

**MINUTES  
CITY OF FARMINGTON HILLS  
PLANNING COMMISSION PUBLIC/REGULAR MEETING  
COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
May 17, 2018, 7:30 P.M.**

Chair Schwartz called the Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. on May 17, 2018.

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

Commissioners Absent: Mantey

Others Present: City Planner Stec, Traffic Engineer Saksewski, Civil Engineer Seewald,  
City Attorney Anderson, Planning Consultant Tangari

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

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

**MOTION carried unanimously.**

**PUBLIC HEARING**

**A. PUD PLAN 3, 2017 INCLUDING SITE AND LANDSCAPE PLAN 71-12-2017**

LOCATION: 32600 Northwestern Hwy.  
PARCEL I.D.: 22-23-02-126-003, 011, 012, 025  
PROPOSAL: New self-storage building and senior living facility in B-2,  
Community Business District and B-3, General Business District  
ACTION REQUESTED: Recommendation to City Council  
APPLICANT: NorthPoint Development, LLC and NWH Holdings, LLC  
OWNER: NWH Holdings LLC

Jed Momot, Project Manager, Northpoint Development, 4825 NW 41<sup>st</sup> Street, St #500, Riverside, MO, spoke on behalf of this application for a recommendation to City Council for PUD Plan 3, 2017, including site and landscape plan 71-12-2017. He noted that there had been several meetings regarding this proposal, and summarized the application, which included a climate controlled 3-story self-storage building, and a 3-story assisted living and memory care building.

This project had been brought to the Commission for PUD qualification in December 2017. They had also presented to the Planning Commission in January and March 2018, with a public hearing in April. The vote in April had been 4-5, and at that time Northpoint had been given the option to make some changes and return to the Commission. They had done that and were presenting the changes this evening:

- The biggest change was that the self-storage building setback was improved from 28' to 50' from the property line, which was 150' from the old property line before the right-of-way taking for the roundabout.
- Additional landscaping had been provided along the self-storage building; more would be provided around and within the courtyards of the senior living community. Significant berms and landscape buffering had been provided along 14 Mile Road.
- Regarding compatibility of uses, the PUD did not consider compatibility of uses, but did stress the

importance of achieving the goals of the Master Plan. The proposal achieved many of those goals, including limiting 14 Mile traffic, transitional development, quiet uses adjacent to residential, etc.

- The two uses stood alone on the site, and would be separated by landscaping and the detention pond.
- On the far east side of the property, the berm on the neighboring property would remain, and the applicants would add a fence and shrubbery to shield that property.

Other important points included:

- 90% + front yard open space was being provided along 14 Mile Road.
- The applicants would add as much architectural downlighting and other accent lighting as necessary so as to not create dark alleys on the self-storage building.
- The property was commercially zoned, and the proposal would be lower impact uses than several that were allowed by right within the commercially zoned site.
- Master Plan goals achieved by this project included: 1) limiting 14 Mile traffic, 2) redevelopment by means of a PUD, 3) transitional uses, 4) high quality architecture.

In response to questions from Commissioner Orr, Mr. Momot explained how they had been able to increase the setback for the self-storage building by modifying the driveway into the senior living facility, and changing the parking. The building's design and footprint was exactly the same.

In response to a question from Commissioner Brickner, Mr. Momot explained that the gate on the access drive from Northwestern Highway would open vertically, and would have a Knox Box code available to City emergency personnel.

Commissioner Stimson asked about the two monument signs shown on the plan, one of which advertised Stonecrest Senior Living from the access on Northwestern Highway. This could be confusing to drivers who might think they could access Stonecrest from the Northwestern entry. Mr. Momot agreed to change the sign.

Commissioner McRae asked about the sign that indicated *Future Retail*. Mr. Momot said that would be on Northwestern Highway, and the words *Future Retail* were just a placeholder at this point. Commissioner McRae wanted to make sure the owner of that property knew he would be limited to a sign that size if it was approved as part of a PUD.

Mr. Momot said the signs were actually going to be removed from this application, as recommended at the last meeting.

Commissioner Goerke asked if the applicants were considering Northwestern Highway their main entrance. Mr. Momot explained that the entrance on Northwestern Highway would be the main entrance for the self-storage building, and the 14 Mile entrance would be the main entrance for the senior living facility.

Commissioner Goerke asked Mr. Momot to explain his thought process for limiting 14 Mile traffic. How did the applicants plan to accommodate emergency access vehicles, especially during rush hour, for instance? Mr. Momot said the emergency access vehicles would most likely enter from Northwestern and utilize the Knox gate entry. The purpose of the gate was to limit cut through traffic from Northwestern to 14 Mile Road, but would not limit emergency vehicle access. They also had emergency routes coming from the east on 14 Mile Road.

Seeing that discussion had ended, Chair Schwartz invited Planning Consultant Tangari to make his report.

Referring to his May 8, 2018 review letter, and utilizing overhead slides, Planning Consultant Tangari described the project, reviewed the PUD process, the Master Plan goals for the area, and highlighted changes in the plan since the last presentation. Outstanding issues included:

- The applicant had not yet applied for the lot split that was necessary to execute the proposed plan.
- The proposed PUD was at odds with the policy of disallowing vehicular access to 14 Mile, though the residential use on 14 Mile, use of the PUD option, visual buffering, and overall orderly redevelopment of the site appeared to further other Master Plan goals and policies.
- Regarding parking at the Stonecrest senior living facility, the Planning Commission should discuss parking demand for this use with the applicant and determine whether adjusting the parking requirement from 74 spaces to 64 spaces as part of the PUD agreement was warranted.
- Regarding parking for the self-storage building, the Planning Commission should discuss parking demand for this type of facility with the applicant; spaces were provided at a rate of roughly 1 per 63 storage units.
- Regarding overall circulation, the Planning Commission and the applicant should discuss whether the traffic-calming measures included on the plan adequately addressed concerns regarding cut-through traffic.
- It was unclear whether rooftop equipment was planned for the self-storage building.
- Regarding signs, bottom-mounted sign lighting was shown; that type of lighting was prohibited. Additional building lighting should be shown on the plans.
- Regarding providing a fence in lieu of a wall on the east side, the Planning Commission should discuss whether the fence achieved the purpose of screening the condominiums to the east.
- Relief from ordinance standards sought included:
  - West setback to commercial district: 20 feet required; 10 feet proposed
  - Front setback: 75 feet required; 25 feet proposed to senior facility/50 feet to self-storage
  - Parking for Stonecrest: 74 spaces required; 64 spaces proposed
  - Screening: 6-foot wall required to east; fencing was proposed

Planning Consultant Tangari concluded his review.

In response to questions from Commissioner Countegan, Planning Consultant Tangari gave the following information:

- The height limit in the underlying zoning district was 40 feet. The Stonecrest facility was 39 feet and the self-storage building was 38-1/2 feet.
- The proposed uses were low-traffic uses, especially compared to the commercial uses that would be permitted on the site by the underlying zoning.
- The underlying zoning district required 20% open space in the front yard for landscaping or other non-paved surfaces. For this proposal, the applicants were only using a small part of the front yard for development, so that 90% of the front yard was kept for landscaping, including retention, berm with plantings, and lawn.

Planning Consultant Countegan asked if it would be reasonable to see the additional front yard open space as a reasonable tradeoff for the setback deficiencies. Planning Consultant Tangari said that determination would be up to the Commission. One of the things to look at when reviewing a PUD was if the applicants were exceeding some standards while asking for relief from others. In the present instance, the applicants were exceeding the standards for front yard landscaping and front yard open space.

Chair Schwartz asked if there was going to be any rooftop equipment. Mr. Momot said the self-storage unit would not have any rooftop equipment. The senior living facility would have rooftop equipment that would be fully screened.

Chair Schwartz asked about the height of the berm. Mr. Momot said about 80% of the berm would be 4-6 feet tall and would taper to zero at both ends.

Chair Schwartz noted that the Commission received letters in support of the project prior to the April meeting. There were no additional letters of support. Those supporting the project were:

Albert Loeffler  
David Loeffler  
Andy Cabase  
Auday Haddad  
Joel F. Yono  
Edita Freedman  
Eric Nelkin  
John Ginopolis  
John Naife  
Mary Shrader  
Meu Paliiz  
Mike Langan  
Peter Ginopolis  
Reema M.  
Ron Thomas (Worldwide Tech)  
Riyadh Asmar  
Sahin Kashat  
Sam Darwid  
Thomas Investments  
Jimmy Asmar  
Robert Carmack  
Renee Semma  
Ann Sagmani  
Ilan Hazan  
Nancy Schuchard  
Craig Homicz  
Hiddi Hadah, Stellar Hospitality  
Don Fith  
Andy Andre  
Frank Yono  
Christine Moore  
Michelle Cunningham  
Riyadh and Ron Asmar  
Doug Saroki  
Daniel J. Lehman, Integrated Law Group

In April letters opposing the project were received from:

Diane Hausner  
Morry Greener

Lisa Berman  
Bonnie & Allen Levin  
Maxine Graff Goodman

Tonight additional letters opposing the project were received from:

Sara Claerr  
Marc D. Manson  
Jay Bassin  
Dory Baron  
Rachel Eickemeyer

Additionally Jay Bassin and Rachel Eickemeyer had asked that their letters of opposition be read into the public record.

All correspondence received would remain part of the file for this application.

Chair Schwartz opened the public hearing.

Jan Wolf, 7433 Heather Heath, West Bloomfield, opposed the PUD project. He thought the buildings would be too high and the buildings would be too massive.

Mark Manson, 30141 High Valley Road, Farmington Hills MI, opposed the PUD project. He remained concerned regarding evacuation from a 3-story building in a high traffic area such as the Northwestern/14 Mile Road roundabout. He felt emergency vehicles would be inhibited and emergency personnel endangered, and that this location for a senior living facility was unnecessarily dangerous.

Ellen Busch, 6825 Heather Heath, West Bloomfield, opposed the PUD project. She was opposed to an out-of-state developer constructing this project, and was further concerned about the 3-story buildings being close to a residential area, with added traffic, bright lights, etc.

Steven Stern (phonetic), Heather Heath, West Bloomfield, opposed the PUD project, which required deviations from the zoning ordinance. He asked for a lower-profile development on this parcel.

Diana Katz, 5580 Abington, West Bloomfield, opposed the PUD project. She felt there would not be enough parking for volunteers at the senior living facility. Parking would be especially difficult when snow storage became an issue in the winter. She referenced other senior living facilities where parking was a continuing issue.

Morry Greener, 5580 Abington, West Bloomfield, opposed the PUD project. He didn't want anything over 2 stories next to his residential neighborhood. The self-storage facility was industrial in nature.

Daniel Gama, 30728 W. 14 Mile Road, opposed the PUD project. He did not want to see the entrance to a commercial building across the street from his driveway. Trees would not screen this development. He was concerned about an increase in traffic, crime, etc.

Linda Schaeffler, 7118 Brookridge, opposed the PUD project. She was concerned about the height of the buildings that would be closer to the road than the ordinance allowed. She was also concerned about emergency access and evacuation, and insufficient parking at the senior facility, especially during the winter.

Joel Katz, 5580 Abingdon, West Bloomfield, opposed the PUD project, which he felt was not consistent with the intent of the Master Plan in terms of architectural development, increased traffic, and was inharmonious with the nearby residential neighborhood. He referenced 2006 and 2009 comments from Planning Consultant Coates and [then] City Planner Gardiner regarding the City's intent toward this property. Also, the applicant needed to address Commissioner comments regarding the size of the property creating the setback issues, etc.

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

Mr. Momot said that underlying zoning height requirements were met. They expected 8 EMS runs per month. Some comments addressed the site as if it were a residential site; the site was zoned commercial and would be developed as a commercial use. Emergency vehicles would mostly enter from Northwestern Highway. In terms of parking, this would be the highest parked community they had. Most of their communities had .6 spaces per unit; in this instance they were providing .74 spaces per unit. Assisted living/memory care residents did not drive. The Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) suggested that this type of senior care needed .41 spaces per unit. In Farmington Hills the parking requirement was the same for all types of senior housing. Again, for assisted living/memory care, less parking was needed.

Mr. Momot concluded by saying they met most of the goals of the Master Plan, and thanked the residents for coming out.

Commissioner Stimson asked if the applicants had any contingency plans when more parking was needed on holidays, such as Mother's Day. Mr. Momot said they would use valet service during events that would require more parking; this was their common practice.

Commissioner McRae noted that he had requested lighting be installed on the south side of the self storage building; would Mr. Momot address the issue of crime around their facilities? Mr. Momot said that they had very little crime at any of their facilities. The self-storage facility closed at 10:00 p.m.

Commissioner McRae asked about landscaping the berm. What would the landscaping look like when it was first planted? Mr. Momot said they were providing dense plantings, and trees when installed would be 2-4 inch caliper, and 6-10 feet tall. He showed a rendering when viewing the property from the north.

In response to questions from Commissioner Countegan, City Planner Stec gave the following information:

- The Fire Department had no objection to approval of the proposed project; however they recommended that the Planning Department consider the number of runs required – approximately 1 per year per bed.
- Farmington Hills currently had 3 self-storage units on commercially zoned property: 2 on Orchard Lake and 1 on Grand River Avenue.
- Residential development was directly west of the self-storage facilities on Orchard Lake Road.
- The height requirement for this project was determined similarly to other height requirements in the City, per ordinance requirement.
- Public Safety had not reacted to the demolition of vacant buildings that could provide an attractive nuisance; however this was a valid point. The AT&T building had been boarded up several times in order to prohibit illegal entry.

- The subject property had never been zoned residential.

In response to a question from Commissioner Turner, City Planner Stec said obtaining lot split approval would need to be a condition of approval.

Commissioner Brickner pointed out that the senior facility would be required to have a fire suppression system. Also, the Fire Department had raised the issue of the runs for planning purposes; it was not a concern from the Fire Department's point of view.

City Planner Stec pointed out that the Engineering Division would like to have a stub constructed or an easement granted from the Northwestern access road to allow access to the rear of the existing properties to the west of the access road.

Chair Schwartz indicated he was ready to entertain a motion.

**MOTION by Orr, support by Countegan, that the Planning Commission recommend to City Council that PUD Plan 3, 2017, including site and landscape plans 71-12-2017 dated April 26, 2018 submitted by Northpoint Development be approved because the plans are in accordance with the objectives, goals and policies of the Master Plan for Future Land Use and is 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, and that the application qualifies for the PUD under Section 34-3.20.2.E, subparagraphs ii, iv, v, vi, vii, and viii.**

**The following findings and determinations are made:**

- **64 parking spaces are adequate for the assisted living facility**
- **A 6' wood fence in place of a masonry wall along the eastern property line abutting an RC-2 district is acceptable**
- **The proposed building setbacks as designated on the plan dated April 26, 2018 are acceptable.**
- **The proposed building materials as presented on April 19, 2018 are acceptable**
- **The 4' fence within the front yard setback is acceptable**

**The following conditions are recommended:**

- **The demolition of the AT&T building and the buildings and foundations identified along Northwestern outside of the PUD boundary must be completed prior to the issuance of construction permits for the new structures**
- **The lot split for the parcels as depicted on the PUD plan is completed prior to the issuance of construction permits for the new structures**
- **All new signage shall be approved under separate permits**
- **An access easement to the properties along Northwestern Highway to the east and west of the Northwestern entrance is granted**
- **All roof top units are screened from view**
- **A revised lighting plan is submitted for administrative review.**

Commissioner McRae said he had voted against this motion in April because of the location of the self-storage building. The applicant had moved the building back 20 feet as he had requested. No project was perfect; he thought the proposal was a good alternative to other business uses on this location. He would support the motion.

Commissioner Brickner said one of the main concerns from the public regarded the height of the buildings. However, the underlying zoning permitted the height. He remained concerned about the oversaturation of uses on this parcel; the two uses proposed had a very low traffic impact, less than a shopping center that could be constructed by right. He had been involved with the City since 1995, and nothing had gone in this parcel. He was impressed with the low impact uses. He would like to see the area get cleaned up and modernized.

Commissioner Goerke said that while she was still concerned about parking, she also appreciated the choices made in the selection of building materials.

Commissioner Turner remained concerned that the two uses were not compatible; as an urban planner he could not accept a residential component mixed with an industrial use. His position was the same as at the last meeting, and he would not support the motion.

Commissioner Stimson said that over the period of time the applicants had been before the Commission they had made requested changes, including addressing the access road from Northwestern to 14 Mile, and improving the setback. This property was zoned B-2 and B-3. If something like Target went on this parcel, the residents across 14 Mile Road would have been looking at the back of a commercial building. From a traffic perspective and a transition perspective, and considering the current zoning, the uses were acceptable. He would support the motion.

Chair Schwartz said his training was also as a planner, and he had consistently voted against this proposal because the two uses were not compatible. The planning consultants had also noted that the applicants were proposing a mix of uses not typically permitted in the underlying districts. Tonight's plan was significantly better than when they had started, and the uses were low impact in terms of traffic. However, he would be opposing the motion.

Commissioner Countegan said he thought the proposal did meet the goals of the Master Plan. The primary concern over the years was low traffic use development and limited curb cuts off 14 Mile Road. This plan accomplished those goals. The 90% open space along 14 Mile Road was significant. Without a PUD, a developer could come in with a plan under the B-2 zoning, build to the 40-foot height limit, and pave the front yard. Under that circumstance, the Commission would have no discretion. The ordinance did not speak to compatibility; there was no requirement that the uses had to be compatible. The development addressed the vision of the Master Plan, and larger issues of traffic and having some control over the development. He would be supporting the motion.

Chair Schwartz called the motion.

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

Chair Schwartz advised that the application would now go before City Council, who would make the final decision.

**B. SPECIAL APPROVAL 60-4-2018 INCLUDING SITE AND LANDSCAPE PLAN**

LOCATION:	33737 Twelve Mile Rd.
PARCEL I.D.:	22-23-16-201-005
PROPOSAL:	Office for electronic automotive component, research, design and testing in an OS-4, Office Research District.

**ACTION REQUESTED:** Special Use Approval including site and landscape plan  
**APPLICANT:** W12 Investment Partners, LLC  
**OWNER:** Wayne State University

Matthew Sosin, President, Northern Equities Group, 39000 Country Club Drive, was present on behalf of this application for a Special Use Approval for a new tenant, Body Control Systems, at 33737 Twelve Mile Road.

City Planner Stec explained that this property had been owned by Wayne State University; public school systems including universities were exempt from local zoning ordinances. As a result Wayne State had made some changes that had never gone through the permit process. Now that Wayne State no longer owned the property, the nonconforming use had disappeared and the Commission had an opportunity to bring the site into compliance with local zoning codes, as much as reasonably possible.

In response to a question from Commissioner McRae, Mr. Sosin said currently the building was owned by Wayne State University, but depending upon what happened tonight the property was ready to change ownership.

Referring to his April 26, 2018 review letter, and utilizing overhead slides, Planning Consultant Tangari gave the review for this application for a Special Use Approval and for site plan, landscape plan, and tree survey approval.

There were no exterior changes proposed to the footprint of the building or to the parking lot. The use proposed was for a mix of office, research and testing uses. Research and testing uses were a special use in the OS-4 district, subject to the standards of Section 34-3.9.5.

Outstanding issues included:

- The site currently had 1,149 parking spaces, which vastly exceeded the required 314 spaces required.
- The existing site was not compliant with the current landscaping standards of the City. Specifically, uses in the OS-4 District were typically required to be screened from uses in adjacent RA districts; in this case, a greenbelt could serve as the screen because the district was across a major thoroughfare. Currently, there was a two-foot berm in place along Twelve Mile Road; this met the parking lot screening requirement only. The Planning Commission should consider whether to require the greenbelt.
- Regarding parking lot trees, within the paved area there were about 45 trees, 26 within the parking lot itself. Around the perimeter, within 10 feet of the lot there were an additional 40 trees. Therefore there were about 85 trees that could be interpreted to be parking lot trees if the Commission so chose.

Commissioner Orr said that it appeared that most of the parking lot did not comply with the ordinance. There were no trees at all in the middle. Driveways were too close to the lot line. The parking lot was too close to the road. Did the Commission have authority to require the applicants to bring the parking lot into full compliance with the ordinance?

City Attorney Anderson said that after discussion of the issues, reasonable conditions could be attached.

Commissioner Orr said he was looking at the setbacks from the 3 property lines to the north, east and west, and the trees that were in the middle of the parking lot.

Planning Consultant Tangari said there was no required setback from the side lot line. As far as the front lot line, the parking lot was set back more than 10 feet so that it also met ordinance requirements.

In response to a further question from Commissioner Orr, Planning Consultant Tangari said the issue was the buffering standard between the OS-4 District and the residential district across the street. Additional trees would be required to meet that standard. The parking lot tree requirement said the trees were to be distributed as uniformly as possible through the parking lot. Disregarding distribution, they had enough trees. The Planning Commission would need to decide if they wanted more equal distribution through the parking lot.

City Planner Stec said the applicant would replace existing noncompliant signage with compliant signs.

Chair Schwartz opened the public hearing. Seeing that no one came forward to speak, Chair Schwartz closed the public hearing.

Mr. Sosin said they were going to redo the parking lot. As already mentioned, there was more parking there than necessary. Body Control Systems would be leasing 450 spots. The owners' further plan was to take the front approximately 4 acres and redevelop that portion of the site. They would be submitting plans for a new building, and the parking lot would look much different than it did today. For now, they would make the lot look better, but he hoped they would not have to add parking lot islands at this time.

Commissioner Turner asked about a note on Sheet C2-0 that referenced removing a sign and replacing it with another sign on Twelve Mile Road. Mr. Sosin said they might have to install the sign but move it later as the front of the parking lot was redeveloped.

Commissioner McRae said that they had to assume nothing would happen until it did happen. City Attorney Anderson reiterated that reasonable conditions could be attached to an approving motion.

In response to a question from Commissioner McRae, Mr. Sosin said they would mill and install a new topcoat on the part of the parking lot that would be leased to Body Control Systems. The rest of the parking lot would be seal coated and striped.

Commissioner Countegan summarized that a closing was pending on the property. Was there a plan that showed the portion of the parking lot that would be milled? Mr. Sosin said they had not provided that; they could provide that to city staff if necessary.

Commissioner Orr asked if parking lot trees could be placed within the area that the applicants would be using. Mr. Sosin said they would do that if required. City Planner Stec said if the perimeter trees were included as parking lot trees, requesting trees within the area being leased would be above the ordinance requirement. If the Commission was not going to include the perimeter trees, they could list how many trees would be required.

Commissioner Orr said the problem was the trees were not evenly distributed. He would like to pursue bringing the property into conformance; he supported putting in parking lot trees evenly distributed through the area they were going to use.

Commissioner Brickner said that at this point the Commission could only look at the plan provided. Future improvements were as yet conceptual only.

Mr. Sosin said that the approval for the special use was critical. The applicants were willing to put in parking islands with trees on the leased portion if that was necessary.

After further discussion, City Attorney Anderson said the Commission could offer a conditional motion that would require the applicants to bring the landscape trees or parking lot trees into compliance in the milled portion only, with the understanding that future development would change the configuration of the front portion. Perhaps a time requirement could be added, i.e., a building would need to be planned within 3 years or the front portion would also need to be brought into compliance.

Commissioner McRae said the aerial view seemed to show locations where parking lot trees had been previously planted. Perhaps those locations could be replanted.

Mr. Sosin said the building had been underutilized for a long time; the entire look of the building would be softened because the exterior including the landscaping would be freshened and better maintained. There were still a lot of trees on the site.

Commissioner McRae suggested giving staff some direction as to how many trees would be required. City Planner Stec said the ordinance required that trees be spaced evenly throughout the parking lot but did not offer any further definition of what *spaced evenly* meant.

Commissioner Orr indicated he was ready to make a motion.

**MOTION by Orr, support by McRae, that Special Approval No. 60-4-2018, submitted by W12 Investment Partners, LLC, be approved subject to all applicable provisions of the Zoning Chapter for the following reasons:**

- 1. The use will not be injurious to the district and environs.**
- 2. The effects of the use will not be contrary to the spirit and intent of the Zoning Chapter.**
- 3. The use will be compatible with existing uses in the area.**
- 4. The use will not interfere with orderly development in the area.**
- 5. The use will not be detrimental to the safety or convenience of vehicular or pedestrian traffic.**

**Motion carried 8-0.**

**MOTION by Countegan, support by McRae, that the Site Plan dated April 26, 2018 associated with Special Use Approval 60-4-2018, submitted by W12 Investment Partners, LLC, be approved because it appears to meet all applicable requirements of the Zoning Chapter.**

After discussion, Commissioner Orr suggested and Commissioner Countegan accepted amending the motion to add the following condition:

**Subject to:**

**A revised site plan including an additional 20 parking lot trees in landscape islands in the area of the 450 parking spaces within the front of the existing building is submitted for administrative review.**

**Motion carried 8-0.**

**MOTION by Orr, support by McRae, that Landscape Plan dated April 26, 2018 associated with Special Use Approval 60-4-2018, submitted by W12 Investment Partners, LLC, be approved because it appears to meet all applicable Zoning Chapter requirements, and applicable Design Principles as adopted by the Planning Commission, subject to the following conditions:**

- **A revised landscape plan complying with the site plan approval conditions is submitted for administrative review.**
- **Additional trees are planted within the greenbelt along Twelve Mile Road within 3 years if a site plan for a new building within the front portion of the parking lot has not been submitted for Planning Commission review.**

Commissioner Countegan said he was opposed to the last condition, which seemed punitive, especially if things were happening on the site within 3 years but a plan had not been submitted.

**Motion carried 6-2 (Countegan, Goerke opposed).**

### **REGULAR MEETING**

#### **A. SITE PLAN AND LANDSCAPE PLAN 57-4-2018**

LOCATION:	23414 Industrial Park Ct.
PARCEL I.D.:	22-23-30-276-061
PROPOSAL:	Parking lot addition in an LI-1, Light Industrial District
ACTION REQUESTED:	Approval of site and landscape plan
APPLICANT:	Steven Chase
OWNER:	23414 Industrial, LLC

Steven Chase, 24309 Industrial Park Court, was present on behalf of this application to add additional parking spaces at the southern end of the property between the property line and the existing building located directly north. They would like to take an asphalt drive that currently had 5 parking spaces and widen it to accommodate 21 spaces.

Referring to his April 18, 2018 review letter, and utilizing overhead slides, Planning Consultant Tangari gave the review for this request, which was to add parking as described to an existing industrial facility. The additional parking would bring the site into compliance with current parking requirements.

The only outstanding issue was that yards abutting a street must provide a landscaped area of at least 10 feet. The southernmost space on the west side of the lot did not meet this standard; this was an existing condition. The Planning Commission should decide whether it was acceptable to continue this existing condition. The plans did not show two-foot screening shrubs between the parking lot and the street, per Section 34-5.14.5.

Commissioner Stimson asked the location of the replacement trees. Planning Consultant Tangari showed where the trees were shown on the plan.

Commissioner McRae asked for clarification regarding the subject site's relationship to the building to the east, since the only access to this site was through the eastern building's property. Mr. Chase explained the management and ownership relationship between the buildings.

Commissioner Countegan asked why the additional parking was necessary. Mr. Chase said they had been at that location since 1972 and they were hiring additional staff.

Commissioner McRae said that trying to shoehorn a two-foot hedge between the parking lot and the street as mentioned earlier was counterproductive and unnecessary.

**MOTION by Goerke, support by Countegan, that Site Plan 57-4-2018, dated April 18, 2018, submitted by Steven Chase, be approved because it appears to meet all applicable requirements of the Zoning Chapter, subject to the following findings and conditions:**

- **Due to the orientation of the proposed new parking spaces a 2 foot landscape berm between the spaces and the Industrial Park Court right-of-way is not needed**
- **The greenbelt between the western parking lot and the property line with the abutting parcel is acceptable as an existing condition**
- **The sign is removed from the site plan**

**Motion carried 8-0.**

**MOTION by Goerke, support by McRae, that Landscape Plan 57-4-2018, dated April 18, 2018, submitted by Steven Chase be approved because it appears to meet all applicable Zoning Chapter requirements, and applicable Design Principles as adopted by the Planning Commission.**

**Motion carried 8-0.**

**B. SITE PLAN AND LANDSCAPE PLAN 59-4-2018**

LOCATION:	38000 Hills Tech Dr.
PARCEL I.D.:	22-23-18-100-021
PROPOSAL:	DTE Substation yard and building in an IRO, Industrial Research District
ACTION REQUESTED:	Approval of site and landscape plan
APPLICANT:	Harley Ellis Devereaux, HED
OWNER:	Robert Bosch, LLC

Jerry Philo, 26913 Northwestern, Southfield MI and architect for this project was present on behalf of this application. Jeff Smigielski-McHenry, Project Manager, Bosch, was also present.

Mr. Philo said they were ready to address any questions regarding this application. The primary reason they needed a new substation was to provide Bosch their own circuit by installing a utility substation dedicated to Bosch's use.

Chair Schwartz asked if the applicants were planning on using a barbed wire fence. Mr. Philo said that was DTE's decision, in order to keep unauthorized people out of their site. The new building would have security cameras. Security on site was critical.

City Planner Stec said the barbed wire fencing would require Zoning Board of Appeals approval.

Referring to his April 18, 2018 review letter and utilizing overhead slides, Planning Consultant Tangari gave the background for this application for the addition of a 40,000 square foot DTE substation yard and a 1,300 square foot utility building to the site. The applicant was also proposing a new 4,476 square foot building adjacent to the existing Building 105. The purpose of the second building was to enclose the base equipment for a total of 12 cooling towers.

Outstanding issues included:

- Building B eliminated 16 parking spaces. There did not appear to be a plan to replace those spaces. The building did not constitute usable floor area and therefore would not increase the overall required parking for the site. However, the applicant must provide an overall parking calculation for the site to confirm that parking for the facility continued to meet the requirements of Section 34-5.2 once those 16 spaces were removed.
- Per Section 34-5.12.C., fences shall not contained barbed wire or razor wire.
- No photometric plan was provided. If the applicant planned to add new exterior lighting for either of the facilities, a photometric plan was required.

In response to a question from Commissioner Orr, City Planner Stec said that a neighboring site had been denied the use of barbed wire by the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Mr. Philo said they would not be changing storm water detention on the site. The parking spaces that were being removed were only used for test vehicles; they were not included in the total vehicle count required by the ordinance. They would bring in the original site plans that showed storm water detention and parking calculations for the entire site.

Regarding lighting, cut-off fixtures would be used. The lights would be on only when employees were on site doing maintenance. Lighting on the buildings would be over exit doors only. One site lighting pole was being removed.

**MOTION by Stimson, support by Brickner, that Site Plan 59-4-2018, dated April 18, 2018, submitted by Harley Ellis Devereaux, be approved because it appears to meet all applicable requirements of the Zoning Chapter, subject to the following conditions:**

- **The barbed wire proposed for the security fence around the DTE equipment is removed or a ZBA variance is granted**
- **A revised site plan showing updated parking calculations and lighting details is submitted for administrative review**

**Motion carried 8-0.**

**MOTION by Stimson, support by Brickner, that Landscape Plan 59-4-2018, dated April 18, 2018, submitted by Harley Ellis Devereaux, be approved because it appears to meet all applicable Zoning Chapter requirements and applicable Design Principles as adopted by the Planning Commission, subject to the following condition:**

- **A revised plan addressing the items identified in the May 8, 2018 Giffels Webster review report is submitted for administrative review**

**Motion carried 8-0.**

**PUBLIC COMMENT** None.

**COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS**

Chair Schwartz noted that two cases that had been set for tonight had been postponed. City Planner Stec reviewed process when cases were postponed.

The next meeting was set for June 14, 2018.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** April 12 and April 19, 2018.

City Planner Stec advised that the April 19, 2018 public hearing minutes needed to include the names of everyone who had sent letters in support or opposition for PUD Plan 3, 2017.

**MOTION by Brickner, support by Countegan, to approve the April 19, 2018 minutes as amended to include the names of everyone who had sent letters in support or opposition for PUD Plan 3, 2017.**

**Motion carried unanimously.**

**MOTION by Orr, support by Brickner, to approve the April 12, 2018 minutes as presented.**

**Motion carried unanimously.**

Commissioner McRae asked why PUD Plan 3, 2017 had another public hearing this evening. City Planner Stec reviewed process, and explained that the application was re-advertised, and therefore a public hearing was required.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Chair Schwartz adjourned the meeting at 10:19 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Dale Countegan  
Planning Commission Secretary

/cem