



City of Plymouth
Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, August 14, 2019 - 7:00 P.M.
City Hall Commission Chambers

City of Plymouth
201 S. Main
Plymouth, Michigan 48170

www.plymouthmi.gov
Phone 734-453-1234
Fax 734-455-1892

1. ROLL CALL

Sisolak called the meeting to order at 7:01 P.M.
Board said the Pledge of Allegiance.

Chair
The

PRESENT: Shannon Adams, Joseph Hawthorne, Tim Joy, Jennifer Kehoe, Chuck Myslinski, Adam Offerman and Karen Sisolak

ABSENT: Hollie Saraswat and Scott Silvers

Also present was John Buzuvis, Community Development Director, Sally Elmiger, Planning Consultant, and Nick Moroz, City Commission Liaison.

2. CITIZEN COMMENTS

Craig Menuck, 550 N. Holbrook Starkweather School, gave an update. Mr. Menuck explained the structural and functional setbacks that they have experienced. Mr. Menuck stated they are steadily receiving phone calls from prospective tenants. There were no questions from the board.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a) Comm. Joy, supported by Comm. Myslinski, made a motion to approve the regular meeting minutes from July 10, 2019.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH ABSTENTIONS BY COMM. ADAMS & CHAIR SISOLAK.

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Comm. Kehoe, supported by Comm. Adams, made a motion to move agenda item number 6. c) after number 7, and approve the agenda as amended.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

Comm. Myslinski asked about the old newspaper stands located on Starkweather, he would like them removed and Mr. Buzuvis explained that it was in the process of being looked into, removing some of them.

Comm. Joy spoke about personally knowing the builder, Menards and also Kecskes & Gadd, Attorneys representing 471 W. Ann Arbor Trail, one of the applicants tonight.

6. OLD BUSINESS

a) **SP18-03**: 471 W. Ann Arbor Trail, Zoned B-1, Local Business, Revised Site Plan Review

Ms. Elmiger went over her review and stated the proposed project is for residential use, and the Planning Commission previously approved a Special Land-Use for single-family residential conditioned on the plan abiding by all R-1 zoning requirements. The applicant has revised the proposal to illustrate a single-family residence. The subject site is 8,763 square feet in size. The proposed building is two stories and 3,478 square

feet in size with a 608 sq. ft. detached garage and a wrap around porch of 420 sq. ft. This proposal has been amended with the intent of meeting the R-1 Single-Family Residential standards.

While we have some questions regarding specific calculations and a few details, we would recommend that the Planning Commission approve the site plan, conditioned upon the Building Official working with the applicant to refine the design and confirm that all R-1 zoning requirements are met.

Larry Gadd, attorney & Robert Bailey, applicant, spoke about the revisions made and are willing to work with Mr. Strong, building official to work out any unresolved details.

There were No comments from the audience.

Board Discussion

Comm. Kehoe asked what the lot coverage was and Mr. Gadd explained the lot coverage was previously over calculated but was revised to be within the allowed lot coverage.

Chair Sisolak asked about the front yard averaging and Mr. Buzuvis explained that it would be worked out by the Building Official.

Comm. Myslinski clarified that the lot is zoned B-1, local business and under the conditions of the special land use it is allowed to be constructed under R -1, single-family residential standards.

A motion was made by Comm. Kehoe, supported by Comm. Myslinski, to approve SP18-03, 471 W. Ann Arbor Trail, Revised Site Plan Review, conditioned upon: the building official working with the applicant to refine the design and conform to all R-1 zoning requirements.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. 7-0

b) **SP19-02**: 110 W. Ann Arbor Road, Zoned AARC, Ann Arbor Road Corridor, AARC Sign Review

The applicant distributed copies of the new revised design to the board members.

Ron Gary, R Gary Signs, explained the revisions made.

Ms. Elmiger went over her review and stated the applicant is proposing to install an internally-illuminated, ground/monument sign. This sign will have permanent signage for the bank tenant, as well as a "lite box" that will contain signs for the other four tenants on site.

This development was approved at the September 13, 2017 Planning Commission meeting. The project includes two new buildings. At the time of approval, the project contained a total of four commercial units. However, the applicant has worked with the Community Development Department to divide the eastern building into two (vs. one) units. Therefore, there are five tenants on this site presently. The western-most unit is designed as a bank with drive-up facilities.

