

**MINUTES
CITY OF FARMINGTON HILLS
PLANNING COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARING/REGULAR MEETING
FARMINGTON HILLS CITY HALL – COUNCIL CHAMBERS
JULY 21, 2016, 7:30 P.M.**

Chair Rae-O'Donnell called the Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. on July 21, 2016.

Commissioners Present: Blizman, Fleischhacker, Mantey, McRae, Orr, Rae-O'Donnell, Schwartz, Stimson

Commissioners Absent: None, one seat vacant

Others Present: City Planner Stec, City Engineer Darnall, City Attorney Schultz, Planning Consultants Arroyo and Tangari

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION by Schwartz, support by Fleischhacker, to amend the agenda by moving 5.A. *Special Approval Plan 64-6-2016* to first on the agenda.

Motion carried 5-3 (Blizman, Mantey, McRae)

REGULAR HEARING

A. SPECIAL APPROVAL PLAN 64-6-2016

LOCATION:	31221 W. Fourteen Mile Rd.
PARCEL I.D.:	22-23-02-101-062
PROPOSAL:	Swim school in a B-2, Community Business District
ACTION REQUESTED:	Set for Public Hearing
APPLICANT:	Brian Tomina of Aqua Tots
OWNER:	14 Orchard Plaza LLC

Referring to the Clearzoning/Giffels Webster review letter dated July 14, 2016, and utilizing overhead slides, Planning Consultant Arroyo gave the review for this application to set for public hearing a special approval request for a swim school in a B-2 Community Business District at 31221 W. Fourteen Mile Road. Adjacent zonings included B-3 Commercial Business District, OS-1 Office and P-1 Parking. There was an R-4 District across Greening.

Planning Consultant Arroyo said that this site had some potential nonconforming situations, and the Planning Commission needed to decide how much information they wanted to see since this was a re-occupancy. Typically with a re-occupancy the primary concern was parking as well as impact on surrounding properties. The occupant had provided the Commission with a revised plan showing setbacks as requested in item 6 of the review letter. A narrative had been provided regarding class sizes, with peak parking being 4-8 vehicles. Parking could be accommodated on site.

There was a standard for swim clubs that the building itself had to be at least 100 feet from a residential district. This standard had been met regarding the residential district across Greening, in that the building was 104.3 feet from the RA district.

Outstanding issues included:

- There was no lighting plan included. The Commission should decide whether or not a photometric plan was required for this re-occupancy.
- The requirement for pedestrian connections did not appear to be met.
- Minor landscaping items could be addressed before the public hearing.

Commissioner Schwartz asked that the applicant be prepared to answer questions regarding parking at the public hearing, specifically whether the school required 47 parking spaces.

MOTION by Schwartz, support by McRae, that Special Approval 64-6-2016, petitioned by Brian Tomina of Aqua Tots, be set for Public Hearing on August 18, 2016.

Motion carried unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARING

A. SPECIAL APPROVAL PLAN 61-5-2016

LOCATION:	26811 & 26789 Orchard Lake Rd.
PARCEL I.D.:	22-23-15-429-080 & 81
PROPOSAL:	Addition to existing MI School of Professional Psychology in a RA-2, One Family Residential District
ACTION REQUESTED:	Special land use and site plan approval
APPLICANT:	Steven Schneemann, S3 Architecture
OWNER:	Ted T. Selever

Steve Schneemann, S3Architecture, 23629 Liberty #200, Farmington MI was present on behalf of this request. Diane Blau, President of the Michigan School of Professional Psychology, 26811 Orchard Lake Road, Farmington Hills, was also present.

Ms. Blau gave some history of the Michigan School of Professional Psychology, which had been in Farmington Hills since 2003, and offered Masters and PhD degrees in clinical psychology. They felt they had been an excellent neighbor and they were sensitive to the needs of the community.

Commissioner Schwartz asked if the trees in between the existing building and the proposed building would remain. Mr. Schneemann said they would be keeping most of the trees between the two buildings with the exception of those that would have to be removed for the new connecting drive. The new drive would allow them to close off two curb cuts and provide pedestrian connectivity from the sidewalk.

Commissioner Schwartz asked about the possibility of another expansion in 10-15 years. Ms. Blau said they intended to maintain the school's small size, which was part of the attraction of the school and was consistent with the educational environment that they valued. They needed the space being discussed this evening for offices and for additional parking.

Chair Rae-O'Donnell asked if they had been able to combine parcels, as was discussed at the June 16, 2016 meeting. Ms. Blau said they were looking at this as a possibility.

Commissioner McRae was concerned about the large parcel of land south of the proposed property. A future owner might look at that property as a possible place for further expansion. The site plan represented a substantial paving of the property. The berm – even though it met the ordinance – did not seem like adequate screening for the proposed use. Was the intent to keep the trees along Orchard Lake Road?

Mr. Schneemann said that while they were trying to keep as many trees as possible on the property, the trees along Orchard Lake Road would have to be removed in order to provide a taller berm as requested at the June 16, 2016 meeting.

Mr. Schneemann said the property to the south was for sale; the school had no interest in it.

Commissioner McRae remained concerned about expanding commercial uses south of 696. Someone would eventually be interested in the property to the south. The site plan showed the property would be cleared of trees up to and behind the house. Everything in front of the house was being removed in order to install blacktop. There seemed to be no green space in front except for the berm itself.

Commissioner Fleischhacker said that the school was originally approved because it appeared residential and was pushed back from Orchard Lake Road. Tonight's application destroyed that concept and made it a parking lot with a business. That was not what was offered when the school was originally approved.

Mr. Schneemann explained that they were removing trees along Orchard Lake Road. However they tried to keep the trees intact along the southern part of the property line and everything to the rear. The purpose was to keep a buffer for the neighboring properties to the west.

Chair Rae-O'Donnell invited Planning Consultant Arroyo to speak.

Referring to his July 14, 2016 review letter and utilizing overhead slides, Planning Consultant Arroyo gave the background for this special approval to allow an addition to the existing Michigan School of Professional Psychology for repurposing an existing building with outdoor seating and parking lot improvements. The request included Site Plan, Landscape Plan and Tree Survey review.

Planning Consultant Arroyo reviewed the location of the subject site, which was south of 696 on the west side of Orchard Lake Road. The property was zoned RA-2, One-Family Residential District, and abutted RA-2 zoned property on all sides. The subject property was a former residence, with a horseshoe driveway in the front that was going to be removed.

The proposed use came under the category of colleges, universities and other such institutions of higher learning, public and private, and as such was a Special Approval Use in the RA-2 District, subject to the dimensional requirements of Section 34-4.10.

Commissioner Schwartz asked if the Planning Commission had to approve the application if all the dimensional requirements were met.

Planning Consultant Arroyo explained that Section 34-6.3 *Special Land Use and Special Approval Use Standards* listed 10 specific requirements. Any approving motion would be a finding that the 10 requirements were met, so the Planning Commission did have some discretion in approving or denying this application. City Attorney Schultz agreed, and further explained that this was also why public hearings were scheduled for special approvals.

Planning Consultant Arroyo reviewed outstanding issues, which included:

- Regarding **parking**, off-street parking within the minimum front yard setback was prohibited. The site plan displayed parking within the required 80-foot front yard setback. The applicant intended to request a variance, per their letter of May 17, 2016.

Chair Rae-O'Donnell asked if the parking situation would be impacted if the lots were combined. Planning Consultant Arroyo said the parking would still be non-compliant.

- Regarding **parking spaces**, minimum spaces for colleges and other institutions of higher learning were not defined. 70 spaces were proposed, with 3 accessible spaces. The Commission would need to decide if they agreed that this number was adequate.
- Regarding the **drive aisle**, changes had been made in the plan since the June 16 meeting, in order to allow for more screening at the front of the site. The drive aisle along the east end of the parking lot had been reduced to an 11-foot wide one-way lane to accommodate the minimum yard requirements along Orchard Lake Road. The mixing of one and two-way movements within a parking lot could only be permitted in exceptional circumstances and with the approval of the Planning Commission.

The minimum width of any maneuvering for 90-degree parking was 20 feet. The narrowest lane/drive aisle width permitted for parallel and angle parking was 12 feet. The 11-foot lane provided along the east perimeter of the parking lot could be widened to 20 feet by eliminating the eastern-most interior parking spaces. This would reduce parking by 4 spaces, resulting in a total of 63 standard spaces and 3 accessible spaces, 66 total. Again, the Planning Commission would have to decide if this number was adequate.

- Regarding **tree removal**, an updated tree survey of sheet C1 should be submitted with revised tree removal and landscape plans, indicating which trees, regulated and landmarked, were to be removed and remain as stipulated in Section 34-5.18.3.C.ii.
- Regarding **replacement trees**, the applicant was asking to plant 23 of the required 69 trees on public property or to place monies in the tree fund account.
- Regarding the **landscape plan**, Section 34-5.15.15 required landscape separation between all parking lots from a public thoroughfare through a planted hedge of small shrubs, or by a masonry wall or berm a minimum of 2 feet high. In addition, all off-street parking areas adjacent to residential use were required to have a 6 foot high wall or berm or, if separated by a thoroughfare, a greenbelt. The plan had been modified from the June 16 review to include a 30-inch berm around the parking area with a 24-30 inch hedgerow on top of the berm, plus trees added as well. The Commission would need to decide if this screening was sufficient given the distance across Orchard Lake Road to the residential area.

Planning Consultant Arroyo concluded his review.

Commissioner Orr pointed out that on sheet 1 there were a number of trees that were shown to remain, such as in the southeast corner of the parking lot, where 1.5 feet of dirt was being cut from the area around the tree, yet the tree was expected to live. How was it possible to determine which trees were to be removed without a grade plan?

City Planner Stec said the Ordinance required no disturbance could occur within the drip edge of trees to remain.

Commissioner Orr remained concerned about any trees where 1.5 feet of dirt was going to be removed all the way around them. Additionally the area at the very back would receive the most fill, yet that was also the area where they were going to be keeping the most trees. He didn't believe trees could be filled around to that extent and be expected to live. Again, without a grading plan it was impossible to determine. He felt more trees would need to be removed than were shown on the plan.

City Planner Stec said a final grading plan would have to be submitted for final Engineering Division approval. No preliminary grading plan had been submitted; the applicant could be asked to provide this.

Commissioner Orr asked what would happen if the Planning Commission approved the landscape plan and then more trees needed to be removed.

City Planner Stec said if the change were significant, the plan would return to the Planning Commission for approval. If the Commission was concerned regarding the tree removal permit and landscape plan, he would recommend that the plan not be approved until the concerns were addressed.

Commissioner McRae said that the 70 additional parking spaces were requested because of parking issues on the current site. Could parking be added to the north side of the existing school building?

Commissioner Stimson asked if there were enough parking lot islands on this plan. Planning Consultant Arroyo said that the parking lot was fairly shallow in front. One option would be to remove the four eastern-most spaces and widen the aisle somewhat. Landscaping could be incorporated as a result. By practice, internal parking lot landscaping allowed some flexibility including planting along the edge of the parking lot to satisfy the requirement for internal landscaping where it was difficult to get landscape islands in the middle of a lot, particularly when the lot was not deep.

Commissioner Blizman asked if parking could be placed between the existing school and the house being discussed this evening. Planning Consultant Arroyo said he thought there was a grade issue in that area; this question should be answered by the applicant.

Commissioner Schwartz remained concerned that approval of this use, with the house being used for office purposes, would open up the property to the south for another requested school or office use. Therefore the City would be looking at school or office “creep” along this portion of Orchard Lake Road, especially as 696 was so close to this site.

City Attorney Schultz said approving a school use was not inconsistent with the Master Plan. The property stood alone, and an approval would not assume an application to the south was entitled to a business or school development. The same standards would apply.

Chair Rae-O'Donnell asked the applicants to address the Commission's questions.

Mr. Schneemann addressed the questions regarding parking around the existing building. They had discussed this at some length and they would be willing to push all the front yard parking to the side and rear yards of the parcel. They knew they did not meet the 80-foot setback. The intent was to maintain the buffer for the residential neighbors to the west.

Regarding parking between the two buildings, there were significant topographical changes between the 2 properties, along with a regulated wetland that was part of that area; at the most they could add 4-5 spaces. Regarding parking to the north of the existing school, similar issues existed, including the wetland issue. A study done some years ago showed a small amount of parking could be added to the existing property. However, because the proposed site had become available, it was better to utilize it for additional parking than the small amount that could be squeezed from the property to the north of the existing school.

Commissioner Fleischhacker confirmed that there was a paper street owned by the City directly to the west of the subject property. This provided a natural 60-foot barrier for the properties to the west.

Commissioner McRae asked how many of the proposed 70 parking spaces would be used for people working in the new building vs. the people using the existing school building.

