



**City of Plymouth**  
**Planning Commission Meeting Minutes**  
201 S. Main Street Plymouth, MI 48170  
Wednesday, March 14, 2018, 7:00 PM

**1. ROLL CALL**

Chairman Mulhern called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.  
The Board said the Pledge of Allegiance.

PRESENT: Tim Joy, Jennifer Kehoe, Chuck Myslinski, Adam Offerman, Joe Philips, Hollie Saraswat (arrived at 7:09PM and left at 9:15PM), Karen Sisolak, Jim Mulhern

ABSENT: Scott Silvers

Also present was Assistant Community Development Director Greta Bolhuis and Planning Consultant Sally Elmiger.

**2. CITIZEN COMMENTS**

None.

**3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Comm. Joy, supported by Comm. Myslinski, made a motion to approve the meeting minutes from the February 14, 2018, as amended.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Comm. Kehoe, supported by Comm. Philips, made a motion to approve the agenda, as presented.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**5. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS**

Comm. Joy told the board he had asked Sally to clarify the parking space size requirements of the Ann Arbor Road Corridor district.

The board discussed altering the ARC zoning district and the required coordination with the township.

Comm. Myslinski asked about the ownership of the vacant properties on York Street near the tracks. Staff confirmed that the parcels are privately owned.

**6. PUBLIC HEARING**

**a) SP 18-02: Flagstar Bank, 1490 W. Ann Arbor Rd., Zoned AARC**

Chair Mulhern opened the public hearing at 7:12 PM.

Ms. Elmiger went over her review. She explained a bank is a permitted use, but the drive-through lanes require special land use approval and a public hearing. Ms. Elmiger did not have any concerns with the drive-through lanes, as proposed. Ms. Elmiger continued with her site plan review. She noted the following items: the masonry screening wall should be constructed in the brick specified in the ARC streetscape detail (not the brick on the building) and the sidewalk along south side of building needs to be widened by one foot.

Michael Boggio, architect addressed Ms. Elmiger's comments and explained that all other outstanding items have been revised on the site plan. He said they would use the brick required in the streetscape design for the screen wall and that the sidewalk width would be widened to six feet and the parking space dimensions would be twenty by five foot.

## **Board Discussion**

Comm. Myslinski clarified the screen wall will be solid, not piers and fencing.

Comm. Sisolak asked if MDOT mandated the boulevard island and the applicant responded MDOT approved a thirty-foot drive with no boulevard island.

Comm. Joy asked if the landscape planting list is approved by the Building Official. Ms. Elmiger responded it will be reviewed by him and he would make recommendations, if needed.

Comm. Philips asked about cars overhanging the sidewalk and the potential safety issue. The applicant responded that they have bumper blocks to stop cars at the edge.

The board discussed not using bumper blocks and increasing the width of the sidewalk to seven feet.

The applicant agreed to provide twenty-foot parking spaces with a seven-foot sidewalk and eliminate the parking blocks.

## **Citizen Comments**

None.

Chair Mulhern closed the public hearing at 7:30PM.

A motion was made by Comm. Myslinski, supported by Comm. Joy, to approve SP18-02, 1490 W. Ann Arbor Road, special land use and site plan review, with the following conditions:

1. Increase the sidewalk width located adjacent to parking to seven feet wide and the bumper blocks removed.
2. Match the brick on the masonry screen wall to the AARC streetscape requirements.

MOTION PASSED 8-0.

## **7. OLD BUSINESS**

### **a) Review and agreement on 2018 Planning Commission Goals**

2018 Draft Goals:

1. Deliver an updated Master Plan to the City Commission for consideration and adoption.
2. Collaborate with City Commission and other City Boards to deliver a multi-modal transportation plan for the City.
3. Present Master Plan to all City Boards and Commissions to gain alignment and commitment toward utilization during and prior to their respective decision making.
4. Develop and participate in new and ongoing Planning Commissioner training.

The board discussed proposed edits.

A motion was made by Comm. Philips, supported by Comm. Sisolak to approve the Planning Commission 2018 Goals, as submitted with the discussed changes and the re-writing of goal number two: Collaborate with City Commission and other boards to develop a standalone multi-modal transportation strategy based upon Master Plan goals.

MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY

2018 Adopted Goals:

1. Deliver an updated Master Plan to the City Commission for consideration and adoption.
2. Collaborate with City Commission and other City boards to develop a standalone multi-modal transportation strategy based upon Master Plan goals.
3. Present Master Plan to all City Boards and Commissions to gain alignment and commitment toward utilization during and prior to their respective decision making.
4. Develop and participate in new and ongoing Planning Commissioner training.

## **b) Review of Restaurant Parking Requirements**

Ms. Elmiger presented her analysis. She explained that thirteen communities were selected for comparison and their populations range from approximately 5,700 residents to more than 59,000 residents. She explained that each community has a downtown zoning district and some have special provisions for “edge” downtown areas. Ms. Elmiger explained that she completed an analysis of the thirteen communities based on a 2,000 square foot restaurant (with and without a bar) and concluded that the average parking requirement was twenty-one parking spaces. She posed the question to the board: do you think Plymouth needs to change the restaurant parking requirements in the downtown?

## **Board Discussion**

Comm. Myslinski felt that the City’s downtown restaurant parking requirements was very low. He believed the analysis supported what the board already knew. He did not believe that increasing the requirement would solve anything. He believed it was not fair to charge new restaurants a fee for parking, when the existing restaurants did not have to pay such fee. He suggested a widespread solution, such as a special assessment district, because he did not feel paid parking was a desired option.

Comm. Kehoe and Comm. Saraswat agreed with Comm. Myslinski’s comments.

