

CITY OF NORTHVILLE
Planning Commission
April 1, 2014
Northville City Hall – City Council Chambers

1. CALL TO ORDER:

Chair Wendt called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL:

Present: Chair Wendt
Steve Kirk
Carol Maise
Dave Mielock
Matthew Mowers
Marc Russell
Anne Smith
Jeff Snyder

Absent: Chris Gazlay (excused)

Also present: James Allen, Mayor Pro Tem
Jim Gallogly, DPW Director
Don Wortman, Planning Consultant

3. MINUTES:

Motion by Mielock, support by Smith, to approve the minutes of March 4, 2014 as published.

Voice vote: Ayes: All. Nays: None. Motion Unanimously Carried.

4. AUDIENCE COMMENTS: None

5. REPORTS:

- A. CITY ADMINISTRATION:** None
- B. CITY COUNCIL:** None
- C. PLANNING COMMISSION:** None
- D. OTHER COMMUNITY/GOVERNMENTAL LIAISONS:** None

**6. SITE PLAN REVIEW
410 N. CENTER – SHARED PARKING**

Chair Wendt noted that Commissioners Russell and Mielock had a conflict of interest in this case.

Chair Wendt further noted that ~~Commissioner Mowers had indicated that his wife had a business relationship with the Applicant.~~ the wife of Commissioner Mowers had communicated a neighborhood issue to the City regarding this application. Commissioner Snyder mentioned that he was also involved

in a possible contractual relationship with the applicants on a separate matter that would be going before the Board of Zoning Appeals. Discussion followed, including whether or not the affirmative disposition of this case would result in financial gains for the named Commissioners. The consensus of the Board was that Commissioners Mowers and Snyder could remain.

Motion by Kirk, support by Smith, to recuse Commissioners Russell and Mielock from the site plan review for 410 N. Center – Shared Parking.

Voice Vote (Russell and Mielock abstaining): Ayes: All. Nays: None. Motion Unanimously Carried.

Planning Consultant Wortman referred to the March 27, 2014 report prepared by Carlisle/Wortman Associates Inc., addressed to City Manager Sullivan, regarding this shared parking request. He explained that the Planning Commission's charge was to make a recommendation to City Council; City Council had the final decision-making authority. Mr. Wortman further explained that shared parking was permitted as a possible option under the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Wortman said that this property had previously been approved for a retail office development. The final site plan for that approval included 37 parking spaces. While the building was currently under construction, the parking lot was not yet complete.

Mr. Wortman explained that the applicant was now considering a brewpub on this site, which use changed the parking requirements and new calculations were necessary. Section 17.02 required bars, nightclubs and lounges (in which a majority of the sales consist of alcoholic beverages) to provide parking at a rate of 1 space per each 75 square feet of usable floor area. Submitted floor plans indicated that the brewpub would have 1,114 square feet of usable floor area, thus requiring 44 spaces. Therefore 7 more spaces were now necessary in order to meet Ordinance requirements.

Under Section 17.01.13, there was the potential for up to a 30% reduction in required parking spaces under a collective parking arrangement. This provision was inserted in the Ordinance specifically for the North Center Street area, a CBD Overlay District, in order to encourage redevelopment there. Shared parking was more efficient, minimized curb cuts on Center Street, and provided more effective parking in the area.

In order to request shared parking, the applicant had submitted required information including proposed hours of operation, a proposed shared parking agreement with 114 Rayson Street, and a parking occupancy survey for 114 Rayson Street for March 4-7, 2014.

Referring to formulas provided by the Urban Land Institute, Mr. Wortman said that if mixed-use parking calculations were used, 40 spaces would be required. With 37 spaces proposed on site, the applicant would require an on-site parking reduction and 3 shared off-site spaces. If general parking calculations were used 44 spaces would be required and the applicant would require an on-site reduction for 7 spaces.

Mr. Wortman said that the proposed agreement permitted the owner of 410 N. Center Street to utilize up to 4 parking spaces at the Rayson site between the hours of 5 p.m. to 12 a.m., during the brewery's peak demand. In return, the owners of the Rayson property were permitted to utilize up to 4 parking spaces at the N. Center site between the hours of 7 a.m. and 6 p.m. when the demand for office parking spaces was highest. He thought the proposed shared parking agreement was reasonable and could meet the projected demand for the 410 Center development.

Section 17.01.13c stated that the Planning Commission and City Council consider the Shared Parking arrangement and possible reduction on the following factors:

- ***Peak hours of operation for each use***
- ***Average/Peak parking demand***
- ***Impact of the shared parking on adjacent uses***
- ***Written legal evidence of a Shared Parking Agreement***

These had all been provided, and now the Planning Commission needed to make a recommendation to the City Council based on their findings.

Chair Wendt opened the Public Hearing.

Carolyn Mowers, 131 Rayson Street, questioned the accuracy of the 114 Rayson Street parking survey. She noted that employees from that building parked on Rayson Street even when there was available parking at the building itself. She requested that the Zoning Official review compliance with parking standards in the area. Also, would the brewpub be allowed to change hours of operation after opening?

Larry Parks, 632 N. Center Street, said that if the brewpub opened prior to 6 p.m. they would have difficulty in finding parking, shared or otherwise. The 40 required spaces shown on page 3 of the review letter did not seem reasonable or viable. He requested that parking be calculated under general parking calculations, not mixed-used. Also, he questioned whether employees would be instructed to park far away from this business, as seemed to be happening with other businesses in the area, forcing employees to park on residential streets.

David Marold, 443 Grace Street, complimented the developers on the design of this building. His concern was also the shared parking agreement, as similar agreements – when actually instituted – had not seemed to work in the past. He wondered if either party could cancel the agreements at any time. He said that other business owners in the area had experienced people encroaching on their parking due to the activities at ~~114 Rayson Street~~ the medical building– how was it possible that 114 Rayson Street had parking to share?

Pamela Schulte, 119 Rayson Street, also addressed the issue of employees from ~~114 Rayson Street~~ the doctor's office parking in front of her home. While she understood this was a public street, why make the situation worse? Grace Street was also congested, with parking on both sides of that street making driving very difficult. What would happen if emergency equipment needed to get down the street? Was it possible to have parking on only one side of the road? She asked that current parking problems be resolved before more parking needs were added.

Nicole Gardner, 464 Grace Street, said that a hostile relationship was developing between the residents and the doctors who worked ~~at 114 Rayson Street~~ on Center Street due to parking problems. Cars had been vandalized, requiring police involvement. Driveways were often blocked. Cars from ~~114 Rayson~~ the medical building on Center Street were often parked from 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. or later. She knew of recent near-miss accidents with pedestrians due to obstructed vision caused by the dense parking on her residential street. Given these issues, how would a new shared parking agreement be enforced? Would a complimentary valet or some other means of enforcement be provided? What would happen if the pub became very successful and even more parking would be required? How long would the shared contract last?

Chair Wendt responded that the minimum time period for the shared parking agreement was five years. Should the brewpub wish to expand, they would need to return to the Planning Commission for further approvals.

Lauri Coppock, 200 Rayson Street, referred to the Michigan Vehicle Code regarding parking near intersections; this Code was often violated in her neighborhood and was not being enforced. She had photos taken today of numerous such violations. Why weren't violators being ticketed? Also, Commissioner Russell himself was not parking his car in the lot at 114 Rayson, but rather was consistently utilizing a residential street. Also, the lot at 114 Rayson was full at 6:00 p.m. and 7:15 p.m. today. Where were the spaces that would be utilized for shared parking?

Maria Silverira, 437 Grace Street, echoed previously stated concerns. Noting that their streets were more narrow than most, the dense parking and inability for rescue vehicles to get to emergencies was a real concern. She doubted that the proposed parking lot could realistically handle 37 normal to large-sized vehicles. More likely far fewer vehicles would fit on the lot and the streets would have to provide for the excess. She asked the Commissioners to visit Grace and Rayson personally. The intersection at Grace and Rayson was close to the intersection at Rayson and Center streets. This situation was often difficult and unsafe, and would be exacerbated by customer traffic at the new location.

Dennis Harris, 250 Rayson Street, said that his neighborhood had the worst parking situation of any of the 10 residential communities in which he had lived. The property being discussed was zoned for office and retail, which did not create a problem and which did allow for adequate parking on site. A brewpub was going to generate too much traffic for the area and would make a bad situation worse.

Kurt Menhart, 483 Grace, had recently purchased the home at the corner of Lake and Grace Streets. Parking was an issue at all times: night and day. Lake Street was always parked with the same vehicles. He asked that the Planning Commission put the interests of the residents first as they were charged. The parking problems were undeniable. Weren't businesses required to provide parking for customers and employees? How could the Zoning Ordinance be enforced as intended?

Lori Rogala, 465 Grace Street, reiterated earlier concerns. She urged the Commission not to support making the parking problem worse. She said that parking was difficult from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m. She noted that on Friday nights – when the brewpub could reasonably be expected to be busy - the doctors at ~~114 Rayson Street~~ had late hours.

Joanne Bandoni-Menhart, 483 Grace Street, echoed previously stated concerns. She was concerned that home values would decrease due to parking concerns. She gave examples of parking difficulties she had experienced. She said the same cars were parked for long periods day after day; she believed the doctors' employees were told not to park on ~~114 Rayson Street~~ the medical building's property. Again, where would the shared spaces at that property come from? She spoke of the home they were renovating at Grace and Lake Streets – with the intense parking situation, she was questioning whether the investment was a good one. Would car doors from brewpub customers be opening and closing into the night?

Sheila York, 443 Grace Street, said that it was important to provide the best plan for this area. If it was not the best plan, why move forward with it?

Katrycia Skillman, 134 Rayson Street, spoke of the difficulty of backing out of her driveway when the street had so many employees of 114 Rayson Street parking there. Some of those vehicles were parked

in violation of the ordinance, being too close to crosswalks and intersections. This proposal would add more parking stress to the area.

Chair Wendt asked if any more representatives of the public wished to speak. None came forward.

Paul Bohn, 41700 West Six Mile Road, Northville, MI., spoke on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Bohn noted that the comments heard this evening were compelling, but addressed a situation that predated the application being heard this evening.

Mr. Bohn pointed out that as serious as the parking problem was, on-street parking was not an issue for the brewpub, which already had 37 spaces provided on the approved site plan. He emphasized that the brewpub had approximately 1,000 square feet of useable space. This was not a large footprint, and there were more people in Council Chambers tonight than could legally enter into the brewpub. The fire code determined how many tables and chairs could be placed in the brewpub; expansion was simply not possible at this location. Enforcement of correct parking would be compelled by the parking contract, which under the Ordinance was a legally enforceable document that had to be reviewed every five years and more frequently if the City chose.

Mr. Bohn said that there appeared to be a real problem with the medical office building ~~at 114 Rayson~~ 422 N. Center Street in terms of parking enforcement. This would not happen at the brewpub. Not only would the owner of the brewpub enforce the parking agreement, parking requirements would be part of the lease agreement, and the lease would also provide a legally enforceable document, stating exactly where the employees would park. Parking thus became a contractual obligation, not just provided or enforced on the goodwill of the business owner.

Mr. Bohn addressed the culture and clientele of brewpubs. Brewpubs attracted established clientele who were willing to pay \$7.00 a pint for specialty brews.

In answer to a question from the audience, Mr. Bohn said that the shared parking agreement between the brewpub and 114 Rayson Street would be enforceable by the City.

Kevin DeGrood, 9110 Oporto, Livonia, MI, and CEO of North Center Brewing Co., LLC, responded to the comments made and addressed his business plan for a micro brewery at 410 N. Center Street. He emphasized that his business plan would not add to the parking problems addressed by the public this evening.

Mr. DeGrood explained that while the term “brewpub” suggested a restaurant, he was proposing a microbrewery that would not serve food other than snacks; there would be no restaurant kitchen on site. The microbrewery would offer a taproom similar to the Witches’ Hat Brewing in South Lyon and Liberty Street Brewing in Plymouth, Michigan.

Mr. DeGrood said that in response to residents’ concerns, he was willing to close the microbrewery on Fridays and Saturdays at 12:00 a.m. instead of 2:00 a.m. as originally requested.

Mr. DeGrood said that microbreweries were not bars; the customer demographics did not skew toward 21 year olds’ binge drinking, for instance. Instead the customer demographics included those who enjoyed time among friends in a relaxed atmosphere. No “liquor” would be served. That is, the microbrewery liquor license would only allow North Center Brewing to serve beer produced on the premises.

Mr. DeGrood further explained that they would enforce a “no left turn” prohibition out of the parking lot. This would steer traffic onto Center Street and discourage traffic from heading into the residential neighborhood.

Mr. DeGrood affirmed that the parking proposed this evening was more than sufficient for the roughly 1,000 square feet of useable customer space at the microbrewery. Maximum seating capacity at the microbrewery was 44; again there were more people in Council Chambers than could legally fit into the proposed microbrewery.

Mr. DeGrood reiterated that the lease document was an enforceable document. Not only was it in his best interest to enforce the lease document and the shared parking agreement, it was critical that he maintain standards in order to keep his microbrewery license. He pointed out that when an establishment lost its liquor license, Michigan required a 10-year wait before reapplying.

The microbrewery would have, at the most, five employees, who would be asked to park in those spaces reserved in the shared parking agreement. He would never direct them to park in the residential neighborhood.

Mr. DeGrood pointed out that North Center Brewing was a finite business model; there was no place to expand at this location. 44 customers were the maximum number allowed inside the location; to have more than this would be a violation of the fire code. Violating the fire code could possibly lead to a loss of his microbrewer’s license.

The Plan of Operation prepared by North Center Brewing was submitted to both the Planning Commission and the Liquor Control Commission for their review. This document addressed safety issues; safety was one of the top concerns of the business plan.

Mr. DeGrood explained that in order to open for business and continue to successfully operate, the City had to agree with the Plan of Operation, and the safety of the residents and the microbrewery patrons had to be assured.

Mr. DeGrood had been working on this particular business model for two years, had looked at locations throughout the country, and had chosen Northville as his final location. He affirmed that a brewpub would be a positive addition to Northville’s downtown.

For those residents who wondered if he could change his hours of operation after receiving approval, Mr. DeGrood explained that he could not change his hours of operation without getting approval from the Liquor Commission.

Mr. DeGrood asked for approval of the shared parking agreement being discussed this evening.

Chair Wendt entertained further audience questions and discussion. In response to a question regarding enforceable parking agreements, Chair Wendt explained ordinance requirements regarding parking. Commissioner Maise explained that not every business owner had similar contracts. Mr. Bohn said that the enforceable contract being sought this evening would be a publicly available document, once it was approved. Mr. DeGrood pointed out that part of the funding for this business proposal came from the Small Business Administration. If he violated his lease or any legal document submitted to that Administration, the SBA could withdraw its support.

Chair Wendt brought the discussion back to the Commission.

Commissioner Mowers thanked the community for their comments and Mr. DeGrood for his response. If the Commission recommended approval of this shared parking agreement, they would need to decide whether they recommended mixed-use or general parking standards. He felt that mixed-use parking standards might not be appropriate because of the ongoing parking issues already existent. Referencing the internal site plan reviews by Public Works Director Gallogly and Police Chief Goss, both of whom indicated some concerns regarding parking enforcement, Mr. Mowers recommended using general parking requirements, or an additional 7 spaces, and also recommended stricter parking enforcement generally in the residential area.

Commissioner Snyder confirmed with Dave Mielock, who was in the audience and was owner of 114 Rayson Street, that the proposed 4 shared parking spaces were available.

In answer to a further question from Commissioner Snyder, Planning Consultant Wortman said that the hours of operation were enforceable through liquor license control, also through the lease agreement and through enforcement of the shared parking agreement.

Consultant Wortman noted that there was a 30 minute discrepancy that needed to be rectified: the proposed plan of operation showed the business opening at 4:30 but the shared parking agreement did not start until 5:00 p.m. However, enforcement was written into the various agreements and approving bodies.

Commissioner Snyder clarified that while restrooms were part of the proposed floor plan, these were not part of the square footage calculations.

Commissioner Snyder noted that current construction and the severe winter just passed had made the parking situation in the neighborhood worse; these were both temporary conditions. Additionally, most of the complaints regarding parking were directed at employee parking from 114 Rayson Street. Had this been addressed to City Council?

Mayor Pro Tem James Allen commented that City Manager Sullivan, who was absent this evening, was already planning on meeting with the owners of ~~114 Rayson Street~~ the medical building in order to resolve some of the parking issues. Police were enforcing current parking regulations. One-sided parking was on the table, as well as posting no parking signs and finding other locations for employees to park.

Commissioner Smith said that she had been unaware of the parking issue in the neighborhood. Relating the history of other parking issues that had been resolved in the City, she felt that the issues being brought forward could also be worked out.

Commissioner Kirk also felt that parking issues could be worked out. He noted that one-sided parking eliminated some problems and created others. He encouraged the residents to present their concerns to City Council. He understood that a brewpub was not a bar and he appreciated the shortening of the hours on Friday and Saturday.

Mr. Kirk confirmed that the brewpub would be selling growlers, and the growlers could potentially leave the premises. This was inconsistent with the claim in the Plan of Operation that “No alcoholic

beverages are allowed to leave the facility or property.” Mr. DeGrood said that they would need to clarify that statement before submitting to the State Liquor Commission. They were permitted to sell sealed growlers that could leave the premises; they were not permitted to sell open containers to their patrons.

Mr. Kirk asked about the locked dumpster lids noted in Item VIII of the Plan of Operation. Property owner Dewayne White said that the dumpster doors would be locked, not the dumpster lids.

Mr. Kirk agreed that general parking calculations – not mixed use – should be used.

Mr. Kirk asked about noise level, noting that the Plan of Operation referred to live entertainment on special occasions. Mr. DeGrood explained that they would have 1 or 2-person acoustic entertainment. They did not have a music permit. They would comply with the City’s sound ordinance. Additionally, the insulation of the microbrewery would also act as a sound barrier.

Commissioner Maise agreed that current parking issues should be resolved, as indicated by Mayor Pro Tem Allen. She was pleased with the shortened hours on Friday and Saturday, the right turn only enforcement out of the establishment, and the limited occupancy of the building. She supported the shared parking agreement, using the mixed use calculations.

Commissioner Mowers said that the Planning Commission was not required to recommend approval of mixed-use calculations for parking. In addition to addressing the unique aspects of the business area, the Commission also needed to protect the interests of residents. He pointed out that this property was located in a primarily residential district which was why he supported using general parking calculations.

Commissioner Maise said she thought the proposed business was truly part of a mixed use area. Unfortunately tonight’s request was being clouded by an existent enforcement issue, which did need to be resolved. The City had resources to manage the enforcement problem.

Commissioner Mowers pointed out that the same facility that was offering up shared parking spaces was also taking advantage of street parking, to the detriment of the residents.

Mr. Bohn said that he and Mr. DeGrood were prepared to offer a compromise. He did consider the area mixed use. However, they felt they could find 7 parking spaces if the general parking calculations were used. Mr. DeGrood had already amended his plan based on concerns presented, including shortening hours of operation on Friday and Saturday, and installing a right turn only exit out of the facility. He was also willing to find an additional 7 parking spaces so that general calculations could be used.

Mr. Bohn said they were inheriting the fallout from existing parking issues. They could not predict the outcome of how that would be resolved. However, they could offer this compromise solution.

Commissioner Snyder noted that City Council would make its own independent decision in this matter.

In answer to a question from Commissioner Kirk, Mr. DeGrood said employees would arrive 30 minutes before opening.

Mr. Wendt confirmed with Mr. White that the rest of the subject building was not occupied. What would happen with parking when another tenant entered the equation? Property owner White noted that he understood the parking issues, and would work with the City and any new tenant to minimize parking conflicts.

In answer to a question from Commissioner Wendt, Mr. DeGrood said that he would do everything he could to keep his employees and patrons from parking in the neighborhood. However, he did not have actual enforcement authority in this regard.

Discussion continued regarding parking issues in the City. Several audience members spoke about the lack of trust regarding promises made due to the current situation with 114 Rayson Street.

In response to a question from Chair Wendt, Consultant Wortman said that a 600 square foot exemption for storage and production was permitted under “useable floor area.” No customers would be in the exempted portion of the building. Mr. DeGrood added that the area would be partitioned off under the Liquor License agreement.

In response to a question from Commissioner Maise, Mr. Bohn said that they were in discussion with other business owners, and they had the ability to provide the 7 additional spaces, though some would be a little further away from the business.

Audience members questioned whether the current parking situation was affecting property values. They asked why they couldn’t get some relief regarding the current parking congestion; without this, more shared parking would only make the problem worse.

Chair Wendt closed questions from the audience and brought the matter back to the Commission.

In answer to questions from Commissioner Maise, Consultant Wortman reiterated that the shared parking agreement would be enforceable under the controlled liquor license, the shared parking agreement itself, and the lease agreement. He emphasized that the shared parking agreement impacted the area during off-peak hours, i.e., after 5:00 p.m. He also noted that a recommendation for approval of this agreement could be conditioned on a review by the City Attorney.

Commissioner Snyder said that he was impressed that the Applicant had agreed to a shared parking agreement under the general parking calculations, and thus had agreed to find 7 required spaces under that calculation. The Applicant met all other City requirements for opening this business. He did not see how the Commission could deny a recommendation for approval. Since City Council had the ultimate authority in this matter, he recommended that the residents present this evening also attend the Council Meeting when this would be decided and voice any further concerns at that time.

Commissioner Kirk confirmed that the amended Plan of Operation as discussed this evening would be sent by the Applicant to the Liquor Control Board and the City Council.

Seeing that discussion had ended, Chair Wendt requested a motion from the Commission.

Commissioner Maise reviewed tonight’s discussion and the amendments offered by the Applicant. Based on that discussion and the agreed upon amendments, she offered the following the motion:

Motion by Maise, support by Smith, to recommend approval to City Council of 410 N. Center – Shared Parking Agreement with the following conditions:

- 1) **General parking calculations would apply, bringing the total of necessary shared parking spaces to seven (7), only four (4) of which would be part of a shared parking agreement with 114 Rays on Street.**
- 2) **The agreement be successfully reviewed by the City Attorney.**
- 3) **The business would open at 5:00 p.m. on Wednesday, Thursday and Friday. The business would close a midnight on Friday and Saturday. Therefore the hours of operation would be:**
Mon-Tues: Closed.
Wed-Thur: 5:00 PM – 11 PM
Fri-Sat: 5:00 PM – 12 PM
Sun: 12 PM – 8 PM
- 4) **A right turn only sign would be posted at the exit to the property on Center Street.**

Chair Wendt called the question:

Ayes: Mowers, Snyder, Smith, Kirk, Maise. Nays: Wendt.
Recused: Mielock, Russell.
Motion carried 5-1.

7. DISCUSSION
Master Plan

Planning Consultant Wortman introduced tonight’s Master Plan discussion, reminding the Commission of their discussion regarding this item on March 4, 2014. Tonight’s priorities included:

- 1) The Master Plan Joint Committee was preparing an RFP (request for proposal) and was seeking guidance in terms of structure and wording of that document, especially in terms of proposed development along Cady Street, which included Cady Town and the Racetrack area.
- 2) Questions of land use and street and block orientation (east/west or north/south) in the Cady Street area needed to be decided. He noted that Beal Street could be a connector to the area. Land use, density, height – big picture issues – needed to be specified in the RFP. The actual urban form could be developed later or perhaps placed in an appendix to the RFP.

With those comments, Mr. Wortman said that Greg Presley, of Presley Architects, would present some possible Cady Street Building Design Standards this evening and also provide some concepts regarding the development of the area.

Mr. Presley suggested that in order to take advantage of the existing river element, Cady Street should go out straight to Main Street, with a traffic light installed at the intersection. The area could be envisioned as a “creative” district, as directed by the Joint Committee, including areas and ways to attract fine arts, industrial arts, etc., along with residential properties. The area could be a counterpoint to the downtown area, with 3-4 story residential units, including rentals, and internal parking. A town square could be incorporated into the design, helping to create a distinct identity for the area. He described further design amenities, including space for the Farmer’s Market and a public park.

Commissioner Mielock noted that the creative district and the proposed straightening of Cady Street conformed to the Form Based Zoning adopted in 2008.

Mr. Presley presented an architectural schematic of a conceptual development four blocks wide by four blocks deep. This concept involved shifting the location of the Farmer's Market, thus giving the ability to create additional 3-story commercial spaces with residential opportunities above, as well as including an attractive boulevard for travel. This would both create a new urban form and provide an extension of the existing downtown.

Mr. Presley suggested possibly extending the Cady deck to ~~Church~~ Hutton Street, thus providing a larger parking opportunity, lined with commercial properties along Cady. The advantage of such a concept would be to provide properly located commercial development, with accompanying residential development becoming less dense as the residential units moved away from the center of action.

Mr. Presley further suggested that properties as high as 5 stories could be located in the Church St./Cady area, with the height stepping down to 4 and then 3 stories as the urban form moved out from the central area. A boutique hotel of 60-100 rooms, with parking beneath, was possible on the south side of Center Street.

Mr. Presley suggested an area for urban residential development, with a passive park along the Rouge River/Johnson Drain area. He suggested another possible boulevard, giving a "wonderful greenspace" to the area, increasing the unique identity there. Other unique features could include a roundabout, and a corner store with residential above. This entire development could potentially result in an additional 350-400 residential units for the City, with a lovely walkable area throughout.

Several commissioners spoke about the need for public parks/green space/pocket parks. Children needed play areas.

Mr. Wortman suggested the Commission also think in terms of what was not desirable. The Commission knew what it wanted: commercial mixed with residential, close to downtown. However, what would happen if a big box retailer came in and developed part of Northville Downs? The Master Plan needed to clearly set forth what was not wanted and what the long-term vision was. Design guidelines should be adopted. As examples, the commissioners had been provided with design standards from Petoskey and triangle design standards from Birmingham. An overlay district for Cady Street was very possible.

Questions regarding the structure and wording of the RFP were discussed. Should the RFP include any reference to a possible overlay zoning district or change in the Master Plan? Mayor Pro Tem Allen said that they had pulled the RFP from 1999-2000 to use as a guide. The most important standard right now was height. Discussion followed regarding current heights in the City, and potential height guidelines for this area, including parapet walls, and the ability to require step-downs from the tallest properties. Allowing opportunities for green roofs was also discussed.

Mr. Wortman said it would be important for the Planning Commission to suggest height limits and guidelines along with other items called out during tonight's discussion. He suggested that the Master Plan discussion be continued at a future meeting.

8. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Kirk, support by Russell, to adjourn the meeting at 10:01 p.m.

Voice Vote: Yes: All. Nays: None. Motion unanimously carried.

Respectfully submitted, Cheryl McGuire
Recording Secretary

Approved as amended: 04/15/2014