Ms. Blau explained there were significant parking issues at the existing school building. They had done several parking studies, and they could not get many additional parking spaces on that property because of the wetlands. They would like to have parking at the subject parcel, so that parking could be used for both buildings. Currently they were renting space at an office building on 11 Mile and Orchard Lake Road, not because they needed the office space but because they needed the parking. This plan would help to resolve the issue while providing them with administrative offices, a training clinic, and some conference rooms. They did not see a problem of walking between both buildings from the additional parking provided.

Commissioner Fleischhacker was concerned that this was a residential home being converted to a new business. When there was a new development, it was not expected that a variance would be needed to meet dimensional requirements. This was a new development that needed to be designed to meet ordinance requirements. He was not willing to approve a new plan that would require a variance. The applicants were looking for parking. They needed to find a way to put it on the new development but not by cutting down all the trees and destroy the view and beauty of the area, which was why the school was permitted to be there in the first place. He suggested tabling the application in order for the applicants to revise the plan to come up with something the Commission could approve.

Ms. Blau said they were willing to do that. Additionally, they were committed to having the combined properties be as visually pleasing as possible. They were not interested in having an office building or institutional appearance. The elevations of the building showed a residential design. The kind of environment they wanted to create was as important to them as it was to the original building.

Commissioner Blizman asked the distance between the edge of Orchard Lake Road and the right-of-way and the berm. Planning Consultant Arroyo said there was 21 feet from the 8-foot pathway to the property line and another almost 14 feet from the property line to where the parking lot began.

Commissioner Blizman asked if more trees could be saved if there were no berm. Planning Consultant Arroyo said he couldn't say that for sure, as the applicant might still have to grade that area in order to construct the parking lot. If the parking lot were moved, then it was possible more trees could be preserved.

Commissioner Blizman said that the existing school was set back in the woods. It was a beautiful building and he was familiar with the good work done there. However, the present application was creating a pattern of office development moving south on Orchard Lake Road. If a berm were constructed with all the parking in front, another developer would look at the property to the south and make the argument that the City already had office along Orchard Lake Road with lots of parking; another office development would just be asking for the same thing. He could not vote to approve this plan.

Commissioner Mantey asked why the school could not use the parking at Oakland Community College just north of this location. Ms. Blau said they were unable to use the parking because the students had to cross the drive and there was no sidewalk.

Chair Rae-O'Donnell confirmed with the applicants that they were willing to reconfigure the plan, based on the comments made this evening, especially regarding parking lot location.

At this time, Chair Rae-O'Donnell opened the public hearing.

Adam Wright, Pasadena Park subdivision, said he owned the property directly to the west of the subject site. He was concerned that his property would be buffered from this new development, especially the parking. He noted that the paper street mentioned earlier was almost entirely wetland without many trees and did not provide a significant buffer.

Ms. Blau read a supporting letter from Lucy Selever, the owner of the subject site, which spoke to the benefits of having the Michigan School of Professional Psychology as a neighbor, in that the school was quiet, pleasant, and non-intrusive. The Selevers also owned the parcel immediately to the south of the subject property and thus had a strong interest in not diminishing the value of that property. They felt the school's addition would be an enhancement to the City and to the neighbors in Pasadena Park subdivision. The letter had been submitted to City staff and became part of the permanent file for this application.

As no one else came forward to speak, Chair Rae-O'Donnell closed the public hearing.

Commissioner McRae addressed Mr. Wright's concerns, saying that the applicant would have screening requirements for the properties to the west. When the applicants returned with changes to the plan, that screening would be part of the review process.

MOTION by Orr, support by Blizman, to table Special Approval Plan 61-5-2016, dated June 29, 2016, submitted by Steven Schneemann of S3 Architecture, to a date uncertain to allow the applicants time to reconfigure the plans to meet the required 80 foot front yard setback from Orchard Lake Road resulting in a preservation of the mature trees in the area.

Motion carried 7-1 (Schwartz).

B. SPECIAL APPROVAL PLAN 62-5-2016

LOCATION:	24505 Halsted Rd.
PARCEL I.D.:	22-23-19-426-031
PROPOSAL:	Addition to existing Bonaventure Family Skating Center in a LI-1, Light Industrial District
ACTION REQUESTED:	Special land use and site plan approval
APPLICANT:	David Hughes of Vanston/O'Brien Inc.
OWNER:	XS Properties LLC

David Hughes, Vanston/O'Brien Inc., 2375 Bishop Circle, Dexter, MI was present on behalf of this application. Dave Neighbor, owner, was also present.

Mr. Neighbor said they were seeking an addition to their building for a trampoline park. In order to keep their skate operation viable they needed to diversify the entertainment provided.

Commissioner McRae asked about the mezzanine use and the public access there. Mr. Hughes said there would be a second floor mezzanine that would meet all barrier-free requirements. An elevator would not be required. The mezzanine would be a gathering area identical to the one right below it.

Chair Rae-O'Donnell asked for the Consultant's review.

Referring to the June 9, 2016 review letter, and utilizing overhead slides, Planning Consultant Tangari gave the review for this request, which was for Special Land Use and Site Plan and Landscape Plan approval to permit a 12,625 square foot addition to the existing Bonaventure skating center.

Planning Consultant Tangari explained that the existing building was 29,220 square feet. The proposed use was a Special Land Use in the LI-1 Light Industrial District. The applicant had described the use as requested. Dimensional requirements were met, as were the requirements for Special Approval Standards (Section 34-4.51) and Special Approval Use (34-6.3)

Outstanding issues included:

- A dumpster enclosure detail was needed.
- The photometric plan did not provide an average to minimum ratio; this could be handled administratively.
- Regarding the landscape plan, a line of shrubs along the portions of this frontage should be provided to supplement those areas that did not have a two-foot berm. Large deciduous trees should have a 3-inch caliper, rather than the 2.5-inch caliper proposed. The Planning Commission could choose to accept the landscape plan as presented, subject to the changes noted.

Commissioner Orr asked about waiving the requirement for a dumpster enclosure if a dumpster was not used. Mr. Hughes said they needed the dumpster and would satisfy the screening requirements, as well as the landscaping requirements mentioned.

Chair Rae-O'Donnell confirmed that the outstanding landscaping issues could be approved administratively.

At this time, Chair Rae-O'Donnell opened the public hearing. Seeing that no one came forward to speak, Chair Rae-O'Donnell closed the public hearing.

MOTION by Blizman, support by Stimson, that Site Plan No. 62-5-2016, dated May 18, 2016 submitted by David Hughes of Vanston/O'Brien Inc. be approved because it appears to meet all applicable requirements of the Zoning Chapter including the standards of approval for special uses as outlined in Section 34-6.3, and also meets the requirements of Section 34-4.51 as follows:

- **Is not injurious to the district and environs.**
- **Is not contrary to the support and purpose of the special land uses chapter.**
- **Is not incompatible with already-existing uses in the area.**
- **Would not interfere with orderly development.**
- **Would not be detrimental to the safety and convenience of vehicular or pedestrian traffic.**

Motion carried unanimously.

MOTION by Blizman, support by Stimson, that Landscape Plan No. 62-5-2016, dated May 18, 2016, submitted by David Hughes of Vanston/O'Brien Inc. be approved because it appears to meet all applicable Zoning Chapter requirements, including the standards of approval for special approval uses as outlined in Section 34-6.3 (1 thru 10), and applicable Design Principles as adopted by the Planning Commission. This approval is subject to the following condition:

- **A revised plan be submitted for administrative approval addressing items 3, 4 and 5 of the Landscape Plan Review on page 3 of the Clearzoning/Giffels Webster review letter dated June 9, 2016.**

Motion carried unanimously.

C. REZONING REQUEST 2-5-2016

LOCATION:

27835 Shiawasse Rd.

PARCEL I.D.:	22-23-36-254-001
PROPOSAL:	Rezone parcel currently zoned RA-4, One Family Residential District to RC-3, Multiple Family Residential
ACTION REQUESTED:	Recommendation to City Council
APPLICANT:	Jacob Bacall
OWNER:	Archdiocese of Detroit

Burt Kassab, 31000 Northwestern Highway, Ste 100, Farmington Hills MI, was present on behalf of this application. Jacob Bacall 30407 W. 13 Mile Road, Farmington Hills was also present.

Mr. Kassab said they were requesting a rezoning for 27835 Shiawassee Road, in order to construct a new senior housing project on the property. The proposed name was Bellaire of Farmington Hills.

As Mr. Kassab began to describe the proposed project, including elevations, etc., Commissioner Fleischhacker pointed out that tonight's meeting was not a site plan review, but was limited to the proposed rezoning only. If the rezoning were approved, anything allowed within the zoning district could be constructed on the property. Therefore it was inappropriate to present the proposed use or anything to do with a site plan this evening.

Mr. Kassab continued that the church had been shuttered in 2014. It was currently zoned for single-family use, RA-4 One Family Residential. A national broker had marketed the property for about 20 months. The broker had not had a single residential developer approach them for the property.

Mr. Kassab said that Mr. Bacall had hosted an open house on April 15 to get feedback from the neighbors regarding the senior housing proposed for the property. He received some positive impact and some concerns from the neighbors. The proposed use was residential in nature. Mr. Bacall was not an apartment developer and was not proposing an apartment development. They believed the proposed use was compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. There was RC-3 do the immediate south. Therefore they believed rezoning this property to RC-3 continued a natural transition.

Mr. Kassab said less traffic would be generated than a single-family development. Based on another senior housing project that Mr. Bacall had developed, they would probably generate 25% of the traffic than a single-family residential development. During peak hours, about 50% of the parking would be occupied.

The intent was to have the curb cuts on Shiawassee and Independence Roads, which faced the existing RC-3 property.

Mr. Kassab said that right now the Archdiocese paid no taxes. When the proposed two-phase project was complete, it would be valued at approximately \$15 million, and would provide the related taxes to the City and State. 25-30 local jobs would also be created by this project. The project would be a positive addition to the area, and would add to the values of the existing homes in the area.

Mr. Kassab continued that Mr. Bacall – whose company was based in Farmington Hills – had 35 years of experience. He owned and operated a senior housing project called Bellaire Riverview, in Riverview MI. Last year the facility was awarded the Senior Housing Assisted Living Award. Mr. Bacall's plan was to bring affordable senior housing to middle-class areas. He was also moving through the site plan approval process in Southgate.

Mr. Kassab concluded that this application provided an opportunity for the City to have affordable senior housing, to change a non-taxed parcel to one that would be on the tax rolls, to provide a project that was compatible with and

would have minimal impact on the surrounding neighborhood, and they requested the Commission recommend approval for the request.

Commissioner Mantey said he was surprised to hear that there was not a market for single family residential on this property. Anecdotal evidence showed a large pent-up demand for affordable housing for young people, and often houses in a moderate price range were selling within days, often for more than the asking price. He asked for more information as how the property was marketed.

Mr. Kassab gave some details regarding the marketing of the property over the past 20 months. The broker had about 10 different national networks to which they subscribed and sent out email blasts. The particular broker involved was very experienced in this area and sold a lot of properties for the Archdiocese in particular. They had not received one proposal in 20 months.

Chair Rae-O'Donnell asked the Planning Consultant to give his review.

Based on his review letter dated June 9, 2016 and utilizing overhead slides, Planning Consultant Arroyo gave the review for this application to rezone the property at 27835 Shiawassee from RA-4 One Family Residential to RC-3 Multiple Family Residential. He noted that a similar request heard by the Commission for a rezoning to either SP-1 or RC-3 had been withdrawn.

Planning Consultant Arroyo reviewed the zoning of the surrounding parcels. Properties to the north, west and east were all zoned RA-4, with RC-3 zoning to the south of the site. The Master Plan for Future Land Use designated the property as Quasi-Public, which was a designation used for community support, and often included governmental, civic, cultural, and educational uses.

Regarding items to consider for a zoning map amendment, as listed on pages 2-3 of the review letter, Planning Consultant Arroyo reviewed the following:

- *Is the proposed zoning consistent with the Master Plan?* The Master Plan addressed via the Residential Densities Map the fact that sometimes quasi-public uses ceased to exist. The Residential Densities Map designated the property for medium density, which was consistent with the RA-3 and RA-4 Single Family Residential districts, and which was intended for single family densities as currently zoned.
- *What other impact would the requested zoning have on public services, utilities, and natural features?* Typically an intensification of use would have a greater impact. However, this would depend on the type of use that was ultimately developed on the site.

In response to a request from Chair Rae-O'Donnell, Planning Consultant Arroyo reviewed the permitted uses in the RC-3 District, as listed in Section 34-3.1.12.

- *Has the applicant provided evidence that the property cannot be developed or used as zoned?* The applicant had not provided any information on possible hardship that could hinder development of this property otherwise. No details regarding asking price, etc., for the property had been provided.
- *Is the proposed zoning district (and potential land uses) compatible with surrounding areas?* RC-3 was compatible with the southern RC-3 property to the south. The Planning Commission needed to decide whether the RC-3 zoning would be compatible with the single-family areas to the west, north and east.

- *Would the proposed zoning place a burden on nearby thoroughfares? If so, how would this burden compare with the existing zoning district?* Shiawassee Road was considered a Primary Collector. Depending on the use, more traffic could be generated than the previous use.
- *Is there other land currently available for this use?* There was very little vacant land in the general vicinity of this parcel, but there were other areas in the city available for senior family housing.
- *Will development of the site under the proposed zoning district meet requirements?* It was possible that the site could meet the requirements of the RC-3 district, but at this point there was no site plan to review.
- *Is rezoning the best way to address the request or could the existing zoning district be amended to add the proposed use as the permitted or special land use?* Amending the RA-4 district was not appropriate.
- *Has there been a change in circumstances and conditions since adoption of the Master Plan that would support the proposed change?* The Commission should consider this as part of their deliberations, as the church had closed in 2014. However, the Densities Map did show the property as medium density.
- *Would granting the request result in the creation of an unplanned spot zone?* Since there was an RC-3 zoning district to the south, this would not necessarily create a spot zone.

Planning Consultant Arroyo concluded his review.

Commissioner Orr asked what the difference in density would be between RA-4 and RC-3 designations. Planning Consultant Arroyo said that RA-4 called for 8400 square feet per parcel. RC-3 allowed for 108 3-bedroom units or 144 2-bedroom units.

Commissioner Mantey returned to the discussion of how the property was marketed. This was only a 10-acre site. He would not expect that a national firm would want to look at this site. Could the applicants name one local developer that had been approached regarding this property?

Mr. Kassab said as they did not own the property, and they did not know all the particulars of the marketing process. Commissioner Mantey said that the Commission needed to establish that a reasonable marketing effort had been performed in order to act affirmatively on this request.

Mr. Kassab said that as a developer he received email blasts regarding this property and others.

Commissioner Mantey wondered what was wrong with this property, that it could not be developed as a single family residential. Mr. Kassab repeated that, as he was not the owner, he did not know of other conversations about this property. Perhaps the property was too small; perhaps the costs to develop as a single-family development prohibited a profit.

Commissioner Mantey asked the size of the RC-3 parcel to the south. Planning Consultant Arroyo said that property was likely less than 10 acres, but he was not sure. Commissioner Mantey thought that changing the zoning to RC-3 was much more than just an extension of the RC-3 zoning district, as this parcel would double or more than double the size of the RC-3 District in the area.

Commissioner Mantey noted that during discussions of the Capital Improvements Plan, every year the Parks and Recreation Department spoke about the need for more parks in this area. Additionally, the Parks and Recreation

millage mentioned as a goal the acquisition of land, though the funding was unsure. Commissioner Mantey was interested in knowing how much money had been set aside for land acquisition.

City Planner Stec said purchasing land for a City-run park would go through the City Manager's office. He could not answer Commissioner Mantey's question regarding funding this evening.

Commissioner Schwartz asked Mr. Kassab if the Archdiocese had tried to sell the property to another religious institution to be used as a house of worship. He had heard that there were religious institutions that were having trouble finding places in Farmington Hills. Mr. Kassab said as didn't represent the broker, he was could not answer on their behalf. The broker did represent that there were no single-family buyers who had come forward.

Commissioner Schwartz said he had walked the property. The walls of the building appeared to be in good shape, as were the sidewalks. The parking lot was acceptable. He assumed the roof needed work. Based on what he saw, he wondered if the food pantry currently operated out of the building. He thought with some renovation it was feasible to use the building for its original purpose as a house of worship or some other community-oriented center.

Mr. Bacall said he had been inside the building and it was beyond repair. The roof needed replacing. The HVAC was from the 60s. While the walls could be saved, to use the building in its current state would require a lot of work.

Mr. Kassab said the Chaldean church had purchased the property on Middlebelt south of 14 Mile. The Archdiocese had welcomed that property and had given terms making it possible for the purchase to go through. He liked to think that they would do that with every site, and that they had explored that option and it did not materialize.

Commissioner Stimson asked what the applicant was asking for RC-3 zoning instead of SP-1. Mr. Bacall said he actually had never requested SP-1 zoning and he did not know what SP zoning was. He had owned and operated senior living facilities for the last 22 years. His intention was always to ask for RC-3 zoning.

Mr. Kassab said that the SP-1 zoning pigeonholed the property for a particular use. When that happened, lenders had concerns because it could affect the owner's ability to remarket the property in the unlikely event that they took it back. Specific use zoning affected their ability to value it for appraisal and collateral, etc.

Commissioner Blizman asked if anyone knew if the property was marketed as a residential property or as something else. Mr. Bacall said the specific broker was specialized in handling and selling closed school and church properties. The brokers were nationally recognized.

Commissioner Blizman said he was familiar with national brokerages who used list-servs and who identified properties as zoned residential but with potential opportunity to rezone. He was curious as to what the Archdiocese was doing in this case. It was almost certain that when the Archdiocese purchased the property it was zoned residential and they knew what they were buying and what the land was zoned. They might want to market it as something else today because they would get a higher price but they bought it as residential in a residential zone and serving a residential neighborhood.

Chair Rae-O'Donnell asked if the owner or a representative of the Archdiocese were present this evening.

Father Krzysztof Nowak said he was the new pastor at St. Gerald's, which had merged with St. Alexander. He was new but he did think it was possible to get someone from the Archdiocese to attend and answer questions. From what he understood they had tried to sell the property to other denominations but the property was not useable. The basement had black mold. They had tried to sell the property to anyone who was interested. They had two other interested parties but their offer was not within the bid amount.

Commissioner McRae said that he had recently gone through a 4-year process of trying to sell vacant land in the City. For him, it had all come down to price. Once he lowered the price, he found he had offers. If no offers had come in within 20 months for the subject property, even if the marketing was extensive, the lack of offers was probably the result of too high a price for what the market was willing to bear.

Mr. Kassab said that the information he received listed the property as a redevelopment opportunity. It did not specify specific uses.

At this time, Chair Rae-O'Donnell opened the public hearing.

Mashe Silver, resident, was opposed to the rezoning request. She did not want a business in her neighborhood. It should not be easy to rezone properties. Otherwise, why have zoning districts?

Garrett Fair, resident, was opposed to the zoning request. He said that rezoning the property to RC-3 would negatively impact the peaceful nature of the area. The apartment complex in the existent RC-3 District was an eyesore. He was concerned about a "bait and switch" happening, since any RC-3 use could go into this property if the zoning were changed.

Kristi Kushner, resident, said she had lived here over 32 years. She was opposed to the zoning request. She felt changing to an RC-3 district would negatively impact property values in the area. She hoped for a single-family residential area to encourage young families to move to the area, which would have children for the Farmington School District. She wondered what the difference in tax assessment would be between a senior living complex as proposed, and single-family residences developed on the property. She also did not want to be looking at a 3-story building, when the neighborhood was overwhelming residential.

Robert Brown (phonetic), resident, opposed the rezoning request. He was opposed to a 3-story building.

Scott W. Peterson, resident, was also concerned with the dangers of "bait and switch."

Kristen Morris, president of the Forest Park Homeowners Association, represented 340 houses. They had been working hard for the past few years to build up their community. She agreed with the comments made thus far and, as asked, would not repeat them. Over 50% of the subdivision had contacted her with strong concerns about this proposed development. The overwhelming community opinion was against this rezoning request.

Ken Wiggle had been a resident for 60 years. He opposed this rezoning request. He spoke to pride of neighborhood. Senior housing would not help the schools. He would like to see the property be a park and community building.

Gary Justice, a 42-year resident, opposed the rezoning request. The property had been a kids' playground for many years. He would like to see that protected. Apartments in that area were not compatible.

Gary Delikta, resident, was opposed to the rezoning request. Senior housing meant more emergency trucks and ambulances in the neighborhood, especially along Shiawassee Road. He would like to see the property maintained as a park.

Sharon Manning, resident for 16 years, opposed the zoning request. If apartments similar to those on Independence were constructed she would no longer let her children go out and play because they wouldn't be safe. While the tax base for the City might be raised, Fire and Police Department costs would go up.

Phillip Bagley, resident, opposed the rezoning request. Should this venture fail, those who wanted to recover their losses would naturally turn to a multi-family use. He knew from experience that apartment-dwellers did not have the same investment in neighborhood that single-family residents did. Also, he would like to have a traffic study to show the traffic impact on the neighborhood.

Pat Williams, 30-year resident, opposed the rezoning request. The uses permitted in the RC-3 district were too broad to justify this rezoning. She felt the asking price for this property was too high for a successful single-family development.

Dan Reilly, resident, opposed the rezoning request. He grew up in the neighborhood, and had moved back so his children would be able to grow up there also.

Megan Ventura, resident, opposed the rezoning request. Should the property be rezoned, she was concerned that crime would increase and property values would decrease, and traffic would increase. She was concerned about possible other uses, and wondered what the demand was for senior housing in Farmington Hills.

Russ Matika, resident, opposed this rezoning request. Multiple family zoning was used as buffer zoning, but there was nothing in this area to buffer other than other multiple family development. RC-3 allowed for a taller building, which he opposed. Most senior housing was on a main road. He was opposed to senior housing as described being at this location.

Bishop Joyce said he had been the bishop at 29341 Shiawassee for 6 years, and a member of the community for 21 years. He felt the interior of the old church was beautiful and he would be willing to talk with the Archdiocese regarding what it would take to bring the building back into full use. The community should concentrate on what could be done to keep the building and its outreach at this location.

Dr. Darrin Lee, pastor of Cornerstone Baptist Church, said that he had put an offer in on the property and never got a call back. He spoke of drug addiction in the neighborhood, which could be increased if apartments were built. He was concerned about bait and switch. He felt the Archdiocese wanted too much money for the property. He had walked the property and planned how to repurpose it, including using the nun's rectory as a women and children's shelter. The pantry outreach there currently fed 220 families every month. Dr. Lee said there was \$300,000 worth of damage to the building, but the building could be fixed and was habitable. He knew of 3 churches that had put in offers on the property. The Archdiocese needed to lower their price.

Joel Rupasinghe, resident, said he had two young children and he would be concerned for their safety should an apartment building be constructed. He would like to see a community center there that would include a food bank and perhaps daycare.

Seeing that no one else came forward to speak, Chair Rae-O'Donnell closed the public hearing. She invited the applicants to address the issues brought forward during the public hearing.

Mr. Kassab said that several members of the public had spoken about "bait and switch." Jacob Bacall had been a developer for over 35 years, and had developed Walgreens, retail shopping centers, and senior housing. He had never developed apartment buildings. He was purchasing the property in order to construct a senior housing development. People wanted to stay in their same neighborhood as they aged. They believed there was a need for this project in this area.

Chair Rae-O'Donnell acknowledged a letter from Michael Holzchu, 21546 Colwell Street, opposing the rezoning to RC-3.

Commissioner Schwartz said that from the elevations the proposed building appeared to be attractive. The Commission knew there was a market for senior housing in the City because of past applications to the Commission. He thought this was the right use and the right type of building for some other location. A 3-story building in his location was not compatible with the surrounding neighborhood.

The existing land use schematic showed a preponderance of yellow (single family) in the area, and the Master Plan also showed that what was contemplated was single family. This rezoning would be a fundamental change to the character of not just the immediate abutting properties but the entire neighborhood from Hamilton to Inkster and from Doreen Avenue all the way down to 8 Mile Road. This rezoning could lead not just to the development of this parcel but the City would then face pressure to rezone and redevelop some of the other single family housing lots to more intense uses, maybe residential or possibly even commercial. He did not think the proposed rezoning was consistent with the Master Plan or the existing uses. Therefore he was ready to offer the following motion:

MOTION by Schwartz, support by Fleischhacker, for the reasons stated above, that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council that Zoning Request No. 2-5-2016, petitioned by Jacob Bacall to rezone land from the RA-4, One Family Residential District to the RC-3, Multi-Family Residential Business District be denied for the following reasons:

- 1. The proposed district does not conform to the Master Plan for Future Land Use and would be in conflict therewith.**
- 2. Would be incompatible with existing uses in the area, which is overwhelmingly single family residential**
- 3. Would negatively affect the City's ability to implement or follow the Master Plan in the area**
- 4. Would negatively affect the objectives, goals, or polices of the Master Plan**
- 5. There has not been a change in circumstances and conditions since adoption of the Master Plan that would support the proposed change.**

Regarding reason 5, Commissioner Schwartz noted that if anything, economic conditions had improved since the last Master Plan update. There seemed to be a problem of price. Public comments this evening referred to interest by other religious institutions in continuing the building as a house of worship. If the roof needed to be replaced, that was a cost factored into the cost of purchasing the property. If heating and air conditioning needed to be replaced that cost was factored into the purchase price. If there was black mold, there were companies that removed black mold and that cost was also added in. Those were all conditions. The Commission had heard from 2 different churches saying that they would like to purchase the property, so it appeared to be a function of economics that the property was not receiving offers for the building to remain a house of worship.

Commissioner Stimson asked if the motion should include language regarding the increased use of City services. Commissioner Schwartz said he was not convinced that the impact to City services and utilities would be an issue, especially if senior housing were constructed.

Commissioner McRae noted that the Planning Commission was recommending denial to City Council. The applicants still had the right to appear before City Council if they chose, and another public hearing would be held and a final decision would be made at that time.

Commissioner McRae said the he would support the motion, which was strictly to recommend denial to the rezoning request. The denial had nothing to do with the quality of the project spoken about this evening. If the property were rezoned and the deal fell through for senior housing, the rezoning opened up the property to many other uses.

Commissioner McRae thanked the residents for coming out tonight, and noted that his church had worked with this food pantry for years. The people in this neighborhood were as “good as gold.”

Commissioner Mantey said he would support the motion for the following reasons:

- The proposed zoning was not consistent with the Master Plan
- The applicant had not provided evidence that the property cannot be developed or used as zoned.
- There had not been a change in circumstances and conditions since adoption of the Master Plan that would support the proposed change.

Commissioner Blizman said he would support the motion. He was impressed with the residents who had spoken this evening, and the number of longtime residents as well as those who had moved back to the area. He mentioned that CDBG (Community Development Block Grant) funds that had been used to enhance this neighborhood by adding sidewalks, streetlights, paved roads, etc. This had been done to improve the area, to encourage residents to improve their homes, and to bring new people into the area. This appeared to have been successful. Also, while the requested rezoning might not be spot zoning, it was a wedge into the residential neighborhood.

Chair Rae-O'Donnell said she would be supporting the motion. She said she was impressed with the proposal generally, and senior housing was a need in the City. She did not feel that the proposed used and rezoning was appropriate for this specific property or neighborhood.

Chair Rae-O'Donnell called the motion.

Motion carried unanimously.

At 9:59 p.m. Chair Rae-O'Donnell called a brief recess.

At 10:10 p.m. Chair Rae-O'Donnell reconvened the public hearing.

D. CITY CODE AMENDMENT 1, 2016

CHAPTER OF CODE:	Chapter 17 “Nuisance”
REQUEST:	Amend to include regulations on the use of window perimeter lighting in non-residential zoning districts
ACTION REQUESTED:	Recommendation to City Council
SECTION:	Article VII, “Performance Standards”, Section 17-106 “Lighting”

Referencing the document *An Ordinance to Amend the Farmington Hills Code of Ordinances by Amending Chapter 17, “Nuisances,” Article VII, “Performance Standards,” Section 17-106, “Lighting,” relating to performance standards to address window perimeter lighting*, Planning Consultant Arroyo gave the background to this request, which was to recommend to City Council an amendment to Chapter 17 to include regulations on the use of window perimeter lighting in non-residential districts.

Planning Consultant Arroyo said that the Commission had been studying this issue for several months. The recommendation of the Planning Commission during the June 6, 2016 study session was to bring the item to a Public Hearing as a courtesy, even though it was not technically required. The concern was about lighting strips that were becoming prevalent in many commercial areas and safety concerns regarding the new lighting and directly exposed light sources. After study, the Planning Commission found it was appropriate under health, safety and welfare to recommend changes to Chapter 17 of the Code regarding this type of lighting.

Planning Consultant Arroyo read the proposed language under Section 17-106 B. (16) *Window perimeter lighting*.

Commissioner Orr confirmed that existing strip lighting would have to conform to the Code or be removed.

Chair Rae-O'Donnell opened the public hearing. Seeing that no one came forward to speak, Chair Rae-O'Donnell closed the public hearing.

MOTION by Fleischhacker, support by McRae, that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council that City Code Amendment No. 1-2016, petitioned by the Planning Commission, to amend Chapter 17 "Nuisance," to include regulations on the use of window perimeter lighting in non-residential zoning districts be approved.

Motion carried unanimously.

REGULAR HEARING:

B. SITE AND LANDSCAPE PLAN 65-6-2016

LOCATION:	29657 Orchard Lake Rd.
PARCEL I.D.:	22-23-03-477-050
PROPOSAL:	Proposed Credit Union in a B-2, Community Business District
ACTION REQUESTED:	Approval of Site and Landscape Plan
APPLICANT:	S. Brewer of Michigan Schools and Government Credit Union
OWNER:	Antonio Barone Revocable Living Trust

Referring to the review letter dated July 12, 2016 and revised July 21, 2016, and utilizing overhead slides, Planning Consultant Tangari gave the review for this application, which was for site and landscape plan approval for a credit union in a B-2, Community Business District. Planning Consultant Tangari described the configuration and zoning of the site, which he characterized as a "difficult site." An existing building was proposed to be demolished and replaced. The curb cuts were proposed to remain. There was a shared driveway with the neighbor to the south. The parking lot was proposed to change.

Planning Consultant Tangari said that a credit union with an accessory drive-thru was a principal permitted use in the B-2 District.

Outstanding issues included:

- Some of the **setback requirements** were not met. The setback from the residential district was proposed to be 65.76 feet; 75 feet were required. The setback from the side street was proposed to be 23 feet; 75 feet were required. Variances would be required for these setbacks. However, if all the setback requirements were met, the building would need to be placed on the neighboring parcel.
- Regarding **parking**, front yard setbacks had to be 10 feet from the proposed right-of-way. Parking was shown 10 feet from the existing right of way. A variance would be required.
- Regarding **stacking requirements**, three stacking spaces were required per lane at a drive-through financial institution. The plan showed three vehicles stacked in each of three drive-through lanes. However, in each lane one of those vehicles blocked a maneuvering lane. This was not an acceptable configuration, as vehicles could not block maneuvering lanes.
- The **dumpster** was located in an exterior side yard and was also located within 20 feet of residential property. The first deficiency could be met by moving the dumpster to the southern property line. The second deficiency would require a variance.
- The applicant had not provided a **calculation of front yard open space**.
- The **monument sign** should be removed from the plan.