Comm. Phillips said he was not in favor of the Planning Commission granting a waiver to provide fewer parking spaces than required. He would prefer that be handled by the Zoning Board of Appeals. He agreed that it wasn’t fair for new restaurants to provide more parking, when the existing restaurants didn’t have to when they were established.

Comm. Joy asked about providing parking for employees versus patrons. He felt that employees of the various businesses surrounding the parking deck take up a majority of the deck parking spaces. He stated the current structure of the parking requirements does not address employee parking at all.

Comm. Phillips agreed that employee parking should be addressed, and felt there is a benefit to different businesses like office and restaurants sharing parking due to different business hours.

Comm. Sisolak agreed with Comm. Myslinski and felt that changing the number of required parking spaces is not the solution because it raises the cost of doing business. She wanted it to be done fairly.

Ms. Elmiger reminded the board that if an existing business expanded, they would be required to go before the Planning Commission and comply with parking regulations.

Comm. Kehoe felt it would be targeting newcomers and a barrier of entry.

Ms. Elmiger reminded the board they were asked to evaluate the current required number of spaces. She explained the task is to find what the right number should be, not changing the number at this time.

Comm. Sisolak said the board needed to come up with the number, but also would like to look at the ordinance as a whole, especially with all the shared parking in the City.

Ms. Elmiger suggested referencing some traffic standard studies for another recommendation besides what other communities are doing.

Comm. Myslinski suggested the community resolve its parking problem by purchasing lots and/or private property for proposed parking and therefore not burdening the individual business owners.

Ms. Elmiger stated there is no such thing as free parking. She explained someone is paying for it whether it is the city or business owner and that the fairest way is for everyone to pay for it.

Comm. Saraswat spoke about the global picture and does not want to select an arbitrary number.

Comm. Kehoe asked what a parking requirement based on for occupancy might be.

Ms. Elmiger explained it is based upon the Building Code, which requires 15 sq ft. per occupant.

Comm. Phillips indicated the Building Code requirement might not be as accurate as the presented analysis. He was ready to pass the analysis and memo along to the City Commission.

Comm. Joy supported the recommendation of 21 spaces.

Comm. Sisolak and Chair Mulhern also supported 21 spaces.

Comm. Phillips said the Planning Commission has a history of choosing a number or percentage that is justified. He felt the analysis provided the necessary justification.

## **Citizen Comments**

Ellen Elliott, 404 Irvin said the parking subcommittee is discussing long-term solutions to the parking problem.

She explained that the parking subcommittee wants the Planning Commission to determine what the reasonable number of parking spaces needed is and fix things going forward. Ms. Elliott invited the board to the next scheduled parking committee meeting.

Wes Graf, Chamber of Commerce felt most employees use the 8-hour parking located in the upper deck parking. He explained that enforcement of the 3-hour spots helps keep the employees in the 8-hour spots. He spoke about solutions suggested by the parking subcommittee: a 4-story parking structure where the deck is currently and Saxton's parking. Mr. Graf said that considering the cost of everything, having a number that is higher would be beneficial, because everyone will be paying for it.

Joe Elliott, 404 Irvin said the increase in required parking does not have to be a wholesale change. He believed the City Commission and the parking subcommittee was looking for guidance.

Comm. Sisolak, supported by Comm. Myslinski, made a motion to forward the restaurant parking analysis to the City Commission.

MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY

## **8. NEW BUSINESS**

### **a) Recommendation for Distribution of Compiled Draft Master Plan**

#### **Board Discussion**

Comm. Silvers wrote an email with his comments that was shared with the board.

Comm. Philips indicated that the review of this will not be completed in one night. He would be in favor of having a study session or start an hour early to have time to review it.

Comm. Kehoe also has edits and would like more time to review.

Comm. Myslinski asked if the blue for the old Central Middle School was correct.

Ms. Bolhuis confirmed the subcommittee had selected Mixed Use as that property's future land use.

Comm. Philips did not believe Mixed Use was appropriate because it did not seem like a residential buffer zoning.

Ms. Elmiger suggested forwarding the questions & edits via email to Ms. Bolhuis, have the study session held with a presentation, then going over the document.

Comm. Kehoe indicated some of the photos in chapter one will be changed.

The board discussed land for sale being retained for parks and open space.

Ms. Elmiger stated that property owners must be given a reasonable use. She explained that a property cannot be restricted to only a park area, but the Commission can plan ahead for a less intense use. She suggested the areas in question could be designated as single-family residential on the Future Land Use Map.

The Board discussed the first four chapters of the Draft Master Plan and made general and specific comments related to grammar and content. City Staff collected the edits and compiled them into the revised draft.

The Board suggested a Special Meeting take place on Tuesday, March 27 from 6:30-8:30pm to finish the discussion of the remaining chapters of the Draft Master Plan.

## **9. REPORTS AND CORRESPONDENCE**

Mike Wright, City Commissioner and PC Liaison, told the board about the Know Our Neighbors event scheduled at the Library for March 22, 2018 at 7:00PM.

Comm. Offerman told the board about the Young Leaders of Plymouth group. He said that meetings are once a month and are intended to get feedback from the younger generation.

Chairman Mulhern told the board the City Commission acknowledged Keep Plymouth Leafy and the efforts of their new 501c3. It was explained that the group plans to plant trees in City through sponsorships and grant funding, and will provide at least 20 street trees in 2018 through a raffle giveaway.

## **10. ADJOURNMENT**

Hearing no further business, a motion was made by Comm. Sisolak, supported by Comm. Joy to adjourn the meeting at 10:10 PM.

MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY