

CITY OF NORTHVILLE
Planning Commission
November 3, 2015
Northville City Hall – Lower Level, Meeting Room A

1. CALL TO ORDER:

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

2. ROLL CALL:

Present: Steve Kirk
Carol Maise
Dave Mielock
Christopher Miller
Matthew Mowers
Mark Russell
Anne Smith
Jeff Snyder
Jay Wendt

Absent: none

Also present: Jim Allen, Mayor Pro Tem
Patrick Sullivan, City Manager
Sally Elmiger, Planning Consultant
James Gallogly, Public Works Director

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

MOTION by Maise, support Mielock, to approve the agenda as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: October 20, 2015

The minutes were amended as follows: page 4, paragraph 3, next to last line: Most ordinances refined the definition of *grade* by ~~have~~ having a . . .

Motion by Kirk, support Smith, to approve the October 20, 2015 minutes as amended. Motion carried unanimously.

5. AUDIENCE COMMENTS: None.

6. REPORTS:

A. CITY ADMINISTRATION:

City Manager Sullivan reported that the City Council had taken action on two requests from the Historic District Commission. The first was a request to start the process for amending the boundaries of the

Historic District to include the entire Foundry Flask site. Currently the east half of the site, which was mostly parking lot, was not included in the Historic District. For several reasons the Council did not take action on that request, preferring to wait until the new budget period, and also waiting to see if an application was received before that time. The process of amending the Historic District boundary would take about a year, and it was noted that anyone who applied during the study period would not be regulated by Historic District standards. Also there was no building on the east side of the site, and researching historical significance of a parking lot seemed problematic.

City Manager Sullivan continued that City Council did approve a request by the Historic District Commission for Carlisle/Wortman to write a grant application for an Intensive Level survey of the District. He asked Planning Consultant Elmiger to explain what this was.

Planning Consultant Elmiger explained that there were two types of surveys: Reconnaissance Level and Intensive Level. The survey types were developed after the 1972 original survey of Northville's Historic District. The surveys were proscriptive from the Secretary of the Interior. A Reconnaissance Level survey was basically a collection of information obtained from looking at a historic resource. An Intensive Level survey included that but also included photographing all the structures within a Historic District and then determining the significant structures and those structures that would need to be researched in the historical archives, etc. The survey would allow the HDC to determine which structures in the District were contributing and which were not.

In response to a question from Commissioner Kirk regarding structures and properties that might be added to the Historic District, Planning Consultant Elmiger said that if the Council wanted to move forward regarding a boundary change, Council would appoint a study committee would include several knowledgeable people including one HDC member; this committee would study whatever areas or properties were proposed for inclusion in the Historic District. If the Planning Commission had certain properties that they thought should be included, they should communicate this to the HDC.

B. CITY COUNCIL: None

C. PLANNING COMMISSION: None

D. OTHER COMMUNITY/GOVERNMENTAL LIAISONS: None

7. FINAL SITE PLAN REVIEW: 335 E. CADY

Referring to the Carlisle/Wortman review letter dated October 26, 2015, Planning Consultant Elmiger gave the background for this agenda item. She explained that the applicant for the Corner House project was returning to the Planning Commission with the materials required by the July 21, 2015 motion granting final site plan approval for this project.

The motion from the July 21, 2015 meeting read:

“MOTION by Mielock, support Maise, to grant final site plan approval including a granting of the waiver for the front setback, for the Corner House at 335 E. Cady Street, Northville MI, with the following conditions to be met prior to the issuing of a building permit:

- A. Submission by the applicant and approval by the Planning Commission of the condominium documents, including the Master Deed and Bylaws.

- B. Submission by the applicant and approval by the Planning Commission of the lighting photometric plan.
 - C. All recommendations on pages 11-12 of the Carlisle/Wortman site plan review letter dated July 13, 2015 be resolved by the applicant.
- And the following condition to be met prior to the issuance of a right-of-way permit:
- D. Level of service traffic analysis on the driveway off of Griswold be submitted by the applicant and approved by the Planning Commission.”

Planning Consultant Elmiger noted that condition A required the condominium documents submitted to the Planning Commission this evening. Those documents included the prohibition against first floor bedrooms and also included regulations for rooftop use so that extraneous items were not stored or left on the rooftops. The documents had been reviewed by the City Attorney and his comments – subject to attorney-client privilege – were included in the Commissioners’ packets.

A photometric plan had been submitted, as required by Condition B. She noted that the lighting levels along Griswold Street adjacent to the side pedestrian door were significantly higher than the rest of the site. Were two, ceiling mounted lights in this area necessary? Also, the final site plan showed a street light on Griswold, but the photometric plan did not. The applicant should confirm that the Griswold Street light would be installed.

The recommendations on pages 11-12 of the July 13, 2015 Carlisle/Wortman site plan review letter had been addressed, as required by Condition C. All items had been resolved except for storm water details, which would be reviewed by Public Works Director Gallogly before a building permit was issued.

A level of service traffic analysis had been submitted, as required by Condition D. The conclusion of the analysis was that the traffic on Griswold would not be adversely affected by this development.

Chair Wendt noted that Griswold had been labeled “Meadowbrook” on the traffic analysis schematics; this should be corrected.

Roger Berent, of Roger Berent Architects, 53064 Nadine Court, Shelby Township, MI 48316, and a partner in the proposed development, was present on behalf of this application. Realtor Shelby Fulkerson, Hub LLC, 829 Penniman Avenue, Plymouth MI, and a partner in the development, was also present.

Mr. Berent said that 8 units were reserved for this project. They were working on financing, and hoped to break ground in the spring.

Tonight they were seeking to resolve all outstanding issues. The street light on Griswold would be installed as proposed; this had been an oversight on the photometric plan. The illumination that was a little brighter represented a porch light. Each unit would have a porch light at each door; those did comply with ordinance requirements. The applicants would provide storm water details as part of the final engineering submissions for the permitting process. The traffic study had been completed and showed a minimal impact on current traffic and future traffic patterns at the intersection. This development had only 11 residential units.

Regarding the condominium documents, Commissioner Kirk asked about the restrictions regarding first floor bedrooms and rooftop storage. Were those restrictions permanent or could the documents be changed at any time?

Ms. Fulkerson said they had modified pg. 42, K, to read: *“unless written consent is provided by the City, no bedrooms may be located below the second floor.”*

Commissioner Russell asked about section 4(y), which regulated storage on the rooftop terraces. He noted that the Ordinance did cover this situation, in terms of regulating accessory structures and setbacks. City Manager Sullivan said that if the approval specifically called out a prohibition for certain items on the rooftop, this would be enforceable by the City.

Commissioner Russell asked the applicants how they foresaw the rooftop terraces being used. Mr. Berent said that he envisioned umbrellas, etc., being on the terraces. This would most likely be a seasonal use. Commissioner Russell said that he did not think this would be visual pollution, but rather could be attractive. No structure – such as those sold at home improvement stores – should be permitted, however.

Commissioner Mielock asked if there was privacy between the terraces. Mr. Berent said that the three end terraces were only separated by the 42” parapet as shown. Commissioner Mielock said that a resident might be inclined to put up something taller in order to gain privacy. Planning Consultant Elmiger advised any addition of that sort would have to be approved by the Historic District Commission. Commissioner Mielock suggested that the developers be proactive in this regard and perhaps design something for approval by the HDC before the project was complete.

In response to a question from Commissioner Mielock, Planning Consultant Elmiger said the Planning Commission could request a complete legal review of the condominium documents. The attorney had reviewed only those items discussed this evening.

It was the consensus of the Commission that a complete legal review of the condominium documents was not merited. Those issues that concerned the City were controlled by Final Site Plan Approval and Zoning regulations.

MOTION by Russell, support Mielock, that the applicant for 335 East Cady Street has satisfied the Planning Commission Final Site Plan Approval requirement to address the items mentioned in the Carlisle/Wortman document dated October 26, 2015 and are in compliance with the conditions of the motion for Final Site Plan Approval passed on July 21, 2015.

Chair Wendt asked for a roll call vote.

Russell	yes
Snyder	yes
Smith	yes
Miller	yes
Kirk	yes
Mielock	yes
Maise	yes
Mowers	yes
Wendt	yes

Therefore, the motion carried unanimously.

8. DISCUSSION

Planning Consultant Elmiger said that a Planning Commission meeting was scheduled for November 17, to include the following items:

- Building heights.
- Rezoning certain R-2 properties to R-1B.
- Hear a conceptual proposal for an assisted living development on the Foundry Flask property. Planning Consultant Elmiger noted that the front part of the Foundry Flask building was likely to be historic. The building itself was falling into disrepair. The site might qualify for a Brownfield development.

Planning Consultant Elmiger said there had been a preapplication meeting with developers who were proposing a mixed-used project with 85 units for 95 residents, with a mixture of studio, 1 and 2-bedrooms units. The average age of the residents would be 85, and the average stay would be 2-1/2 years. 40% of the facility would be devoted to memory care. The developers understood the Master Plan called for a mixed-use development with no first floor residential. They also understood items in the Master Plan such as straightening out Cady Street, a farmers' market location, a walkway along the river, and a possible pedestrian plaza at Main and Cady Streets.

Planning Consultant Elmiger said that assisted living was not a use contemplated in the Master Plan for this site. However there were assisted living facilities in the CBD District.

Planning Consultant Elmiger said these developers were working on facilities in Troy and Rochester Hills. There was no corporate building style, but rather these were high-end developments that blended with the community. All units would be private pay.

The Commission would receive an opinion letter before November 17 regarding this conceptual plan including a review of how the proposed development fit with the intent of the Master Plan and Zoning Ordinance for this area.

Commissioner Mielock asked if the ordinance included, or could include, language regarding deferred parking. Planning Consultant Elmiger said she would research this.

In response to a question from Commissioner Kirk, Public Works Director Gallogly said the gravel lot next to the Pizza Cutter had been addressed. The property owner had been given a deadline to either put the lot back to lawn or come in with a site plan for a parking lot.

9. ADJOURN

After brief discussion regarding various sites/issues in the City, Chair Wendt asked for a motion to adjourn.

**MOTION Kirk, support Russell, to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting at 8:21 p.m.
Motion carried unanimously.**

Respectfully submitted,
Cheryl McGuire

Recording Secretary

Approved as published 11/17/15