



## CITY OF PLYMOUTH

201 S. Main

Plymouth, MI 48170

www.ci.plymouth.mi.us

### PLANNING COMMISSION - REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, September 14, 2016

---

The regular meeting was called to order at 7:00 P.M. by Vice Chairperson Frey.

#### 1. ROLL CALL

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jim Frisbie, Jennifer Kehoe; left @ 9:13p.m., Charles Myslinski, Joseph Philips, Schewe, Karen Sisolak and Jennifer Frey

MEMBERS ABSENT: Scott Silvers and Jim Mulhern

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

#### 2. CITIZEN COMMENTS:

Ed Krol, 1108 Beech spoke about Section 78-190 within the Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Krol asked about the section referring to the 7200 sq foot required lot minimum and Mr. Buzuvis, Community Development Director (CDD) explained that this portion was for newly created lots and has a footnote stating that.

Dave Rucinski, 1392 Maple, asked about the changes proposed for Kellogg Park and if the Planning Commission would be involved in these changes. Comm. Frey stated a meeting was held back in February or March and Mr. Buzuvis also explained the designs are being finalized and a meeting with the chair and vice chairs of each board will attend before the info goes forward to the Historic District for their approval and then an informational presentation will be shown to the Planning Commission, but no approvals will be needed from the Planning Commissioners.

Joe Valenti, 1350 Woodland Place, asked if the tree canopy discussion was on last month's Agenda and Mr. Buzuvis, CDD, responded it was tabled due to the meeting running late and explained that the Ordinance is currently being drafted internally by City Staff. Mr. Valenti spoke about possibly establishing a moratorium on the removal of trees, until the new tree canopy Ordinance is in place. Comm. Frey explained that moratoriums or policies would come from the City Commissioners and would not impact trees located on private property. Comm. Frey also stated the PC is supportive of tree planting replacements but needed regulations to require the replacement and maintenance of street trees. Mr. Buzuvis added that the new Ordinance will be focused on tying into the storm water management mitigation aspect for health, safety and welfare. Comm. Myslinski spoke about new residential development not being allowed to remove established street trees. Mr. Buzuvis explained if trees (that are located in the public right of way) need to be taken down the Department of Municipal Services (DMS) handles it, and are picky on which trees come down. Comm. Frisbie explained that currently there are no regulations for street trees.

Lee Jasinski, 1380 Maple, spoke about Northville's successful tree Ordinance and would like the City of Plymouth to also have one.

Marie Everitt, 1240 Fairground, asked about last month's meeting minutes and Comm. Frey explained that they were done based upon notes taken and that meeting minutes were a snap shot and not verbatim of what was said during the meeting.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Comm. Myslinski supported by Comm. Frisbie, to approve the meeting minutes from the August 24, 2016, as presented.

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

A motion was made by Comm. Myslinski supported by Comm. Philips, to add the discussion of tree canopy onto Old Business, Number 2, and if the meeting exceeds 9:00pm, Comm. Philips will Chair the remainder of the meeting, as amended.

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

5. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

None.

6. NEW BUSINESS:

None.

7. OLD BUSINESS:

1. REVISED SITE PLAN REVIEW

SP16-04      O'Reilly Auto Parts  
                  874 W. Ann Arbor Road  
                  Zoned: ARC- Ann Arbor Road Corridor  
                  Applicant: Remy Jonna

Sally Elmiger, Planner, explained the applicant is proposing to remove (three sections) approximately 6,900 square feet of the existing 13,900 square-foot building, leaving one commercial unit equaling 6,864 square feet. The property has two existing vehicular access points from Ann Arbor Road, which will be retained and in addition, the Rite Aid Pharmacy (to the east) has an access easement on the subject site that accommodates the pharmacy's drive-through lane.

Ms. Elmiger stated with the information provided, the proposed retail use is a permitted use in the Ann Arbor Road Corridor (ARC) District. The most significant comment in her review was the inconsistency of the "corporate design" of the front façade with the Ann Arbor Road Corridor standards. Ms. Elmiger recommended that any approval granted by the Planning Commission should be conditioned upon changes to the façade design and materials that better reflect the Ann Arbor Corridor building design standards. Ms. Elmiger explained the outstanding items that will need to be addressed, these items include:

- A. 1. Obtain MDOT permission to locate screening trees in the Ann Arbor Road right-of-way.
- 2. Confirm irrigation is proposed in landscaped area in MDOT right-of-way.
- B. 1. Lower mounting height of proposed parking lot fixtures to 20 feet on the site plan.
- 2. Minimize light levels shown on the photometric plan along property boundaries to one (1) foot candle or less.
- 3. Additional information regarding ability to shield proposed light fixtures.
- 4. Information provided about decorative wrought-iron light fixtures proposed by applicant.
- C. Ensure consistency of dumpster screen materials with AARC standards.
- D. Provide sign information.
- E. Modify proposed front facade design and materials to meet the Ann Arbor Road District requirements.

Leo Gonzalez, CRS Commercial, made a presentation and explained the north, west and east side of the building will be painted, and three new windows will be added to the west side of the building. Mr. Gonzalez understands that anything located on the AARC will need to have **a brick front façade** and stated the entire front will be brick. Mr. Gonzalez explained the only portion of the existing building that will remain is the portion with the barrel roof, the rest will be removed, the lights in the parking lot will be shielded and lowered to twenty feet and two wrought iron lighting fixtures will be added onto the side of the columns.

Laith Jonna, developer, explained the changes and renovations planned. Mr. Jonna explained the panel brick will match the brick color of the Rite Aide building, installed over the block **walls of the front façade** and an "EIFS" product will fasten to the block wall and be of a limestone color for the crown molding columns. Mr. Jonna stated that limestone sills will be added under the new three west windows and will use the same transition from EIFS to the brick.

The Planning Commissioners had discussion regarding the following subjects:

Comm. Myslinski **asked about the façade and limestone columns** and asked for the brick detail to go from ground to soffit above the barrel roof line on the east and west sides.

Comm. Frey asked about the ground level application of EIFS and it was suggested to use block or a base at the bottom. Comm. Frey asked about the barrel roof and Mr. Gonzalez answered it would be black in color. Comm. Frey would like to see a color package for the building.

Comm. Phillips suggested adding to the base a mesh to make it more durable, due to the EIFS product possibly getting damaged near the base and Mr. Gonzalez stated he will put brick along the bottom base three feet up.

Comm. Frisbie asked about the west elevation, and Mr. Gonzalez explained the cinder block will be stripped down, then tuck-pointed flush and all three sides painted.

Sally Elmiger suggested assigning a sub-committee to administratively review any new revisions made.

Comm. Frey asked about the screening of the Mechanical equipment and Mr. Jonna responded they planned to build a painted block corral with wooden gates on the NW corner of the building, similar to a dumpster corral and Comm. Frey requested that it be included on the site plan. Comm. Frey stated that if MDOT does not allow any trees within their right-of-way she would like them all moved to the other side within the greenbelt area, and if MDOT approves the trees, move one of the oak trees out due to overcrowding, so they will thrive.

Comm. Frey would like a natural barrier of street trees or a boxwood hedge row planted instead of all the bumper blocks along the east & south edge of the bio-swale, and perhaps consulting a landscape architect.

Comm. Frisbie asked about the signage and Ms. Elmiger stated that the signage would be reviewed during the permit process by the City building inspector. Comm. Frisbie also asked about the type of materials for the dumpster surround and Ms. Elmiger answered that it would be a concrete wall with a brick looking design.

Comm. Philips suggested that the light located between the vertical columns above the front door be more decorative than the parking lights and all lighting should be shielded and directed towards the site, away from adjacent properties.

Mr. Gonzalez suggested as an alternative to the parking blocks, constructing a curb with an occasional gap (not interfere with the water flow) and Comm. Frey suggested a type of fence detail if Wayne County does not allow any hedges or landscaping along the bio-swale area.

**A motion was made by Comm. Philips, supported by Comm. Myslinski to approve SP16-04, 874 W. Ann Arbor Road, Site Plan, with the following conditions to be administratively reviewed by Comm. Myslinski, John Buzuvis & Comm. Frey:**

- 1. Provide the Paint Color**
- 2. Property line demarcation with landscaping**
- 3. Provide the type of Light Sconces**
- 4. Light source, not visible**
- 5. No EIFS within three inches of the grade.**
- 6. Provide the Brick, Stone, Paint color package for the building**
- 7. Mechanical screening shown on plans w/concrete brick pattern**
- 8. Place the trees in right-of-way unless Wayne Co. states, otherwise, as discussed.**

**YES FRISBIE, KEHOE, MYSLINSKI, PHILIPS, SISOLAK AND FREY**

**NO NONE.**

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

## 2. Tree Canopy Discussion

Sally Elmiger, Planner, explained she maintains and/or administers the tree Ordinance in the City of Northville and it does cover every tree in the City, public or private property. If someone wants to remove a public tree or private they need to apply for a permit, this tree gets an inspection for the diameter at breast height (dbh) along with the condition of the tree, on private property a permit is needed only if it is a landmarked tree. The landmark is determined by the species with an appropriate size, greater than 18 inches dbh. Otherwise the landowner can take down the tree even if it is in great shape, however if in great shape, they do have to replant (mitigate) on site based upon the size. If they cannot replant onsite they will have to make a contribution to the Cities- Natural Environment Fund. If it is a dangerous tree the City will work with them. When a builder/developer takes down trees he is required to mitigate every tree that is six inches or greater and if the tree(s) absolutely cannot be replanted, then up to six bushes may be able to take it's place. Ms. Elmiger explained this Ordinance can be administratively very burdensome.

There was discussion on trees, street trees replacement, the mitigation process and having a tree survey done City wide.

John Buzuvis, CDD, explained that the tree ordinance is currently being drafted internally.

Public Comments:

Marie Everitt, 1240 Fairground, commented that she would like an incentive program put in place for citizens that are concerned their sidewalks may lift from street trees. This program would be similar to the placement of street trees, with also being able to put grates around the base of the trees, in place of the sidewalks. Ms. Everitt felt the grates would help to prevent the sidewalks from lifting and could be ordered through the City. Ms. Everitt suggested the City ordering them in bulk, due to the expensive cost of the grates.

Ed Krol, 1108 Beech, was in favor of the tree ordinance changes proposed tonight, he would like the ordinance changes fast forwarded into changes made. Mr. Krol stated that we are in an established City where the trees are part of the established environment; trees are part of the street canopy and shade the homes from the summer heat.

Lee Jasinski, 1380 Maple, thanked the board for their diligence with the tree ordinance and if additional help is needed with the enforcement Mr. Jasinski suggested his or citizens assistance, if needed.

Ricardo Long, 751 Sunset, commented he would like to also thank the board for all their efforts with the new tree Ordinance.

3. Potential Residential Ordinance Amendment Discussion:

Continuation of Lot Envelope Discussion

Comm. Myslinski, summarized his points from last month's meeting and explained the lot width analysis was color coded to determine the actual percentage of lots that were 45, 50, and 60 feet within the City. Due to the current ordinance only allowing front facing garages on a sixty foot lot, and also to show how many times it would impact lot coverage & rear yard setback issues vs. the buildable envelope.

The current Ordinance is based upon a flat percentage of lot size with little regard to any lot also having a building envelope, so if a lot is less than 60 feet it only allows a rear garage which increases one side setback line to 9 nine feet to accompany the driveway with the other side being six feet. (This would decrease the buildable lot size on a 50 or 45 foot lot by 16 feet). Also the current Ordinance allows a 25-foot front yard setback with a 35-foot rear yard setback, and are both subtracted from the lot depth, which creates the building envelope.

When doing the math on the percentage of lot coverage vs. the building envelope, Comm. Myslinski was surprised to find, for an example: on a 50 by 120 foot lot: The 25% lot coverage is 1500 square feet, 30% lot coverage is 1800 square feet, and 35 % lot coverage is 2100 square feet, then when calculating the building envelope with the setbacks it would be 2,040 square feet. With the building envelope and percentage of lot coverage being so close, Comm. Myslinski felt that this may not be the right path to continue down.

Comm. Myslinski then realized that it was not the percent coverage but the massing that seemed to be the problem. Comm. Myslinski explained that if a resident wanted to build on a 50 x 120 foot lot with 35% lot coverage and using a ranch home that was 2100 square feet, it would be welcomed by the Community, but by adding the second floor with the higher roof, it doubles this square footage to 4200 square feet.

Comm. Myslinski explained to reduce the mass, there is another equally easy math equation to bring the massing into scale and suggested possibly using a 1.5 multiplier. For example, using the 35% lot coverage for a single story construction the home will be 2100 sq foot, but for any construction beyond the single story, use the 1.5 % which would become a 3150 square foot home, thereby reducing what could be a 4200 square foot home.

Ms. Elmiger explained that the lot coverage is what actually goes on the ground and can not be compared to the volume calculation. The home will remain with 35% lot coverage, but with a reduction of the second floor. Ms. Elmiger explained similarly how the floor/area ratio works where by adding up all square footage of each floor divided by the square footage of the property or this could also be determined by using the floor/area ratio calculations of the surrounding homes within 300 feet; which brings in the existing character of the neighborhood.

There was discussion regarding using the 1.5 multiplier to control the size of the home, this change will still have larger homes within the City but they would be built on larger lots.

Comm. Myslinski also suggested, if the property owner builds a new home with a detached garage that the 35% lot coverage would be allowed for just the home, but with the condition of using the 1.5 times multiplier, as an incentive. This would increase green space, air movement, sight lines from adjacent properties, etc.

There was discussion and some board members would like to see some results on designs of what the lots would ultimately look like along with the resulting math calculations with varying multipliers such as 1.4 and 1.6 also with and without the inclusion of garages, to see visually if this would be something the board would want.

There was also discussion regarding the builder and/or owner who wants the full two story colonial will be the ones not happy with this change. Possible loopholes were also discussed.

There was discussion on using a sliding scale with a larger lot the square footage for the home would diminish with new home construction. Ms. Elmiger stated that many communities have a sliding scale for two sets of codes (remodeling vs. new homes and/or lot coverage vs. multipliers on different sized lots) for use with an existing community. It was suggested to use one number and not a sliding scale.

**Vice Chair Frey left the meeting and Comm. Philips took over as Chair for the remainder of the meeting.**

Public Comments:

Marie Everitt, 1240 Fairground, felt the neighbors will not be respectful and Ms. Everitt was in favor of the changes but spoke of a loophole where homes are being torn down with the foundation left, calling it an addition where it should be labeled as a new home, not an addition.

Ed Krol, 1108 Beech, was in favor of the proposed 1.5 multiplier, he felt it will address the issues fairly, he would like this Ordinance implemented as soon as possible.

Ricardo Long, 751 Sunset, was in favor of the proposed Ordinance change with the 1.5 multiplier and sliding scale.

John Buzuvis, CDD, explained per building code with new construction, if any portion of a home remains such as the foundation or a wall it is considered an addition or a remodel, and this is usually done to expedite the construction schedule or for tax reasons.

#### 4. Location of Garages for Incentive Porches Discussion

John Buzuvis, CDD, explained at the previous Planning Commission meeting that one of the residents in the audience asked about the incentive portion for the existing detached garages. The resident asked what portion or where does the existing garage have to be placed to qualify for this front porch incentive? The existing garage does conform with the current Ordinance and a portion of the detached garage is in the rear yard.

Ms Elmiger stated the Ordinance reads new construction of the garage will be located either in the rear of the new building, attached or located in the rear third of the lot, detached. It was decided for the Community Development Department to make an administrative determination.

#### 8. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS:

There were no comments from any of the commissioners

#### 9. REPORTS AND CORRESPONDENCE:

Master Plan Review Update:

Comm. Kehoe explained the survey for the Master Plan has been completed. The statistical survey analysis of 157 pages of comments, is currently being worked on internally by the City and Ms. Elmiger is working on the qualitative portion of the analysis.

Mr. Buzuvis gave a recap of the Saxton property subcommittee meeting. The sub-committee meeting for the Saxton property was last Friday. The subcommittee members consisted of Oliver Wolcott, DDA Chair, Jim Mulhern PC Chair, Michael Devine ZBA Chair, Colleen Polin HD Chair, Jason Smith, DDA Planner, Ms. Elmiger, City Planner & City Mayor Dan Dwyer

The meeting was held to outline a process to evaluate the three proposals submitted, for the next step of the consideration process for a recommendation to the DDA board. The proposals were to provide a public/private development with a minimum of 150 parking places, in perpetuity to the city, along with other proposed amenities.

Jason Smith, DDA Commissioner along with Ms. Elmiger, City Planner, were chosen to establish a recommended interview process for the DDA board to use. The discussion will continue with the next proposed meeting

#### 10. MOTION TO ADJOURN

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

Meeting adjourned at 9:40 PM.

Respectfully Submitted, Marleta S. Barr, CDD, Office Manager