Grand River Avenue. Mr. Selkirk said that plans for the bus shelter were moving forward. They were waiting to hear from SMART personnel to make final arrangements to install the shelters.

Commissioner Stimson said that right now the staff was parking on the 4<sup>th</sup> level of the Deck. The applicants had said they did not need more parking; they simply wanted to separate employee and patient/guest parking. What would happen to the 4<sup>th</sup> parking level? Would it be empty?

Mr. Kumar said there would be vacant space on the 4<sup>th</sup> floor except perhaps during peak parking times. The 1<sup>st</sup> floor would be completely dedicated to accessible parking.

Commissioner Stimson commented that it appeared the southern quarter of each deck might be empty. Mr. Kumar said he did not think the area would be empty, but rather would not be as densely parked as at present. Mr. Thompson noted that the deck had stair structures on the north and south ends, but only had elevators on the north end.

Chair Schwartz said that one of the conditions of the original PUD was for the hospital to encourage residents and employees to live nearby, hopefully in the surrounding neighborhood. Wasn't tearing down an apartment building that would allow residents to live close inconsistent with that requirement? The apartment building was a brick building, and the shell and roof looked to be in decent repair. Why not utilize the building for housing for staff?

Mr. Kumar said no staff or residents lived in the building currently. Regarding the original PUD condition, the hospital was partnering with local realtors, the Chamber of Commerce, and the City's Economic Development Director to offer incentives and discounts for people to move to Farmington Hills, such as covering closing costs and providing other incentives. Any new resident or employee who came in to Human Resources was provided a list of housing opportunities and realtors in Farmington Hills.

The PUD was approved in 2015. At that time they had 269 employees. In 2018 they had 303 employees, approximately 45 of whom lived in Farmington Hills.

Chair Schwartz asked why the apartment building could not be used for housing. Mr. Kumar said the demand was not there. Chair Schwartz asked why it could not be used for office. Mr. Kumar said the need was more critical to provide parking for families and patients and to separate staff parking. The entire campus would be patient and family focused.

Commissioner Countegan said he liked the idea of convenient parking. The proposed parking changes allowed for some future growth as well as patient accessibility to the hospital. Regarding the existing apartment building, he did not relish the idea of the helicopter landing next to either an apartment or office building. He liked the landscaping to the east as well as the extension of the wall to the south. He seconded Mr. Orr's concern about maintaining all the landscaping, including the landscaping on the western property line. He liked the idea that the hospital supported the community in terms of helping employees and residents find housing in the area; the hospital itself supported the southeast portion of the City. He supported the current request.

City Planner Stec pointed out that the applicants were requesting another deviation along the northern property line that should be discussed. The screen wall along the northern property line should be a masonry wall. The applicants were proposing a wooden fence.

Chair Schwartz opened the public hearing.

City Planner Stec noted that an email had been received from an anonymous resident. The Commissioners had a copy of the email, and City Planner Stec had responded to the questions in the email.

Commissioner Countegan confirmed that legal notifications had been sent out per requirement, and the public hearing had been published in the newspaper. Four large signs had been installed on the impacted property announcing the proposed change.

Seeing that no one came forward to speak, Chair Schwartz closed the public hearing and brought the matter back to the Commission.

**MOTION by Orr, support by Countegan, that the Planning Commission recommend to City Council that proposed amendments to Site and Landscape Plan 66-7-2016 for P.U.D. 1, 2015, dated June 22, 2018 submitted by Michael Thompson of HKS Architects, be approved because the plans are in accordance with the objectives, goals and policies of the Master Plan for Future Land Use and are consistent with the objectives and applicable provisions of the Planned Unit Development Option as outlined in Section 34-3.20 of Chapter 34, Zoning Ordinance, subject to:**

- 1. The masonry wall on the east side along Colwell Street be extended 14 feet to the south or to the utility pole, whichever is greater.**
- 2. Beaumont Hospital becomes responsible for the maintenance/removal of weeds and undergrowth within the public rights-of-way along the eastern and western property lines.**

**And that the Planning Commission also make the determination that:**

- 1. The modified landscaping is approved, and the wood fence along the northern border of the parking area is acceptable as screening from the northern adjacent apartment complex.**

Commissioner Stimson said he was not convinced for the need for as much additional parking as was being requested. He was disappointed that additional greenbelt had not been added on the northeast side of the new parking lot by removing the eastern row of parking, as had been discussed at the last meeting. At a minimum the landmark trees that were already there could be retained to provide good screening in that area. He preferred for the building to remain but if it was demolished, he would like to see more greenbelt added. He would not support the motion.

**Motion carried 6-2 (Schwartz, Stimson opposed).**

## **REGULAR MEETING**

### **A. PUD QUALIFICATION 1, 2018**

LOCATION: 34918 Eight Mile Rd.  
PARCEL I.D.: 22-23-33-376-024

PROPOSAL: Attached one-family dwelling Planned Unit Development in an RC-2, Multiple Family Residential District  
ACTION REQUESTED: Preliminary PUD qualification  
APPLICANT: Ari Kosterlitz, CLR18, LLC  
OWNER: Sterling Land Ventures, LLC

Utilizing a PowerPoint presentation and referencing the June 16, 2018 Giffels Webster memorandum, Planning Consultant Tangari gave the background to this request for PUD qualification. The parcel was zoned RC-2 Multiple Family Residential, was 4.651 acres, and fronted on 8 Mile Road just west of Gill Road.

The property was surrounded by residential zoning, with RA-3 single-family homes to the north, RC-2 zoning to the east (30 unit multiple family development), R-4 Single Family to the south in the Livonia, and RC-2 zoning to the west (77 unit multiple family development).

The applicant had proposed to rezone this property from RC-2 to RC-3 in May 2017. The Planning Commission did not take any final action on a recommendation, and the application was withdrawn so that the applicant could convert it to a request for PUD qualification.

PUD Qualification. Under Section 34-3.20, the Planning Commission may make a determination that the site qualified for a PUD based on a list of criteria and procedures, all of which should be met. Whether or not the Commission thought the application qualified for a PUD, the applicant could still move forward after tonight's regular meeting.

Planning Consultant Tangari reviewed the qualification criteria as follows:

- A. The PUD option may be effectuated in any zoning district.
- B. The use of this option shall not be for the sole purpose of avoiding the applicable zoning requirements. Any permission given for any activity or building or use not normally permitted shall result in an improvement to the public health, safety and welfare in the area affected.

*The applicant was seeking higher density of units than permitted in the RC-2 district. The density sought by the applicant was likely more in line with the RC-3 district (43 units on 4.6 acres = 9.24 units/acre). This depended on the number of rooms per unit and would be addressed during final qualification. The RC-2 and RC-3 districts had identical dimensional standards.*

- C. The PUD shall not be utilized in situations where the same land use objectives can be accomplished by the application of conventional zoning provisions or standards. Problems or constraints presented by applicable zoning provisions shall be identified in the PUD application. Asserted financial problems shall be substantiated with appraisals of the property as currently regulated as proposed to be regulated.

*The applicant had not explained why the PUD option would permit the development of the site not possible under conventional zoning.*

- D. The Planned Unit Development option may be effectuated only when the proposed land use will not materially add service and facility loads beyond those contemplated in the Future Land Use Plan unless the proponent can demonstrate to the sole satisfaction of the city that such added loads will be accommodated or mitigated by the proponent as part of the Planned Unit Development.

*This standard appears to be met – this area is considered for high density multiple family development in the Master Plan.*

- E. The Planned Unit Development must meet, as a minimum, one of the following objectives of the city:
- i. To permanently preserve open space or natural features because of their exceptional characteristics or because they can provide a permanent transition or buffer between land uses.
  - ii. To permanently establish land use patterns which are compatible or which will protect existing or planned uses.
  - iii. To accept dedication or set aside open space areas in perpetuity.
  - iv. To provide alternative uses for parcels which can provide transition buffers to residential areas.
  - v. To guarantee the provision of a public improvement which could not otherwise be required that would further the public health, safety, or welfare, protect existing or future uses from the impact of a proposed use, or alleviate an existing or potential problem relating to public facilities.
  - vi. To promote the goals and objectives of the Master Plan for Land Use.
  - vii. To foster the aesthetic appearance of the city through quality building design and site development, the provision of trees and landscaping beyond minimum requirements; the preservation of unique and/or historic sites or structures; and the provision of open space or other desirable features of a site beyond minimum requirements.
  - viii. To bring about redevelopment of sites where an orderly change of use is determined to be desirable.