Section 78-169(g) of the Ann Arbor Road Corridor District requires the Planning Commission to review ground/monument signs.

There were no comments from the audience.

A motion was made by Comm. Kehoe, supported by Comm. Offerman, to approve SP19-02, 110 W. Ann Arbor road, Revised Sign Review, conditioned upon the applicant to work with the building official to adjust the location of the signage to ensure the location preserves and does not damage the existing landscaping and that all zoning requirements are met.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. 7-0

c) Sign Ordinance Review: Section 78-227. Temporary Signs (Continued) & 78-228. Sign Permits.

A motion was made by Comm. Adams, supported by Comm. Myslinski, to postpone the Sign Ordinance Review to next month's meeting.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. 7-0

7. NEW BUSINESS

a) **PUD19-01**: 587 W Ann Arbor Trail, Zoned B-2, (Preliminary PUD Review)

Ms. Elmiger went over her review and stated the applicant has submitted a Planned Unit Development (PUD) application for the land currently occupied by the City parking lot, Saxton's, and the Jewell-Blaich building on W. Ann Arbor Trail, and abutting single-family and vacant properties on Maple Street. The applicant is proposing to remove the two residential homes located on Maple street and the two 1960s additions on the Saxton's building, leaving the original 1920s Jewell building to be renovated and repurposed into offices on the 2nd floor with retail on the 1st floor.

City administrative are proposing to reconfigure the lots by splitting off the east and south Maple street sections of the City's property and transferring this land to the developer. The applicant will construct 10 townhome units along Maple Street. Access to parking for the Jewell building and the rear garages of the townhomes would be through the City-owned parking lot.

Ms. Elmiger stated the PUD meets most of the PUD eligibility criteria.

PUD Eligibility

Ms. Elmiger asked for clarification and asked the applicant to provide the following information:

1. Description of what improvements to the public parking lot, if any, will be implemented by the applicant.
2. Information regarding evaluation of the structural integrity of the Jewell building, showing that it can withstand the proposed renovations.
3. Health condition information of 42" and 48" Maple trees to be removed, can they be preserved?
4. Townhouse building and height dimensions with cross sections - to show how tall in relation to the homes across the street.
5. Floor plans of a townhouse unit, and total floor area of townhouse unit/units.
6. Cross-sections of Maple St. and Deer St. showing the proposed townhomes and the building(s) across the street.

Preliminary Site Plan

A. Amend site plans to include required information, including:

1. Vehicular access points on the west side of Deer St. and the north side of Ann Arbor Trail.
2. Proposed building height/ number of stories.
3. Usable open space.
4. Curb turning radius to garages on lower level.
5. Front porches on townhomes
2. Existing easements
4. Description of phasing of project, if any.

B. Residential density.

C. 1. Proposed building height/number of stories. 2. Usable open space.

D. Parking/Loading. 1. Add barrier-free space to Jewell-Blaich building parking. 2. Plans describe types of delivery trucks visiting the Jewell-Blaich building. 3. Plans to show loading/unloading area for Jewell-Blaich building. 4. Shift townhouse building out of the clear vision area at the intersection of Deer and Maple streets.

E. Plans to show that extended cab pick-up truck or emergency vehicle can maneuver around the access driveway curve leading to the townhouse garages.

F. Develop PUD Agreement with performance guarantees for public benefits.

G. Front porches on Maple Street façade of townhouse building.

Also as mentioned in the review, we recommend that any PUD approval be conditioned upon the applicant receiving HDC approval for the proposed changes to both buildings, as well as an access easement agreement from the City of Plymouth.

The administration explained that the Planning Commission was not required to vote or take any action on the proposal at this meeting; however, if they were satisfied with the proposed PUD and the site-plan was generally in good shape they could schedule a Public Hearing, to further review the proposal and take public comment.

If there are were major concerns or issues the Planning Commission could refer it back to the applicant.

Mark Abanatha, Alexander V. Bogaerts & Associates Architects, Leo Gonzalez, developer and Mike Polmear, Giffels Webster Engineers, made a power point presentation of the proposed new project.

Mr. Abanatha provided revised renderings of the proposed project to the board members. He explained they have been before the HDC last week and was granted notice to proceed and were asked to return with further details of the project.

The applicant went over the primary 3 objectives:

1. Restoration & repurposing of the Saxton's /Jewell building.

2. Create a vibrant neighborhood and aesthetically pleasing development on Maple Street: that acts as transition architecture between the public parking lot and downtown to the north and the existing single-family homes to the south.

3. Provides additional public parking spaces for the City of Plymouth.

The applicant presented a power point presentation of historic photos from 1928. The first additions were the barrel roof and flat roof structures in 1960/1965. The applicant showed photos of the deterioration of the buildings from the roof leaking. The goals of the DDA and Master Plan are to increase the parking with this area slated for parking. They intend to keep the Saxton two-story brick structure and remove the older two additions along with the two residential homes located on Maple Street. With the removal of the two additions more parking will be available. The parking lot will be expanded and reconstructed with a total of approximately 79 parking spaces.

They intend to restore the Saxton two-story building back to its original form, greatly expanding the parking along with added landscaping and adding the townhome structure. The ten townhomes will have a double front façade facing both Maple Street and Ann Arbor Trail. The townhomes will act as a transitional buffer between the parking lot and the residential homes on Maple to the South. The raised two-story façade design and materials used were designed to work in harmony with the residential single-family homes on Maple Street. Each unit will have a unique design, every other unit offsets, the dormer elements vary from hip to shed dormers with tripled up windows on brackets to create an interesting facade.

The project goals will bring: 1. A fresh new look and improvement benefitting to the immediate neighborhood and downtown areas. 2. Restoring and repurposing of the historic Jewell/Saxton building back to a vibrant successful commercial business. 3. Reconstruction and expansion of the public parking lot will provide improved aesthetics at a prominent City corner that will provide much needed parking that is part of the Cities Master Plan for both residents and visitors. 4. The new parking lot will be completely reconstructed with new paving, storm system and landscaping. 5. The two houses located on Maple Street are slated to be part of the Master Plan as multiple-family (2 1/2 stores +/- 12-18 dwelling units/acre). 6. The Downtown Sub Area plan delineates the Saxton property as a location for increased parking. 7. The 2-home project furthers the Master Plan for multi-family, but currently zoned for office use, (that the owners have been unable to sell). The houses therefore are a deterrent to the realization of the Cities own Master Plan.

The proposed townhomes will bring additional new housing to the City center with furthering the goals to maintain a vibrant downtown. The proposed development strengthens the walkability to downtown. The long range vision for the downtown Sub Area is to continue growth and development and the designation of the Maple parcels for multi-family is a City wide policy that cannot be realized without the demolition of the existing structures, and why the Historic District granted the notification to proceed. The townhomes project will produce increased tax revenues.

Employment/jobs will be created during construction along with the Saxton buildings new lower level retail businesses and offices on the second floor which will create additional tax base. The new townhomes will help local businesses with additional residential being within walking distance to them. The major public benefit will be the development helping the Downtown Development Authorities (DDA) plan to increase parking inventory and pay for half of the bond cost with the sale of the Jewell building and also an increased tax base.

The applicant explained the restoration of the Jewell/ building. They will be removing the 2-1960s additions. Currently there exists a tile near the storefront bottom that does not appear to be historical, to be replaced with a historical looking wood element that is water resistant. Cable hung awnings will be put at each first floor main entrances & office entry and also sun screens will be added for added character. The rear roof will have a deck area with railing on raised pedestals so that it will not impact the new proposed rubberized membrane roofing. The existing openings in the lower level of the Jewell building will have glazed windows inserted. All of the restoring of the Jewell building will be done in accordance of the Secretary of Interior Standards for the treatment of historic properties. The applicant showed the board photos of historical buildings with cable-hung canopies & awnings. The applicant provided building sections & details of various address & tenant signage, lighting specs, windows, roof pedestal systems, membrane roofing and brick colors with black trim and detailing.

Windows: The Pella “architect series reserve line” windows for historical renovations of windows. The window have a through joint rather than mitered joint, and can be fit right into the opening. The current windows in the building are not the original windows.

