



CITY OF PLYMOUTH
201 S. Main
Plymouth, MI 48170
www.ci.plymouth.mi.us
PLANNING COMMISSION - REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, May 11, 2016

The regular meeting was called to order at 7:05 P.M. by Chairperson Mulhern.

1. ROLL CALL

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jennifer Frey, Jim Frisbie, Jennifer Kehoe, Charles Myslinski, Joseph Philips, Scott Silvers, and Jim Mulhern

MEMBERS ABSENT: Conrad Schewe and Karen Sisolak

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

2. CITIZEN COMMENTS:

Adam Szymczak, 333 Sunset, was in favor of the goals for walkability but would like some leniency in variances for the new Ordinances taking place and for some who may be in the middle of plans that may need to be changed to abide by these new Ordinances. Mr. Szymczak asked for clarification of limitation of widths of porches in new construction verses existing homes, and the Commissioners decided to address this question during the Public Hearing portion on Ordinance amendments.

Paulette Longe, 690 Forest, spoke about larger homes built on small parcels. Ms. Longe would like to maintain the diversity within the City, but by also keeping in mind what size of home fits on a certain sized property.

Ed Krol, 1108 Beech, asked what the definition of height for a home is. Comm. Philips explained the height of a home is 25 feet, and is measured by the average of the eave to the ridge and this Ordinance has been in place for over thirty years.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Comm. Frisbie supported by Comm. Myslinski, to approve the meeting minutes from the April 13, 2016, as presented.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

A motion was made by Comm. Frisbie supported by Comm. Philips, to approved the agenda adding Residential Vision onto Number 8. Report and Correspondence.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

5. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

PUBLIC HEARING FOR ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENTS OF:

1. 78-21-Definitions,
2. 78-43, Single Family Dwelling Unit Standards
3. 78-53, Single Family Dwelling Unit Standards
4. 78-191- Notes to Schedule,
5. 78-217 - Projections into Setbacks
6. 78-273 - Residential Driveways

78-21-Definitions

Sally Elmiger, Planner, explained to the audience that the Code of Ordinances is located on the City's Website and can be used to look up any definition. Ms Elmiger explained the changes made to the Definitions portion of the ordinance, per her Memo dated, May 4th.

Comm. Philips wanted to clarify Mr. Szymczak's question regarding the width of porches in new construction verses existing homes. This proposed Ordinance is for existing single-family dwellings when constructing a new garage in the rear yard or have an existing garage in the rear to give them some relief on the construction of a front covered porch as an incentive to support walkability throughout the City. Comm. Philips explained the incentive Ordinance for new residential porches was created and then it was decided to extend some relief to the existing homes as well, but so that there were no unintended consequences, it was decided the widths of existing home porches would be allowed to have an 80 % coverage (width) across the front of the home and to encroach six feet into the required front yard setback without being calculated into the lot coverage.

Ms. Elmiger explained that the Planning Commission will make a recommendation to the City Commission to adopt these Ordinances.

Chairperson Mulhern Opened the Public Hearing at 7:26 PM

Adam Szymczak, 333 Sunset, asked about various percentages for encroachments. Comm. Philips answered that he felt unintended consequences could possibly arise and the Zoning Board of Appeals could determine if it was a reasonable request of the applicant. Mr. Szmczak also asked if the 80 % width would include just the floor area or all architectural elements including roof overhang. Ms Elmiger responded that it does not include the overhang just the main body of the porch.

Ed Krol, 1108 Beech, felt the smaller lot homes would be penalized and he would like the 80% dropped from the limitations and 100% put in instead, and this would also minimize the ZBA requests

Matt Thurber, 641 S. Harvey, spoke about his approved ZBA variance and was in agreement with the 100% for full width residential front porches. Mr. Thurber also spoke about the homeowner's having new additions on homes wanting large front porches.

There was discussion on existing homes regarding the 80% limitations of covered porches verses the 100% to promote the porches and walkability. Ms. Elmiger stressed that equity is important. Comm. Silvers explained the need of having a hardship when applying to the ZBA for variances.

Ms. Elmiger suggested modifying the Ordinance- For new home and existing home porches going into the required front yard setback, but exempting only the four foot of lot coverage for both.

78-43, Single Family Dwelling Unit Standards

78-53, Single Family Dwelling Unit Standards

Ms. Elmiger explained the changes made to two zoning districts R-1 and RT-1 standards. There was discussion on including photos or providing examples for Port Cocheres.

78-191- Notes to Schedule

78-217 - Projections into Setbacks

78-273- Residential Driveways

Ms. Elmiger explained the changes made to the Notes to Schedule, Projections into Setbacks and Residential Driveways portions of the Ordinance.

There was discussion on the 90 % averaging Ordinance on front yards. Front Yard averaging can be done in residential, RT-1, Office and Mixed Use zoning districts. The 90% front yard averaging Ordinance has a minimum averaged front yard setback for the incentive porch that shall not be less than 15 feet.

Chairperson Mulhern Closed the Public Hearing at 8:20 PM

A motion was made by Comm. Frisbie, supported by Comm. Frey to recommend to the City Commission for adoption:

1. Section 78-21-Definitions,
2. 78-43- Single Family Dwelling Unit Standards
3. 78-53- Single Family Dwelling Unit Standards
4. 78-191- Notes to Schedule,
5. 78-217- Projections into Setbacks
6. 78-273- Residential Driveways

with the discussed revision changes.

YES FREY, FRISBIE, KEHOE, MYSLINSKI, SILVERS AND MULHERN.

NO PHILIPS

MOTION PASSES.

6. NEW BUSINESS:

1. SITE PLAN REVIEW FOR:

SP16-03 Cross Fit Forgiven
770 Davis
Zoned: B-1, Local Business
Applicant: Brent Gostomski

Sally Elmiger, Planner, explained the applicant proposes a change of use from an auto body shop to an exercise business that requires additional off-street parking to operate this business in an existing building. This business offers members workout classes for up to 20 participants several times a day. The members will use the facility for specified classes, and do not drop in to use exercise equipment on their own. This use is similar to both a private club and service establishment, as the business is members-only and staff provides fitness services and instruction to members. All activities will be conducted within an enclosed building. The applicant also has permission from Station 885 to use their parking lot as needed for overflow parking.

The applicant will need to address the following:

1. Number of employees at largest shift.
2. Written information indicating that excess spaces are not required for adjacent property owner's use.
3. Eliminate three (3) proposed parking spaces that about the rear of the building.
4. Description of how refuse will be handled.

Brent Gostomski, Applicant, presented an enlarged site survey and explained how the membership operates. Mr. Gostomski expects small indoor classes at the exercise business that was previously located at Five Mile and Haggerty Roads, and expects

The Planning Commissioners had discussion regarding the following subjects:

Comm. Phillips suggested another parking layout that would add an additional parking space. Comm. Myslinski, described the seven parking spaces along Davis Ave that appear to be located across the sidewalk and public right-of-way and the applicant may need some of the additional parking spaces located at Station 885. Mr. Gostomski explained those parking spaces (out front) would be used for temporary parking for customers stopping in to see the new business, the members would use the onsite parking spaces. Comm. Myslinski asked what the fenced in area will be used for and Mr. Gostomski responded the fenced in area would be used for equipment storage to be brought into the building when needed.

Comm. Kehoe asked about the outside being used during the early morning hours and Mr. Gostomski explained the classes will be indoors but some members may go outside to run or jump rope to warm up for the classes, which are quiet activities, the first class will start at 6:30AM and the last class ends at 8:30PM.

Comm. Frisbie asked about the parking spots and Ms. Elmiger explained there are a total of 27 parking spaces located on site (including the 3 parking spaces located out front) & also permission for additional parking spaces located at Station 885. Comm. Frisbie would like a binding legal agreement provided with Station 885.

Comm. Frey was concerned about continuing the use of the non-conforming parking spaces, in the front and would prefer the front parking spots eliminated and reverted back to a sidewalk. Comm. Frey asked about the fence & gate area and Mr. Gostomski responded that he does not need the use of the shed, fence or gate and he would not mind if they come down.

Comm. Myslinski would like the right-of-way restored and the Station 885 legal document for the three parking spaces provided.

There was discussion regarding converting the shed and shaded area (#10), on the site plan, to more parking spaces.

A motion was made by Comm. Frisbie, supported by Comm. Myslinski to approve SP16-03, 770 Davis, Site Plan, conditioned upon all 27 parking spots to be located on site, reverting the front parking spaces back to a public sidewalk & removing the fencing and gate.

**YES FREY, FRISBIE, KEHOE, MYSLINSKI, PHILIPS, SILVERS AND MULHERN.
NO NONE.**

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

7. OLD BUSINESS:

1. Potential Ordinance Amendment - Double fences on property lines

Sally Elmiger, Planner, explained the proposed changes made to the fence Ordinance:

1. The definitions of decorative fence and solid fence were added.
2. Solid fences-that do not allow airflow, are not allowed.
3. Double fencing shall be prohibited.
4. Only one fence on the property line is allowed and must be agreed upon by both parties.

There was discussion on privacy and solid fences whether to have a description/type of fence or a dimension/percentage of airflow, some Commissioners were ok with allowing the double fences if put three feet off the property line with a gate and some did not want double fencing allowed.

Ms. Elmiger passed out some example diagrams and asked the Commissioners to decide on the fence diagrams for next month's meeting.

A motion was made by Comm. Philips, supported by Comm. Myslinski to approve the Fence Ordinance with the following changes.

1. **To include the fence diagrams provided.**
2. **No double fencing will be allowed.**
3. **To remove and replace an existing fence, it must be agreed upon by both parties.**
4. **No restrictions on the type of fencing.**

Voice Vote: THREE COMMISSIONERS VOTED YES.

THREE COMMISSIONERS VOTED NO.

MOTION FAILS.

2. Potential Ordinance Amendment - Finished grade must match the original grade
3. Schedule forthcoming meeting for required review of lighting ordinances.
4. Roof pitch review & discussion

It was decided to table the discussion until next month's meeting.

The Planning Commissioners Training session was set for: Wednesday, June 29th at 6:00PM.

8. Reports and Correspondence:

Master Plan Review Update

Comm. Kehoe spoke about the last sub-committee meeting, Carlisle/Wortman had submitted a proposed work plan and cost estimate for the Master Plan update, to be reviewed as it progresses by the Mayor & Chair Committee, the final document will be a searchable web based document.

John Buzuvis explained this will be on the next City Commission agenda for their approval of the budgeted amount plus an approximate 10 percent more for contingencies.

Residential Vision

Chair Mulhern spoke about a desirable residential neighborhood in the City of Plymouth.

Master Plan Vision for Residential:

Homes in the City of Plymouth shall contribute to the character and desirability of the City. They shall maintain the walkable character of the neighborhoods, with appropriate heights relative to the street, and appropriate distance from sidewalks. They shall be built size-appropriate to their lots, allowing adequate space and sunlight to neighboring homes. They shall maximize green space and trees, and minimize concrete surfaces to allow for both the continued forestation of Plymouth, and allow for the City Storm Water Management goals.

A motion was made by Comm. Philips, supported by Comm. Frisbie to endorse the draft as a guiding principle towards the Master Plan Vision for Residential preamble.

YES FREY, FRISBIE, KEHOE, MYSLINSKI, PHILIPS, SILVERS AND MULHERN.

NO NONE.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

9. Commissioner Comments:

Comm. Frey would like lot coverage added to the Zoning Ordinance discussions.

There was discussion on various city properties with new construction and their allowed lot coverage. The Commissioners discussed possibly changing the lot coverage percentage or possibly using a floor area ratio as a tool to curtail any loop holes.

10. MOTION TO ADJOURN

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

Meeting adjourned at 10:21 PM.

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