*The applicant's narrative addresses each of these standards; the Planning Commission must determine whether the responses given to any one of them are sufficient to qualify the project for a Planned Unit Development.*

- F. The PUD shall not be allowed solely as a means of increasing density or as a substitute for a variance request; such objectives should be pursued through the normal zoning process by requesting a zoning change or variance.

*It appeared that the applicant was pursuing higher density than permitted under current zoning, as well as relief from a handful of dimensional standards.*

The consultants did believe the applicant had provided sufficient information for the Planning Commission to reach a determination on PUD qualification.

Conceptual Site Plan and Use: The applicant proposed 8 buildings with a total of 43 attached units, arranged side-by-side, with garages on the ground floor. No elevations had been provided, but it appeared that they would be 3-story units. There was a proposed office on the plans, though it was not clear whether this was part of the multiple family complex or intended to be a separate use.

Master plan. The property was designated Multiple Family on the Future Land Use Map.

Residential Densities Map. The residential densities map designated this land as high density. This category included all three RC districts.

Dimensional standards. It appeared that the applicant would be seeking relief from the side setback standards of the ordinance.

Parking. Apart from the parking spaces at the office, all parking was located in ground floor garages or directly in front of the garages (four spaces per unit). Multiple family development required two spaces per unit with 3 rooms or fewer, and 2.5 spaces per unit with 4 or more rooms.

Pedestrian connections. A pedestrian connection to 8 Mile Road would be required.

Density. Per Section 34-3.20 the Planning Commission and City Council may permit greater density than that allowed in the underlying district as part of a PUD approval. Current zoning would permit approximately 144 rooms. With RC-3 zoning, 192 rooms would be permitted. The Commission would need to see the final plan in order to know the number of rooms on the site.

Planning Consultant Tangari concluded his presentation.

Commissioner Mantey reviewed the criteria that would qualify a plan for the PUD option. He did not feel the proposal met criteria i, ii, iii, iv, vi, or vii. Criteria v and viii were close, but the qualification would depend on why the site had never been developed and if the PUD qualification for necessary for development.

Chair Schwartz invited the applicant to speak.

Jake Modesto, Stonefield Engineering and Design, Royal Oak Michigan was present on behalf of this application for a PUD qualification.

In response to a question from Chair Schwartz, Mr. Modesto said they were proposing 86 units.

Mr. Modesto summarized the location of the site and the zoning of the surrounding parcels. In May 2017 they had been before the Commission requesting approval for a convalescent home, which would have been one building just over 60,000 square feet, and which required 2 dimensional variances which were approved. That building would have covered 30% of the site. Unfortunately that project did not go forward.

Regarding the current request, the applicants had met with City staff, and proposed 100 units with a north/south orientation, with 10 buildings, and 34% lot coverage. After discussions with City Planner Stec, they had modified their application to that being presented this evening, which had 86 units, with 8 buildings, 24% lot coverage, and clustered buildings rather than a strict north/south orientation. Therefore this application was a lesser use than those previously brought to the City.

They were proposing 202 parking spaces; they were preserving the existing drainage ditch in the rear that would act not only as preservation but also a landscaping buffer for the single family homes in the rear. They believed they met the qualifications for a PUD, A through F, and that they were presenting a development that was consistent with the Master Plan and the density that the City wanted to see on the site. The development would act as an infill between the 2 properties to the east and to the west, and would be similar in style, with clusters of buildings as noted. Natural features would be preserved on site, such as the drainage ditch and they were providing open space. They were also providing 2 roundabouts on site located to the north and south that would allow fire trucks to exit and enter safely. They would also be providing an office on 8 Mile that would be for management purposes and amenities for the residents.

This property has been vacant under its present zoning. It was very deep, with only 271 feet of frontage along 8 Mile, with 734 feet of depth. Past applications had required variances that were approved. The property was not developable by current zoning standards of RC-2 or RC-3 districts. They did feel they met the qualifications for a PUD.

In response to a question from Chair Schwartz, City Planner Stec said the variances had expired after one year without moving forward.

Chair Schwartz asked if a development had previously been approved with variances granted, why did the applicants need a PUD to develop the site?

Mr. Modesto said that the Commission had asked them to come back with a PUD application, which gave the applicants and the City the chance to work together to provide an appropriate development for this site. A PUD agreement would allow them to provide a more pleasing development than one constructed under traditional zoning.

Chair Schwartz asked if this proposal provided more landscaping or more trees over the City's minimal requirements. Did it provide more open space or other features than would be provided under current zoning?

Mr. Modesto said they would provide as much landscaping as they could and still have a marketable property and they were preserving a natural feature. Under conventional zoning they would potentially have to demolish more trees to provide parking, etc.

Commissioner Mantey believed this PUD was not offering the City significant benefit in return for this proposed agreement.

In response to questions from Commissioner Turner, Mr. Modesto said they were planning 26 1-bedroom and 60 2-bedroom units. There would be no 3-bedroom units.

Commissioner Countegan asked staff to address the density issue and how the properties to the east and west were developed. Planning Consultant Tangari said that there were approximately 30 units to the east and 77 to the west. Those properties were developed under conventional zoning.

Mr. Modesto explained that if they had more 2-bedroom homes, they would have fewer units. If they had more 1-bedrooms, there would be more units on site.

Commissioner Countegan said he was weighing the issue of density and how the applicants were going to benefit from the PUD process. Why in this case didn't conventional zoning work? Was the PUD chosen because of an economic issue? To either side properties had been developed under conventional zoning.

Commissioner Stimson said if the applicants were able to get setback variances the first time, there was nothing being presented that compelled the use of a PUD, when clearly the applicants could go through conventional zoning process again and probably get setback variances if needed. The proposal was for 146 rooms and the zoning district allowed 144. He struggled to see the need to go to a PUD vs. development under standard zoning. He didn't see the public benefit.

Mr. Modesto said the PUD offered the opportunity to cluster some of the homes and avoid generic north/south placement. The Master Plan talked about different types of multi-family dwellings and they

felt that this product provided that. Also, a PUD gave the City the opportunity to work with the applicants to come up with a development that worked.

Commissioner Mantey said the Ordinance stated that a PUD should not be allowed solely as a means for increasing density or as a substitute for a variance request. The Commission would find it difficult to approve this application under the Ordinance.

Mr. Modesto said that under a PUD proposal there was an opportunity to have less building and more open space.

Chair Schwartz said the plan made sense to him generally. The difficulty the Commission was having was labeling it a PUD. He suggested that the application be postponed to give the applicant time to return to the Commission to show what the development would look like under traditional zoning with maximum density, maximum height and then also tweak the landscaping under the PUD proposal to provide more benefit.

**MOTION by Orr, support by Stimson, that the Planning Commission make a preliminary finding that P.U.D. 1, 2018 submitted by Ari Kosterlitz does not qualify for the Planned Unit Development Option under the provisions of Section 34-3.20.2.A. through E. of the Zoning Chapter.**

Commissioner Countegan said he could not support this PUD qualification request. There was no public benefit. He felt the applicants could return with a proposal under traditional zoning.

After a general discussion regarding process, the applicant asked if they could postpone action.

Commissioners Orr and Stimson agreed to withdraw their motion.

**MOTION by Stimson, support by Orr, to postpone this application request to date uncertain in order to allow the applicant to revise plans to show how the proposal meets the PUD qualification criteria.**

**Motion carried unanimously.**

Chair Schwartz called a 5-minute break at 9:48 p.m. Chair Schwartz reconvened the meeting at 9:53 p.m.

**B. SITE AND LANDSCAPE PLAN 51-1-2018**

LOCATION:	32418 Northwestern Hwy.
PARCEL I.D.:	22-23-02-126-027
PROPOSAL:	Gas Station and convenience store in B-3, General Business District
ACTION REQUESTED:	Approval of site and landscape plan
APPLICANT:	Tarak Gayar (Gas Town, LLC)
OWNER:	Northwestern Vineyards, LLC

Chair Schwartz noted that this was the 3<sup>rd</sup> time the Commission had seen this application.

Utilizing overhead slides and referencing the Giffels Webster review letter dated June 18, 2018, Planning Consultant Tangari gave the background for this application for Site and Landscape Plan approval. Outstanding issues included:

- Parking. The Commission had previously discussed the office use on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor of the building and what the parking requirements would be for that. If site plan approval was granted, any motion should specifically address the use of the upper floor. Use of this floor as tenant space would render the site noncompliant.
- Exterior lighting. The photometric plan exceeded the maximum permitted average-to-minimum ratio and maximum levels of illumination at the residentially zoned property lines. This could be handled administratively as a condition of approval.
- Walls and screening. The issue outlined in the review letter had been resolved as the new section of masonry wall was shown on the plans.
- Pedestrian connections. A pedestrian connection to the front of the convenience store was provided in the form of striped pavement that passed through the designated loading zone. The Commission would need to determine if this met requirements.
- Overall Site Circulation. They were deferring to the City Engineer regarding the feasibility of the truck path shown on Sheet SP-3.
- Miscellaneous issues. At the northeast corner of the site, there was a small paved area striped for parking that according to the parcel lines on the plan and in the City's GIS system was not on the subject property. The plan did not address this area.
- Loading and unloading. Circulation concerns applied to the loading and unloading on the site.

Chair Schwartz asked Staff Engineer Kennedy to comment regarding circulation issues.

Staff Engineer Kennedy explained the City had asked Consulting Engineers Hubbell, Roth & Clark (HRC), Inc., to comment on the circulation. HRC found that a WB-40 truck could make the movements on the site. However any vehicle at the pump would prevent the truck from being able to maneuver the site. Additionally the WB-50 had a 45-foot turning radius and a fire truck needed a 50-foot turning radius; those vehicles could not make the turn as shown and could not exit the site without conflicting with the curb or crossing multiple lanes of Northwestern Highway. Therefore Engineering did not recommend approval of this plan.

Chair Schwartz asked what vehicle would be used to respond to a medical emergency on site. Fire Marshall Olszewski said that would depend on the time of the day and who was in service. The medical units would be able to maneuver the site but a fire truck would not be able to do that. In any event, certain emergencies such as a fire would necessitate shutting down a portion of Northwestern Highway.

In response to a question from Commissioner Orr, Staff Engineer Kennedy said that a truck driver of even a WB-40 truck would have to be right on target to make the turn shown on the plans – there was no room for even a small error.

Commissioner Mantey said that while he found the discussion regarding a fuel truck accessing the site relevant, in terms of any use on the property the Fire Department would have difficulty maneuvering on site. Was this more of an issue because the use was a gas station?

Fire Marshall Olszewski said site was reviewed per Chapter 12, regardless of use. This site was a challenging one, which was why they had HRC review it. The circulation did not meet ordinance requirements.

Commissioner Mantey said that the City would have to allow something to go into the site, as every site was developable. Was there a specific reason that a gas station should not be permitted?

City Attorney Schultz said that Section 34-6.1 *Site Plan Review* required that during the review process the Commission look at traffic circulation and how traffic related to adjacent roads. The difference in this case was the tanker movement, which was an issue because the proposal was for a gas station.

Commissioner Brickner asked if the Commission could approve something that didn't pass engineering standards. City Attorney Schultz said that site circulation was a planning standard.

Chair Schwartz invited the applicant to speak.

Tarak Gayar, 20447 Northwestern Highway, Southfield MI., Robert Rollinger, Attorney, 30500 Northwestern Highway, Suite 500, Farmington Hills MI, and Alexander Orman, Orman Engineering LLC, 5476 Vivian Lane, Waterford MI 48327, were present on behalf of this application.

Regarding the tanker maneuvering issue, Mr. Rollinger said no larger than WB-40 delivery trucks would be used. Food and beverage deliveries typically used smaller trucks. The applicant was willing to ensure that gas deliveries would be made after business hours or early in the morning before anyone came to buy gasoline. The pumps would be filled at odd hours when no one was around – this could be accomplished relatively easily. The fueling truck would exit the site to the right and immediately cross lanes to almost immediately utilize the turnaround to travel southbound on Northwestern Highway.

Mr. Rollinger said the 2<sup>nd</sup> story office was strictly for the owner and storage. No 3<sup>rd</sup> party tenant would use that space. The photometric plan would be corrected to meet City requirements. There was a 6-foot high masonry wall along the north side of the property, and a screen wall was also shown on the eastern boundary to the residential property there. The pedestrian connection ran along the front of the property, just west of the bicycling path, and would connect to the adjoining property also. To his knowledge there had never been an issue with the pavement over the property line at the rear of the property.

Regarding the fire truck issue, the adjacent property owner to the west was entering into an easement agreement to provide 2 access points, one at the northwest portion of the property, and also one at the southwest portion at the pump area, so that there could be egress and ingress through the abutting property.

Regarding tree planting, there would be tree planting and relocation of trees to meet the intended use on the site. The new front beds would be planted, along with 4 new trees on the front of the site and 2 new trees at the rear planting strip.

Mr. Orman explained that due to easements mentioned earlier, emergency vehicles would be able to circulate through the site.

In response to a question from Commissioner Orr, Fire Marshall Olszewski said he would need to review the revised plan showing the new easements, but it was possible that the revised plan would meet requirements.

Commissioner Orr asked if emergency vehicles would be able to go around the rear of the building without using the neighbor's property to the east. Mr. Gayar said he thought they could do this.

Commissioner Orr said he was reluctant to support approval of this site without the fire truck having clear access to the site.

City Planner Stec noted that the easement solution was new tonight. Could the applicants explain how the easement would be achieved since the auto care facility to the west had a fenced area at the rear? Mr. Gayar said the fence would be removed at their expense and the area would be unobstructed.

In response to a question from Commissioner Orr, City Attorney Schultz said an approving motion should specifically state that the improvement on the eastern property was not part of the approval or City authorization, and the site plan review was limited to improvements on the subject site only.

Commissioner Stimson said the diagram showed the circulation of a WB-40 tanker needing to hit the circulation pattern perfectly every time, and even then they were still going over the curb. HRC's review also showed zero clearance, along with truck going into the 2<sup>nd</sup> traffic lane going out.

Commissioner Countegan asked if this parcel was a result of a previous lot split. Staff Planner Stec said he didn't know. Commissioner Countegan noted that this was B-3 zoning, and gas stations were permitted in this zoning district. While he thought this site was tight, gas stations were an allowed use. There was some difficulty with maneuvering on site, but he did not believe this was more of a safety concern than some of the locations currently established in the City. He liked the idea of the easement agreement in the rear to alleviate circulation concerns. He supported this request.

Commissioner Brickner noted that the plan with an easement was significantly different than the plan presented. Perhaps the Engineering and Fire Departments should be given a chance to review the new plan. The easements represented a major change. Should the easement be restricted to the Fire Department or should it be allowed for other vehicles, including the gas tanker?

Commissioner Mantey said the easements would be an improvement. He reiterated that whatever use was on the site, the fire trucks would not be able to turn around. To him there was no point to wait until further review. The applicant had committed to use only the WB-40 sized delivery truck.

**MOTION by Mantey, support by Countegan**, that Site Plan 51-1-2018, dated June 21, 2018, submitted by Tarak Gayar, be approved because it appears to meet all applicable requirements of the Zoning Chapter, subject to the following conditions:

- Use of the second story is limited to accessory office and storage by the owner only, with no 3<sup>rd</sup> party use.
- Cross access agreements with abutting property to the west be reviewed and approved by the City along with a revised plan, prior to recording with the County.
- Fuel tanks be filled during non-peak hours.
- Revised photometric plan be submitted for administrative review.
- WB-40 tanker trucks only are used for fueling.

The motion also notes that the site plan approval is limited to improvements on the subject site only, and does include any improvements on the eastern property or authorization by the City to use that property.

The motion includes the finding that the pedestrian crossing as shown going across the loading zone is acceptable, since loading will be limited to off-peak hours.

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

Commissioner Turner said he could not find another gas station in the City from 10 Mile to 14 Mile Roads that did not have 2-way ingress and egress utilizing two different streets.

Commissioner Countegan asked if there were changes or further conditions that might persuade the opposing Commissioners to support this application. Commissioner Countegan felt the applicants had come before the Commission 3 times, and made appropriate changes, and demonstrated the use could work. There were other examples in the City of conflicts with tankers and customers. On this site there was single access from Northwestern Highway, which was appropriate to the one-way traffic there.

Commissioner Mantey said he would offer the same motion, with the addition of a condition of Engineering Division approval that the WB-40 tanker trucks could negotiate turns on to Northwestern Highway without crossing two lanes. Also, he thought the smaller WB-40 truck would not hit the curb as shown in the drawings, since the drawings were based on larger tanker trucks.

Mr. Orman pointed out that HRC said WB-40 trucks could make the turning movements in/out and within the facility.

Commissioner Stimson remained concerned that the WB-40 truck would cross lanes of traffic when exiting the site.

City Attorney Schultz said the drawings showed exiting trucks crossing the bike path only. Commissioner Stimson said the HRC drawings showed the WB-40 truck going into the 2nd lane. After 6:00 a.m. that would be a problem. Mr. Orman argued that that drawing showed the truck crossing the bike path only.

In response to a further question from Commissioner Stimson, Mr. Gayar said deliveries would be after hours from midnight to 5:00 a.m.

Commissioner Countegan pointed out examples in the City where tankers had to pull out in front of traffic, cross lanes, then stop at a light, etc. In the present instance there was one-way traffic, and a truck would simply wait for an opening in order to exit and cross over to the turnaround to southbound Northwestern. This site was no more hazardous than circulation at other sites in the City.

City Attorney Schultz said the HRC report showed the WB-40 truck able to make the turn. The applicant said they were going to use the WB-40 truck, the same one that HRC approved.

Mr. Gayar interjected that the neighbor to the west, who was present this evening, had just agreed to include delivery tanker trucks in the easement agreement.

Chair Schwartz and Commissioner Brickner suggested allowing the Engineering Division, Fire Department and City Attorney time to review the easement agreement before moving forward.

Commissioner Stimson said if there could be a restriction that the station could only be fueled between midnight and 5:00 a.m., and also if the City Engineer could determine that the delivery truck could make the turn and come out into a single lane, he would support an approving motion.

**MOTION by Mantey, support by Brickner, that Site Plan 51-1-2018, dated June 21, 2018, submitted by Tarak Gayer, be approved because it appears to meet all applicable requirements of the Zoning Chapter, subject to the following conditions:**

- Use of the second story is limited to accessory office and storage by the owner only, with

**no 3<sup>rd</sup> party use.**

- **Cross access agreements with abutting property to the west be reviewed and approved by the City along with a revised plan, prior to recording with the County.**
- **Fuel tanks be filled between midnight and 5:00 a.m.**
- **Revised photometric plan be submitted for administrative review.**
- **WB-40 tanker trucks only are used for fueling.**
- **Engineering Division demonstrate that a WB-40 tanker truck can negotiate turns on to Northwestern Highway without crossing over two lanes.**

**The motion also notes that the site plan approval is limited to improvements on the subject site only, and does include any improvements on the eastern property or authorization by the City to use that property.**

**The motion includes the finding that the pedestrian crossing as shown going across the loading zone is acceptable, since loading will be limited to off-peak hours.**

**Motion carried 6-2 (Schwartz, Turner opposed).**

Chair Schwartz asked for a motion regarding the landscape plan.

**MOTION by Countegan, support by Goerke, that Landscape Plan 51-1-2018, dated June 21, 2018, submitted by Tarak Gayar be approved because it appears to meet all applicable Zoning Chapter requirements, and applicable Design Principles as adopted by the Planning Commission.**

**Motion carried unanimously.**

**C. 8 MILE BOULEVARD UNIFYING FRAMEWORK**

<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	The 2018 8 Mile Boulevard Association document is intended to help coordinate multi-jurisdictional planning efforts along the Eight Mile Road corridor between the I-94 and I-275 freeways
<b>ACTION REQUESTED:</b>	Resolution of support
<b>REQUESTED BY:</b>	8 Mile Boulevard Association

Cindy Thomas, Executive Director of the 8 Mile Boulevard Association, presented the 8 Mile Boulevard Unifying Framework Report dated February 2018.

The Planning Commission approved the following resolution:

**STATE OF MICHIGAN  
COUNTY OF OAKLAND  
STATE OF MICHIGAN**

**RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF FARMINGTON HILLS PLANNING COMMISSION IN SUPPORT OF THE 8 MILE BOULEVARD ASSOCIATION UNIFYING FRAMEWORK PLAN, ESTABLISHED FEBURARY 2018**

**RESOLUTION NO. R-PC-1-18**

At a regular meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Farmington Hills, County of Oakland, State of Michigan, held on the 19<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2018, at 7:30 p.m., with those present and absent being,

PRESENT: Brickner, Countegan, Turner, Mantey, Orr, Goerke, Schwartz, Stimson

ABSENT: McRae

The following resolution was offered by Commissioner Brickner and supported by Commissioner Orr:

**WHEREAS,** The 8 Mile Boulevard Association is a historic transportation, business, and residential thoroughfare that serves to connect the Metro Detroit region. Within a 27-mile focus area between I-275 on the west and I-94 on the east, 13 municipalities and three counties saw a common interest in preserving the vitality of 8 Mile Road and in 1993 came together along with other stakeholders to found the 8 Mile Boulevard Association (8MBA); and

**WHEREAS,** A regional collaboration was launched with a cornerstone plan “A Vision for 8 Mile Boulevard: Joining Together to Make a Difference”. The plan was the result of input from all of its founding members based on the opportunities they identified along 8 Mile to build upon its existing assets and deepen their connectivity; and

**WHEREAS,** 8MBA and its member communities adopted Eight Mile Boulevard Design Guidelines to encourage consistency and a higher standard of aesthetic for development along the Boulevard. It provides guidance for planning commissions, zoning boards, community groups, developers or anyone looking to develop or improve property along 8 Mile; and

**WHEREAS,** 8MBA has worked to build countless partnerships to further our mission. The 8 Mile Boulevard Unifying Framework (8MBAUF) is among the latest examples of the continuing efforts to bring members and partners to the table; and

**WHEREAS,** The Plan includes extensive input of the 8MBA Planning Advisory Committee, (PAC) comprised of representatives of 8MBA’s Member Communities, board members and other stakeholders; and

**WHEREAS,** The unifying framework and design guidelines help define 8MBA’s role in these plans and visions and sets the stage for 8MBA to take their work to the next level; specifically, the purpose of the 8MBAUF is to help 8MBA prioritize resources and activities; align multi-party efforts to combine resources and broker partnerships; and promote transformative levels of investments; and

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED** that City of Farmington Hills Planning Commission acknowledges that the City of Farmington Hills is a member community of the 8 Mile Boulevard Association. The City of Farmington Hills Planning Commission hereby offers their support to the 8 Mile Boulevard Unifying Framework Plan, dated February 2018, for the on-going work and efforts at establishing unifying geographical zones along Eight Mile Road. The Planning Commission supports the efforts establishing how 8MBA works with its member communities and that the member communities recognize their connectivity and work to align their resources to work together.

AYES: Brickner, Countegan, Turner, Mantey, Orr, Goerke, Schwartz, Stimson

NAYS: none  
ABSENT: McRae  
ABSTENTIONS: none

RESOLUTION DECLARED ADOPTED.

STATE OF MICHIGAN            )  
  )ss.  
COUNTY OF OAKLAND    )

I, the undersigned, the duly qualified and acting City Clerk for the City of Farmington Hills, County of Oakland, State of Michigan, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and complete copy of a resolution adopted by the Planning Commission of the City of Farmington Hills at a regular meeting held on the 19th day of July, 2018, the original of which resolution is on file in my office.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my official signature, this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2018.

\_\_\_\_\_  
PAMELA B. SMITH, City Clerk

**Reopening of Motion:**

**4.D: PUD PLAN 2, 2017, INCLUDING SITE AND LANDSCAPE PLAN 56-3-2018**

LOCATION:	21500 & 21430 Haggerty Rd.
PARCEL I.D.:	22-23-31-101-023 & 024
PROPOSAL:	New Office building in OS-4, Office Research District
ACTION REQUESTED:	Recommendation to City Council
APPLICANT:	Century Project LLC
OWNER:	Century Project, LLC

City Planner Stec said that the applicants for Item 4.D: **PUD PLAN 2, 2017, INCLUDING SITE AND LANDSCAPE PLAN 56-3-2018** had asked to be scheduled for the August meeting after all. Therefore the following motions were made:

**MOTION by Countegan, support by Mantey, to reconsider the motion for Item 4.D: PUD Plan 2, 2017, including Site and Landscape Plan 56-3-2018.**

**Motion carried unanimously.**

**MOTION by Countegan, support by Mantey, to reschedule PUD Plan 2, 2017, including Site and Landscape Plan 56-3-2018, to the August 16, 2018 meeting.**

**Motion carried unanimously.**

**PUBLIC COMMENT**   None.

**COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS**

The next meeting was set for August 16, 2018.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** June 14, 2018

**MOTION by Stimson, support by Orr, to approve the June 14, 2018 minutes as published.**

**Motion carried unanimously.**

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Chair Schwartz adjourned the meeting at 11:04 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Dale Countegan  
Planning Commission Secretary

/cem