

**MINUTES
CITY OF FARMINGTON HILLS
PLANNING COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARING/REGULAR MEETING
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBER
31555 11 MILE ROAD, FARMINGTON HILLS MI
May 14, 2015**

Vice Chair Rae-O'Donnell, acting as chair this evening, called the Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. on May 14, 2015.

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

Commissioners Absent: Mantey, Schwartz, Topper

Others Present: Staff Planner Stec, Staff Engineer Gushard, City Attorney Schultz, Planning Consultants Arroyo and Stirling

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Items 5B, Site and Landscape Plan 58-4-2015, and 5C, Site Plan 59-4-2015, were removed from the agenda per the applicants' request.

MOTION by Stimson, support Orr, to approve the agenda as amended.

Motion carried 6-0 (Mantey, Schwartz, Topper absent).

PUBLIC HEARING:

A. REVISED SITE CONDOMINIUM PLAN 1, 2013

LOCATION:	Northeast corner, Halsted and Howard Roads
PARCEL I.D.:	22-23-17-176-024
PROPOSAL:	Tentative Approval of Preliminary Plan for Site Condominium Plan (six (6) detached single-family homes) In RA-1A, One-Family Residential District
ACTION REQUESTED:	Tentative Approval of Preliminary Plan
APPLICANT:	John R. Pastor, of Pastor 4G's, LLC
OWNER:	Pastor 4G's, LLC

John Pastor, of George H. Pastor & Sons, 34018 Beacon Street, Livonia MI was present on behalf of this application. He explained that this revised site condominium plan had received approval from the Engineering Department. He noted that the right-of-way easements could not be finalized until the site plan was approved. The applicants had been working on this plan for some time and they felt the plan presented this evening was one everyone could be happy with.

In response to a question from Commissioner McRae, Mr. Pastor said the *stone driveways* would be crushed stone, a porous material. Responding to questions and comments from the Commission, Mr. Pastor explained that any porous material would meet the requirements of the Engineering Department.

In response to questions from Commissioner Stimson regarding Site Plan Sheet C-02, Mr. Pastor said the crushed stone would form the individual driveways. There would be pavement right in front of the

garages, noted by an X on the plans. There would be grassed drainage swales in between the homes draining to the retention pond.

Mr. Pastor concluded his presentation.

Utilizing overhead slides, and referring to the ClearZoning review letter of May 5, 2015, Planning Consultant Arroyo gave the background for this revised condominium plan for the development called Whispering Meadows Estates.

Planning Consultant Arroyo noted that the Planning Commission reviewed the preliminary site condominium plan on January 16, 2014 and made a motion to table the item to allow time for the applicant to work out storm water detention measures with the Engineering Department. A revised application was submitted on March 15, 2015.

Planning Consultant Arroyo summarized his findings as follows:

1. The 6.7 acre subject property was located on the north side of Howard Road, east of Halsted and south of I-696. The applicant was proposing to subdivide the parcel into six lots with an average size of 33,697 square feet. A one-family detached dwelling unit was proposed for each lot. The property was currently undeveloped.
2. The property was zoned RA-1A One Family Residential District (minimum lot size was 33,000 square feet) and abutted RA-1A zoned property to the east and south. The property to the west on the other side of Halsted Road was zoned OS-1 Office Service District and I-696 was located directly north.
3. The proposed lots met the 33,000 square foot minimum requirement and ranged between 33,028 square feet and 36,170 square feet. The average lot size was 33,697 square feet.
4. Site built, one-family detached dwelling units were a permitted use in the RA-1A District.
5. The dwelling units would all have frontage on Howard Road, which was a 66-foot wide gravel road.
6. The site plan had been revised from the previous four shared driveways to six stone driveways to service the six dwelling units.
7. There was a 2.02 acre open space area that extended the full length along the rear end of each lot.
8. Per Section 34-3.11, the setback standards for the RA-1A District were as follows: 50 foot front yard setback; 15 foot side yard setback; 35 foot rear yard setback. This standard had been met.
9. Per Section 27-58 of the Subdivision of Land Ordinance, the location of utility line easements should be provided along the rear or side lot lines of each lot as necessary for utility lines. There was an easement noted along the north property line, to the north of the open space area. This should be discussed with the Engineering Division to confirm the easement location was acceptable.
10. Per Section 34-3.1.1, each lot must have a minimum lot width of 140 feet. This standard was met.
11. The building envelope of each proposed condominium dwelling was the same size at 3,000 square feet. The dwelling on Lot 6 would have a walkout basement.
12. The applicant had revised the plans to address deficiencies noted by the Engineering Division, as follows:
 - The applicant had removed the three rain gardens previously proposed and installed swales that ran along the side property lines. The swales were dimensioned at 17 feet with a 6-inch freeboard and a total possible water depth of 12 inches.
 - The driveways were proposed with a gravel surface that allowed permeability.
 - An 8,100 square foot retention pond was proposed to the north of Lot 6. The retention pond was adjacent to the existing wetland area located on property to the east. The plans for the

- retention pond did not specify any landscaping. The retention basins should comply with the City of Farmington Hills Landscape Design Principles for Storm Water Detention Basins; the Engineering Department would review this proposed storm water system.
13. Per Section 27-59 of the Subdivision of Land Ordinance, the lot size, width, depth, and shape in any subdivision proposed for residential uses should be appropriate for the location and the type of development contemplated. Lot areas and widths should conform to at least the minimum requirements of the zoning ordinance for the district in which the subdivision was proposed. This standard was met.
 14. Building setback lines should conform to at least the minimum requirements of the zoning ordinance. Corner lots in residential subdivisions should be planned at least ten (10) feet wider than the minimum width permitted by the zoning ordinance. This standard was met.
 15. Excessive lot depth in relation to width should be avoided. A depth-to-width ratio of three to one (3:1) should normally be considered a maximum. Lots intended for purposes other than residential use should be specifically designed for such purposes, and should have adequate provision for off-street parking, setbacks and other requirements in accordance with the zoning ordinance. This condition was met.

