

**CITY OF FARMINGTON HILLS  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
31555 W ELEVEN MILE ROAD  
FARMINGTON HILLS, MICHIGAN  
DECEMBER 18, 2025, 7:30 P.M.**

**CALL MEETING TO ORDER**

The Planning Commission Regular Meeting was called to order by Chair Trafelet at 7:30 p.m.

**ROLL CALL**

Commissioners present:           Aspinall, Brickner, Countegan, Grant, Lindquist, Mantey, Stimson, Trafelet

Commissioners Absent:           Ware

Others Present:                   Staff Planner Mulville-Friel, Planning Consultants Tangari and Upfal (Giffels Webster), Staff Engineer Emerson, City Attorney Schultz

**APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

**MOTION by Brickner, support by Stimson, to approve the agenda as published.**

**Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.**

**PUBLIC HEARING**

**A. SPECIAL APPROVAL 66-10-2025**

**LOCATION:**                       36336 Eight Mile Rd  
**PARCEL I.D.:**                 22-23-32-326-057  
**PROPOSAL:**                 Construct new utility building and pump station within the RA-1:  
  One Family Residential District  
**ACTION REQUESTED:**       Special Approval Use  
**APPLICANT:**                Brown and Caldwell  
**OWNER:**                     Great Lakes Water Authority

**Applicant presentation**

Clayton Johnson, Brown and Caldwell, was present on behalf of this request for site plan and special use approval to construct a new GLWA utility building and pump station within the RA-1 zoning district. George Nicholas, Great Lakes Water Authority (GLWA), was also present.

The applicant made the following points:

- GLWA was proposing to construct a 52 million gallons per day capacity booster pumping station that includes yard piping, a standby generator, and a switch yard to replace an existing Newburgh Pump Station located across Eight Mile Road. The new facility would be located on the northwest corner of Metroview Road and Eight Mile Road.
- GLWA performed a condition assessment on the existing pump station, which is over 50 years old. Based on the age, condition, limited capacity, and outdated equipment, rehabilitation was determined to be less cost-effective than constructing a new facility.
- A new pump station could not be built in the existing location because the new pump station has to be operational before the existing pump station can be taken out of service.

- Design was nearly 100% complete. Construction is tentatively scheduled to begin in the fall of 2026. The schedule included bidding for an award early in 2026, and a two and a half to three year construction period.

In response to questions, the applicant provided the following information:

- The fence around the building would be eight feet tall.
- A photometric plan will be submitted to demonstrate compliance with ordinance requirements. There would be security cameras along the building. Lighting will be minimal and limited to door-mounted fixtures, with no site or parking lot lighting.
- GLWA will be seeking variances associated with the project.

#### **Planning consultant review**

Referencing the November 19, 2025 Giffels Webster memorandum, Planning Consultant Tangari highlighted the following points:

- A portion of the proposed building will exceed the RA-1 30 feet height limit, with a proposed height of approximately 34.5 feet.
- A dumpster was shown in the interior side yard without the required enclosure.
- All ground-mounted equipment outside of the proposed building was contained within obscuring walls, as required.
- Fourteen parking spaces are proposed for an unmanned facility; the rationale and parking space dimensions were not provided.
- The landscape plan showed the location of existing trees, but did not include a tree replacement plan or tree inventory. All trees on the site would be removed.
- The tree requirements for the parking lot could not be calculated without parking lot dimensions.
- There was significant landscaping on berms in the front and west side yards that met requirements. However, no screening was proposed along the north property line where the site abuts a residential property. A wall was typically required in that circumstance, but a greenbelt could be approved by the Planning Commission.
- There was a detention basin in the east yard, with no landscaping proposed.
- The fence on the east side of the property encroached into the 40 foot required street setback.
- A photometric plan was not included during the original review. The photometric plan would need to be reviewed for ordinance compliance.

In response to a question from Commissioner Countegan, City Attorney Schultz explained that the proposed station was a public building sponsored by GLWA. All zoning standards apply.

#### **Public hearing.**

Chair Trafelet opened the public hearing.

William Ferguson, 20841 Metroview Road, was the owner of the property along the north property line. He asked that as many trees as possible be left on the subject site, particularly along the north property line, and noted that trees on his property could not be removed. The site plan was not clear about whether a fence or a greenbelt would be located on the property line, but in any event, it was important to screen his property from views of this commercial building. He asked that lighting be directed toward the building and not onto his property

No other public indicated they wished to speak, and Chair Trafelet closed the public hearing and brought the matter back to the Commission.

**Commissioner questions:**

In response to questions, the applicant provided the following information:

- All of the trees on the site would be removed in order to construct the proposed building and parking lot. Replacement trees would be provided via monies placed in the tree replacement fund.
- The 14 parking spaces would be used for operations, maintenance, or construction activities on a very infrequent basis. The pump station would be operated remotely.
- The pump station itself would not generate significant noise. An emergency generator would be in a soundproof, attenuated enclosure. There would also be sound attenuation panels inside the building. The operation would not exceed sound ordinance limits.
- The applicants had been unaware of the 40 foot setback requirement in the east yard. They agreed to evaluate relocating the fence between the building and the stormwater basin
- No vehicles would be stored on the site. The parking lot would only be used by staff visiting the site for operations and maintenance purposes, and their vehicles would primarily consist of personal or light commercial vehicles.
- Reducing parking or pavement would be difficult due to required truck turning radii and fire department access requirements. The site was designed to accommodate a 72 foot truck used for pump removal, should that ever be necessary. Tree removal was based on the required truck turnaround room.
- The increased height – requiring a variance – is required to accommodate an overhead bridge crane within the pump room, which is necessary for pump maintenance and removal.
- The site would be gated. Access would be controlled by badge entry, with an automated gate on Eight Mile Road and a manual gate on Metroview Road.
- The applicant acknowledged comments about fire department access. Chair Trafelet suggested coordination with the Fire Marshal regarding emergency gate access.
- The applicants were considering options for screening on the north property line including shrubs and shorter trees, necessary because of the overhead wires and communication wires located there. They would consider moving the proposed fence to make more room for screening.
- The station provides water to the West Service Center which is east of the subject site. The station boosts the pressures and flows to the surrounding areas including Farmington Hills, Livonia, and other areas. The station is necessary to maintain pressures within the distribution system and to maintain pressure for required fire flows.
- Eight Mile Road will be open cut to complete the connection with the transmission main lines on the south side of the road.
- Calculations demonstrating compliance with 100-year storm event requirements will be submitted as supplemental information.

**Commission deliberation and motion**

Chair Trafelet clarified that public utility uses are permitted within residential districts under applicable ordinance provisions. The Planning Commission is deliberating on a request for a special approval, which includes review of the site plan.

Commissioner Mantey commented that a commercial building this large in a residential neighborhood must be effectively screened from abutting residential properties.

In response to questions, Planning Consultant Tangari confirmed that a wall is an acceptable screening option under the ordinance. The code requires either a wall or a greenbelt. The fence by itself does not meet the opacity or screening standards. City Planner Mulville-Friel pointed out that the applicant could construct a wall instead of a fence if greenbelt plantings are not possible on the site.

Commissioner Countegan acknowledged the necessity of the proposed facility and its role in serving Livonia, Farmington Hills, and surrounding communities. Potential compatibility issues with the adjacent residential property to the north could be addressed through site design and operational measures. Concerns related to lighting, screening, and noise impacts could be mitigated through appropriate site improvements. The facility is not expected to be high impact except during periodic maintenance activities, for which on-site parking is necessary to avoid overflow parking along Eight Mile Road.

**MOTION by Countegan, support by Brickner, that the application for Special Approval Site Plan 66-10-2025, dated September 20, 2025, as revised, submitted by Brown and Caldwell, BE APPROVED, because it meets the standards for Special Approval Uses set forth in Section 34-6.3. The APPROVAL is SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS and DETERMINATIONS:**

**CONDITONS AND DETERMINATIONS:**

1. All outstanding issues identified in Giffels Webster's November 19, 2025, review shall be addressed to the reasonable satisfaction of the City Planner;
2. All outstanding issues identified in the City Engineer's November 6, 2025, interoffice correspondence shall be addressed to the reasonable satisfaction of the City Engineer; and
3. All outstanding issues identified in the Fire Marshal's October 30, 2025, interoffice correspondence shall be addressed to the reasonable satisfaction of the Fire Marshal.
4. The 8-foot-high fence proposed in the front yard requires a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals.
5. A greenbelt is required along the north property line where the property abuts the residential district. The location and composition of the greenbelt shall be subject to administrative approval.
6. Proposed building height over 30 feet requires a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals.
7. A dumpster enclosure that meets Section 34-5.1.2.D is required to be constructed, unless there is a variance to that requirement.
8. A total of fourteen (14) parking spaces provided is adequate for the use proposed.
9. A tree replacement plan is required.
10. A photometric plan is required and must comply with standards contained in Section 34-5.16.
11. The building materials proposed are generally consistent with architectural objectives of design standards in Section 34-5.20 and relief from commercial design standards related to ground floor window coverage is granted.

Motion discussion:

Regarding #5:

- Commissioner Countegan confirmed with Mr. Ferguson that a landscaped greenbelt was preferred over a wall. Mr. Ferguson reiterated that there was a narrow line of trees along the northern boundary and he requested that these trees be preserved.
- Mr. Johnson said that they would explore providing shrubs, planters, or similar landscaping elements to serve as the required greenbelt.
- Commissioner Countegan clarified that the intent of the motion was to address the screening needs of the northern neighbor to the extent possible.

Regarding #11, Commissioner Countegan noted that the operational necessity of the pumping station warranted a waiver from commercial design standards related to ground floor window coverage.

**Roll call vote:**

<b>Stimson</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Countegan</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Aspinall</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Lindquist</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Grant</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Brickner</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Mantey</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Trafelet</b>	<b>yes</b>

**Motion passed 8-0.**

**B. SPECIAL APPROVAL 67-10-2025**

<b>LOCATION:</b>	<b>27900 Orchard Lake Rd</b>
<b>PARCEL I.D.:</b>	<b>22-23-11-351-013</b>
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	<b>Construct new fast food restaurant with drive-through within the B-3: General Business District</b>
<b>ACTION REQUESTED:</b>	<b>Special Approval Use</b>
<b>APPLICANT:</b>	<b>Brewtopia Michigan, LLC</b>
<b>OWNER:</b>	<b>Farmington Hills Beef Company</b>

**Applicant presentation**

Reid Cooksey, Stonefield Engineering Design, was present on behalf of this request for site plan and special use approval to construct a new fast food restaurant with drive-through within the B-3 General Business District.

Mr. Cooksey explained that Brewtopia proposed to redevelop a former Arby's restaurant site on Orchard Lake Road. The proposed use is a 7 Brew coffee kiosk, a national drive-through focused coffee concept with over 500 locations. The business model provides only coffee and related type drinks, with simplified operations designed to reduce service times and improve traffic predictability. By simplifying processes, 7 Brew had throughput times from order to delivery of under 2 ½ minutes, which creates a very predictable traffic flow.

Mr. Cooksey made the following points:

- The proposed building would be 510 square feet with a 200 square-foot external cooler.
- Customers would place orders either via QR code or through employees using handheld tablets; there would be no menu board or pickup window.
- Employees deliver drinks directly to vehicles, allowing customers to exit the site from either drive-through lane when orders are complete.
- Six parking spaces are provided for employees only; no on-site seating or customer parking is proposed.
- The site features one-way circulation intended to reduce congestion and improve traffic flow.
- The external cooler stores frozen items, with a canopy connecting it to the main building.

In response to questions, Mr. Cooksey added the following:

- During the peak business time of 7:30am-8:30am, the restaurant could serve an estimated 60-80 vehicles per hour, with average service times of 2.5 to 3 minutes.
- Vehicles in the interior lane cannot access the bypass lane once queued but rapid service minimizes delays.
- The applicant would work with City engineers to ensure that there was adequate space beyond the exterior two lane stop to accommodate traffic in both lanes and traffic entering from Orchard Lake Road.
- This location would not have walk-up service, due to limited pedestrian activity in the area, as well as due to Michigan's cold winter climate.
- The prefabricated buildings (kiosk and cooler) would arrive as modular units.
- They will modify the site plan to show the outside cooler 10 feet behind the restaurant building.
- The proposed site allows the stacking of 30+ cars, exceeds MDOT stacking standards, and provides more than 400 feet from the pickup point to the right-of-way.
- The counterclockwise, one-way circulation pattern minimizes conflicts by preventing vehicles exiting the drive-through from crossing incoming traffic.
- The existing entrance and current turn patterns would be maintained.
- A traffic study had not been completed.
- 7 Brew would serve coffees, teas, lemonades, energy fizzies, smoothies, etc.

Commissioner Mantey stated that, given the high traffic volumes at the Twelve Mile Road and Orchard Lake Road intersection, the proposed stacking plan appeared to be a feasible design.

Commissioner Stimson expressed concern that peak traffic would occur during the morning rush hour, unlike the former Arby's use, which primarily experienced midday peaks. Left turns from the site during morning peak hours could be very difficult due to southbound traffic volumes, and a right-turn only exit might be needed.

It came out in discussion that an alternative exit route via Twelve Mile Road could potentially reduce left-turn conflicts.

Mr. Cooksey stated that the business primarily serves repeat commuter customers who are familiar with local traffic patterns and would adjust their routes as needed.

In response to a question from Commissioner Lindquist, Mr. Cooksey said that customers exiting onto Twelve Mile Road would circle through the site and exit before reaching the stacking lanes. 7 Brew did not anticipate stacking where there was a single lane. Only 16 to 17 stacking spaces would be needed at the busiest times, and 21 stacks were available. He agreed that if traffic exceeded available stacking that the single lane could be blocked, but they did not anticipate that occurring.

Commissioner Grant noted that traffic could enter from Twelve Mile Road through the Shell station and try to get to the front of the line at the kiosk. Mr. Cooksey explained that if the stacking lanes were full, traffic entering through the Shell station would be able to take the bypass lane around the building or wait to queue into the line.

Chair Trafelet questioned whether a formal cross-access easement exists for continued use of the adjacent property to the east. City Attorney Schultz stated that the matter would be reviewed during engineering review and that any existing documentation would need to be confirmed. Mr. Cooksey affirmed that the applicant would review the title and existing agreements.

Commissioner Brickner noted that recent roadway improvements include a left-turn lane on Orchard Lake Road that allows access into the site. He believed left turns into the site are feasible, but left turns exiting the site may be more challenging.

In response to a question from Commissioner Brickner, Mr. Cooksey said that the proposed building would be closer to Orchard Lake Road than Arby's was, and noted that the building met required setbacks.

In response to a comment from Commissioner Grant, Mr. Cooksey said that the applicant would apply for waivers for both indoor and outdoor seating requirements.

#### **Planning consultant review**

Referencing the November 18, 2025 Giffels Webster memorandum, Planning Consultant Upfal highlighted the following points:

- The applicant proposed to demolish the existing building and construct a 510 square-foot coffee drive-through structure with a separate accessory cooler structure.
- The parking lot would be redesigned to accommodate two drive-through lanes and six parking spaces.
- The site is zoned B-3 and is surrounded by other B-3 or B-4 zoned properties, and is across the street from an OS-2 zoned property.
- Primary access was from Orchard Lake Road. Additional access was through the Shell station and from Twelve Mile Road.
- A drive-through restaurant was a special land use in the B-3 zoning district. The proposed application meets all dimensional standards of the B-3 district.
- The off-street loading requirement is calculated at 157 square feet based on building frontage; no loading space was shown, and the Commission may consider whether a minimum 200-square-foot space should be required.
- The indoor seating requirement for this drive-through restaurant was 20 seats, and the outdoor seating requirement was six seats. The outdoor seating requirement was eligible for a waiver from the Commission.

- The proposed dumpster location was compliant.
- The number of proposed parking spaces was compliant based on the number of employees. If any seating was added to the restaurant additional parking spaces would be required.
- Turning radii for the drive-through lanes must be demonstrated on the site plan.
- The applicant would need to pursue a variance to address sign compliance issues, or bring the signs into compliance.
- A required tree inventory was not provided. Landscaping includes three large deciduous trees and five existing evergreen trees counted toward parking lot landscaping; the Commission may consider whether evergreen trees are acceptable and whether tree distribution is adequate.
- Screening along the pedestrian pathway on the south side of the site may require further review.
- Lighting information was incomplete, including illumination levels, fixture heights, hours of operation, and photometric data.
- The accessory structure did not meet the required 10 feet separation distance for accessory structures and would need to be relocated or granted a variance.
- The structure also did not meet fenestration requirements. The Commission could waive those requirements.
- Pedestrian connections to Orchard Lake Road and within the site were found to be compliant.

In response to questions, Consultant Upfal provided the following additional information:

- The purpose of the ordinance requirement for indoor seating was to reduce auto-oriented uses.
- The purpose of the separation requirements between buildings was to address fire safety.

Commissioner Mantey pointed out that variances require a demonstration of a practical difficulty related to site conditions. Personal preference does not meet the criteria for granting a variance.

Commissioner Brickner asked about ownership and maintenance of the parking lot located behind the subject property and questioned whether easements may exist to allow shared access. Commissioner Lindquist noted that the rear parking area was formerly associated with the Ruby Tuesday site. It was noted that the rear parking area does not provide functional access for the proposed development.

Commissioner Countegan stated that, while many site plan issues could be addressed administratively, he had concerns related to the Special Approval Use standards, specifically with the standard requiring that the proposed use not create vehicular or pedestrian traffic hazards, particularly given traffic conditions along Orchard Lake Road. No traffic study had been provided, and he needed additional analysis regarding site access and circulation.

Commissioner Countegan also raised concerns regarding the lack of indoor seating and how a variance request regarding this ordinance requirement would be evaluated.

In response to a question from Commissioner Lindquist, Mr. Cooksey said that the applicant planned to move the exterior cooler to meet the separation requirement.

#### **Public hearing.**

Chair Trafelet opened the public hearing.



Staff Planner Mulville-Friel noted that a letter from an adjacent property owner was included in the meeting packet.

David Elkus, owner of the adjacent property to the south, referenced his correspondence to the Commission outlining his concern regarding a 7 Brew coffee kiosk at the proposed location, and also listing significant traffic issues experienced at other 7 Brew locations. Mr. Elkus was particularly concerned regarding traffic impacts at Orchard Lake Road and Twelve Mile Road, including left-turn movements into and out of the site. Mr. Elkus' property shares cross-access easements with the subject site and the adjacent gas station. Vehicles frequently cut through his parking lot to access the gas station despite prior assurances that a traffic barrier on Orchard Lake Road would prevent such movements. A high-volume drive-through use would exacerbate these issues and negatively impact his property.

No other public indicated they wished to speak, and Chair Trafelet closed the public hearing and brought the matter back to the Commission.

#### **Commission deliberation and motion**

City Attorney Schultz discussed the Planning Commission's historical and current practice regarding applications requiring Zoning Board of Appeals variances. This proposal requires variances from the indoor seating requirement and minimum square footage requirement. Given the nature of those variances, the ZBA may need to determine whether a use variance is required. Attorney Schultz suggested that denial at this stage would be the most appropriate action.

Commissioner Countegan stated that while the site design and stacking appeared well designed, he remained concerned about compliance with the Special Approval Use standard requiring that the proposed use not create hazardous traffic conditions. He cited the absence of a traffic study and requested additional analysis of ingress and egress along Orchard Lake Road. He also expressed concern regarding the lack of indoor seating and how a variance request to allow this would be evaluated. Commissioner Countegan supported denial of the request, which would allow the applicant to continue the process, appear before the ZBA, and if variances were granted, gather more information before returning to the Commission.

Commissioner Mantey said that the proposal was well designed with good stacking. However, the drive-through ordinance requires indoor seating. He further noted that the criteria for special approval require a finding that the use would not make vehicular traffic more hazardous; this had not been demonstrated. He echoed concerns with left turns to and from Orchard Lake Road. He did not support approving the request.

**MOTION by Aspinall, support by Stimson, that the application for Special Approval Site Plan 67-10-2025, dated October 10, 2025, submitted by Brewtopia Michigan, LLC, BE DENIED, because it DOES NOT appear to meet all applicable requirements of the Zoning Chapter and the standards for Special Approval Uses set forth in Section 34-6.3. The Denial is based on the following determinations:**

- **A ZBA variance is required from the requirement for a minimum 1,100 square-foot building, with indoor seating for at least twenty (20) people.**

- **Additional information is required to demonstrate the second special approval use standard: that the proposed use will not make vehicular and pedestrian traffic more hazardous than is normal for the district.**

**Motion discussion:**

Commissioner Brickner expressed openness to the applicant's plan, and said denial was an opportunity for the applicant to bring new plans to the Commission after obtaining a variance.

In response to a request from Commissioner Lindquist, City Attorney Schultz explained that a use variance had an unnecessary hardship standard, which was a higher standard than a dimensional (non-use) variance which had a practical difficulty standard. A use variance required a supermajority of votes to pass as opposed to a simple majority.

City Attorney Schultz emphasized that he was not making a determination either way – whether the request would be for a use variance or a dimensional (non-use) variance. This would be decided as the application moves forward through the City's processes.

**Roll call vote:**

<b>Stimson</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Countegan</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Aspinall</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Lindquist</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Grant</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Brickner</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Mantey</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Trafelet</b>	<b>yes</b>

**Motion to deny passed 8-0.**

**REGULAR MEETING**

**A. SITE PLAN APPROVAL 68-11-2025**

<b>LOCATION:</b>	<b>24535 Hallwood Rd</b>
<b>PARCEL I.D.:</b>	<b>22-23-19-426-035</b>
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	<b>Addition to an existing granite and cabinet shop within the LI-Light Industrial District</b>
<b>ACTION REQUESTED:</b>	<b>Site Plan approval</b>
<b>APPLICANT:</b>	<b>A R Samona Construction</b>
<b>OWNER:</b>	<b>Allow Investment, LLC</b>

**Planning consultant review**

Referencing the December 5, 2025 Giffels Webster memorandum, Planning Consultant Tangari highlighted the following points:

- The site is located on Hallwood Court between Halstead Road and M-5, and is zoned LI-Light Industrial. The surrounding properties are also zoned LI-Light Industrial, with M-5 highway located to the west and south.
- The site is approximately 2.154 acres with an existing 25,939 square-foot building.

- The site would continue to be accessed from Hallwood Court.
- The applicant proposed adding 9,829 square-feet to expand an existing granite and cabinet shop. The proposed use was a permitted use in the zoning district and met the dimensional standards of the district.
- No outdoor storage was shown on the plans; any outdoor storage would be required to be located in the rear yard.
- Rooftop equipment screening was not identified, and an existing front-mounted mechanical unit is currently unscreened.
- A landscape plan was not submitted and will be required.
- A hedge would normally be required between the site and a public right-of-way, but a 20 foot storm sewer easement prevented trees from being planted there. There was, however, extensive vegetation between the site and M-5.
- Parking exceeds the minimum required; up to 20 percent additional parking may be approved. Employee counts were not provided, limiting the ability to verify whether parking calculations based on floor area or employee count would be controlling.
- Parking space dimensions must be added to the plans.
- Lighting plan information was incomplete; pole-mounted fixtures appear compliant, but wall-mounted fixtures do not meet cutoff requirements and must be revised.

#### **Applicant presentation**

Contractor Raad Samona, Samona Construction, W. Bloomfield, and Adnan Al-Saati, A&M Consultants, Dearborn, project engineer, were present on behalf of this request for site plan approval to construct an addition to an existing granite and cabinet shop within the LI-Light Industrial District.

Mr. Samona explained that the applicant planned to construct an addition for inventory storage including inventory that did not sell quickly and inventory that would be sold to other retailers. Inventory arrived every three months and the applicant needed more space to store enough inventory to last three months.

The applicants made the following points:

- The addition would be constructed of masonry and will maintain required fire department access.
- The existing detention basin will be maintained and placed under a regular maintenance contract. The applicant would work with City engineers to evaluate the drainage system and make sure that the existing sewer could accommodate the addition.
- The business closed at 5:00pm, and there would only be a light to illuminate the parking lot at night which would turn off automatically.
- Landscaping will be provided where feasible, including shrubs and trees within any landscaped islands.
- The addition is located in a previously vegetated area and does not eliminate parking.

#### **Planning Commission deliberation and/or motion**

**MOTION by Brickner, support by Countegan, that Application for Site Plan Approval 68-11-2025, dated August 4, 2025, as revised October 27, 2025, submitted by A R Samona Construction, BE**

**APPROVED, because it appears to meet all applicable requirements of the Zoning Chapter,  
SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS and DETERMINATIONS:**

**CONDITIONS AND DETERMINATIONS:**

- All outstanding issues identified in Giffels Webster's December 5, 2025, review shall be addressed to the reasonable satisfaction of the City Planner;
- All outstanding issues identified in the City Engineer's December 2, 2025, interoffice correspondence shall be addressed to the reasonable satisfaction of the City Engineer, and;
- All outstanding issues identified in the Fire Marshal's November 20, 2025, interoffice correspondence shall be addressed to the reasonable satisfaction of the Fire Marshal.
- A photometric plan is required and must comply with standards contained in Section 34-5.16.
- A Landscape Plan is required and must comply with standards contained in Section 34-5.14.
- The twenty-two (22) parking spaces provided are adequate for the use proposed.
- Roof-top mechanical equipment must be screened as required.

**Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.**

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES                      November 20, 2025, Regular Meeting**

**MOTION by Grant, support by Countegan, to approve the November 20, 2025 Regular Meeting minutes as submitted.**

**Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.**

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

None

**COMMISSIONER/STAFF COMMENTS**

- Staff Planner Mulville-Friel said that the capital improvement plan meeting was scheduled for January 22, 2026 at 6:00pm. The regular January meeting will be January 15.
- Commissioners shared holiday greetings.
- Commissioners briefly discussed aspects of the drive-through ordinance.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION by Mantey, support by Brickner, to adjourn the meeting.**

**Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.**

The meeting ended at 9:13pm.

Respectfully submitted,  
Kristen Aspinall,  
Planning Commission Secretary

/cem