- Regarding the **tree removal permit**, some technical information and details needed to be provided as listed on page 3 of the review letter.

Chair Rae-O'Donnell asked if the existing rear wall was in good shape. Planning Consultant Tangari said it was in decent shape.

Commissioner McRae asked about the dumpster enclosure that was there now. Planning Consultant Tangari said the plan proposed a new dumpster enclosure, which had a larger footprint.

Commissioner Orr asked about the drive-thru speakers facing a residential neighborhood. He would not want someone's private financial information being overheard in someone's rear yard.

Regarding the stacking issue, Commissioner Schwartz did not think this was a high volume use. Commissioner Mantey asked if the applicants could seek a variance from the stacking requirement. Planning Consultant Tangari said the applicants could seek a variance so that the requirement for stacking would be for 2 and not 3 stacked vehicles.

Commissioner Orr remained concerned about noise of the speakers bleeding into the residential neighborhood. Perhaps the plan could be flipped and the drive-through speakers could be placed in front of the building.

Commissioner Stimson asked if the ATM could be placed onto the outside lane, thus helping to keep the noise closer to the building.

Commissioner McRae was opposed to flipping the plan as suggested by Commissioner Orr.

City Attorney Schultz advised that the applicants would have to conform to the noise ordinance.

Commissioner Blizman said that the proposal had to go to the ZBA, where all neighbors within 300 feet would be noticed. If there were concerns about noise, they would come out at that hearing.

Chair Rae-O'Donnell invited the applicants to speak.

Steve Brewer, 40400 Garfield, Clinton Township, MI, and Mike Blanek, 27172 Woodward, Royal Oak, MI were present on behalf of this application. Mr. Blanek described a possible solution to the stacking problem. They could extend the bypass lane past the building so the second lane could get the clearance for the stacking lanes.

Regarding the dumpster, they would move the dumpster to the south. They would seek a variance for locating a dumpster closer than 20 feet to a residential neighborhood.

Regarding the open space calculation, currently they were at 22.6 percent, which met the requirement for the front yard.

They would seek variances as described by Planning Consultant Tangari.

Mr. Blanek said they were trying to improve the site, with trees and landscaping past the drive thru to soften the view from the residents into the site. Regarding noise, the speakers would only be used during banking hours. They did use speakers and typical pneumatic tubes.

In response to a question from Commissioner Fleischhacker, Mr. Brewer said their business hours were Monday-

Wednesday, 9-5, Thursday 9-6, Friday 9-7, and Saturday 9-1.

Commissioner Mantey asked if the credit union needed 21 parking spots. The requirement was for 13 parking spaces.

Mr. Blanek said they did need the parking spaces, including 10 spots for employees. They also wanted to make sure they could meet parking requirements should Orchard Lake Road be made into a boulevard in the future.

Commissioner Mantey recommended seeking a variance for the parking stacking requirement instead of extending the bypass lane past the building. Planning Consultant Tangari agreed, saying that a variance was preferable to widening of the bypass lane.

Commissioner McRae confirmed with the applicants that a dumpster was needed by this use.

Commissioner McRae indicated he was ready to make a motion.

MOTION by McRae, support by Blizman, that Site Plan No. 65-6-2016, dated June 20, 2016, submitted by S. Brewer of Michigan Schools and Government Credit Union be approved because it appears to meet all applicable requirements of the Zoning Chapter. This approval is subject to the following conditions:

- 1. The freestanding sign is removed from the plan**
- 2. The following variances are granted by the ZBA:**
 - **A 9.24' variance from the required 75' setback from RA districts (rear yard)**
 - **A 52' variance from the required 75' setback from a side street (Bond)**
 - **A variance from the minimum front yard setback due to the setback being based on the proposed Orchard Lake right-of-way.**
 - **A variance to permit a dumpster enclosure within 20' of a residential district**
 - **A variance of 3 drive-thru stacking spaces**

Commissioner Stimson said that while he was in favor of this application, he was opposed to sending a conditional approval to the ZBA when so many variances were required. He would rather deny the application, have the applicants go to the ZBA, and then return to the Planning Commission if the variances were granted.

Mr. Blanek explained that the purchase agreement would last until September 16. The earliest they could get on the ZBA agenda was September 13. This gave them a 3-day window to proceed should the variances be granted.

Commissioner Mantey said he agreed with Commissioner Stimson in spirit, but in this case would support the motion.

Motion carried 7-1 (Stimson opposed).

MOTION by McRae, support by Blizman, that Landscape Plan No. 65-6-2016, dated June 20, 2016, submitted by S. Brewer of Michigan Schools and Government Credit Union be approved because it appears to meet all applicable Zoning Chapter requirements and applicable Design Principles as adopted by the Planning Commission. This approval is subject to the following condition:

- **A revised plan addressing the deficiencies identified in the July 12, 2016 Clearzoning report be submitted for administrative review.**

Commissioner Mantey said he felt the landscape plan should return to the Commission after the ZBA heard the case.

Motion carried 7-1 (Mantey opposed).

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: June 9, 2016 and June 16, 2016.

Commissioner Stimson pointed out that he should now be listed as secretary on the minutes.

MOTION by Blizman, support by Fleischhacker, to approve the June 9, 2016 and June 16, 2016 minutes as amended to show Commissioner Stimson as secretary.

Motion carried unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS:

Commissioner McRae asked if the ordinance prohibited drive-through lanes in front of buildings, as suggested by Commissioner Orr this evening. He also noted that the ACO Hardware store was storing open pallets to the south of the credit union site. Last, he suggested placing individual lights on the dais in Council Chambers.

Meetings for August would include August 18, and possibly August 11.

Meetings for September would include a study session on September 8, with a regular meeting on September 15.

Commissioner Stimson noted that the property at 14 Mile Road and Northwestern had been taken off the auction block.

Commissioner Schwartz asked City Planner Stec to follow up regarding parking on the OCC Campus for the MI School of Professional Psychology. Commissioner Mantey said that if necessary, the school could provide a shuttle to the parking on the OCC Campus.

Commissioner Fleischhacker asked why a portion of the property to the south of the subject property discussed this evening for the School of Professional Psychology couldn't also be sold to the school, to allow them additional parking, and keep the green space along Orchard Lake Road.

Chair Rae-O'Donnell congratulated City Planner Stec on his recent promotion.

ADJOURNMENT:

Seeing that there was no further discussion, Chair Rae-O'Donnell adjourned the meeting at 10:57 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Steven J. Stimson
Planning Commission Secretary

/cem