

Present: Chairperson Fox; Members: Belaustegui, Bliven, Jensen, and Smith

Absent: Borowski, Domzal, Robiner and Tillman

Also Present: Building official, Byrwa
Planning consultant, Wyrosdick
Council liaison, Walsh
Council president, Craig

Chairperson Fox called the meeting to order at 7:35 p.m. in the Village municipal building at 18500 W. Thirteen Mile Road.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was approved as published.

PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ITEMS NOT ON THE PUBLISHED AGENDA

There were no comments from the public.

APPROVE MINUTES

MOTION by Bliven, supported by Smith, that the minutes of a regular Planning Board meeting held on Wednesday, September 27, 2000 be approved as submitted.

Motion passes unanimously.

REVIEW "BIG FOOT" STUDY

Planning consultant Wyrosdick presented a comparison of the Beverly Hills zoning regulations within its smaller lot single-family home districts with those of surrounding communities that are similar in size or have a well-established downtown area. Bingham Farms, Birmingham, Clawson, Ferndale, Plymouth and Rochester were included in a comparison chart. The chart provides an overview of standard residential building setbacks, height, lot coverage, and lot sizes in order to identify areas in zoning standards that may permit or prohibit "bigfoot" housing to occur. This comparison does not address market demand or land value and economic aspects, which are influences that play a major role in the "bigfoot" housing issue.

Referring to the comparison chart, Wyrosdick pointed out that setback requirements in Beverly Hills are substantially greater than those in the other communities. A 40 foot front setback is required in all residential districts. The smallest rear setback is 30 feet, and the minimum combined side yard setback is 25 feet. The setback requirements leave less buildable area for a home compared to a community like Birmingham or Ferndale that have a 25 foot front yard setback and 30-35 feet rear yard setback requirements. The maximum building heights are fairly consistent, ranging between 25-30 feet in Beverly Hills and up to 35 feet in Plymouth and Ferndale.

Wyrosdick also provided the board with AutoCAD drawings of what these setbacks look like on the ground. The drawings compare lot standards in Beverly Hills, Rochester and Clawson.

Wyrosdick mentioned that Beverly Hills does not have a restriction on the maximum percentage of a lot that could be covered by a building. Birmingham recently added this element to its zoning ordinance in addition to a minimum open space requirement. The minimum open space cannot include impervious surfaces such as driveways and sidewalks over a certain size. Forty percent of the lot must be maintained in a yard or unenclosed deck. Wyrosdick commented that this is how Birmingham has attempted to counteract the effect of infill housing.

The diagram shows that a house in Beverly Hills built to the maximum setbacks on a 6,000 SF lot results in a footprint with only 17.5 percent of the lot covered by a building. The only situation that could enable infill housing to occur is if a lot less than 60' wide was granted a variance from the minimum required setback by the Village Zoning Board of Appeals. This would allow the owner to build a larger house that may not be in character with the surrounding neighborhood. There may be small lots in the Village that are less than 6,000 SF or less than 60 feet wide. It will come down to a variance issue.

Board members commented on the material presented. Smith noted that Beverly Hills has more zoning categories and gives more options than most communities of its size.

Fox remarked that there is continuous improvement made to houses in Beverly Hills particularly on the east side of the Village where the lots are smaller and there are more non-conforming lots. There are houses with setbacks that vary from the ordinance. Additions are regularly allowed to continue along the existing line of the house. People generally comply with front and rear yard setbacks. Fox does not think that this presents a problem with "bigfoot" housing.

Belaustegui observed that minimum lot coverage and open space regulations are not always a good thing. Sometimes regulations adopted to solve a problem create another problem. Because the driveway is included in the coverage space of new buildings, "ribbon" driveways with open centers are being constructed by those who are attempting to maximize the house size.

It was the sense of the board that there is no need to pursue the "Bigfoot" housing issue further based on the Village's Zoning Ordinance restrictions. It was agreed to discuss this with Council at the joint meeting scheduled for November 8, 2000.

Craig questioned at what point a house being renovated loses an existing variance. He recalled that Bob Bliven prepared a map showing all of the lots in the Village that are not in compliance with the Zoning Ordinance. One-third or more of the lots east of Southfield are not in compliance with the ordinance.

Byrwa read a section of the ordinance that states, "should a structure be destroyed to an extent of more than 60 percent of its replacement cost, exclusive of the foundation, it shall be reconstructed only in conformance with the provisions of this ordinance."

MOTION by Bliven, supported by Smith, to table discussion and recommendation on the "big foot" housing issue to the November 8, 2000 joint meeting with Council.

Roll Call Vote:

Motion passes unanimously.

REVIEW OUTLINE OF 14 MILE ROAD CORRIDOR STUDY

Wyrosdick presented an outline of how the Planning Board might want to proceed with the 14 Mile Road Corridor Study. The work program begins with identification of problems and challenges to be addressed in the study. The planning consultant and Planning Board will focus on the perceived issues and what the board would like to achieve from the study.

The next step is an existing conditions analysis followed by formulation of goals and objectives for redevelopment of the corridor. The board will then analyze alternative land use arrangements and develop a preferred land use plan text and maps. The next element is implementation of strategies and opportunities. The final step is a public hearing and recommendation. Wyrosdick estimates a six month time frame for completion of the study considering the holiday season.

Fox noted that the plan for resurfacing and widening 14 Mile Road will have to be taken into consideration as a future condition. Information is needed on the status of this project.

Smith suggested that collection of information be included as an element of the first step of the work program. He thinks that the Village should communicate with the City of Birmingham to make them aware of this study. Smith proposes contacting SEMCOG regarding ongoing plans and programs. Information on past traffic studies should be collected by contacting the Traffic Improvement Association of Oakland County. Information from the Oakland County Road Commission relative to traffic counts and the 14 Mile Road improvements would be useful.

There was discussion regarding the extent of Birmingham's participation in this corridor study. There was a suggestion that Royal Oak be notified of the study because the same problems affect their community along 14 Mile Road toward Woodward. Fox suggests inviting those communities to Planning Board meetings to seek out whatever input they have as part of the information gathering

process. The board will commence the 14 Mile Road Corridor Study at its first meeting in December.

ITEMS TO BE DISCUSSED AT JOINT PLANNING BOARD/COUNCIL MEETING SCHEDULED FOR NOVEMBER 8, 2000

The Planning Board considered topics to be discussed at a joint meeting with Council. The board will present its recommendation on the "big foot" housing issue and ask Council if it has any further concerns on that topic. Other ongoing projects that will be discussed with Council are the Pathway Plan and Village Entrance Signage. It was suggested that the Planning Board ask for Council input and direction on the upcoming 14 Mile Road Corridor Study. Underground utilities is a topic that has been designated as a Planning Board priority.

Board members would like to discuss the Southfield Road corridor study as a 2001 project. Incorporating portions of the Site Development Handbook guidelines into the Zoning Ordinance is also a project that the Planning Board would like to address. The board will entertain other ideas from Council on its 2001 priorities.

Belaustegui thinks that one of the things that needs to be discussed with Council is some sense of a vision for the Village. He would like to talk about the idea of a Village center and a cohesive vision for major roadways in Beverly Hills. Belaustegui suggested that there is a need for a 13 Mile Road corridor study that extends from Greenfield to Kennoway.

Smith suggests having a discussion with Council on whether the Village should pursue regulations relative to gates.

Craig commented that a product of this process that starts on November 8 should be an earlier submission to Council of budgetary information on 2001 priority Planning Board projects.

PLANNING BOARD COMMENTS

Belaustegui commented that he was not present at the last two Planning Board meetings, and he is concerned about what has started to happen to the pathway plan. The board started out with general ideas and a broad plan, which it developed at one point into a tight, pithy plan. It was a plan driven by a "community by community" need or want. A group could petition for a special assessment district to construct sidewalks with the participation of the Village.

Since then, the board has been adding pieces, which has resulted in a plan that Belaustegui thinks includes compromises in the form of "other recommendations". The plan does not represent the thorough consensus of the board, and Belaustegui does not think it will be acceptable to the public. Belaustegui feels that the Pathway Plan has gone from a neighborhood oriented plan to a plan that is not inclusive enough for a ballot issue. He suggests that the Planning Board is losing its focus in the current plan.

Fox stated that the plan will be discussed with Council. If there is a consensus that Council wants more or less, the Planning Board will receive that input. That does not denigrate the work that has been done on this pathway plan.

Bliven does not think the plan being proposed is meant for Village wide financing. He has expressed the view that the pathway plan should show all the sidewalk recommendations equally without prioritization.

Jensen remarked that the main objective of the pathway plan was to address safety issues. This was accomplished in the proposed document.

Wyrosdick will have the display boards set up in the municipal building lobby this Friday. The material will outline elements of the Pathway Plan.

PLANNING CONSULTANT'S COMMENTS

Wyrosdick informed Planning Board members that the Michigan Society of Planning Officials conference will begin next week.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Walsh asked if the Planning Board will be sending notice of the Pathway Plan discussion to property owners along major roads. Fox responded that notices will not be sent to individual property owners. Individual notices will be sent to the major businesses at the corner of 13 Mile and Greenfield where sidewalk is recommended. Notice of the public discussion is directed at neighborhood associations and Village organizations. The date of the meeting was published in the Eccentric newspaper.

In answer to a question asked by John Smith at a previous meeting, Walsh stated that there are Village ordinances that prohibit someone from cutting trees or logs and tossing them into the Rouge River. If anyone sees this being done, they should contact Renzo Spallasso.

Walsh stated that the Planning Board referred to an article in the Planning and Zoning News requesting that municipalities send copies of their master plans and ordinances to universities in the state with planning programs. Walsh suggested that those institutions secure that information from the Village's web page or through a Freedom of Information Act request. The Park Master Plan and the Zoning Ordinance appear on the web page.

MOTION by Smith, supported by Bliven, to adjourn the meeting at 8:52 p.m.

Motion passes unanimously.

Carry over items:

- 1 - Entranceway signs (10-27-99)
- 2 - Bikeways, walkways and pedestrian safety study (11-11-99).
- 3 - Bigfoot study recommendations (10-11-00).

**Sharon Mullin Fox, Chairperson
Planning Board**

**Ellen E. Marshall
Village Clerk**