Additionally, the following applied:

- a. Every lot should front or abut on a street. This standard was met.
 - b. Generally, side lot lines should be at right angles or radial to the street lines. This standard was met.
 - c. Residential lots abutting major thoroughfares or collector streets, where marginal access streets were desirable or possible to attain, should be planned with reverse frontage lots, or with side lot lines parallel to the major traffic streets, or should be planned with extra depth to permit generous distance between building and such traffic way. This standard was met.
 - d. Generally, lots should have a front-to-front relationship across all streets where possible. This standard was met.
 - e. Where lots bordered upon bodies of water, the front yard could be designated as the waterfront side of such lot provided the lot had sufficient depth to provide adequate setback on the street side to maintain a setback for all structures equal to the front setback on the street side as well as on the waterfront side. This standard did not apply.
16. Compliance with signs would be determined at a later review.
 17. For lots, the removal of trees would be assessed during the individual permit review process. Trees were proposed to be removed in the proposed detention area. A tree removal permit application was required for removal of regulated trees outside of the proposed lot boundaries.
 18. A landscape plan, in accordance with Section 34-5.14 should be submitted for review and approval.

Planning Consultant Arroyo concluded his review by noting that the Planning Commission's action would be a recommendation to City Council.

In response to a question from Vice Chair Rae-O'Donnell, Mr. Pastor said the landscape plan would be submitted once the site plan was approved. He explained that their goal was to thicken the wooded area between the homes and the freeway.

In response to a question from Commissioner Orr, Staff Engineer Gushard confirmed that a new water main had been installed in the right-of-way of the subject property.

Seeing that there were no further questions, Vice Chair Rae-O'Donnell opened the public hearing. When no one came forward to speak, Vice Chair Rae-O'Donnell closed the public hearing.

MOTION by Fleischhacker, support McRae, that the Planning Commission recommend to City Council that tentative approval of the preliminary plan for Site Condominium Plan No. 1, 2013, dated April 20, 2015, submitted by John Pastor, be approved, with the following conditions:

- 1. Landscape plan be submitted for review by the Planning Commission.**
- 2. Tree removal permit be submitted.**

In response to a question from Commissioner McRae, Commissioner Fleischhacker clarified that the landscape plan and tree removal permit submissions would be after the site plan was heard by City Council.

Motion carried 6-0 (Mantey, Schwartz, Topper absent).

REGULAR MEETING

A. SITE PLAN 57-4-2015

LOCATION:	29975 Orchard Lake Rd.
PARCEL I.D.:	22-23-03-433-045
PROPOSAL:	Addition of an upper story to existing building in a B-2, Community Business District
ACTION REQUESTED:	Approval of Site Plan by Planning Commission
APPLICANT:	Darren Zebari of Daz Architectural Design, Inc.
OWNER:	CLV Orchard, LLC

Utilizing overhead slides, and referring to the ClearZoning review letter of May 5, 2015, Planning Consultant Stirling gave the background for this application for an addition of an upper story to an existing building at 29975 Orchard Lake Road.

Planning Consultant Stirling said that the property was zoned B-2 Community Business District as were the adjacent properties to the north and south. Properties to the west were zoned RA-1, One-Family Residential (20,000 square feet). Properties on the east side of Orchard Lake Road were zoned OS-1, Office Service District. Property use was consistent with the zone district.

Site configuration and access: A dry cleaning establishment occupied the southerly portion of the one-story commercial building. The north tenant space was vacant and proposed for mercantile. The site was configured with parking within the front yard (Orchard Lake Road) with a drive along the south property line leading to additional parking in the rear yard (west of the building). The site had 75 feet of frontage along Orchard Lake Road with a depth of 390 feet, resulting in 29,250 square feet. The property was accessed from Orchard Lake Road. The Thoroughfare portion of the Master Plan required a minimum of 150 feet of right-of-way. Per Section 34-2.2, setbacks were measured from the existing or proposed right-of-way line, whichever was greater. Existing setback dimensions and requirements were discussed below.

Parking: There were 38 parking spaces shown on the site – nine to the east of the building and 29 to the west of the building.

The property was improved with a 5,000 square foot, one-story commercial building. The current building height was 15 feet.

Lighting: There was a combination of wall packs and ground and building pole mounted lighting fixtures. The pole mounted light fixture located at the west end of the rear parking area and the poles installed on the building were not in compliance with current ordinance requirements which required a down shielded fixture.

Accessory structures: A dumpster container that was screened on three sides by a wooden fence was located at the northwest corner of the site, 40 feet from the residentially zoned property. In addition, there was a temporary storage container located in the rear yard that would be removed upon completion of the interior tenant space. Approximately 40 feet from the west property line was a six (6) foot high masonry wall separating the commercial from the residential zone district.

Service Area: Services areas were along the west and south building wall. During a recent on-site inspection, vehicles were observed parked along the south building wall within the 21.8 foot drive aisle and a metal storage container was located along the north property line.

Planning Consultant Stirling explained tonight's application as follows:

Proposed Use: The applicant proposed to construct a 600 square foot (12 feet by 50 feet) second story addition to the front (east) portion of the building. The applicant proposed to use the second floor for display/storage.

Site Plan Requirements: The applicant had limited the dimensional information for the areas outside of the proposed improvement. Per Section 34-6.1, Site Plan Review, submission of a site plan to the Planning Commission must be submitted in accordance with article III of chapter 21. The following deficiencies needed to be resolved:

- Note regarding installation or modification of outdoor lighting.
- Property lines, including the relationship of the subject property to abutting properties.
- The plans should include a table showing the usable and gross floor area of each tenant space in order to determine compliance with parking standards, including the setback to existing parking areas.
- The plans should include the total front yard open space as required for the B-2 zone district.
- If a landscape plan was required, it could be submitted under a separate application; however, the applicant should consider submitting them concurrently, addressing the screening between the public rights-of-way and the parking areas as part of the site plan review application. The centerline of the public right-of-way should be shown.
- Provide exact dimensions for the new construction.

The table on page 2 of the review letter went through the minimum yard requirements. Specifically:

- The proposed Orchard Lake Road right-of-way extended 15 feet beyond the identified property line. A 75-foot front yard set back was required; a 63.39 foot setback was proposed from the future right-of-way line. This did not meet ordinance standard.
- Rear yard setback requirements were met.
- South side yard setback requirements were met.
- North side yard setback requirements were not met by the existing building, making this building an existing nonconforming structure. A 20-foot setback was required; the proposed

addition maintained the existing setback of 3.10 feet. Extending the building up with the additional of a second story increased the nonconformity. *This project could not go forward without Zoning Board of Appeals approval.*

- Minimum setback from a residential district was 75 feet; 200 feet were provided.
- Maximum building height was 40 feet. The proposed height of 28 feet fell within this standard.
- The front open space requirement was 20%. This needed to be confirmed with the applicant.

Planning Consultant Stirling emphasized that:

- *There appeared to be inconsistencies between the site plan and the floor plan.*
- *The applicant would need to seek a variance from the Board of Appeals for the determined east front yard setback and the north side yard setback.*

Parking: The plans identified 38 parking spaces. The applicant proposed to maintain the current parking configuration. There was a note on the plans that the parking lot would be restriped. The applicant proposed to use the north tenant space for retail. The south tenant space would remain as a dry cleaning establishment. Per section 34-5.2.13, retail stores required one parking space for each 175 square feet of usable floor area and dry cleaning establishments required 1 parking space for each 800 square feet of usable floor area and one additional space for each two persons employed within. As presented, the retail consisted of 2,500 square feet of usable floor area which required 14 parking spaces. Using an estimated 1,600 square feet of usable floor area for the dry cleaners and an estimate of 3 employees, the dry cleaning establishment would require approximately four parking spaces. This resulted in 18 parking spaces required for the property. The site exceeded the minimum standard for parking. *The applicant should confirm the usable floor area and the staffing level of the dry cleaners for administrative review.*

Dumpster requirements: Per section 34-5.3.D.ii. dumpsters must be screened from view on all sides. Such screening must consist of any permanent building wall, obscuring wall or earth mound which was not less than six (6) feet in height and as far as practicable from any residential property line or district (minimum 20 feet). Gates providing access must also provide screening. The existing refuse container was located 40 feet from the residentially zoned district to the east of the masonry screening wall. It was enclosed on three sides with wooden (fence) walls. The enclosure was not gated. *The applicant should modify the plan to include the gate and consider upgrading the current enclosure to match the building materials.*

Truck Access and Unloading Area: Per section 34-5.4.2., off-street loading space must be provided in the rear yard only and in the ratio of at least ten square feet per front foot of building. There was an area within the rear yard that could be considered as a loading space with an overhead door located for the dry cleaning business. *The applicant should confirm that this ratio had been met and that the current configuration met the intent of the ordinance by not conflicting with drive aisles and parking spaces. Additionally, the applicant should address the standing of delivery vehicles within the south drive aisle and any designated fire lane with the Fire Marshall.*

Landscaping: The applicant was not proposing additional landscaping. An approximately 12 foot wide landscaped area with mature deciduous trees and a small berm was along Orchard Lake Road, abutting the front parking area. Per Section 34-5.14.5. parking lots should be separated from a public thoroughfare by a planted hedge of small shrubs or by a masonry wall or berm a minimum of two feet in height. This provision did not appear to be met for the existing site. The Planning Commission should determine if the landscaping was sufficient to meet the intent of the Ordinance. *Should the Planning Commission determine that additional landscaping was required between the public rights-*

of-way, a landscape plan should be submitted for review.

Exterior Lighting: Per Section 34-5.3, all lighting used to illuminate any off-street parking area should be installed in accordance with Section 34-5.16, Exterior Lighting. The applicant had not shown new or existing lighting on the plans and had not submitted a photometric plan. The Commission should review and determine if additional compliance with existing standards was necessary.

Per Section 34-5.17, roof top equipment should be screened. The majority of the rooftop equipment was located on the rooftop at the rear of the building. The installation of a parapet wall along the west building wall would conceal this equipment from the residential and secondary entrance to the building. The Planning Commission should review and determine if additional compliance with existing standards was necessary.

Referring the Commissioners to pictures illustrating deficiencies included with the ClearZoning review letter, Planning Consultant Stirling concluded her report.

In response to questions regarding setbacks from Orchard Lake Road from Commissioner McRae, Planning Consultant Stirling said the plans showed a one foot overhang on the front of the building and the proposed extension went beyond that. She said the plans weren't clear regarding how far the overhang would go. Right now she was measuring the setback from the glass front of the building.

Commissioner McRae addressed the existing covered walkway at the rear of the building. Drawing SP-1 showed the walkway as being a loading zone but this space could not be used for that purpose. Planning Consultant Stirling agreed, but also noted that the applicants might lose some parking spaces but could meet the 10 square foot per front of building ratio for loading. There was an overhead door on the dry cleaners' side; that area could be counted as loading and unloading. They might be able to count a portion of the area where the covered walkway was, and then, if necessary, they could take out a couple of parking spaces to use for loading.

Darren Zebari, DAZ Architectural Design, 30057 West 8 Mile Road, Livonia MI, was present on behalf of this application. Beth Kranyak, co-owner, 2696 Kentmoor, Bloomfield Hills MI, was also present.

Mr. Zebari said that they hoped to keep the existing landscaping. They would provide a gate for the dumpster enclosure. The overhang mentioned in the earlier discussion was from an earlier drawing and had been eliminated. Their plans were to go straight up from the existing columns. There was an existing parapet wall; the rooftop elements might already be screened, plus the new addition would provide additional screening from the front.

In response to a question from Commissioner Orr, Ms. Kranyak explained that the display space would be used for mannequins displaying clothing. They would highlight local artists. They were planning on having a quarterly contest for students from the Center for Creative Studies, and the winners would have their work displayed. The displays would be changed every 3 months.

Commissioner Orr clarified that they were using the existing columns.

Commissioner McRae explained that even though they were not moving the building any closer to Orchard Lake Road, they were required to seek variances from the Zoning Board of Appeals, as they

were expanding a non-conforming use. A brief discussion regarding process followed.

Commissioner Blizman noted that there were several outstanding issues, including landscaping, lighting, and the parapet wall. While the applicants were not proposing a new building, they were expanding the square footage of the existing structure. Any time an applicant wanted to expand a non-conforming use, the City tried to get as much conformity to the ordinance as possible. Did Planning Consultant Stirling have any further recommendations?

Planning Consultant Stirling said that the pole lighting was not down-shielded. She suggested that the pole lights be brought into ordinance conformance. Rooftop equipment also needed to be screened from the rear, shielding the residential properties to the west, though this did not necessarily have to be the same materials as on the front of the building.

Commissioner McRae commented that requiring a 2-foot berm or wall for front yard landscaping seemed out of place. Planning Consultant Stirling responded that there were some existing deciduous trees in front. One potential solution was to plant 2-foot shrubs in that area, and then do a planting in front of the building as part of the proposed improvements to the building.

Commissioner Orr said he believed rooftop equipment had to be screened regardless of whether it was viewed from a main street or residential property.

In response to a question from Vice Chair Rae-O'Donnell, Mr. Zebari said he was uncertain as to why the parapet wall had to be raised on the rear of the building. The building and view were existing; there were many trees behind the property. Commissioner Orr said the ordinance required screening of rooftop equipment, with the screening required to be the same height as the top of the equipment. Planning Consultant Stirling affirmed that the equipment had to be screened "from view," or from the property line. Building materials needed to be compatible with the existing materials. Screening just needed to be around the equipment, not along the entire wall.

Vice Chair Rae-O'Donnell confirmed with the applicants that they were willing to resolve landscaping issues. However, Ms. Kranyak pointed out that there was no place for landscaping adjacent to the front of the building.

MOTION by Orr, support Stimson, that Site Plan No. 57-4-2015, dated April 20, 2015, submitted by Darren Zebari of Daz Architectural Design, Inc., be approved because it appears to meet all applicable requirements of the Zoning Chapter, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Dimensional variances for the front and north side yard setbacks are granted by the Zoning Board of Appeals.**
- 2. The plans are revised to address the deficiencies outlined in the May 5, 2015 ClearZoning review letter, including the issues identified with the dumpster enclosure, lighting, and rooftop equipment screening.**
- 3. Landscaping review and approval.**

Motion carried 6-0 (Mantey, Schwartz, Topper absent).

B. SITE AND LANDSCAPE PLAN 58-4-2015

LOCATION:	27555 Farmington Rd.
PARCEL I.D.:	22-23-16-201-015
PROPOSAL:	Addition of parking structure in OS-4, Office Research District

ACTION REQUESTED: Approval of Site and Landscape Plan by Planning Commission
APPLICANT: 27555 Farmington Road Office Building, LLC
OWNER: 27555 Farmington Road Office Building, LLC

This item was removed from the agenda at the applicant's request.

C. SITE PLAN 59-4-2015

LOCATION: 25780 Middlebelt Rd.
PARCEL I.D.: 22-23-24-101-015
PROPOSAL: Addition to existing building in B-2, Community Business District
ACTION REQUESTED: Approval of Site Plan by Planning Commission
APPLICANT: Matt Andrus of Jeffery Scott Architects
OWNER: The Kroger Company

This item was removed from the agenda at the applicant's request.

D. PUD QUALIFICATION 1, 2015

LOCATION: 28050, 28080, & 28100 Grand River Ave and 21347 Colwell.
PARCEL I.D.: 22-23-36-403-003, 004; 404-003, 010, 011; 430-013
PROPOSAL: Planned Unit Development Qualification request for expansion of existing Hospital and support facilities in a B-3, General Business District, P-1, Parking District and SP-2, Special Purpose District
ACTION REQUESTED: Planned Unit Development (PUD) Qualification by Planning Commission
APPLICANT: Michael Thompson for HKS Architects, PC
OWNER: Botsford Equities, Botsford General Hospital and Zieger Osteopath Hospital dba Botsford General

Planning Consultant Arroyo introduced this agenda item, calling Commissioners' attention to page 1 of the May 4 2015 ClearZoning review letter, which outlined the building expansions in this proposed PUD. He noted that the PUD option was available in all zoning districts, and this project could potentially qualify for a PUD, subject to the Planning Commission's determination that this was the case.

Planning Consultant Arroyo explained that this property involved multiple zoning districts. The biggest portion was SP-2 Special Purpose, but there was also some B-3 and P-1 zoning as well. The proposed improvements were within the SP-2 zoning area.

Planning Consultant Arroyo reviewed process, explaining that in order for a zoning lot to qualify for the Planned Unit Development (PUD) option, the zoning lot shall either be located within an overlay district or other qualifying area or meet all the following criteria per Section 34-3.20.2:

- A. The PUD option may be effectuated in any zone districts.
- B. The use of this option shall not be for the sole purpose of avoiding the applicable zoning requirements. Any permission given for any activity or building or use not normally permitted shall result in an improvement to the public health, safety and welfare in the area affected.

The applicant had proposed this project to address the growing demands and changing protocol for hospitals and medical care facilities by expanding the existing hospital campus. Hospitals and their accessory structures and uses that were customarily incident to the hospital were considered principal permitted uses in the SP-2 zone district. Likewise, in the B-3 and P-1 districts the current uses and improvements – medical office and parking – were principal permitted uses within their respective districts. The activity or use of the property as a hospital campus was consistent with its current zoning classification. The applicant was not proposing improvements in the B-3 or P-1 zone districts.

The applicant had requested additions to the south and east hospital towers, a parking structure and an energy plant. Deviations to the building height and setbacks were required to construct the proposed plans. In his letter dated April 20, 2015, the applicant outlined their intent and the reasons for proposed design. The applicant stated that “One goal of the Botsford Hospital Master Facility Plan (MFP) is to provide patients and their families from Farmington Hills with a modern hospital in their community providing the most innovative and advanced medical technologies in a safe and welcoming environment designed for patient-centered care.”

The Planning Commission should review the applicant’s letter of qualification and proposed plan to determine if the proposal resulted “in an improvement to the public health, safety, and welfare.” Further, the Planning Commission might wish to discuss with the applicant community benefits associated with this project.

- C. The PUD shall not be utilized in situations where the same land use objectives can be accomplished by the application of conventional zoning provisions or standards. Problems or constraints presented by applicable zoning provisions shall be identified in the PUD application. Asserted financial problems shall be substantiated with appraisals of the property as currently regulated and as proposed to be regulated.

It appeared that the applicant intended to meet the use requirements for this development, though certain zoning standards were not met. As presented, the building additions proposed for medical services exceeded the minimum setbacks of the SP-2 zone district. The parking deck exceeded the maximum height and minimum setbacks requirements of the same district. In addition, the applicant stated their intent to create a master signage plan for the campus that would be submitted concurrently with the site plan. They believed the signage plan would also require a deviation from current ordinance standards. The applicant identified the constraints of the applicable zoning provisions on page 6 (A-F) of their letter dated April 20, 2015. Several of the constraints were directly related to the site size and configuration, adjacency of existing residential developments, and existing access routes to buildings and parking areas.

The Planned Unit Development option may be effectuated only when the proposed land use would not materially add service and facility loads beyond those contemplated in the Future Land Use Plan unless the proponent could demonstrate to the sole satisfaction of the city that such added loads will be accommodated or mitigated by the proponent as part of the Planned Unit Development.

The hospital use was permitted, and so would not by itself add any facility loads beyond what had been anticipated. In an effort to meet the facility load and remain within the site’s constraints, the applicant was proposing to construct a three story parking structure and a new power plant. In

addition, the applicant proposed a new truck route, using Oxford Avenue with an entrance adjacent to the B-3 zone district that fronted on Grand River Avenue. Botsford Drive would remain as the primary access for patients, visitors and staff. The change to the access point and reconfiguration of the internal movements required further review. The applicant should explain how their PUD would mitigate this impact of additional capacity on existing infrastructure. The Engineering Division should determine whether a traffic impact study would be appropriate as part of final PUD determination.

D. The Planned Unit Development must meet, at a minimum, one of the following objectives of the city:

- i. To permanently preserve open space or natural features because of their exceptional characteristics or because they can provide a permanent transition or buffer between land uses.

There were no natural features or public open space for preservation or conservation.

- ii. To permanently establish land use patterns which are compatible or which will protect existing or planned uses.

The hospital existed; the expansion of existing buildings was within the current extent of the existing campus. The proposed use was compatible with other uses. However, greater integration between uses with open space, bike and walking paths, landscaping, might help to establish a more cohesive pattern of use.

The Planning Commission might wish to discuss the redevelopment potential of this area and determine what scale and density should be permitted for future developments in the area.

- iii. To accept dedication or set aside open space areas in perpetuity. Did not apply.
- iv. To provide alternative uses for parcels which can provide transition buffers to residential areas.

The surrounding residential areas might be impacted by increased traffic on nearby arterial roads with the increase in services and amenities at the hospital. Residents along Oxford Avenue might be impacted by the proposed truck route. The access drive to the west of the central energy plant and existing loading dock should be considered for emergency access to deter traffic on Oxford Avenue.

This should be evaluated by the Planning Commission in greater detail.

- v. To guarantee the provision of a public improvement which could not otherwise be required that would further the public health, safety, or welfare, protect existing or future uses from the impact of a proposed use, or alleviate an existing or potential problem relating to public facilities.

The Planning Commission should discuss traffic and infrastructure impacts with the Engineering Division. The applicant should discuss the provision of public

improvements with the Planning Commission.

- vi. To promote the goals and objectives of the Master Plan for Land Use. The Master Plan for Future Land Use identified this parcel, parcels to the east, and parcels fronting Grand River Avenue as Community Facilities. A special planning area had been identified in the 2009 Master Plan for the Botsford Hospital area. The Master Plan stated the following about the Botsford Hospital area:

“Botsford Hospital is a unique land use that represents an expanding area of the economy. It is surrounded primarily by existing residential land uses. The hospital has been able to expand gradually by adding some parcels fronting on Grand River Avenue (including Botsford Inn) and the adjacent elementary school. Hospital facilities have also been located on other sites nearby but separated from the main site. Additional expansion would be desirable as long as nearby residences are maintained as separate areas in terms of traffic and are separated by suitable buffer/transitions to any hospital use expansion.”

Goals

- Accommodate expansion of Botsford Hospital with the least disruption of the residential neighborhood.

The applicant indicated that their intent was to “minimize any effect on the surrounding residential parcels.” They had not proposed any additional access points onto residential streets with the exception of Oxford Avenue which had a “limited service entry” from Grand River Avenue which was labeled as a proposed truck route access. The truck route extended approximately 230 feet from Grand River Avenue and entered the site through an existing medical center parking lot. The property directly west of this access point was zoned B-3.

The internal traffic flow and reconfiguration of the parking spaces would require additional review at final PUD determination.

- Encourage redevelopment of existing uses and buildings on Grand River Avenue.

The applicant stated that when the project was completed, it would “raise the quality and appearance of this well-established local hospital and this will improve the area and will help encourage adjacent investment in the area and help spur redevelopment.”

- With expansion of hospital or business uses, change the present local street pattern to prevent through traffic.

The applicant stated that there would be “no thru-traffic and Botsford Hospital is well aware of past concerns with local residents.” The Planning Commission should discuss with the applicant methods to mitigate these “past concerns” as part of the project.

Policies

- If proposed, consider expansion of Botsford Hospital on a planned basis; maintaining reasonable separations between hospital uses and the remaining residential neighborhood through the establishment of zoning transitions along rear lot lines including transition land uses, extensive landscaping or open spaces.

The applicant responded that the proposed “expansions have been carefully planned to functionally work with the current hospital and be located to provide separation for adjacent residential parcels. The proposed South Tower addition was not possible to locate in any other configuration due to the requirement of how it must functionally tie into the existing south tower.”

The Planning Commission should discuss with the applicant methods to transition between land uses, including but not limited to the use of integrated open space, landscaping and pedestrian/bicycle pathways.

- Encourage mixed-use development that could be ancillary to the hospital with the same policy guidelines to protect residential uses.

According to the applicant, the campus included additional mixed uses such as day care center, administrative office spaces, apartment building, medical education classrooms, and a community room.

The Planning Commission should discuss with the applicant the extent of public access within the mixed-use facilities.

- Encourage LEED Certification and other landscape amenities.

The applicant indicated that the development had a number of “green” features.

- Promote Best Management Practices for the control of storm water quality and quantity.

The applicant proposed modernizing the storm water management system with two underground storm water detention systems.

- Apply Overlay Zoning to small business lots.

According to the applicant, this was not a part of the project scope.

- Permit the changes only if all properties involved in the change are included so that there are no isolated residential uses.

The applicant stated that the scope of the project was within their property lines and that there would be “no effect on the surrounding residential uses.” The proposed plan did not appear to isolate the residential uses.

The Planning Commission should discuss with the applicant methods to integrate the site with the surrounding residentially and commercially zoned properties.

- Separate traffic generated by the hospital from the local traffic pattern serving the residential neighborhood

The applicant noted that they had maintained the separation from the residential neighborhoods with the exception of Oxford Avenue where they planned to bring trucks from Grand River for approximately 230 feet north and then enter the site. The truck access route and access point were adjacent to the B-3, General Business zone district that fronted on Grand River Avenue.

As stated previously, a traffic impact study and further details on the internal and external traffic flow, parking spaces and drive aisles should be addressed as part of the planning process. This could be addressed at final PUD determination.

- Install bike paths and/or sidewalks to provide non-motorized access to Waldron park, the hospital and businesses from the surrounding residents.

The applicant was receptive to exploring this policy statement. The Planning Commission should discuss with the applicant the possibility of creating a more integrated site through the installation of bike paths and/or sidewalks, landscaping and open space areas.

- Preclude the through traffic potential of existing local streets by looping them together or by sending them in cul-de-sacs while maintaining reasonable vehicular access to the neighborhood.

Planning Consultant Arroyo emphasized that while the proposal was in keeping with many of the goals and policies established under the Master Plan's Botsford Hospital Special Planning Area, additional details and information were required to determine compliance with the policy objectives. In particular, the applicant should address pedestrian access and connectivity for the site and adjacent areas, how the project would address LEED-standard buildings, and how internal and external traffic circulation will be managed.

- vii. To foster the aesthetic appearance of the city through quality building design and site development, the provision of trees and landscaping beyond minimum requirements; the preservation of unique and/or historic sites or structures; and the provision of open space or other desirable features of a site beyond minimum requirements.

The applicant noted that they intend to provide landscape buffers between the hospital and adjacent residential areas in the final PUD submission. The applicant should discuss how the proposed landscaping (and building design, which had not been provided) would enhance the site beyond that which that would otherwise be required.

- viii. To bring about redevelopment of sites where an orderly change of use was

determined to be desirable.

The Planning Commission should determine if the proposed redevelopment of this site was sufficient to warrant fulfilling this qualification.

- E. The PUD shall not be allowed solely as a means of increasing density or as a substitute for a variance request; such objectives should be pursued through the normal zoning process by requesting a zoning change or variance.

As stated above, the proposed uses were principal permitted uses within the zone district. The proposed location of the buildings was, in part, dictated by the lot configuration, existing buildings and uses, parking areas and the need for vehicular circulation that was unique to a medical facility.

The Planning Commission should discuss whether the benefits associated with this request were sufficient to warrant the requested deviations.

Planning Consultant Arroyo explained that the Botsford Hospital campus was also referenced in the Grand River Corridor Plan. The Plan stated that the “Botsford area redevelopment concept leverages the existing Botsford Hospital as the foundation for future economic growth and development by clustering supporting land uses that reinforce the strength of the hospital. The area will become a medical campus anchored by the hospital.”

The applicant noted in their April 20, 2015 letter that they had been unsuccessful in their attempts to acquire additional property. The Master Facility Plan attempted to address the goal of developing a medical campus within the confines of their existing property. In reviewing some of the adjacent and ancillary uses on and around the site, this campus concept appeared to have generated medical service uses along Grand River Avenue. Continued strengthening of the existing facility and expansion of medical services offered at the hospital had the potential to leverage additional support businesses.

Planning Consultant Arroyo emphasized that this was a request for a preliminary determination. During later PUD hearings, much more detail would be given and more detailed discussions would be held.

Planning Consultant Arroyo concluded his review by explaining that the Planning Commission should approve or deny the applicant’s request for qualification. Whether approved or denied, the applicant could proceed to prepare a PUD plan upon which a final determination would be based.

Regarding Architects Plan document 1-1.01, Commissioner Orr asked about the dark dotted line labeled *Indicates boundary of proposed PUD* that was above a lighter dotted line to the south. [Note: This question was answered by Mr. Thompson, in comments on page 17 below, as follows: Mr. Thompson noted that the bold dotted line discussed earlier should have been pulled down to match the lighter dotted line – this would be corrected for the formal application.]

Paul LeCasse, President and CEO of Botsford Health since 2007, was present on behalf of this application. Michael A Thompson, HKS Architects, 235 East Main Street Suite 102C, Northville MI and Joe Siekirk, Plante Moran Cresa, 26300 Northwestern Highway, Southfield MI were also present.

Mr. LeCasse gave a brief history of Botsford Health Care, including significant improvements and

accomplishments that had been made in the last few years. Utilizing overhead slides, he emphasized the following points:

- Botsford had owned the property since 1963, with the first facility built in 1965. They had a long history within the community.
- Currently they had 2 patients to a room. These standards were changing to every hospital offering only private rooms.
- 65,000 emergency patients were treated each year; this would continue to grow to an anticipated 85,000 patients. 15,000 patients were admitted to the hospital each year.
- In order to borrow the \$150 million needed for a master facility project, the hospital needed partners. They had been successful and a new health system was created on September 1, 2014, with a merger involving Beaumont Health System, Oakwood Hospital and Botsford, all under the name of Beaumont Health Systems. They were now an 8-hospital system, the largest hospital system in southeast Michigan. The Botsford campus was then successful in getting \$160 million for facility improvements.
- The hospital was an economic engine in Farmington Hills with 2,000 employees on site with another 2,000 employees at their skilled nursing facility and their ambulance facility. They were a major teaching hospital with an affiliation with Michigan State University.
- They would be in Farmington Hills for many years to come as long as they were able to invest appropriately in the 330-bed facility.
- The name of the facility had changed just today to Beaumont Farmington Hills. Signage would show Beaumont Botsford Campus.

Continuing to utilize overhead slides, Mr. Thompson continued that:

- A truck access drive would be needed for construction traffic that would branch off of Oxford Avenue into the campus. This had been carefully located so that the drive was adjacent to a commercial parcel across the street on Oxford and did not extend past this location in front of the residential parcels there. In the long term they would like to improve this drive and make it a dedicated service drive for their service vehicles.
- They were requesting the construction of a three-level parking structure as noted on A1.01. This would house 460 cars. This needed to happen first to provide parking so that the displaced parking spaces could be used for the overall project.
- The temporary ambulance canopy would be constructed next; this would be dismantled and disposed of when it was no longer needed.
- The next phase would be the east pavilion, which would be three stories and 55 feet to the top of the penthouse. Concurrently, a new central energy plant would be constructed on the southwest corner of the site.
- The final piece would be the five-story bed tower, which would have 80 beds.

Mr. Thompson said this was the full facility plan, valued at \$160 million. They would like to break ground in the fall.

Mr. Thompson continued with the next slide, which showed the conceptual landscape plan. They were providing landscaping in excess of ordinance requirements. They wanted to use landscaping to improve the drives around the campus. More details would be shown on the formal PUD submission. However, they were developing greenbelts between the campus and the residential neighborhoods.

Mr. Thompson showed a conceptual image of the completed improvements, explaining their location,

benefits, and configuration. He explained that the entire project did not increase the amount of staff or patients. Rather they were expanding to modern sizes – what was needed for modern healthcare.

Mr. Thompson showed the current view from Oxford Avenue, and then a rendering of the proposed parking structure. He explained that the west side would have plantings in front to help screen it from residential view, and would be designed with a series of punched openings to reduce the vision into the structure, control sound and noise, and help it appear similar to the adjoining Botsford buildings to the north and south. All the entry elevators and stairs would be on the campus side. The building would work as a physical barrier between the residential area and the greater campus.

Mr. Thompson noted that the bold dotted line discussed earlier should have been pulled down to match the lighter dotted line – this would be corrected for the formal application.

Mr. Thompson noted six zoning deficiencies that would be requested within the PUD and which were noted in their application letter of April 20, 2015. These included:

1. The truck access drive from Botsford.
2. Parking structure west setback distance.
3. Parking structure height.
4. South tower setback distance.
5. Parking structure east setback distance.
6. Signage.

Mr. Thompson summarized their qualifications for a PUD, noting that they were limited to the land that they had. He emphasized:

- The public benefit of a state of the art facility.
- The PUD promoted the Master Plan for the area, including the surrounding area.
- The PUD offered an enhanced, modern, high-profile aesthetic appearance.
- The PUD offered sophisticated and sensitive transition buffers to the surrounding areas.

Mr. Seakirk said that right now they were working to provide the Engineering Department with information, so that any input or direction the Commission had would be valuable and timely. Their intent was to start in late fall, immediately after PUD approval. They were preparing materials throughout the summer. The parking situation really drove the ability for the other construction to go forward, and thus they would start with the parking deck, as already explained. They anticipated that the parking structure would be complete in May or June, 2016. They would then begin the power plant and critical care addition. These would take approximately 18 months and would be completed in late summer 2018. The patient tower would begin in spring of 2017, and would be completed by fall 2018. The renovations of the existing buildings would be finished by September 2019. The merger agreement required that they finish this project by September 2019.

The applicants concluded their presentation.

Commissioner Fleischhacker revisited the question regarding the PUD boundary as shown on Botsford Drive on Plan A1.01. Would the existing/new sign be part of the PUD geography? If so, it needed to be part of the PUD plan. If not, the sign would need to go before the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Mr. Seakirk said they would work with staff to make sure the boundary was accurately shown. Mr. Thompson said they hoped to submit a formal PUD site plan on June 18, and meet with the Planning

Commission again on July 16. They would have this question resolved by that time.

Commissioner Blizman cautioned the applicants against assuming approval in their presentations. While he supported this PUD application, issues still needed to be resolved.

Commissioner McRae also made general comments in support of this PUD application. If the improvements did not go forward, the City would be negatively impacted. He felt the applicants had made a remarkable beginning with this preliminary presentation.

Mr. LaCasse said that the plan proposed was their best plan in terms of being able to utilize their present property. They had not been successful in land acquisition efforts. They did want to be respectful of the residents on Oxford Street, and they had sent invitations to approximately 300 people who lived in the area to an informational meeting. He would be there to explain what they were proposing and what these changes meant to Botsford and the surrounding residents.

Commissioner McRae noted that one of the key comments in the Master Plan was that Botsford was the anchor for this part of the Grand River Corridor. The hope was that other nearby areas would combine, grow and expand as a result of this redevelopment activity.

In response to a question from Commissioner McRae, Mr. Thompson said they were retaining the existing facades on the existing buildings. The new buildings would blend with and enhance those facades.

Commissioner Orr said that a hospital was a very important component of every viable larger city. He felt the plans presented this evening represented a great addition to the City.

In response to a question from Commissioner Blizman, Mr. Thompson explained that the heliport was going on the three-story building because this location streamlined transport of trauma patients. The building housed surgeries directly below the helipad, with intensive care right below that.

MOTION by McRae, support Blizman, that the Planning Commission make a preliminary finding that P.U.D. No. 1, 2015, submitted by Michael Thompson of HKS Architects, P.C. qualifies for the Planned Unit Development Option under paragraphs *(4(c)(5)a. through h.,) of Section 34-580 of the Zoning Chapter, and that it be made clear to the petitioner that final granting of the P.U.D. Plan and Contract is to be approved by the City Council, after recommendation by the Planning Commission, because of the finding that the P.U.D. request meets the qualifying criteria of Section 34-3.20.1 and 34-3.20.2, A., B., C., D., at least one of D., and E., subject to clarifying the PUD outline during the formal application.

Commissioner Blizman said that the Commission had spent a lot of time studying various focus areas in the City, including the Grand River Corridor, all with the hope that there would be private investment because there was so little public money to be had. This private investment in the Beaumont/Botsford facility would have significant positive impact not only on the hospital itself but also on the surrounding area.

Motion carried 6-0 (Mantey, Schwartz, Topper absent).

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: April 16, 2015

MOTION by Orr, support Fleischhacker, to approve the April 16, 2015 minutes as published.

Motion carried 6-0 (Mantey, Schwartz, Topper absent).

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

COMMISSIONER'S COMMENTS:

In response to a question from Commissioner Stimson, Staff Planner Stec said that the PUD agreement for the Hamilton Court area was proceeding and was on track.

Commissioner Fleishhacker said the upgrades at Botsford presented this evening were positive and needed.

Commissioner Orr asked Staff Engineer Gushard to follow up on the asphalt emulsion used on the roads that dissolved on 80-degree days.

In response to a question from Commissioner McRae, Staff Engineer Gushard said the 14/Orchard Lake Road roundabout was on schedule and should be operational at the end of this construction season. Landscaping would follow.

In response to a further question from Commissioner McRae, Staff Engineer Gushard said that the cleaning of some contamination at an existing water well in the 14 Mile/Halsted area was nearing completion. This was an Oakland County project.

Commissioner Blizman said he found the 14-mile roundabout design during construction was actually brilliant – you could get to wherever you needed to go in that area.

Commissioner McRae asked for an update on the approved out lot building at 12/Orchard Lake. Staff Planner Stec said that there was no plan for this building as of yet.

Vice Chair Rae-O'Donnell commented that she was excited about the plans for the new Beaumont/Botsford campus.

ADJOURNMENT:

Hearing no further comment, Vice Chair Rae-O'Donnell adjourned the meeting at 9:18 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Steven Schwartz
Planning Commission Secretary

cem