

CITY OF PLYMOUTH  
PLANNING COMMISSION – REGULAR MEETING  
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 13, 2016  
7:00 P.M.

Planning Commission Mission Statement:

The Planning Commission considers the development and current and future land use within the City of Plymouth so as to preserve the health, safety and welfare of our residents and business owners. We are an unpaid volunteer body of City residents appointed by the City Commission. We act as an advisory body considering land use, zoning and planned developments making recommendations for the City Commission to vote upon to become policy.

Meeting called to order at \_\_\_\_\_ P.M.

1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL

Jennifer Frey	Jim Frisbie	Jennifer Kehoe
John King	Charles Myslinski	Joseph Phillips
Conrad Schewe	Scott Silvers	Jim Mulhern

2. CITIZEN COMMENTS

3. ELECTION OF OFFICERS:

CHAIRPERSON

Nominated by \_\_\_\_\_

Action taken \_\_\_\_\_

VICE-CHAIRPERSON

Nominated by \_\_\_\_\_

Action taken \_\_\_\_\_

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES  
Regular Meeting – December 9, 2015

5. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

6. PUBLIC HEARINGS

None.

7. NEW BUSINESS:

1. Welcome New Planning Commissioner
2. Planning Commission 2016 Goal Setting

8. OLD BUSINESS:

1. Zoning Ordinance 78-21 Amendment Projections into Yards

9. REPORTS AND CORRESPONDENCE:

Master Plan Review Update

10. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS:

11. MOTION TO ADJOURN



## CITY OF PLYMOUTH

201 S. Main

Plymouth, MI 48170

www.ci.plymouth.mi.us

### PLANNING COMMISSION - REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, December 9, 2015

---

The regular meeting was called to order at 7:04 P.M. by Chairperson Mulhern.

#### 1. ROLL CALL

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jennifer Frey, Jim Frisbie, Jennifer Kehoe, John King,  
Joseph Philips, Conrad Schewe, Scott Silvers and Jim Mulhern

OTHERS PRESENT: John Buzuvis, Community Development Director  
Sally Elmiger, City of Plymouth Planner

#### 2. CITIZEN COMMENTS: Re: Saxton's Proposed Parking:

Bill Lincoln, 606 Maple, was not in favor. He spoke about the Saxton's proposed parking lot and explained the number one planning goal listed in the Master plan is to preserve and enhance the strong and vibrant neighborhoods, and he felt this parking lot opposes that goal. Mr. Lincoln felt we all want Plymouth to survive but we need to come up with common strategies. He passed out a suggested layout for a solution and stated this layout would help keep Maple street, residential, preserve the historic buildings and provide parking for future parking endeavors and asked the board for any feedback.

Jason Findlan, 548 Harding, was not in favor of the zoning change, he would like 624 Maple and this neighborhood to remain zoned residential, this does not fit into the Master Plan and he passed out and read from some of his material related to this.

Ryan Shaw 686 Maple, owns the blue house that will be surrounded by the proposed parking lot. Mr. Shaw does not think this will be the best option for the City and was not aware of this proposed development until last month. He has put a a lot of time and money into his home and does not want his residential neighborhood changed into a parking lot. Mr. Shaw stated he will lose alot of money invested into his home because no one will want to purchase a home surrounded by parking lots. Mr. Shaw finds it puzzling that the DDA will force the three existing businesses out to supply parking. Mr. Shaw is not in favor of this development.

Joe Cislo, 589 Kellogg, is not in favor of this development and does not understand how this development can destroy the existing residential neighborhood.

Robert Whelan, 351 Maple, is not in favor of this development and wants to keep his neighborhood zoned residential.

Rick Garrett, 413 Maple, Fairground Park Assoc., is in support of his neighbors, and urged the board to keep the current residential zoning in their neighborhood.

Paulette Long 690 Forest, is in support of keeping the residential neighborhood. Ms. Long spoke about autonomous vehicles coming.

Ms. Long then switched subjects and spoke about Ordinance revisions and was not in favor of third floors being habitable and urged the board to think about the residents and and not allow the massive new homes.

Bill Lincoln, 606 Maple, understands Comm. Frisbie's opinion of expanding the parking stock but what will happen to our homes and property values, don't they matter also?

No Name given, stated people come to Plymouth for the historic building district and diversity of homes, and this proposed parking lot is clearly in a neighborhood. He suggested using another location that would be less of an infringement on the neighborhood.

Citizens comments closed at 7:44PM

Planning Commissioners Comments:

Comm. Philips, explained that the third floor being habitable was for a new house that per current Ordinance can allow the third floor, (the Ordinance change is not allowing homes to be increased in mass) and if the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor can be built, then it should also be allowed to be habitable or occupied.

Comm. Schewe felt that as soon as they start allowing the third story to become occupied, the architects will get creative and in Mr. Schewe's opinion, then houses will become larger.

Comm. King explained the reason the Saxton's property was rezoned years ago, was done so, to prevent a McDonald's from being allowed on that property, under that properties' zoning at the time, it would have been allowed.

Comm. Frey stated that the conditions have changed (related to the Saxton's property) since then and in Comm. Frey's opinion it would be more appropriate to maintain the residential use in that area, but this is an important consideration when we start to look at the Master Plan and Future Land Use.

Comm. Mulhern stated that this board spends a lot of time on residential zoning and will continue to do so. The Master Plan is a big job and is looked at and revised every few years, this board's sub-committee is currently doing so and should be completed within the next couple of months, any suggestions can be emailed to Comm. Mulhern or John Buzuvis.

Sally Elmiger, Planner, stated the Planning Commission will have the finished document located on the City's website to view and there will be a public hearing for input

Comm. Frisbie, explained he has been on the DDA board for the last seven years, parking has been a primary concern to the merchants and has been on the City Commissions objective (to expand the parking inventory) for seven years. Plymouth is vibrant right now, people come to see the activities, during festivities but we cannot accommodate them on a daily basis (we come short on parking for our residents and businesses) and those are the ones we must address first and as long as the City remains vibrant, in his opinion, property values will continue to go up. Comm. Frisbie now talking from a resident's standpoint, people want to live here and are willing to pay the higher price of homes for it. No one wants a parking structure in their neighborhood but Comm. Frisbie would rather see a well done parking structure than a massive developer come in or a McDonald's put there.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Comm. Frisbie supported by Comm. King, to approve the meeting minutes from the November 11, 2015, as amended.

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

A motion was made by Comm. Schewe supported by Comm. Silvers, to approve the agenda, as submitted.

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

5. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

None.

6. NEW BUSINESS:

1. SITE PLAN REVIEW FOR:

SP15-03      874 W. Ann Arbor Road  
Zoned: ARC- Ann Arbor Road Corridor  
Applicant: Jonna Properties

The applicant was not present.

A motion was made by Comm. Frisbie supported by Comm. Frey, to postpone SP 15-03, 874 W. Ann Arbor Road, until the applicant is present.

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

7. OLD BUSINESS:

1. Zoning Ordinance 78-21 Amendment Projections into Yards

2. Discussion of allowances for existing homes to install/expand front porches

Sally Elmiger-Carlisle Wortman, Planner, spoke about Zoning Ordinance 78-21 Amendment - Projections into Yards.

Ms. Elmiger is proposing revisions to some areas of the ordinance language as follows:

1. Deck, Porch, Terrace and Patio were changed to be consistently worded throughout.
2. The table was modified, based upon the previous discussion of different allowances for projections into yards.
3. A copy was provided of the amended "required and un-required" yard illustrations.
4. The word setback or required/un-required yard was looked at within the Ordinance, and it was found that one is not predominantly used more than the other, they are used interchangeably.

Planning Commissioners Comments:

Comm. Philips, suggested the following changes to the draft ordinances:

1. Deck-(within the chart), 10 feet of permitted encroachment from an accessory structure, taken from the Fire Code.
2. Dormers- removing the information under dormers, in the first column.
3. Under \*Areaway construction, pg.3- add "can" project.
4. A Deck and/or uncovered porch, 12-foot projection (into the rear yard setback) should be consistent, and averaging a three-foot max height (only if going into the rear-yard setback).
5. Eliminate – Require and un-required Yard, from the Ordinance changes.

Comm. Philips & Comm. King, and with help from ZBA Chair Devine, provided an addendum of proposed Ordinance changes and revisions and suggested the following:

1. Revise Ordinance on New Homes with detached garages – for new porches extending four feet into the required front yard setback and allows the square footage of the porch to be omitted from the lot coverage.
  - a. to allow the front porch width of six feet (that is located within the required front yard setback), not be included in the lot coverage.
  - b. Front Porch located within the required front yard setback- cannot be enclosed.
  - c. To allow an existing detached garage the same conditions that new homes with a detached garage will receive.
  - d. Corner lots with two front yards- may have two separate porches or one wrap-around porch.
2. Provide a New Ordinance on existing homes with new or existing rear detached garages-
  - a. The front covered porch may extend six feet into the required front yard setback (front yard averaging shall not be considered).
  - b. The front covered porch shall not exceed 80 percent of the width of the home's front elevation.
  - c. Square footage of the covered front porch (that is located within the required front yard setback), shall not be included in the lot coverage
  - d. Front covered porches (taking advantage of the square footage not being included in the lot coverage)-cannot be enclosed.
  - e. The front porch must meet all six criteria for new home porches.
3. Revise Ordinance to allow the occupancy of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor Area:
  - a. The 3<sup>rd</sup> floor would be less than 50 percent of the second floor area.
  - b. It would have a permanent stairway to the 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor area.
  - c. Dormers limited to 1/3 of the sloped roof area.
4. Provide a New Ordinance for side-by-side driveways:
  - a. To prohibit the positioning of driveways next to each other.
5. Revise Ordinance reducing the current ten foot separation between an accessory structure and the main dwelling requirement to an eight foot separation.
6. Provide a New Ordinance to allow Breezeways to connect from the principal structure to the detached accessory structure, if the following criteria is met:
  - a. The maximum breezeway width is six feet.
  - b. The breezeway shall have a minimum clearance of seven foot below the structure.
  - c. The breezeway height (to the top of the roof) would not exceed ten feet.
  - d. The breezeway will be completely open and supported by modest columns, (not walls) to the residence or garage.
  - e. If the breezeway grade matches the adjacent grade or driveway, walkway or patio grade, it shall not be included in the lot coverage.
  - f. The breezeway, if attached to a garage will not be considered attached, if the breezeway exceeds eight feet between garage and home.

7. Provide a New Ordinance to allow Porte Cocheres to connect to principal structures and not be included in the lot coverage, if the following conditions are met:
  - a. There is a minimum clearance of eight feet clear below the structure.
  - b. The maximum overall height of the top of the roof shall not exceed eleven feet.
  - c. The structure is completely open and shall be supported by modest columns, (not by walls) or by the primary structure.
  - d. The area of the structure is included in lot coverage and together with all other structures does not exceed the maximum lot coverage.
  - e. The structure is a minimum of two feet clear from the side yard setback. This is to allow construction, maintenance and repair of the structure.
  - f. The structure cannot be used as a porch and no railings will be allowed on top.

Planning Commissioners Comments:

Comm. Schewe was not in favor of changing the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor to be occupied, due to wanting to reduce the big foot homes. Comm. Schewe felt that Porte Cocheres should be included in the lot coverage.

Comm. Frisbie, would like the Ordinance to remain with the separation of ten foot between home and accessory structures.

Comm. Silvers, felt that reducing the separation to eight feet would help with encouraging the detached garages located in the rear yard.

A motion was made by Comm. Frisbie, supported by Comm. Philips, for future draft by Sally Elmiger, to include items 1, 2, 4, and 7 and table 3, 5 & 6 for further discussion.

-Comm. Philips added an addendum to 7(b) stating the maximum height is ten feet.

-Comm. Schewe added an addendum to 4. (b) Adding a one foot landscape strip requirement, along the property line when adjacent to another driveway.

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

3. Ann Arbor Road Corridor- Draft Façade Ordinance  
Discussion/Review

Sally Elmiger-Carlisle Wortman, Planner, spoke about having made suggestions of language modifications to accomplish flexibility and direction and suggested revisions- on the purpose of the section, building orientation, and materials.

Comm. Frisbie asked about the potential façade Ordinance being limited to the Ann Arbor Road Corridor. Ms. Elmiger and John Buzuvis answered that our copy will be modified to the AARC only, removing the residential portion.

Comm. Kehoe, spoke about buildings with different uses can have different building materials and was concerned about the next occupant of the building not being of the same use. Mr. Buzuvis answered that if another use comes in, it would go before this board for a "Change of Use Review". Comm. Frey agreed that the Ann Arbor Road Corridor does not have all the same uses as all of Plymouth Township and this area of the Ordinance should be modified.

There was discussion regarding the comparison of building design vs. our Cities design and guidelines and also having mirrored landscaping.

Sally Elmiger suggested a possible joint sub-committee meeting discussion between the City and Township.

Comm. Philips suggested the Township create a Design Overlay designated for their area only.

Mr. Buzuvis to return to Plymouth Township with the following comments:

1. A design overlay for the Township areas only
2. Suggest to Plymouth Township the areas of concern, and suggested to achieve this by not amending the AARC Ordinance.

8. Reports and Correspondence:

1. Master Plan Update:

Sally Elmiger, Planner, will return in January with a proposal from Carlisle/Wortman of the scope of work for a plan of action.

Comm. King spoke about the three main entranceways into Plymouth and would like more trees planted in these areas. Comm. King was concerned about the sidewalk corners with the bumps, and asked if they could be smoothed out. Comm. Schewe explained that the sidewalks are sloped for ADA compliance

9. Commissioner Comments:

Chair Mulhern thanked Comm. King for his many years of service with the Planning Commission, the Planning Commissioners will miss his kind and thoughtful demeanor.

10. MOTION TO ADJOURN

**A motion was made by Comm. Frisbie and supported by Comm. Frey to adjourn.**

Meeting adjourned at 9:29 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Marleta S. Barr,  
Community Development Department,  
Office Manager



CARLISLE

WORTMAN  
associates, inc.

605 S. Main Street, Ste. 1  
Ann Arbor, MI 48104

(734) 662-2200  
(734) 662-1935 Fax

**MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** City of Plymouth Planning Commission

**FROM:** Don Wortman  
Sally M. Elmiger

**DATE:** January 6, 2016

**RE:** Projections into Yards

As discussed at the December, 2015 Planning Commission meeting, we have revised the proposed ordinance language regarding projections into yards. The changes include allowing porches and decks to project into a rear setback by up to 12 feet, and modifying the term "required yard" to the term "setback." We've attached a clean copy of the text with the most recent changes.

We look forward to discussing this with you further.

---

CARLISLE/WORTMAN ASSOC., INC.  
R. Donald Wortman, RLA, PCP, AICP  
Vice-President

CARLISLE/WORTMAN ASSOC., INC.  
Sally M. Elmiger, AICP, LEED AP  
Senior Associate

cc: John Buzuvis

## CITY OF PLYMOUTH

## ORDINANCE NO. 2015-02 \_\_\_\_\_

**AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 78, THE CITY OF PLYMOUTH ZONING ORDINANCE IN THE CODE OF ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF PLYMOUTH FOR THE PURPOSE OF REGULATING PROJECTIONS IN SETBACKS.****Section 1     Modify Section 78-21****Section 78-21. - Definitions.**

*Architectural feature* means belt courses, sills, lintels, and similar ornaments used to exclusively provide a decorative function and not increase living space within the building.

*Balcony* means an exterior cantilevered platform located above the ground that projects from the façade of a building and is surrounded by a railing, balustrade, or parapet.

*Deck* means an uncovered floor or platform structure primarily used for outdoor residential living activities, the height of which is six inches or more above the average grade, and constructed on an elevated foundation which may include joists, beams or posts

*Lot coverage* means the part or percent of the lot occupied by buildings including accessory buildings and including but not limited to covered porches (enclosed or unenclosed), decks, terraces, pools, outdoor enclosures and similar structures. Lot coverage is measured from exterior wall to exterior wall, including all structural projections containing floor area.

*Outdoor enclosure* means a permanent covered structure used for outdoor activities, such as a gazebo, porch, or screened enclosure.

*Patio* means a hard-surfaced, floor-type area used for outdoor residential living activities, the height of which is less than six inches above the average grade and constructed directly on the surface of the ground.

*Porch* means a covered or uncovered floor or platform structure primarily used to allow entry to a building, the height of which is six inches or more above the average grade.

*Terrace* means a hard surfaced, floor-type area used for outdoor residential living activities, the height of which is six inches or more above the average grade, and constructed directly on the surface of the ground with an earth embankment or a retaining wall.

*Yard* means the open spaces on the same lot with a main building unoccupied and unobstructed from the ground upward except as otherwise provided in this chapter, and as follows:

- (1) *Front yard* means an open space extending the full width of the lot, the depth of which is the minimum horizontal distance between the front lot line and the nearest point of the main building.

- (2) *Rear yard* means an open space extending the full width of the lot, the depth of which is the minimum horizontal distance between the rear lot line and the nearest point of the main building. In the case of a corner lot, the rear yard may be opposite either street frontage.
- (3) *Side yard* means an open space between a main building and the side lot line, extending from the front yard to the rear yard, the width of which is the horizontal distance from the nearest point on the side lot line to the nearest point of the main building.

**Section 2     Modify Section 78-217**

**Section 78-217. - Projections into Setbacks.**

Projections into setbacks shall be permitted as follows:

Projection...	...Into Front Yard Setback	...Into Side Yard Setback	...Into Rear Yard Setback
<b>At or Below Grade:</b>			
Egress window/areaway recess*	Not permitted	3 feet from face of structure (interior dimension)	3 feet from face of structure (interior dimension)
Stairs from basement	Not permitted	Not permitted	4 feet (interior dimension)
Patios	4 feet, but no closer than 10 feet from the front property line	Not permitted	10 feet from property line
<b>Above Grade but Below Roof:</b>			
Architectural features, as defined	4 inches	4 inches	4 inches
Awning/canopy	3 feet	Not permitted	3 feet
Balcony	4 feet	Not permitted	4 feet
Bay window (limited to 8 feet in width; maximum 2 per side)	2 feet	Not permitted	2 feet
Cantilevered floor area (Box Out)	2 feet	Not permitted	2 feet
Cellar door	Not permitted	Not permitted	8 feet
Chimney (limited to 8 feet in width)	1 foot	Not permitted	1 foot
Mechanical equipment (i.e. air conditioning condensers, generators)	Not permitted	Not permitted	4 feet
Deck**	Not permitted	Not permitted	12 feet, but limited to three feet high
Porch, uncovered	6 feet	Not permitted	12 feet, but limited to three feet high
<b>Roof Area:</b>			
Cornices, eaves, overhangs, brackets, soffits (excluding gutters)	2 feet	2 feet	2 feet
Dormers	Not permitted	Not permitted	Not permitted

\*Areaway construction can project above grade no more than 12 inches.

\*\*The portion of a deck which occupies the rear yard setback shall not be converted into any enclosed habitable spaces.

- (1) Projections containing floor area, including decks, shall be included in the lot coverage calculation. See Sections 78-43 and 78-53 for the front porch exclusion from lot coverage.

**Section 3 Rights and Duties**

Rights and Duties which have matured, penalties which have incurred, proceedings which have begun and prosecution for violations of law occurring before the effective date of this ordinance are not affected or abated by this ordinance.

**Section 4 Validity**

Should any section, clause or paragraph of this ordinance be declared by a Court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, the same will not affect the validity of the ordinance as a whole or part therefore, other than the part declared invalid.

**Section 5 Ordinances Repealed**

All other ordinances inconsistent with the provisions of this ordinance are to the extent of such inconsistencies hereby repealed.

**Section 6 Effective Date**

This ordinance shall become effective one day after publication.

Introduced      x-xx-2016  
Enacted:        (Date)  
Published:      (Date)  
Effective:       (Date)



CARLISLE

WORTMAN  
associates, inc.

605 S. Main Street, Ste. 1  
Ann Arbor, MI 48104

(734) 662-2200  
(734) 662-1935 Fax

**MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** City of Plymouth Planning Commission

**FROM:** Don Wortman  
Sally M. Elmiger

**DATE:** January 11, 2016

**RE:** Master Plan Proposal

As requested, we have prepared a work plan to assist the Master Plan Committee in updating the Master Plan document. This approach follows the approach suggested in our memo dated November 11, 2015, which listed the plan elements that, in our opinion, should be considered during the update process.

This proposal suggests that CWA and the Master Plan Committee meet one hour before regularly-scheduled Planning Commission meetings to discuss each topic and potential revisions.

Note that this approach assumes that the Planning Commission/Master Plan Committee is satisfied with the existing layout and organization of the current Master Plan draft. If not, this can also be a topic of conversation.

We look forward to discussing these ideas at the upcoming meeting.

CARLISLE/WORTMAN ASSOC., INC.  
R. Donald Wortman, RLA, PCP, AICP  
Vice-President

CARLISLE/WORTMAN ASSOC., INC.  
Sally M. Elmiger, AICP, LEED AP  
Senior Associate

cc: John Buzuvis  
Marleta Barr

# Master Plan Update

City of Plymouth

January 11, 2016

Task	Week of:
1. Review and revise the Background Studies chapter, as needed.	February 8
2. Work with Master Plan Subcommittee before regularly-scheduled meeting to review city-wide planning goals and guiding principles. Research and prepare revisions as needed.	February 8
3. Work with Master Plan Subcommittee before regularly-scheduled meeting to review intent of future land use categories. This would include research/discussion of multi-family density options near downtown and along Ann Arbor Road corridor. It would also include research/discussion of a second single-family residential district and any necessary changes to the Future Land Use map. Research and prepare revisions as needed.	March 7
4. Work with Master Plan Subcommittee before regularly-scheduled meeting to review transitional properties (per attached listing and map).	April 11
5. Prepare Area Plans for the following transitional areas: Central Middle School property, Saxton's property, Wilcox property, and/or Bathy/Amelia street area.	May 9
6. Research and provide descriptions of desirable form-based zoning techniques.	June 6
7. Review Complete Streets chapter developed by Committee and provide recommendations for conceptual approaches to various pedestrian/bicycle issues.	July 11
8. Prepare Zoning Plan, as required by the Planning Enabling Act.	July 11