



City of Plymouth
Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
201 S. Main Street Plymouth, MI 48170
Wednesday, June 13, 2018, 7:00 PM

1. ROLL CALL

Chairperson 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 arrived at 7:41pm; Adam Offerman, Joe Philips, Hollie Saraswat, Karen Sisolak and Jim Mulhern

ABSENT: Scott Silvers

Also present was Community Development Director, John Buzuvis and Planning Consultant, Sally Elmiger.

2. CITIZEN COMMENTS

Vickie Nicol, 337 Joy, asked the board to consider amending the sign Ordinance to reduce the number and size allowed on a property. Ms. Nicol spoke about the numerous signs located on the front lawn of 340 Joy for the past four years. Ms. Nicol has spoken to the City Commission and distributed her comments and notes from that meeting to the board. Ms. Nicol stated there are too many signs that are too large, that have been up too long, & all is acceptable under the current Ordinance code.

Karen Ochman, 768 Fairground, also spoke about the signs located at 340 Joy. Ms. Ochman presented photos of the signage to the board. She felt the signage is demoralizing, especially because a City employee resides there. She felt her property values are dropping and the owner stops and talks to people passing by, why is this allowed, she asked.

Chair Mulhern explained the Planning Commissions role with Ordinance revisions but the City Commission is the deciding board, and explained this is on their radar along with the legal aspects of protecting the City as well.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a) Comm. Joy, supported by Comm. Kehoe, made a motion to approve the meeting minutes from May 9, 2018, as presented.

MOTION CARRIED WITH ABSTENTIONS.

b) Comm. Kehoe, supported by Comm. Offerman, made a motion to approve the study session notes from May 9, 2018, as presented.

MOTION CARRIED WITH ABSTENTIONS.

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

Commissioner Sisolak reminded the board to please contact John Buzuvis if you are unable to attend a meeting.

Commissioner Offerman spoke highly of the Friday night concerts and how busy and vibrant the downtown areas are during the concerts.

Commissioner Kehoe gave an update on the Master Plan that was recently sent to the City Commission for recommendation of distribution.

Chair Mulhern commended Comm. Kehoe, Comm. Silvers, Sally Elmiger, John Buzuvis and Greta Bolhuis for their hard work and participation in the creation of the newly drafted Master Plan.

Colleen Pobur, City Comm. Liaison, was very pleased with the draft Master Plan structure & contents and suggested a copy be kept on the dais to be checked whenever needed. Ms. Pobur spoke about the redevelopment ready response on where our accomplishments and deficiencies lay, such as an active business attraction and economic development engine.

Ed Krol, 1108 Beech, commended the Master Plan also and asked about a possible award for the accomplishments of the draft Master Plan as a possible model and Sally Elmiger suggested submitting an application to the Michigan Association of Planning for their annual award.

6. OLD BUSINESS

a) PUD 18-01: 250 N. Main, Zoned B-3 (Revised Preliminary PUD Review)

Ms. Elmiger presented her analysis. She explained this is the second time the applicant has come before the Planning Commission, the plans have been revised and re-submitted for a second review.

The proposal is for a mixed-use retail/office and residential PUD with reduced residential units of seventy-five (75) and increased square feet of 10,666 retail-office space.

Ms. Elmiger has concerns with the PUD project still not meeting the PUD eligibility requirements. In her opinion, the project is still too tall and with the residential density there is deficient parking, a lack of usable green space and screening which does not meet the criteria for the proposed PUD in the Ordinance.

If the applicant were able to reduce the density to the allowed PUD density within the Ordinance, the remaining element (parking, green space & screening) could be designed to comfortably fit on the site and create an attractive and functional mixed-use project.

A summary is provided below:

1. Site Plan requirements
2. PUD Eligibility: Amount of commercial vs. residential land uses; residential density; parking; usable green space; screening; consistency with underlying zoning and Master Plan.
3. The City Engineer to confirm capacity of City water and sewer systems to accommodate the proposed development.
4. The height of the apartment building up to four(4) stories to coordinate with surrounding developments. Consider including fourth story in a mansard-style roof to mitigate the height of the building.
5. The residential density.
6. Parking and Loading: 1. Parking deficiencies due to proposed scope of project. 2. Deviation in parking lot screening/buffering. 3. Deviation from the length of proposed parking spaces. 4. On-street parking space dimensions. 5. Number of barrier-free parking spaces. 6. Barrier-free spaces in underground and garage parking areas. 7. Description of anticipated deliveries and truck maneuvering paths shown on plans. 8. City Engineer evaluation of pole in clear vision area.
7. Circulation: 1. City Engineer evaluation of proposed driveway locations. 2. Traffic study provided and evaluated by the City Engineer. 2. Access road a minimum of 26-feet wide to meet fire code.
8. Pedestrian Amenities/Landscaping: 1. Location of planters 2. Space for tables and chairs along Main Street in front of commercial units. 4. Replace turf with pavement in right-of-way. 5. Raised beds along Main St. vs. at-grade planting beds, trees in grates. 6. Parking lot screening and landscaping. 7. Foundation plantings along large apartment building. 8. Desirability of proposed "pocket park." 9. Desirability of proposed "walking path."
9. PUD Agreement: Develop PUD Agreement with performance guarantees for public amenities.
10. Architectural Elevations: 1. Architectural interest on and architectural coordination of the apartment building with the commercial buildings. 2. Flat roof at rear of Corner building. 3. West elevation of Tower Building.

Ron Jona, Jona /Abro Architects, discussed with the board the parking requirements for the proposed PUD. Parking - Mr. Jona spoke about the land bank parking provided & the proposed parking calculations he felt they needed for adequate parking. The applicant provided renderings and explained the two proposed smaller restaurants will be 1500/1600 square each, being perfect for this overall development.

Mr. Jona spoke about roof top events not only just for the residents but also being open to the public. The applicant spoke about a study done with 40 to 50 percent of the residential units being either one bedroom or studio apartments and with 150 parking spaces provided, he felt the provided parking more than covers the 75 residential units, with a surplus of 40 parking spaces for cars and with more surplus parking coming from the breakfast and lunch restaurants vs. retail/office parking at different hours of the day.

The applicant spoke about aesthetics, placing the mechanical units in the attic space or inside the units, The applicant discussed the planner wanting more office space but the applicant felt there was not a market for it, the applicant was not opposed to it but felt it would be leased better by residential units.

The applicant spoke about the changes made:

- A pedestrian path with a pocket park with the sidewalk extending around the entire project.
- For a pedestrian/ public friendly area a canopy with columns was added.
- The fifth floor was removed with modified trusses to accommodate the lofts, but he would like to keep the pitched roof, due to the cold climate and snow.

The applicant also presented the board with a letter of support and went over the reasons the project was PUD worth listed below:

- The underlying zoning of B-3 allows retail and residential
- The project will extend the downtown –(using white poles and built in planters).
- Creating a streetscape.
- A new and different type of living option.
- The setbacks are in place, not to close to the lot lines.
- The parking works
- The rooftop terrace, pocket park and canopy & lofts being the public element
- Increase property values that spur development in the area
- Underground detention and parking

The applicant stated if they have to scale back the garages, the underground parking will need to be removed.

Public Comments

Sherry Seaver, owner of 280 N. Main, Bode's Corned Beef, asked what the hold-up is. She would like the site to be developed, she felt the existing building is an eyesore and this will bring business down to north Main Street. Chair Mulhern responded their job is to evaluate any and every plan properly, and explained this board is very interested in the connection of downtown to the North Main area.

Board Discussion

Chair Mulhern asked Sally Elmiger about parking on this lot and Sally explained with the information that she was provided with, she calculated the potential parking allowed for all different scenarios to help determine what parking would be necessary if the buildings were used for any other permitted uses other than just a smaller restaurant.

Commissioner Kehoe spoke about walkability, easy access and possibly over estimating the parking requirements.

PUD Worthiness

Commissioner Myslinski asked what the public benefit is and Ron Jona responded, the Main street landscape/pedestrian improvement, landscaping, pedestrian path & pocket park, public roof terrace, open air pedestrian patio area attached to the restaurant use, retail units to be pedestrian friendly, street lighting, underground detention, underground parking and a development worth approximately 20 million dollars.

Mr. Jona also added the garages are 12 to 13 feet each, if one or more are eliminated we could add 5 or 6 more parking spaces per carport along with the land banked parking area.

Commissioner Kehoe felt the interface was not there. She felt the height is not a concern but the building is large and bulky.

Commissioner Joy, was ok with the height and liked the pedestrian friendly project.

Commissioner Offerman, spoke about the proposed PARC theatre helping the restaurants, he felt the parking was adequate & was pleased with the amount of trees proposed on site being similar to Detroit projects.

Commissioner Sisolak, was in favor of the trees and parking but felt the east facade was too long. She would like the amount of smaller square foot apartments reduced which will reduce required parking.

Commissioner Philips spoke about what has changed and what the public benefit is and stated a lot of what is proposed for PUD worthiness is really just to make their numbers work. He felt the density is too much, and agreed with Comm. Sisolak. He indicated the walkway is just a walkway on an easement and the pocket park is setback too much to even view the trains. Comm. Philips explained the parking and landscaping is inadequate and he does not see a public benefit or being PUD worthy. Comm. Philips felt there is not a balance between the green space and the buildings.

Commissioner Myslinski stated the site has not changed much, the height is adjusted but felt the site does not have any additional parking nearby for public use like the downtown does. He indicated the site needs to attempt to meet the Ordinance in some fashion as there isn't any overflow parking available. He liked the streetscape storefronts on Main Street and the rooftop terrace but stated the landscaping isn't adequate and **the east façade is way too long** with little architectural style and he just isn't supportive.

Commissioner Saraswat, asked for examples of community benefits and indicated she was not bothered by the density, scale, parking or size.

Commissioner Sisolak, spoke about the 22-23 parking spaces located next door at 280 N. Main, Bode's Restaurant, with some portions on the north side parking lot being leased to Bode's by the railroad. There was discussion regarding existing additional parking located on Theodore Street.

Chair Mulhern commended Sally on her thorough evaluation report for this site. Chair Mulhern indicated this development looks great on paper however, it is a large development for this site. Chair Mulhern has issues with 60 % higher density, double the height, deficient parking, and with no real public benefits.

Mr. Jona was disappointed with the comments he felt he has adequate parking, he has one bedroom apartments, land banking provided & underground parking being an amenity. If this development does not get approval the underground parking goes away. He felt replacing the antiquated building with a great development was a public benefit.

There was discussion on façade & building design.

Chair Mulhern asked the applicant to focus on page 17 of the planner's recommendations.

A motion was made by Comm. Philips, supported by Comm. Kehoe, to approve PUD 18-01, 250 N. Main, for PUD eligibility.

YES JOY, OFFERMAN, AND SARASWAT

NO KEHOE, MYSLINSKI, PHILIPS, SISOLAK AND MULHERN

MOTION FAILS

7. NEW BUSINESS

a) PUD 18-02: 100 S. Mill, Zoned I-2 (Preliminary PUD Review)

Ms. Elmiger presented her analysis. She explained the applicant is proposing a PUD development for a 76-unit townhome development on a 9-9 acre parcel. The buildings are 3 to 3.5 stories tall with parking at first level garages located under each unit. The proposal redevelops the vacant industrial Brownfield site that is highly contaminated and will be cleaned up by the developer. Ms. Elmiger suggested the two detention ponds have walking trails or other useable elements around them, a walking trail to the rear that runs towards the north will be installed hopefully connecting over to Main Street. The density is well under what is permitted and with a small setback change the development meets all other Ordinance requirements. The project meets the standards for PUD criteria.

Ms. Elmiger went over the following outstanding items that will need to be addressed:

- A. Preliminary site plan and PUD informational requirements added to the plan set.
- B. More information about how the "park" will be preserved as open space and how it will be a part of this project needs to be explained.
- C. Work with Road Commission to establish a pedestrian crossing across S. Mill St. to access Edward Hines Drive as a public benefit of the project. Relocate the seating area outside S. Mill St. right-of-way; coordinate with pedestrian crossing across S. Mill St. to access Hines Drive.
- D. Encourage sidewalk extension as a public benefit; confirmation for agreement with property owner at north end of walk.
- E. The floor plans for the units needs to be provided to confirm the density calculation.
- F. City Engineer to confirm capacity in City water and sewer systems to accommodate this development.
- G. Confirm that this project will be under one ownership.
- H. Provide architectural elevations, drawn and printed to scale, with dimensions.
- I. Planning Commission to evaluate residential-only development on north end of area planned for mixed-use.
- J. Planning Commission to evaluate building locations away from street, and any additional information for this design provided by applicant.
- K. The building height compared to surrounding residential properties.
- L. The barrier-free spaces provided.
- M. Boulevard style entryway in contrast with Plymouth's traditional neighborhoods.
- N. Develop the PUD Agreement with performance guarantees for public amenities.
- O. Discussion of "dual owners' suites" and "in-law suites."

Chris Plumb, Director of Land Acquisition, Pulte Homes and Bill Anderson, Atwell Civil Engineer made a presentation and went over with a power point presentation the environmental, stormwater drainage, topography, northern groundwater and soil contamination remediation areas of the site.

Mr. Plumb explained the MDEQ outreach processes, tests and signs off on the remediation. The new boulevard will align with Park street across Mill Street. They would look into the road commission for a pedestrian crossing across S. Mill St. as requested. The total open space equals 5.2 acres.

Renderings were provided to the board which included the list of proposed building materials.

There is an additional loft area of 400 sq. ft. which is an option to the buyer to finish.

The topography that will be left on the site after remediation has dictated the location of the detention pond (being the lowest portion of the site).

John Buzuvis indicated that the Fire Marshall has reviewed the plans with no foreseen issues with the fire department requirements.

Board Discussion

Commissioner Kehoe asked about the disclosures regarding the other half of the undeveloped site being contaminated.

Chris Plumb explained the vapors that enter the ground water under the surface. He explained the disclosure is required when you are within a certain range of contamination and also ownership. The ground water does not have a migration pattern, it has remained in the same area for a long time, so they are comfortable that their site and with the 100 foot buffer zone meets all of MDEQ's requirements, the testing is complete per MDEQ requirements also.

The seller will retain the other parcel which may be developed with disclosures

Colleen Pobor, stated she has been the chairperson for the Brownfield committee since the 1990's. Ms. Pobur indicated this parcel is the most challenging Brownfield site in Plymouth. She said several environmental studies have been performed on this site and she felt the site is safe with no threats to the neighborhood and the City has these reports that prove this. The site could be capped off (closed off with a layer of clay) it cannot be built on but there are other uses that are acceptable for this site.

She commended the applicant on the impressive reuse given the challenging nature of the site.

Commissioner Kehoe asked about the path that is running down the adjacent property and Ms Elmiger responded that an easement agreement would need to be obtained.

Chair Mulhern asked the applicant if the townhomes height could be reduced to three stories as requested by the Planner and the applicant responded that he felt they could make it work.

Comm. Kehoe suggested that the applicant add wider front porches onto the townhomes for neighbor interaction.

Steve Valli, Broker/owner, spoke about the easement agreement, the future owner of the Markham building is the last person whom they will need to obtain the agreement from.

Commissioner Joy was not concerned about the height of the building especially with the nearby Daisy Square development which is adjacent to single story homes. Comm. Joy felt the alignment of Park Street and also with Hines Park fit right in with the newly revised Master Plan.

Commissioner Offerman was pleased with the project he felt it will be a benefit to our Community along with the reasonable price range.

Commissioner Sisolak asked about possibly using geothermal and the applicant responded he felt that it would drive up the cost.

Commission Phillips liked the boulevard, crosswalk, the 3-1/2 stories with the added window and the sidewalk easement leading to Main Street along with the maintenance agreement. He asked the applicant to stagger the buildings so they don't appear to have so many facades line up and to use a wider front porch and asked the applicant to provide a concept drawing of what could be possibly proposed for the adjacent potentially contaminated site.

Commissioner Kehoe agrees with Commissioner Phillips and does not want an unusable site left and agreed she would like to also see a concept drawing.

Commissioner Myslinski felt the developers did an amazing job developing the property, this development is a huge benefit to the public and this community. He initially agreed with the Planner that the open grassy pond area with the buildings setback so far into the site, but the grade raises ten feet vertically which will drive up all the buildings and he was concerned about what that image driving down Mill Street might be. He asked if the high water table portion of the detention pond could be forested with oak trees, for those traveling on Mill street will suddenly see a park space instead of buildings for a visual respite. He also would like the wider front porches. The third floor may be against the code and with the ten feet higher topography may force the roof heights much taller. Comm. Myslinski asked about the adjacent developer if they're development would be on top of this development and Ms. Elmiger responded, if a more intense use, they would be required to screen it.

Sally Elmiger suggested that two adjacent property owners both maintain the walking path and come up with an agreement.

Commissioner Saraswat felt the project was impressive and agreed with the comments made and suggested changing the homes to make them appear a little different.

Board Discussion

There was discussion regarding the Markham building located @ 340 N. Main, possibly being in receivership and may now be handled by a bank and to obtain the easement agreement for the possible pathway may be a difficult task. A cross section was requested of the applicant for determining the building height.

A motion was made by Comm. Kehoe, supported by Comm. Myslinski, to approve PUD 18-02, 100 S. Mill, for PUD eligibility & schedule a Public Hearing for next month.

**YES JOY, KEHOE, MYSLINSKI, OFFERMAN, PHILIPS, SARASWAT, SISOLAK AND MULHERN
NO NONE**

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

8. REPORTS AND CORRESPONDENCE

John Buzuvis discussed the proposed joint Planning Commission training scheduled with Northville City, on Wednesday, June 27th at 6:30PM.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no further business, a motion was made by Comm. Myslinski, supported by Comm. Joy to adjourn the meeting at 10:48 PM.

MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY