

CITY OF NORTHVILLE
Planning Commission
August 15, 2017
Northville City Hall – Council Chambers

1. CALL TO ORDER:

Chair Wendt called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL:

Present: Steve Kirk
Carol Maise
Dave Mielock
Christopher Miller
Jeff Snyder
Jay Wendt

Absent: Marc Russell (excused)
Ann Smith (unexcused)
1 vacancy

Also present: Ken Roth, Mayor
James Allen, Mayor Pro Tem
Patrick Sullivan, City Manager
Sally Elmiger, Planning Consultant

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

MOTION by Mielock, support by Kirk, to approve the agenda as published.
Motion carried unanimously.

4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: August 1, 2017

Motion by Mielock, support by Kirk, to approve the August 1, 2017 minutes with the following amendment:

- Page 2, 4th paragraph under 8. Final Site Plan Review: 528 Randolph, to read:
Commissioner Snyder disclosed that he had a business relationship with the ~~architect~~
applicant, . . .

Motion carried unanimously.

5. AUDIENCE COMMENTS: None.

6. REPORTS:

- A. CITY ADMINISTRATION:** None.
- B. CITY COUNCIL:** None.

C. PLANNING COMMISSION: In response to a question from Commissioner Kirk, Mayor Pro Tem Allen updated the Commission on the progress toward filling the vacancy on the Commission.

D. OTHER COMMUNITY/GOVERNMENTAL LIAISONS: None.

**7. PRELIMINARY/FINAL SITE PLAN REVIEW
212 W. CADY STREET – NORTHVILLE DISTRICT LIBRARY**

Planning Consultant Elmiger gave the background for this application, which was a proposal to construct a meeting room and two study rooms underneath an overhanging portion of the east side of the existing Northville District Library building. The building's footprint would not change. However, the new addition did allow more people to use the library and therefore increased the parking requirement.

When the building was constructed in 1995, the Northville Public Schools agreed to allow library patrons to use their parking lots adjacent to the Library, but no formal agreement was ever adopted. Northville's Zoning Ordinance did not have a calculation for library parking. As explained in the July 25, 2017 Carlisle/Wortman review letter, in order to calculate how much additional parking this new addition would generate, Planning Consultant Elmiger looked at other communities' ordinances that included a calculation for library parking and also used the 1995 parking standards that determined whether or not existing parking could accommodate the library. From this information, it was determined that 5 additional spaces were necessary to accommodate the new addition.

On August 7, 2017, the Library Board wrote a letter to the Planning Commission stating that they agreed to make a contribution for constructing the 5 new parking spaces. Most likely those funds would be used to construct 5 spaces along Cady Street when the City's reconstruction of Cady occurred.

Since the School was thinking about and had made overtures regarding selling the Main Street School and repurposing the Old Village School, the future status of the Library's parking was unknown. Therefore Planning Consultant Elmiger recommended that any approval on this addition be conditioned on the Library Board and the City creating a written agreement for how parking would be provided in the future.

Also, the applicant should show on a plan how the mature trees in the adjacent park would be protected during construction and how the rest of the park would be protected from any heavy equipment that would be needed to move materials back and forth during construction of the new addition.

Ron Cieslak, Merritt Cieslak Design, 33610 Grand River, Farmington, MI, was present on behalf of this application. He distributed the letter from the Library Board referenced above to the Commission, along with a Tree Protection Plan dated August 15, 2017.

Mr. Cieslak explained that the applicants were seeking to fill in under the upper level of the library, which was currently cantilevered over the grade. This would add about 800 square feet to be used for two additional study rooms and a meeting space, all of which the Library badly needed. They would match existing material, including brick, architectural masonry, and color of window treatments.

As noted in the letter, the Library Board committed to paying for the 5 additional spaces on the north side of Cady when the reconstruction occurred. They were willing to enter into a written agreement with the City stating the Library would take responsibility for Library parking and they would establish a written agreement with the Board of Education regarding parking space use.

Mr. Cieslak continued that the proposed Tree Protection Plan for the park showed snow fencing at the dripline of the trees, and also how they proposed to access the construction area, coming north from Cady as close to the building as they could in order to limit access. Because the construction was under an existing building he did not think heavy equipment would be utilized. Small equipment could be used as needed.

Chair Wendt asked about the possibility of eliminating parking at the rear of City Hall and using that area for construction access.

In response to a question from Commissioner Kirk, Mr. Cieslak said they would address the closet door access issue as noted in the Building Department review when they applied for a permit.

Julie Herron, Northville District Library Director, 6505 Pembroke, Westland, MI, said that the occupancy of the new area would not increase the number of people coming into the Library, but would better serve the people already utilizing their spaces. Right now conditions were crowded, and patrons needed additional meeting space.

In response to a question from Commissioner Maise, City Manager Sullivan said there was a formula for determining the cost of new parking spaces.

Commissioner Mielock commented that paying for parking in lieu of meeting parking requirements was only allowed in the CBD District. City Manager Sullivan agreed, and said the contract between the City and the Library would address the Library making a cash contribution for the 5 parking spaces.

In response to a question from Commissioner Kirk, City Manager Sullivan said the time frame for reconstructing Cady Street was as yet undetermined, but would likely be in less than 5 years.

Commissioner Kirk commented that it was likely patrons would stay longer at the Library when there was more space, thereby increasing parking needs.

City Manager Sullivan questioned whether a written agreement between the City and the Library requiring future parking should be required. The City did not own the parking lot west of the library, and could not enter an agreement for the use of that property. Future parking was uncertain, as the School still didn't know what their plans were for the two buildings to the west. All parties were committed to work together regarding parking, but nothing was ready to be documented.

Commissioner Mielock's concern was not the additional parking needed for this small addition. Broadly speaking, there would likely be parking issues if Main Street School closed and the uses there were moved into Old Village. He would prefer any positive motion be contingent upon reaching a parking agreement regarding future use.

Commissioner Snyder suggested there were several areas close by that provided available parking, including south on Wing Street, across from the cemetery, in front of the Post Office, and the public parking lot.

Commissioner Mielock further explained his concerns about future uses by the school buildings. For instance, if a preschool activity moved into Old Village School, safety and traffic issues would need to be

addressed. It would be better to do this sooner than later. Commissioner Kirk pointed out that those issues would need to be addressed with the Board of Education.

Mr. Cieslak said that the School Board was not in a position to enter any kind of formal agreement until they knew what they were doing with their property. The Library's intent was to take responsibility for their parking, and work that out with the City and School Board as soon as they could. However, this process might take a long time, and in the meantime they did not want to wait to construct the addition.

City Manager Sullivan added that another complicating factor was the lease agreement between Parks and Rec and the School District for their portion of the parking lot.

City Manager Sullivan continued that representatives of the City, the Library and the School District had all met to talk about this issue, but the School could not commit parking spaces until they knew how Old Village School was going to be used.

In response to questions from Commissioner Mielock, Mr. Cieslak said they would conform to any conditions required by the Planning Commission in an approving motion. They were seeking preliminary and final site plan approval this evening so that they could go to City Council next week.

The Commission acknowledged that the parking issues in this area of the City were difficult.

Commissioner Miller summarized that there were some fundamental parking problems underlying this area of the City. However, tonight the application was for an 800 square foot addition that required 5 additional parking spaces.

Commissioner Kirk indicated he was ready to make a motion.

Discussion followed as to whether the motion could include a condition requiring a written agreement for future parking needs of the library. It was the consensus of the Commission that since the City could not enter into an agreement for land it did not own, and since the School could not enter into an agreement until they knew how the buildings involved would be used, such a condition should not be included.

It was also the consensus of the Commission not to require the 5 parking spaces to be *on Cady Street*, though that was the intent at present. Ultimately it would be up to the City where the money was spent. Requiring the 5 spaces meant that the parking situation would not be worse as a result of the requested addition.

Seeing that discussion had ended, Chair Wendt indicated he was ready to move ahead with the motion.

Motion by Kirk, support by Maise, that based on the information received from the applicant, and reflected in the minutes of this meeting, the Planning Commission finds that the Site Plan proposed for the building addition to the Northville Public Library, dated July 25, 2017 meets the required standards and findings for Approval pursuant to Article 19 – Site Development Plan Procedural and Approval Process of the Zoning Ordinance, and approves the Site Plan with the following conditions:

- 1. The applicant provide tree protective fencing at the dripline around the tree adjacent to the construction area before construction begins.**

2. **The applicant provide additional information regarding how the construction area will be accessed with heavy equipment and the park protected.**
3. **The Library Board makes a payment to the City to contribute toward constructing five (5) parking spaces.**

Chair Wendt asked for a roll call vote.

Miller	yes
Maise	yes
Mielock	yes
Kirk	yes
Snyder	yes
Wendt	yes

Therefore the motion was approved unanimously.

8. PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN REVIEW: 158 EAST MAIN – “160 MAIN”

Planning Consultant Elmiger gave the background for this application, explaining that the applicant was renovating an existing building for a new restaurant with carryout service. Both of those uses were permitted uses within the CBD District. The building changes included modifying the second floor to a mezzanine, and making some exterior changes.

The applicants proposed to add a balcony on the west side that extended over City property in the Town Square; this would need City Council approval. The restaurant use required 4 additional parking spaces. The applicant could construct or lease those spaces, or provide a payment in lieu of parking spaces.

The applicants had provided a response letter dated August 8, 2017 regarding questions and issues called out in the July 25, 2017 Carlisle/Wortman review letter, as follows:

- Information had been provided regarding deliveries to the restaurant.
- Regarding carryout service, patrons would use either the front door off Main Street or the west side door on Dunham.
- The existing vines on the west wall would be reduced to accommodate new windows. In an August 14, 2017 email, DDA Director had Ward had commented regarding this reduction:

We have an easement agreement that runs with the land that requires the vines to stay up. The DDA anticipated, in fact hoped that the west façade would be opened up at some point and the vine cabling would need to be reduced. We are happy with the plans that they have shown that leaves as much of the cable system in place as is possible.

- Lighting details would be provided after HDC approval. The applicants would also contact the DDA to ensure lighting would not interfere with any activities in the Town Square.
- Elevation of the building and an architectural rendering were submitted. The applicant had revised renderings to show the Commission tonight that were consistent with those submitted to the HDC.

Brian Maiorana, 36167 Parklane Circle, Farmington Hills MI, and William Carpenter, A3 studios Architects, 1441 E. Maple Road, Suite 312, Troy, MI were present on behalf of this application.

Mr. Maiorana said he was the owner of Saponi Italian Restaurant in Washington Township, MI, and would bring a similar concept and cuisine to downtown Northville by using the now vacant Riffle's building as a one-use restaurant space, including second floor mezzanine seating. Elements on the west elevation would allow them to integrate activities on the Town Square with the restaurant experience.

Chair Wendt thought that having carryout on the west side of the building could conflict with activities there. Some activities in the park were so intense you could hardly walk through it. He would like to see the carryout move to the front door or another location that was easier for customers to access.

Mr. Maiorana said his existing restaurant had carryout through the front door; this was not an issue. Mr. Carpenter mentioned that they were also considering curb delivery in the rear, on Mary Alexander Court.

In response to a question from Commissioner Snyder, Mr. Maiorana said they were planning on having outdoor seating next year.

Commissioner Snyder asked if the City had an allotted number of table and chairs for outdoor seating. City Manager Sullivan said that there was no formula for this. In the past, Riffle's had outdoor seating on that side of the building.

In answer to further questions from Commissioner Snyder, City Manager Sullivan said there was a separate approval process for outdoor seating that involved the Fire Marshall, for instance. The applicant would need to apply for outdoor seating, and then that review process would be initiated. Additional parking was not required for outdoor seating. If people were eating in outdoor cafes, they were likely parking in one location and perhaps stopping at several locations in the downtown.

Commissioner Snyder spoke to the increased number of restaurants downtown and the accompanying impact on parking.

In response to further questions from Commissioner Snyder, Mr. Carpenter said that given their responses and improved design as presented this evening, if possible they would like final site plan approval. They would be before the HDC tomorrow night.

Further discussion included:

- The area under the canopies included the windows and blank wall space.
- The western door allowed for service to the outdoor seating area, without disrupting the flow of customers using the front door.
- The windows were operational on the front façade, but not on the side, where noise from events could be intense.
- The balcony was not functional as such; it overhung just enough to allow the doors to open.

In response to a question from Chair Wendt, City Manager Sullivan said there would need to be an agreement between the City and the restaurant regarding anything that entered City space, including the balcony. Mayor Pro Tem Allen added that such an agreement would also include the awnings, for instance.

In response to a question from Mayor Roth, Planning Consultant Elmiger said the balcony had been on the floor plans shown to the HDC. However, the rendering had not shown the balcony projection.

In response to a question from City Manager Sullivan, Planning Consultant Elmiger said the balcony projected 1.75 feet.

Commissioner Snyder spoke to the many sparrows that nested in the vines; the sparrows could swarm like bees and bird droppings could be a nuisance.

Commissioner Maise asked for clarification as to what was happening with the vines. Mr. Carpenter said they would remove vines and cables in order to install windows, but the vines would remain as shown on the rendering on the rest of the building.

Commissioner Miller thought this was a nicely conceived project. The updated version of the front elevation as shown created a dynamic, open feel for such a small storefront.

Commissioner Maise asked about the review letter comments on page 6 regarding lighting, which stated the ordinance didn't permit building-mounted lighting intended to attract attention to the building and/or use. Wasn't that the purpose of lighting?

Planning Consultant Elmiger explained that this applied to lights shining on the building itself to make sure people knew the building was there, rather than having downward facing lights on the sidewalk. Mayor Pro Tem Allen added that this also referred to the Historic District Design Standard, which required that lighting be accent only.

In response to a question from Commissioner Maise, Planning Consultant Elmiger said the HDC would look at the lighting fixtures, but not lighting levels.

In response to further questions from Commissioner Maise, Mr. Carpenter said they were providing accent lighting only. There were already uplights in the Town Square. They were working within the ordinance requirements, and were trying to find the right fixtures.

Planning Consultant Elmiger said that if it was acceptable to the Planning Commission, the Building Official and she could look at it the lighting levels once the HDC approved the fixtures in order to confirm that ordinance requirements were met.

In response to a question from Commissioner Kirk, Planning Consultant Elmiger said the applicants should consult with the DDA to make sure the lighting was acceptable; that could be a condition of approval.

There was discussion as to whether this application was for preliminary or final site plan approval. The HDC, City Administration, and DDA would all be involved with this project. The agenda showed this as an application for preliminary approval.

Mr. Carpenter said they were hoping to get a final approval, with conditions. There were some financial constraints in play, in that they needed Building Department approval in order to move forward with the purchase agreement.

Planning Consultant Elmiger explained that the applicant had not checked the box on the application form for either preliminary or final approval. She had made the recommendation to grant preliminary approval based on the number of unresolved issues. However, the applicant had addressed several of those issues in their response memo. If the Commission was comfortable with the final site plan and with the open-ended

issues being addressed by the Building Official and other City Departments, they could offer a final approval.

Chair Wendt pointed out that the Historic District Commission would approve the sign design.

In response to a comment from Commissioner Maise, Planning Consultant Elmiger said that signage information was on the checklist for site plan review, in terms of meeting zoning requirements. Commissioner Snyder noted the sign also projected into City space.

Commissioner Maise pointed out that the sign exceeded the permitted area. Would this go to the BZA? Planning Consultant Elmiger said the applicant could reduce the sign size and keep the graphics, or make application to the BZA for a variance. The Building Official would make sure the sign was compliant with the Zoning Ordinance and the HDC would ensure compliance with the Design Standards for the Historic District.

Commissioner Maise asked about the carryout activity also being on City property. Mayor Pro Tem Allen explained that technically any carryout in that area was on City property.

Commissioner Maise addressed traffic issues, when people blocked traffic for 5-10 minutes while they ran in to get their carryout. She wanted to make sure that carryout service was fully addressed by the site plan, as noted in the Carlisle/Wortman review letter.

Planning Consultant Elmiger said the applicant had provided information regarding carryout service at tonight's meeting. They had also provided information regarding deliveries.

In response to a comment from Chair Wendt, Mr. Maiorana said there would not be a specific carryout sign. The only proposed signage was as shown this evening.

After brief discussion regarding what conditions should be included in an approving motion, Commissioner Mielock indicated he was ready to make a motion for preliminary and final approval.

MOTION by Mielock, support by Maise, based upon the information received from the applicant, and reflected in the minutes of this meeting, the Planning Commission finds that the Preliminary and Final Site Plan proposed as 160 Main, located on the south side of E. Main Street, dated July 25, 2017 meets the required standards and findings for Preliminary and Final Approval pursuant to Section 19.05 – Site Development Plan Standards of the Zoning Ordinance and approves the Preliminary and Final Site Plan, with the following conditions.:

- A. City Council approval of balcony, lights, awnings and any other features that may fall on to City property.**
- B. Four (4) additional parking spaces, per methods outlined in the ordinance.**
- C. Permission from City Council and DDA to modify the existing vines/supports on the west side of building before building permits are issued.**
- D. 1. Photometric studies for proposed lighting. 2. Details of proposed fixtures to ensure light sources are not visible. 3. Consult with the DDA Director to ensure the proposed lighting will not disrupt activities in the Town Square.**

- E. Building Official’s evaluation of proposed signage when Sign Permit is applied for.**
- F. Elevation of entire front of building.**
- G. Approval from the Historic District Commission.**
- H. The drawings submitted this evening for the project be dated and titled and become part of the record as the approved drawings, along with all other information that was previously submitted. Any drawings submitted this evening supersedes earlier submitted drawings.**

Regarding parking, Mr. Carpenter noted that they had calculated each floor’s square footage independently as had been done with the past use, thus resulting in needing only 3 parking spaces. Planning Consultant Elmiger’s calculations had resulted in a requirement for 4 spaces. Since there was a cost associated with the parking spaces, he asked if the requirement could be reduced to 3 spaces.

Chair Wendt replied that the Commission would use the Consultant’s calculations. Commissioner Mielock explained that they had to consider the calculations based on a single use, and 4 spaces were required.

Seeing that discussion had ended, Chair Wendt asked for a roll call vote.

Miller	yes
Maise	yes
Mielock	yes
Kirk	yes
Snyder	yes
Wendt	yes

Therefore the motion was approved unanimously.

9. DISCUSSION

None.

10. ADJOURN

As there was no further discussion, Chair Wendt asked for a motion to adjourn.

MOTION by Kirk, support by Maise, to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting at 8:14 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,
Cheryl McGuire
Recording Secretary

Approved as published 09/05/2017