

FARMINGTON PLANNING COMMISSION PROCEEDINGS
City Council Chambers, 23600 Liberty Street
Farmington, Michigan
December 11, 2017

Vice Chairperson Chiara called the Meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. at City Council Chambers, 23600 Liberty Street, Farmington, Michigan, on Monday, December 11, 2017.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chiara, Crutcher (arrived 7:05 p.m.), Gronbach, Kmetzo, Majoros, Waun

Absent: None

A quorum of the Commission was present.

OTHER OFFICIALS PRESENT: Director Christiansen, Recording Secretary Murphy, Building Inspector Koncsol

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION by Gronbach, seconded by Majoros, to approve the Agenda.
Motion carried, all ayes.

APPROVAL OF ITEMS ON CONSENT AGENDA

a. November 13, 2017 Minutes

MOTION by Majoros, seconded by Kmetzo, to approve the items on the Consent Agenda.
Motion carried, all ayes.

Chairperson Crutcher arrived at 7:05 p.m.

**SITE PLAN AMENDMENT – CONSIDERATION TO APPROVE HOME ADDITION,
JOSHUA KLEIN, 33614 ADAMS STREET**

Vice Chairperson Chiara introduced this Agenda item and turned it over to staff.

Christiansen stated this is a site plan amendment in consideration to approve a home addition at 33614 Adams Street. He stated construction, renovation, and expansion of buildings and structures within the City of Farmington's Historic District are subject to site plan review by the Planning Commission. He said prior to the site plan coming before the Planning Commission, it must be submitted to the City's Historical Commission for review and comment.

He indicated the City had received an application from Vivid Design Group on behalf of Joshua Klein at 33614 Adams Street to construct a 427 square foot single story addition with crawl space to their existing one story single family home located in the City of Farmington's Historic District. The design and location of the home addition is shown with the attached information in the staff packet that was submitted by the Applicant.

Christiansen stated that there was a 475 square foot two-story addition with a basement that was requested by the Applicant in 2016 that both the Historical Commission and the Planning Commission approved at their October 27th and November 14th meetings respectively but the original project did not happen due to costs and therefore new plans have been submitted now for review and approval of a scaled back addition by the Petitioner. The Historical Commission reviewed the plans at their last meeting on Thursday, December 7th and did not offer any objection to the modified plans.

The Zoning Board of Appeals approved the necessary variances for the original home on the subject property in 1994 and a copy of those minutes are attached in the staff packet.

The building staff has reviewed the dimensional aspects of the plan and has indicated it meets the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance with the approved variances from 1994.

Christiansen went over the contents of the staff packet on the screen with the Commission. He stated the Planning Commission's role is to consider a modified addition to the house that was previously approved in 2016.

Chairperson Crutcher invited the Petitioner to the podium.

Jeff Harrison from Vivid Design Group came to the podium and stated that Christiansen had covered everything very well but would welcome any questions from the Commission.

Chairperson Crutcher opened the floor for questions from the Commissioners.

Gronbach asked if the material colors would be consistent with the ones approved for the 2016 plans and the existing house and Harrison responded in the affirmative.

Christiansen stated that that had been reviewed by the Historical Commission and that there were no objections.

Crutcher asked Harrison if he was the architect on the site plan submitted in 2016 and he responded yes.

MOTION by Waun, supported by Chiara, to approve the site plan amendment for the home addition for Joshua Klein at 33614 Adams Street, as submitted.

Motion carried, all ayes.

SCHEDULE OF PUBLIC HEARING – BOJI DEVELOPMENT, INC., 10 MILE DEVELOPMENT GROUP, LLC, OLD 47TH DISTRICT COURTHOUSE PROPERTY, 32795 TEN MILE ROAD

Chairperson Crutcher introduced this agenda item and turned it over to staff.

Christiansen stated that this is a request to schedule a Public Hearing for the proposed PUD for the redevelopment of the Old 47th District Courthouse property. He indicated that Boji Development, Inc. was present at the November 13th Planning Commission meeting to present their plans at an optional preapplication conference and that a Public Hearing is required to be scheduled as the next step in the process which would be at the January 8, 2018 meeting, along with review of the preliminary PUD plan at that time.

MOTION by Chiara, supported by Waun, to schedule a Public Hearing on the proposed PUD for the Old 47th District Courthouse Property, 32795 Ten Mile Road, for the January 8, 2018 Planning Commission meeting.

Motion carried, all ayes.

2018 SCHEDULE OF PLANNING COMMISSION MEETINGS

Chairperson Crutcher introduced this agenda item and turned it over to staff.

Christiansen stated that this is a request by the Economic Development and Planning Department and Administration to approve the proposed 2018 schedule of Planning Commission meetings, which typically fall on the second Monday of each month.

MOTION BY Majoros, supported by Waun, to approve the 2018 schedule of Planning Commission meetings as presented.

Motion carried, all ayes.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None heard.

PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS

Chairperson Crutcher introduced this agenda item and opened the floor for comments from the Commissioners.

Majoros stated that not knowing when the Maxfield Training Center issue will be back before the Planning Commission, he feels it would be appropriate for the City to take some measure of responsibility, whether its Director Christiansen, or the City Manager or City Council, to address the anticipated dialogue that will come about and issues that the public should be reminded of or that context should be put behind the development of the Maxfield Training Center, so his recommendation is that before the project comes back

before the Planning Commission, that there be some way that information can be disseminated to the public and address some of the issues that may come up, i.e. the purchase of two homes recently, and the economic benefit of this project to the City and how does it fit in with the Master Plan. He stated he feels everyone needs to be brought back up to speed and have a dialogue around these issues as well and not just the development itself. He stated he feels it is an important issue for everyone to deal with and deserves an evaluation of not just the property itself but some of the details that go around the bigger picture plan and is making this as a formalized request of Administration.

Chiara stated that he agrees with Majoros and based on the fact that 99% of the people that were in the room for the last meeting where it was addressed were against the project and that it is going to be an uphill battle that the Planning Commission should be prepared for and that the City Council should be more involved in the process.

Majoros stated that he believes there will be a lot of spirited discussion about this project and that he thinks there is an opportunity to put some context behind it. He indicated the project has been years in the making and it's not anything that's brand new, it's all a matter of public record from Master Plans and meetings from years ago but doesn't feel the general public keeps track of these things as closely as staff and that there is an opportunity to bring them up to speed and put some context behind it so that in whatever form Maxfield comes back before the Planning Commission that they are prepared to address some of the issues, not just of the development or the proposal itself, but the considerations that go into the broader vision of how it fits in the broader plans.

Chairperson Crutcher stated he feels the responsibility for that presentation is on the developer.

Majoros said in his opinion the City has a responsibility to inform the public, that he feels that the developer can respond to questions about the project and provide feedback, but the City should provide context to the project and that if that was left to the developer, he doesn't feel that would be the most ideal situation for the developer to state why the City is engaging in something like this.

Kmetzo stated that she agrees with Majoros, that there is a huge responsibility that they all bear as members of the Planning Commission to really have a full understanding of the impact that this development would have on the City and how it relates to the overall vision. She stated it's been a while since they've addressed the project and she feels there were bits and pieces the Planning Commission was not privy to and that it would benefit the Planning Commission if the City could provide some of that background information, i.e. what the financial impact such a development will bring or not bring, what

is the impact or the relationship of the purchase of the two properties on this development, if there is any. She feels the Commission needs to have a good basis and understanding of the impact of this project on the overall development of the City of Farmington in order to make informed decisions, whether that be in the form of a separate meeting or open forum or document.

Chairperson Crutcher asked Kmetzo if her statement was with regard to not only this project but any project in general and she indicated it would include any project in general as well.

Waun stated that she would like to see something added to that to help the public understand taxes and how property taxes would be paid. The comments she received from some of the public is if someone is renting an apartment, they're not paying taxes and what they don't understand is that the building owner are paying taxes and paying them at a much higher nonhomestead rate and feels the public doesn't understand that and the impact on property taxes.

Christiansen asked the Commissioners if they would like him to comment or respond.

Majoros asked for a brief comment from Christiansen stating he feels if the public doesn't know what's going on it is incumbent on the Planning Commission to have an understanding of the development itself and it fits into the picture.

Christiansen stated that the discussion is very appropriate and thanked the Commissioners for all of their comments and is indicative of their focus as a Planning Commissioner and as residents in the community.

He stated that all of the points made are excellent points and that it's absolutely imperative that it is a transparent and seamless process and that it's a public process. The City's processes, their ordinances, their rules and regulations and its approaches are all structured that way.

This particular project, the Maxfield Training Center redevelopment is moving forward through one of the City's processes, and that is the Planned Unit Development, PUD process and there are very specific steps in that process.

Without getting into what's already been done, the City has put together its long range plans over several years, from the Master Plan, to the Vision Plan, to all the tools the Planning Commission has been a part of and talked about, we know the groundwork has been laid. We know there's been a lot of focus on redevelopment of properties throughout the community, transformational projects that are going to add to the community's

economic vitality as well as enhance the community in many other ways through what they're going to provide but there are plans that basically lay out the direction that the Planning Commission and the City as a whole with City Council and other boards and commissions where they have laid out that direction.

With this particular project there has been the preliminary preapplication back in March, meeting with the Applicant, there were two Public Hearings, one in April and one in May. Since that time this item has not come back in the public forum but the developer has been working on alternatives taking into account and consideration the comments that were made by the Commission at those meetings, by the public at those meetings, the two Public Hearings, and trying to incorporate those and make some changes and look at the economics and many other things, working with the goals of the City in terms of adjacent properties that were mentioned, the acquisition of the two homes that the City Council has approved, and how all that works. In light of that, the City was expecting the developer to come back to the City continuing the PUD process with revised plans and that has not yet happened as there were some details that need to be worked out but that may be at the January 2018 meeting. In light of all that, that's where it stands right now.

The comments that were made are absolutely significant as to how this project needs to move forward and that is a seamless and transparent public process. That's what the City's ordinances, and their rules and regulations and processes are set up to achieve. So when this comes back, in whatever form the project is in and it's brought back into the public forum, the issues, the concerns expressed here, questions, need to be up front, need to be answered and information needs to be provided, whether it's to the Commission or whether it's to those in attendance or the community at large so this becomes a community project which it is and needs to be.

He thanked the Commission for their input and indicated these comments will be incorporated into the minutes and are part of the dialogue and they will be shared with Administration and City management, with Council and everybody engaged in this project. And when it's ready to come back, it comes back with everybody knowing what the project is as proposed, and the questions posed this evening answered. And until this project is the one that everybody can get their arms around and move forward with in the majority, then the outcome may be that it will be a project that is not going to move forward but stated he is very confident that the developer wants this to be a successful project for their interest but more importantly for the City's interest and there has been quite a bit of dialogue about that.

He indicated knowing what's been done to date, all of the planning that's been done, the years in the making of all the tools, the continuing implementation by the community, by

the City, by the Commission as well, they are looking to make sure this project moves forward in accordance with the City's ordinances, rules and regulations and is in the best interest of the City.

He stated depending on what is brought back to the City by the developer, there may be a whole new notification process and another hearing, depending on what is brought back.

Chiara asked if there could be another public hearing on this matter and Christiansen stated that if there is a significant change in the project as presented, it may necessitate that that be the case. He stated they want to make sure the public and anyone interested is completely aware of what is being presented and proposed.

Chairperson Crutcher inquired if there would be other opportunities for the Planning Commission to provide input into the process and Christiansen responded that any time the Commission is reviewing a project and a plan, it's a public process and if there are significant changes, modifications, it is possible that there will be a necessity for another public hearing type review, a renote, and another public hearing held.

As far as other opportunities, he indicated that all information related to this project is online, the meeting back in March, the Agenda, the meeting packet, the materials, the minutes from that meeting are on the City's website under Agenda and Minutes, Planning Commission, the Public Hearing and all the materials there, all the plans, the minutes from the March and May meeting, all of that information is on the website if anybody wants to see what's presented to date, it is all there. He welcomed everybody to contact the City with any questions about the project.

Chiara commented that not much has been heard from the Farmington Public Schools who owns the property and asked what if involvement, if any, they have.

Christiansen responded that the School Board is involved as owners of the property, the Farmington Public Schools owns the Maxfield Training site so they are involved in the sale of the property.

Chiara asked if they can provide input into the development itself and Christiansen stated that the plan, the proposed project and any review and approval of that is the responsibility of the City, however there are terms and conditions in the purchase agreement that the developer, AC Acquisitions, entered into with Farmington Public Schools, so there are timelines, milestones, other sorts of things that must be satisfied but the project approval

is the responsibility of the City. The property sale is the responsibility of the School District.

Christiansen thanked the Commission again for their comments and the opportunity for discussion.

Chairperson Crutcher asked if there are plans for a work session to be scheduled and Christiansen responded not at this stage but it is dependent on alternative or revised plans that are brought back.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION by Majoros, seconded by Chiara, to adjourn the meeting.
Motion carried, all ayes.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:34 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Secretary