Townhomes: The applicant provided illustrations of the townhomes that went over the townhome materials list. Each of the townhomes will have their own look and color scheme. Each unit has its own brick scheme -

3 colors and “Hardie” cement based siding with shake or siding on the dormers. The roof shingles will be the same, with black railings, the windows and trim will be white.

Height and Massing- The townhouse height and massing are based upon 3 principles:

1. To provide a small building footprint, to allow for more public parking.
2. To transition & respect the existing single-family homes on Maple Street & commercial across Deer Street.
3. Design the townhome units to meet the market demands.

The developer has looked at the square footage, the amenities, spatial requirements, and that program sets up the footprint, height and square footage of the units.

Lower level- will have the garage and a bonus room to be used as an exercise room, office or a lower living room.

First floor- Kitchen, Dining area, Great Room and ½ bath with a large outdoor terrace facing Kellogg Park. The view will have an avenue of trees that will also face Kellogg Park.

Second floor- Two bedrooms with two bathrooms.

Third floor- The third bedroom will be located in the dormer truss space of the dormer roofline.

The applicant showed building sections with dimensions. The townhomes were lowered to 3-foot porch level to meet the neighbors on Maple Street with a 2- foot above grade level. One section shows the buildings in relation to the corner home at 693 Maple along with the townhomes and Jewell building. The overall height of the townhomes is 31.5 feet.

The turning radius for cars was shown at the corner of Maple and Deer Streets.

The applicant stated they are in the low range density according to the Master Plan and the density based upon RM-2 is 45 rooms and they are proposing 40 rooms. To remove a unit or two will not work for the project, the density is not extreme, a tremendous amount of work has gone into meeting the goals of the DDA, Master Plan and the downtown area.

Leo Gonzalez, developer of this project, pointed out the 2 public benefits of this project.

1. An easement would be established between the developer and the City for their proposed parking lot with two means of access/egress to benefit the Community.
2. The applicants have agreed to assist in the bidding, planning and whatever assistance they can provide and requested by the City, with the construction of the parking lot, at no charge to the City.

The maneuvering of trucks coming into the parking lot was reviewed by Giffels-Webster, to prevent any conflicts.

The applicant went over the merits of each structure, the Jewell building being paramount. To remodel & repurpose the Jewell building is expensive, so they needed a development that would put that capital back into this building, to accomplish this there are compromises that are necessary. He suggested donating the two homes to interested individuals and they could move them to another site within the City.

Chair Sisolak asked that all the demolitions, and historic renovations stay with the Historic District for their review as they are not under the purview of the Planning Commission.

Ms. Elmiger stated the applicants are not redeveloping the parking lot. It is not owned by them or being developed by them or part of this PUD and therefore not part of this discussion. Ms. Elmiger had reviewed the previous proposals for the City.

Nick Moroz, City Commission Liaison explained the property was purchased by the City with DDA bonds back in 2015. The primary purpose was to aid in the creation of more parking for the downtown area. The proceeds from the sale of this property will be used for parking and also to control what happens to the historic buildings, especially the 1910 Jewell Building. Therefore, proceeds would go towards the renovation of the parking lot, but the details of the construction of the parking lot has not been worked out as yet. About half of the property is being sold, approximately ½ of the bond would be paid back. This is the second proposal, it is important to the residents that the parking lot not be located on Maple Street.

Citizen Comments

Bill Lincoln, 606 Maple, explained he lives adjacent to the new development and explained how much this project will have an effect on them. He spoke about the past 5 years being painful for them with the dilapidated fencing and empty buildings. They support the project and wants the project to move forward, he understands the compromises and felt this is a great solution.

Lucy Kohler, 302 Maple, explained she supports this long-term developer to be built for our future generations.

Ellen Elliott, 404 Irvin, spoke about the PUD eligibility, and spoke about the past Jewell building tenants and their history. She explained the types of work these past tenants did are no longer used and the preservation of this building from that timeframe is important. She stated the building was made from brick and tile and provided photos showing the tile and the building without canopies. Ms. Elliott felt the boards are obligated to preserve the 1928 history along with it being a main component of the public benefit.

Debbie Neubecker, 647 Maple, is in favor of preserving the neighborhood. Her view from her front porch is two green doors and the rear Saxton building in disarray with a terrible white roof falling apart. She is in favor of this new project. Ms. Neubecker felt this is going to make our neighborhood beautiful and felt the neighborhood will be coming back. Her only concern is keeping the traffic down on their street.

Dema Lincoln, 606 Maple, stated she is in favor of the project, she felt it will be great to have families moving in and replacing the empty homes, fences falling down and empty fields. She stated it is important to keep the cars and parking off of Maple and Deer streets.

Taylor Neubecker, 647 Maple, stated she is in favor of this development.

Tiffany Pupa, 243 Pinewood, felt the description of the two homes is inaccurate and felt these homes are deserving. She stated she is not satisfied with how the townhomes will fit in the context of Plymouth. The multiple storied building will overwhelm Maple Street and she would prefer a lower storied residential or duplex that has increased density that matches the master plan. She would also like this prominent corner to have green space and maintain its beauty.

Jerry Norquist, Canton Township resident, spoke about working for the Saxton's. He felt this development is a political football, the lot was purchased for the additional parking. He spoke about the developers violating the historical bylaws of the state, the townhomes do not fit Plymouth. He felt this lot should be an extension of Kellogg Park, and put the parking lot somewhere else.

Jim Mulhern, 396 Irvin, spoke about what the master plan calls for on that corner. He does not feel this plan from a public benefit gives any walkability. He felt parking is not a community benefit and should be taken out of the equation. He felt it should be about the Master plan vision, rezoning for the neighbors and developer, & what is best for the community. His issues are with the Community benefit, walkability, not enough green space, & removal of trees. He was not in support of this project.

Board Discussion

Comm. Adams, has lived in the City forever, he is not sure if this fits and has mixed feelings on the project.

Comm. Myslinski, sympathizes with the neighbors but does not see the public benefit or PUD worthiness. Bringing in a new development does not make for grounds to violate the height restriction requirements, etc. This type of development has been welcomed in other areas of the City, but not where clearly it should remain a single-family residential neighborhood.

Ms. Elmiger clarified the townhome units have three bedrooms and are clearly within the density allowed. It is within the Master plan density and also the multi-family density within the zoning ordinance.

Comm. Hawthorne spoke about Daisy Square's height with ten units and felt Daisy Square has become integrated into Plymouth. With this proposed development, He felt they have one shot at improving this corner, if not it can remain a parking lot. Comm. Hawthorne struggles with Ann Arbor Trail turning into condos with a parking lot instead of it becoming a street scape. Comm. Hawthorne believes these townhomes are seven feet shorter than Daisy Square. He felt the ten units fits Maple Street and the neighborhood, and would be a benefit to Plymouth, but would prefer the townhomes located on Ann Arbor Trail

Comm. Kehoe was weighing the positive with the negative. She indicated that the corner parking lot does not encourage walkability and there will be no interest and the walking traffic will not move down there, if there was a continuation of businesses on Ann Arbor Trail maybe they might. She felt they could do better at that corner, the PC decides where parking is to go, it's not a good land use decision that's not supported by the Master Plan. Comm. Kehoe felt most of the parking is employees parking and that shouldn't be adjacent to Kellogg Park.

Comm. Offerman does not see the public benefit and asked the applicant why townhomes were chosen and Mr. Gonzalez explained how the single-family homes would have larger yards which meant fewer parking spaces for the City and also with homes they would have front entrances and the developer wanted to deter the parking to the rear garages, like they did with the townhomes. They wanted two fronts so that it was also appealing from Ann Arbor Trail and felt it does promote the Master Plan with additional housing.

Ms. Elmiger felt the planning commission is stuck on the parking lot. If this was private property owner's parking lot they would get to choose what happens on it, & the Planning commission would not be able to comment on it. The City owns this parking lot, but it needs to be looked at in the same way. A surface parking lot is a permitted use in this zoning district & the Planning Commission should take the public parking lot out of their discussion and consideration.

Comm. Joy felt the height of the townhomes and the Jewell building will be a benefit to the residents on Maple Street. If you drive down Deer Street everything on the west side is a parking lot and everything to the east is commercial properties.

Comm. Hawthorne felt there is a public benefit by knocking down the corner home and allowing the city some easement and parking spaces.

There was discussion regarding the access easements needed for the parking lot and for the Jewell building.

Chair Sisolak, spoke about the PUD ordinance & eligibility, the four key items we should be reviewing are:

Grant of the planned unit development will result in one of the following: a. A recognizable and material benefit to the ultimate users of the project and to the community, where such benefit would otherwise be unfeasible or unlikely to be achieved without application of the planned unit development regulations; b .Long-term protection and preservation of natural resources and natural features of a significant quantity

and/or quality, where such benefit would otherwise be unfeasible or unlikely to be achieved without application of the planned unit development regulations; c. Long-term protection of historic structures or significant architecture worthy of historic preservation; or d. A nonconforming use shall, to a material extent, be rendered more conforming, or less offensive, to the zoning district in which it is situated.

Chair Sisolak felt the historic restoration of the Jewell building falls under criteria c), but she has concern with the scale, mass and height of the building. She stated we can work through this by using the implementation metric system within the master plan: To monitor and encourage appropriate home size and massing. The townhomes will act as a buffer but the green space and walkability is lacking. The Maple Street side will have mature trees that will remain.

There was discussion on which of the three buildings is of more historic value.

Comm. Adams spoke about the structural integrity of the Jewell building and the townhomes matching the zoning.

Ms. Elmiger stated the townhomes meet zoning but with a slight height deviation of ½ story, using the master plan of 2.5 stories. Ms. Elmiger felt using the master plan is the most appropriate height at this location, RM-1 is 2 stories and RM-2 is 4 stories. The density is inline with the master plan and also with the RM-2 zoning.

Chair Sisolak asked about the lower grade garages if they will flood and Mr. Gonzalez responded they have asked the new home builder, located 3-doors down on the same side of Maple street and was told that they did a full excavation and did not run into any problems, the townhomes will only be a partial excavation. Mr. Gonzalez explained to prevent seeing garage doors from Kellogg Park the finished driveways will be six feet below the finished grade of the future parking lot along with a separation retaining wall and a row of bushes. The concept started at 11 units and went with the wider 10 units instead, to cover the cost of the expensive renovation of the Jewell building which is in good structural shape. The builder has moved the 150 year old barn to another location within the City.

Comm. Adams asked how experienced the builder is for restorations like this and Mr. Gonzalez responded that they will hire the most experienced to do the job required.

Chair Sisolak asked if the developer would refurbish the Jewell building first and Mr. Gonzalez stated that the townhomes would take a longer review process, so they are prepared to begin work on the Jewell building first.

Comm. Kehoe read aloud a letter from Comm. Silvers who could not attend, this is a summary of his concerns, dated August 12, 2019: 1. His biggest concern is the City passing a large chunk of the property onto a developer that will not build a street-wall that is a pedestrian oriented similar to the shops along main street and Penniman. 2. To complete the street-wall all around Kellogg Park. To have a parking lot in front is incompatible with the downtown urban core. 3. To possibly integrate the Saxton building into a new development to complete the street-wall.

City Comm. Moroz reminded the board there is a proposal in front of them and they need to decide if it is PUD worthy.

Comm. Myslinski asked why the developer is asking for a PUD instead of using the RM-2, rezoning it with a site plan request and Mr. Buzuvis responded that they are both similar but it would be more work to rezone as there are three different zoning classifications on the properties being discussed and then site plan approval where a PUD would accomplish both the rezoning and site plan approval together.

Motion

A motion was made by Comm. Myslinski, supported by Comm. Hawthorne, to schedule the public hearing of PUD19-01, 587 W. Ann Arbor Trail, Preliminary PUD Review, to next available PC meeting upon developer resubmission, with consideration to the comments and clarifications as discussed tonight.

YES ADAMS, HAWTHORNE, JOY AND SISOLAK

NO MYSLINSKI, KEHOE AND OFFERMAN

MOTION PASSES. 4-3

8. REPORTS AND CORRESPONDENCE

None.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no further business, a motion was made by Comm. Adams, supported by Comm. Joy to adjourn the meeting at 9:54 PM.

MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY