

CITY OF NORTHVILLE  
Planning Commission  
September 4, 2018  
Northville City Hall – Council Chambers

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

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

**2. ROLL CALL:**

Present: Steve Kirk  
Andrew Krenz  
Carol Maise  
Dave Mielock  
Mark Russell  
Ann Smith  
Jeff Snyder  
Donna Tinberg

Absent: Christopher Miller (excused)

Also present: Ken Roth, Mayor  
Pat Sullivan, City Manager  
Sally Elmiger, Planning Consultant  
Lori Ward, Downtown Development Authority Director

**3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:**

**MOTION by Maise, support by Tinberg, to approve the agenda as published.**

**Motion carried unanimously.**

**4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: August 21, 2018**

**Motion by Tinberg, support by Smith, to approve the August 21, 2018 minutes as published.**

**Motion carried unanimously.**

**5. CITIZEN COMMENTS: None.**

**6. REPORTS:**

**A. CITY ADMINISTRATION: None.**

**B. PLANNING COMMISSION: None.**

**C. OTHER COMMUNITY/GOVERNMENTAL LIAISONS: None.**

**7. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**SEVEN MILE – SOUTH MAIN STREET OVERLAY (SM-O) DISTRICT ORDINANCE**

Planning Consultant Elmiger explained that the purpose of tonight's public hearing was to discuss language that created a new overlay district for the Seven Mile/South Main Street area. Similar to

other overlay districts, the new language provided specific use, setback, height and design standards for this part of Northville. The language was based on the Master Plan Seven Mile/South Main Street Sub Area Plan, and incorporated Master Plan goals into the Zoning Ordinance.

The proposed overlay district had specific standards for:

- Density
- Area, height, and placement of a development on a site
- Driveways and parking, including sharing those facilities
- Pedestrian amenities
- A connection to Hines Park
- Streetscapes
- Stormwater management
- Architecture

Commissioner Snyder disclosed that he had a financial interest in property in the Seven Mile/South Main Street area.

**MOTION by Mielock, support by Russell, to recuse Commissioner Snyder from both public hearings and the P.U.D. proposal being heard this evening.**

**Motion carried 7-0-1 (Snyder recused).**

Commissioner Snyder left the dais.

Chair Kirk opened the public hearing at 7:07 p.m.

Laura E. Wagner, Dearborn, Board Member of Friends of the Rouge, referred to items in the Commissioners' packets, including a letter dated August 29, 2018, and 3 documents: (1) *A Summary of The Economic Impact of the Huron River*, (2) *Daylighting Streams: Breathing Life into Urban Streams and Communities*, and (3) *10 Reasons Why Cities Should Daylight Rivers*.

Ms. Wagner referred specifically to her letter, which addressed why the Friends of the Rouge believed that daylighting the part of the Rouge River that flowed beneath a layer of concrete from Beal Street to Seven Mile would offer the City multiple benefits to quality of life, and represented an opportunity that would not likely be an option again in the lifetimes of anyone present.

As Ms. Wagner did not have time to finish her presentation, Chair Kirk invited her to return to the next Planning Commission meeting to complete her comments.

Jeff Gaines, 334 Yerkes Avenue, Northville, supported the proposed zoning change for the Seven Mile and Main Street intersection, as it would allow a more interesting development at that intersection. He was concerned that the current Master Plan language would not result in a quality development at the site, or a true gateway appearance of the development. The Commission should demand good design, not a design by spreadsheet. He did not think the proposed architecture for the P.U.D. on tonight's agenda measured up to expectations, but was rather a cookie-cutter, uninteresting type of development. He supported mixed use, but the proposal this evening did not show true mixed use, but rather a segregated development, leaving no obligation to the developer to develop commercial use.

Seeing that no one else came forward to speak, Chair Kirk closed the public hearing at 7:18 p.m.

Regarding the proposed South Main Street Overlay District (SM-O), Commissioner Maise suggested eliminating or further regulating outdoor storage, and eliminating truck and trailer rental and self-storage warehouses.

Planning Consultant Elmiger noted that outdoor storage in the General Commercial District was subject to Section 16.11. Truck and trailer rental could be listed in the excluded special land uses for the overlay district. Other uses could be excluded from the SM-O District as the Commission desired. Outdoor storage could be regulated or prohibited. Section 16.11 did limit outdoor storage in terms of setbacks, loading activities, display areas, etc., but other standards could be added.

Commissioner Maise suggested regulating outdoor storage in terms of location, screening, and site plan placement, and adding any other reasonable criteria, especially for seasonal storage and/or sales.

Commissioner Mielock thought that Section 11.05.o, which listed 4 factors that would allow the Commission to waive or modify the design standards and landscape requirement set forth in paragraphs “f” through “n”, should be entirely eliminated. He thought the factors were subjective, and opened the door for an applicant to ignore design standards, such as the standard that garage doors shall not be permitted on the front facade. If the Commission was looking for quality architecture the standards needed to be maintained, and be in place as something to be measured against. He did not want to have to argue with an applicant that one of the 4 factors in “o” existed or didn’t exist, so that the applicant could request waiving the standards in “f” through “n”.

Planning Consultant Elmiger pointed out that the language permitted the Commission to waive or modify the standards, but did not require them to do so. The same language was in the Cady Street Overlay regulations.

Commissioner Tinberg asked if an applicant could go to the BZA for relief from requirements in the overlay ordinance. Discussion followed regarding whether or not the BZA should hear cases that hinged on architectural style, site constraints, compatibility with the surrounding areas, etc. BZA criteria included things such as practical difficulty, hardship, and so on, which would be difficult to argue in terms of subjective standards.

Commissioner Russell said that since “o”, if removed from the SM-O District would also have to be eliminated from the Cady Street Overlay District, perhaps should be left in, at least for now. “o” gave the Commission the ability to argue positively or negatively when an applicant claimed one of the 4 factors.

Commissioner Maise said there could be some built in flexibility in the requirements “f” through “n”. “m” Architecture was the most subjective requirement.

Commissioner Mielock remained concerned about giving black and white guidelines, and then with “o” giving applicants a way out of compliance.

Commissioner Tinberg pointed out that the BZA had certain criteria by which to judge whether to grant a variance. The Planning Commission did not have that.

Commissioner Maise said that the Master Plan and Ordinance language, including Overlay Ordinance language, did have criteria by which to judge a submitted plan. She was concerned

with the BZA being asked to make discussions regarding coordinated architectural elements, building architecture, and so forth.

Commissioner Mielock suggested giving the architectural portion its own category, so that it was not subject to the waiver suggested in “o”.

The consensus of the Commission was to remove *m. architecture* from this part of the overlay ordinance, and instead list it separately, so that “o” would apply to “f” through “l” (*el*) only.

Planning Consultant Elmiger said she would bring refined language back to the Commission. Whatever changes were made in this section should also be made in the Cady Street Overlay ordinance.

### SOUTH MAIN STREET REZONING FROM PR-1 TO GCD

Planning Consultant Elmiger explained that the proposed rezoning was to change several parcels with frontage on the south side of Main Street that were currently zoned PR-1, Performance Regulated Industrial District No. 1 to GCD, or General Commercial District.

This action was supported by the following:

1. The rezoning was consistent with the Master Plan, which envisioned this area as a commercial area.
2. The rezoning was consistent with Northville Township’s future land use map in their Master Plan. The adjacent Township parcels were planned for local commercial or office uses.
3. The rezoning would complement the existing commercial corridor, and adjacent GCD Zoning to the north.

Existing land uses on the rezoned parcels would be able to remain and operate, but they would not be able to expand without a variance.

Chair Kirk opened the public hearing at 7:48 p.m. Seeing that no one came forward to speak, Chair Kirk closed the public hearing at 7:49 p.m.

Commissioner Maise noted that the property owners in the subject area had been notified regarding this proposed rezoning.

In response to questions from Mayor Roth, Planning Consultant Elmiger said the existing uses could change ownership. The existing businesses could exist into perpetuity in their existing configuration, but they would not be able to be expanded without a variance.

Commissioner Maise noted that the Seven Mile/South Main Sub Area Plan map in the Master Plan needed to be corrected to show the subject area as included in the Sub Area.

Seeing that there was no further discussion, Chair Kirk indicated he was ready for a motion.

**MOTION by Mielock, support by Tinberg, that the Planning Commission recommend to City Council that the parcels on South Main Street identified on the cover page of the June 25, 2018 Carlisle/Wortman memorandum be rezoned from PR-1 Performance Regulated Industrial District No. 1, to GCD General Commercial District.**

Chair Kirk asked for a roll call vote:

<b>Kirk</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Krenz</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Maise</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Mielock</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Russell</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Smith</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Tinberg</b>	<b>yes</b>

**Therefore the motion carried 7-0-1 (Snyder recused)**

**8. P.U.D. ROBERTSON BROTHERS – RIVER PARK**

Planning Consultant Elmiger gave the background for this application for PUD qualification and preliminary site plan approval. She noted that her review letter contained many comments, and she would highlight the most important this evening.

The applicant had submitted an application for two items:

1. PUD eligibility for a 37-unit townhome development, with a future commercial component.
2. Preliminary site plan review for the townhome portion of the project.

The project was located on the south side of Seven Mile west of South Main, and proposed to reconfigure and combine a number of undeveloped and underdeveloped parcels. The requested actions might require a boundary adjustment or lot split, to be addressed at a later date.

Regarding PUD eligibility, outstanding issues included:

1. It was not clear whether the applicant intended to build a mixed-use project. Mixed use was a priority along this corridor.
2. There was a traffic study submitted. While the proposed townhomes would not add significantly to the underlying traffic, the Seven Mile/Main Street intersection already did not function well in the afternoon peak hours.
  - Had the applicant spoken to Wayne County Road Commission?
  - What, if anything, would the project do to help the current traffic situation?
3. The applicant would be doing an environmental cleanup of the site as a benefit. However, the review neglected to mention that this project might be considered for Brownfield assistance. The applicant should discuss if this would be pursued.
4. The applicant should also clarify whether the townhomes and commercial development would be under single ownership. One criterion for PUD qualification was that the entire PUD be under single ownership.

Regarding the site plan, outstanding issues included:

1. There might be too many units to fit comfortably on the site, primarily because of the parking. Each unit had a two-car garage, but no driveway parking. Any unit with more than 2 cars would need to use the surface parking spaces. To ensure there was enough visitor parking, the recommendation was to reduce the density by 2 units, to 35 total.
2. This reduction in density would also eliminate the need for an extra internal drive next to the 2-townhome island.
3. How would this site coordinate with the adjacent commercial property?

4. Regarding pedestrian amenities, the plaza needed to be increased in size to accommodate more than one bicycle and be oriented toward the Hines Park pathway. The plaza could serve as the gateway feature.

Planning Consultant Elmiger concluded by suggesting the Commission give the applicant more time to address the PUD eligibility concerns as well as site plan issues.

Members of the development team present this evening included:

James V. Clarke, President, Robertson Homes, 6905 Telegraph Road, Suite 200, Bloomfield Hills MI

Greg Presley, Presley Architecture, 108 N. Center Street, Northville, MI

Tim Loughrin, Manager of Land Acquisition and Development, Robertson Homes, 6905 Telegraph Road, Suite 200, Bloomfield Hills MI

Robert Emerine, Engineer, Seiber, Keast Engineering, LLC, 100 MainCentre, Suite 10, Northville MI.

In response to review comments, the applicants distributed a packet of updated elevations and other information to the Commission.

Mr. Clarke noted they had been before the Commission previously. The site plan presented this evening was similar to past presentations, with modifications as previously suggested by the Commission. They had provided additional setbacks on Seven Mile Road to accommodate some of the height of the project. The ordinance required a minimum setback from the right-of-way, which was a 100-foot right-of-way at that location. The pavement was 30 feet from the edge of the right-of-way and they were then set back 35 feet from that so they were 65 feet back from the pavement. The sidewalk would be 8 feet wide, not 6 feet as shown on the plan.

Regarding the commercial component, Mr. Clarke explained that Robertson Brothers was not a commercial developer, and the site currently had two owners, one of whom was Mr. Snyder, and the other was Inch Memorial. They would like to move forward with a quality residential development, and partner with Mr. Snyder who would develop the commercial component separately.

Regarding parking, they had added a number of parking spaces, so that the final parking ratio was 2.67 spaces per unit. The condominium documents would not allow a 3<sup>rd</sup> car to be parked outside the garage, and if 2 cars were owned, they would both have to be kept in the garage. There were 3 spaces at the end of building 1-6, 4 spaces to the left of the center courtyard area, and added spaces between units 11-14 and 15-18. They had a single one-way drive coming around the south side of units 28 and 29, and they had provided parallel parking all along that driveway. They also would have a shared access for parking as required by Mr. Snyder.

Mr. Clarke said their density at 12.42 units per acre was below that allowed in the overlay ordinance the Commission was considering. They were providing almost 27% open space including the 50-foot buffer to Hines Park, and the quarter acre central park.

They were willing to upgrade the gateway element, but had not yet decided what to do. They would be seeking input from the County Park, the Planning Commission, and the owner.

Mr. Clarke said they were proposing a horizontal mixed-use project, with a separate commercial building. Residents would be able to walk both to the park and the commercial use.

The site was contaminated with volatiles, carbons and fuel oil. Remediation would be in the range of \$100,000-\$200,000. They would follow up with seeing if they would qualify for Brownfield funding.

They had had some preliminary conversation with Wayne County regarding traffic impact, and the County's initial – though not formal – response was that they would probably need accel/decel lanes, which could eliminate some or all of the on-street parking on Seven Mile Road. That parking was not included in the 2.7 parking ratio.

Mr. Clarke said that they felt the proposed development harmonized with the area, in that it provided a buffer to the commercial uses across the street, and also provided the 50-foot buffer to Hines Park.

They had provided data supporting their price point for the units, based on the sales activity in the City of Northville over the last 6 months. Condominiums were currently selling at \$148.00/square foot, or between \$200,000-\$300,000, and single-family homes were selling for \$185.00/square foot. With normal add-ons, townhomes in River Park would be selling for approximately \$208.00/square foot, with a base price of \$189.00/square foot.

Mr. Clarke reiterated that they were not commercial developers, and didn't want to build the commercial use. Right now the entire project was not under single ownership, and they didn't want to represent that it was, or that they were interested in constructing the commercial component. They felt they could build the residential development, and see what the market determined for the commercial use.

Mr. Presley addressed the architecture of the proposed development. The height of the units was 35 feet, which would be allowed under the overlay ordinance since they did not have habitable space on the 1<sup>st</sup> floor. The garage was tucked inside the building, with garage access off the back. There were awnings in the front. The effort was to give a Craftsman feel and to express a variety of interplay and materials that were already found in Northville, including lap siding, vertical board and batten, pitched roofs, and also some Craftsman elements such as brackets. Balconies would be in front.

In response to a question from Commissioner Maise, Mr. Clarke said they didn't have any photos of similar elevations because they had not offered this architectural style before. He noted that some setbacks would be 35 feet, and some 40 feet.

In response to a further question from Commissioner Maise, Mr. Presley said he did not think these units had the potential to change from *missing middle* to luxury housing. Commissioner Maise wondered if people could purchase 2 units, combine them, and have a luxury condominium.

Mr. Clarke explained that *missing middle* referred to 1500-1600 square foot homes, targeted to first time homebuyers. He named communities where Robertson Brothers had success with such housing, including downtown Milford, Ferndale, Royal Oak, Troy, and others.

Commissioner Maise said that the demand for such housing was in communities that had the demographic of first time young homebuyers. Northville did not have that demographic.

Mr. Clarke said they had faced the same concern in other communities, such as Wixom, and had been very successful there.

Commissioner Maise thought targeting first time homebuyers fell under PUD eligibility criteria.

There was considerable discussion as to whether this development would be successful in Northville. Commissioner Smith relied on her professional experience to question whether 3 floors, and the low \$300,000's price point, would match buyers' needs here. She gave examples of condominium units in Northville in terms of square footage, and price per foot. This development as presented would be an outlier. Also, she could not match the data presented for homes sold in the last 6 months in the City.

Mr. Loughrin explained their methodology regarding the data presented.

Commissioner Smith compared the demographic of Northville to an hourglass: there were many residents between zero to 18 years old, and many 30 years old and older. But Northville had very few residents between 18 and 30, and that was the demographic that would want this kind of housing. Even if there were people in that age group looking in Northville, the proposed development costs would also include taxes and association fees, and that demographic would be priced out of the market.

Mr. Clarke remained confident that the proposed development would be successful in Northville.

Commissioner Tinberg was concerned with the issue of single ownership, and the admission that the applicants were not interested in developing the commercial component, yet the applicants were asking for PUD approval for a site that needed mixed use. The entire project needed to be integrated in terms of parking, curb cuts, etc., and one of the eligibility requirements was single ownership.

Commissioner Krenz asked what would be done with the commercial site while the residential site was being developed. Would it be empty and blighted?

Mr. Clarke reiterated that they were proposing a horizontal mixed-use project. At prior meetings they had shown a concept commercial building with frontage on Seven Mile and the new boulevard, and they could add that back in.

Mr. Clarke explained certain design elements, including the shared parking, the storm water accommodation for the entire site, and two driveways and providing additional parking. They could provide a concept plan for commercial use, but they could not promise to develop it. That would be Mr. Snyder's responsibility.

Mr. Clarke argued that the Commission wanted something that the market did not support. The market did support residential housing such as they were proposing. What they would like to also propose was that if the commercial use never was built because no one wanted to build it, they would return to the Commission with a plan for further residential housing on that space.

Commissioner Tinberg said that after many discussions, the consensus of the Commission was to require mixed use commercial along Seven Mile Road.

Commissioner Maise asked why the Commission wanted commercial in that area, especially when it would add to infrastructure needs. According to the submitted traffic study, the level of service at Seven Mile/South Main was rated F for fail. The Commission had spent a lot of time talking about this area, but now the traffic study shed new light on the situation.



Planning Consultant Elmiger said that after lengthy discussion the Commission had decided they did not want a single-use project on this site, but rather wanted mixed use. Mixed use was reflected in the Master Plan and it was part of the language of the new overlay district. Commercial could be retail, food market, or offices.

Planning Consultant Elmiger continued that the first question was whether or not only a mixed-use project would be accepted at this location. If it had to be mixed use, this project was not presenting a mixed use PUD; a residential project could not be approved and built based on a future hope that the site would someday have commercial use.

Mr. Clarke said they could present a phased development with commercial being the last phase. However, their preference would be to present a single use residential PUD.

Commissioner Maise suggested conditional rezoning.

Commissioner Mielock pointed out that if the project were approved with the hope of commercial later, the developer would have no incentive to develop the commercial at all. Under the current ordinance, this proposal did not meet Master Plan goals or the new overlay ordinance criteria.

Commissioner Smith asked about providing stacked ranches. Mr. Clarke said those were a lesser product, and noise complaints were inevitable. Robertson Brothers stood by the project they were presenting this evening.

In response to a question from Commissioner Maise, Mr. Clarke said if the units did not sell, they would modify the type of units being offered. At that point the entire infrastructure would have been constructed, and that investment would compel the developers to make sure the product sold. However, they were convinced the product they were proposing would sell.

In response to a further question from Commissioner Maise, Mr. Emerine said they had not yet submitted the traffic study to Wayne County, and would not until they had an approved site plan. Commissioner Maise said the traffic study presented significant information regarding level of service, and if Wayne County changed the drive location or other traffic management elements, it could change the entire plan. The Commission could not really talk about the site plan until they had Wayne County's input.

In response to a comment from Commissioner Russell, Planning Consultant Elmiger said if the Commission wanted to accept a single-use application, the Master Plan would not have to be changed because it called for single use or mixed use. However, the language in the proposed overlay district would have to be changed, especially Section 11.05.b.2, which required that *Residential uses shall not be located along the Seven Mile and South Main Street frontages unless part of a mixed-use project that has commercial on the first floor and residential above.*

Regarding PUD eligibility, Commissioner Russell said he was a proponent for mixed-use development in this area. He felt commercial development had to be part of the submission, and while it could be conceptual it had to be real. The submission should include commercial square footage, parking requirements, and circulation.

Commissioner Russell especially supported neighborhood commercial uses in a mixed-use project. Such uses encouraged walkability and related to several elements in the Master Plan. By not including commercial, the development was putting people in a car and directing them

elsewhere. This site provided an opportunity for businesses catering to local residents, and could provide a transition to CrossFit as well as provide a bookend type of gateway into the community. All that was being provided for a gateway now were 2 seats and a single bicycle repair station; that was inadequate.

Mixed use gave strength to streetscape, and outdoor activity potential that energized the street, so the development didn't become another bedroom community. Mixed use offered a component that enriched the street and encouraged people to stop along the bikeway, and reinforced the gateway component to the City.

Regarding the site plan, Commissioner Russell said he would like to see written language, including in the condominium documents, about the protection into perpetuity of the 50-foot greenbelt. Also, circulation systems behind or adjacent to residential areas was discouraged for safety reasons. Lighting was a strong and important component. Site furniture needed to be incorporated into the site plan.

Commissioner Russell felt the community benefit was non-existent on the plan. That benefit needed to be strong and representative of a gateway area. Right now the 50-foot buffer and the connection to the Hines Park trail system only provided a benefit to the residents of the proposed development.

Commissioner Russell agreed that the project would benefit by eliminating units 19 and 20. Doing this would give room to provide all necessary parking on site. He was not a fan of one-way circulation, particularly in a development such as this one. There would need to be plenty of directional signage. He was opposed to on-street parking, and it was likely Wayne County would not allow that anyway. In any event, that parking should not count toward the parking requirement. The two parking spaces adjacent to the boulevard entrance seemed awkward and unsafe.

The Commission needed to have a comprehensive understanding of how commercial would work on this site, both from a pedestrian and vehicular point of view. It was important that the development did not provide a cut-through from South Main to Seven Mile Road.

Commissioner Russell concluded by saying that while he liked this development, he would not vote for a single use development on this site.

Commissioners Tinberg supported Commissioner Russell's comments.

Commissioner Maise noted that the Master Plan language was for the whole area and not just this one site. She also pointed out that there were commercial uses that would not add significantly to the traffic flow.

Commissioner Mielock thought the Commission needed to address PUD eligibility. Commissioner Maise thought it clear that the Commission could not make a decision on eligibility tonight. She reiterated that Wayne County's input was critical. If the County changed the location of the driveway or didn't allow street parking, everything would change.

Mayor Roth commented that along with a Wayne County response to the traffic study, the City would need to have a City engineering consultant review the traffic report independently.

Mayor Roth said that the ownership component had to be resolved. A basic pre-condition for PUD eligibility was single ownership.

Mr. Clarke pointed out that the traffic study did note that .88 acres was dedicated to a commercial development. He could come back showing a commercial component. He did feel they had met PUD eligibility requirements. He felt the 50-foot buffer was a big benefit, in that land next to the Rouge River would not be developed but would be maintained into perpetuity.

They would have to consider the single ownership condition, to see if that could be resolved. They could not promise to change their business in order to construct a commercial development.

City Manager Sullivan emphasized that the PUD requirement was for single ownership, and that the single owner had the responsibility for completing the project.

Planning Consultant Elmiger suggested the applicants seek the advice of a land use attorney.

Chair Kirk said that previously he had strongly supported a mixed-use development on this site. However, after reading the traffic report, especially that the South Main/Seven Mile intersection received an *F fail*, he did not want to add any more than necessary to the traffic flow there, and would now be in support of a single use residential development. Commercial businesses would pull traffic in from other areas, and that was just what that corner did not need.

Chair Kirk was also concerned about parking on the street. Commissioner Maise said she did not think parking would be an issue. She did wonder if there was space to pull a car into a driveway and leave it there for a short time. Mr. Clarke said there was not.

Commissioner Krenz echoed Chair Kirk's concern. He didn't know if there was enough of a pulse signal for commercial in this area, and commercial would add more to the existing traffic issue.

Commissioner Maise said that neighborhood commercial would increase walkability. In a PUD they would be looking for the timing of the commercial development. Perhaps it would be all right for the applicants to present a conceptual commercial development, as Mr. Clarke had suggested.

Mr. Clarke said he thought they could meet Commission and consultant concerns and put the site under single ownership if they had the ability to convert the .88 acres set aside for commercial development to residential development if the commercial never sold. They could bring in a plan that showed a single-use development.

Mr. Clarke also wondered why the Commission was trying to pull people away from downtown businesses. He noted they could provide a mixed-use plan in terms of two residential types, addressing two market segments. What he could not do was say he was going to be a single owner doing a commercial development next year.

In response to questions from Commissioners Russell and Maise regarding the commercial development across the street, Mr. Snyder said he still had 1250 square feet vacant there. He said they did have interest from local businesses for that space, but they were not always the type of businesses he wanted in that location. The current mix of businesses was heavily patronized by Northville residents. Many people stopped as they drove by and saw something they wanted to patronize.

Planning Consultant Elmiger said the applicants needed clear direction as to whether they must pursue a commercial component or not.

Chair Kirk said that he felt commercial in the area would draw away from the downtown and from commercial facilities in the Township, and it would direct traffic to a difficult location.

Commissioner Russell argued that neighborhood businesses would service Beal Town; this was an opportunity for neighborhood commercial to provide service to local residents.

Commissioner Maise asked who was responsible for providing information on the appropriateness of commercial use in the area. Should the Commission consider Mr. Clarke's suggestion that if commercial did not happen, Robertson Brothers could return with a plan for residential development on the commercial site?

Commissioner Mielock thought such an agreement would leave the developer without incentive to develop the commercial component. As planners it was important to plan for the future, to try to control the way the City developed and to provide a vision for that development. What was discussed by the Commission over the past year was the need for commercial in that area of Seven Mile Road, and the requirement for mixed use. He thought the horizontal mixed use as described could be a good compromise but the Commission needed to see circulation, parking, etc., before discussing this plan. The entire site needed to be seen as a single development.

Commissioner Maise suggested that the Commission think about whether commercial was going to work on this site. The City needed to be able to defend the commercial component requirement.

Commissioner Russell said the commercial component could be developed as Phase 2, but it had to be thought out and presented on paper as part of the application.

Mayor Roth said the single ownership issue, as well as the public benefit, still needed to be resolved. In terms of requiring mixed use, earlier this evening the Commission discussed and supported an overlay district that would require mixed use.

Chair Kirk noted that all of the previous discussion regarding mixed use had not had the benefit of a traffic study; the traffic study gave new information.

Mr. Clarke said they would probably pull their application if they had to develop a single commercial property. They felt they met PUD qualification requirements as outlined in their presentation and application letter. He asked if they should pull their application or could they come back with a residentially viable development, with Mr. Snyder being the commercial developer on the project?

Commissioner Mielock felt it was important that the Commission not base a decision on mixed use on this one project. Commissioner Tinberg agreed.

Planning Consultant Elmiger noted that office use would meet the commercial requirement, and office use did not have a big traffic impact.

Mr. Clarke again argued that the City was requiring things in the ordinance that would never happen. Robertson Brothers were offering a high quality development in a transitional area. They

felt that the area already provided a mixed-use environment. They would like to have a period of time to develop the commercial component and if they were unable to do that, have the ability to return to the Commission with a proposal to add more residential housing.

Commissioner Maise again suggested the applicants try for a conditional rezoning.

Chair Kirk asked each Commissioner to comment.

Commissioner Russell said that the Master Plan and the proposed overlay district all required mixed use along Seven Mile, and that's what he would like to see.

Commissioner Krenz said he would like to see the conceptual commercial component. However, no one wanted to see that piece of land be vacant for 5-10 more years. He was intrigued by the idea of striving for a commercial component, and if that failed, to then allow residential development. However, he didn't want to take away the incentive to give an opportunity for commercial development; neither was he sure commercial would be successful there.

Commissioner Russell said the Commission needed to be aware that 700 residential units were being proposed for the Downs property. Also, the recent DDA study showed that Northville could support an additional 50,000 square feet of retail space.

Commissioner Smith said she was conflicted. While she was not an expert in commercial real estate, she felt there was a good chance a business could be viable at that location.

Commissioner Tinberg said that when the applicants first came to the Commission, they made some persuasive arguments as to why commercial would not work at that location. She didn't object to single-use residential there but the Commission's decision should be based on what they were holding as a vision of what was valuable for Northville and not what was expedient to have this property developed now.

Commissioner Maise said she wanted this project to work. She felt a PUD agreement would allow enough flexibility to help the project go forward.

Commissioner Mielock said he wanted to stay parallel with the ordinance and the Master Plan as written after many discussions over the past year.

Chair Kirk said that he could go either way, but after reading the traffic study, he would prefer single use residential on this site.

Commissioners discussed the impact of the Downs development on this intersection, and noted that in any event, road improvements would be needed.

Chair Kirk advised the applicants that they would need to come back to address tonight's discussion as well as the consultant's letter. He also had concerns with units 19 and 20, but that would not be a deal breaker for him. Some of the public benefits listed would need to be completed whether or not the land was developed under a PUD. He thought the development would be a viable addition to the City, and would be interested in seeing how they presented a commercial component, though he was still supporting single-use residential.

**MOTION by Mielock, support by Maise, to refer P.U.D. for River Park back to the applicant to address comments from this evening’s meeting, as well as comments from the August 29, 2018 Carlisle/Wortman memorandum.**

Chair Kirk asked for a roll call vote:

<b>Kirk</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Krenz</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Maise</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Mielock</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Russell</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Smith</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Tinberg</b>	<b>yes</b>

**Therefore the motion carried 7-0-1 (Snyder recused).**

Planning Consultant Elmiger advised that she would be bringing amended language for the Cady Street Overlay District to the Commission.

## **8. ADJOURN**

Seeing that there was no further discussion, Chair Kirk asked for a motion to adjourn.

**MOTION by Maise, support by Russell, to adjourn the meeting at 10:02 p.m.**

**Motion carried unanimously.**

Respectfully submitted,

Cheryl McGuire  
Recording Secretary

Approved as amended 10/02/2018