Present: Chairperson Jensen; Vice-Chairperson Borowski; Members: Hayes, Nedley, Schneiders, Smith, Tillman and Woodrow.

Absent: Bliven

Also Present: Building Official, Byrwa
Planning Consultant, Wyrosdick
Council Liaison, Downey

Vice-Chairperson Borowski called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. in the Village municipal building at 18500 W. Thirteen Mile Road.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA
The agenda was approved as prepared.

APPROVE MINUTES

MOTION by Smith, supported by Tillman, that the minutes of a regular Planning Board meeting held on Wednesday, June 27, 2001 be approved as submitted.

Motion passes unanimously.

ELECTION OF CHAIRPERSON AND VICE-CHAIRPERSON
Borowski stated that the Planning Board elects a chairperson and vice-chairperson each year at the end of June or first meeting in July. He opened the floor for nominations for the office of chairperson.

Smith nominated David Jensen as chairperson of the Planning Board. There were no further nominations. The Planning Board voted unanimously to elect David Jensen as chairperson.

Smith nominated Vince Borowski as vice-chairperson of the Planning Board. There were no further nominations. Borowski was elected as vice-chairperson by a unanimous vote.

Jensen assumed the chair.

REVIEW PROPOSED GROUND SIGN FOR OUR LADY QUEEN OF MARTYRS
Brad Shoemaker from Visual Signs was present requesting approval of a ground sign for Our Lady Queen of Martyrs Church property at 32460 Pierce. He explained that a sign is needed to direct people to the facilities at the rear of the property, which include the gymnasium, chapel, parish office and parish center. The sign would keep visitors from stopping at the parish office to ask for directions to the appropriate buildings.

The board discussed the need for the sign and its placement. The sign is 30” x 36” on 48” high posts. It was determined that there are no safety issues with the proposed placement of the sign. The sign will not be illuminated.

MOTION by Tillman, supported by Borowski, to approve the sign request from Our Lady Queen of Martyrs Church subject to review by the Village building official for conformance to the Village Sign Ordinance.

Motion passes unanimously.

REVIEW SKETCH PLAN FOR LOT SPLIT AT 15705 AMHERST AND SET POSSIBLE PUBLIC HEARING DATE
Planning consultant Wyrosdick stated that she has completed a preliminary review of the information submitted by the applicant. The information submitted by the Nowickes does not constitute a complete application. The required 45 day review period outlined in the Beverly Hills Subdivision Ordinance is not applicable until a complete application has been submitted and accepted by the Village. A list of the additional information requested is included in Birchler Arroyo’s review letter of July 5, 2001.

Wyrosdick distributed copies of an aerial photograph that show the lots involved in the lot split request. She indicated the location of Charrington Court and condominium development that

abuts Proposed Parcel B. A survey of the lots in the vicinity submitted by the applicants was displayed on the board. Wyrosdick pointed out the parcels involved in the proposed land division: parcels #TH24-01-433-013, #TH24-01-433-006, and #TH24-01-477-002.

The applicants Cheryl and Richard Nowicke were present in the audience. The Nowickes own the three lots. Their residence is located on parcel # 013.

Wyrosdick related that the applicants request that 25' of parcel #006 be split off to be combined with parcel # 002, which has no road frontage. The resulting parcel will have access to Amherst Avenue. The Nowickes are attempting to create a parcel that can be developed. A major issue is what will happen to the remainder of parcel #006, which would have a non-conforming lot width for the zoning district. The Nowickes informed the board that it is their intent to combine the remainder of parcel #006 with parcel #013.

Dorothy Pfeifer of 160 Charrington Court related that parcel #002 was created years ago through a land division of property fronting on Fairfax. Parcel #002 became a part of parcel #013 and #006 fronting on Amherst. Wyrosdick noted that the Village would not permit this split today because it creates a land-locked parcel.

Wyrosdick noted that the proposed splitting of Lot 1285 for the driveway would not create a non-conforming side yard setback for an existing structure because the non-conformity is a pre-existing situation.

Another issue associated with this request is that the resultant Parcel B created by the lot split does not meet the 75' lot width requirement for the R-2 zoning district and the lot width to depth ratio. The Village's land division regulations permit the Council to waive the lot width to depth ratio under certain findings. A variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals would be required for the deficient lot width.

Wyrosdick reiterated that this is a preliminary submittal and an opportunity for the board to ascertain the main issues involved in the proposal.

The appropriate procedure was questioned with respect to Planning Board review and recommendation considering the variances needed from the Zoning Board of Appeals and Council. Wyrosdick responded that the way in which a lot split request proceeds is a policy issue. Some communities may require the applicant to go before the ZBA first. She prefers that the petitioner come before the Planning Board to ensure that all the necessary variances are identified.

Smith asked the planning consultant to comment on the possibility of access from the Charrington cul-de-sac as opposed to creating a flag lot with a long asphalt driveway coming from Amherst. Wyrosdick stated that Charrington Court is a private road that will be overseen by the condominium association. She pointed out that there is a strip of land between the proposed Parcel B and Charrington Court which prevents access to the road without an easement from the condominium association. There is also the issue of gaining use of a private road.

Wyrosdick commented that flag lots place homes in an odd position of not facing a road. Emergency vehicle access on the long driveway is a consideration. The driveway location would require approval by the Village engineer.

Jensen remarked that the Charrington developers attempted to purchase this piece of property to develop two building sites. The condominium association may not want to include a house in its neighborhood that does not fit within the character of that development for the sake of providing a buildable lot. He suggests that the petitioner go before the Zoning Board of Appeals to demonstrate that there is a hardship in creating a buildable lot before the Planning Board makes a recommendation on a lot split request.

Borowski questioned if the Village is compelled to solve the petitioner's problem of creating a buildable lot. Wyrosdick expressed the opinion that it is the Village's charge to consider proposals that come before it based on its ordinances. If the Planning Board is not comfortable making a recommendation knowing that there are significant variances required, the request

could be tabled to allow the applicant an opportunity to go before the Zoning Board of Appeals rather than making a recommendation subject to variances being granted.

Pfeifer stated that developer Jim Merritt tried to purchase this property to create two more sites at the end of the cul-de-sac. The current owners were not interested in selling. There is a private road and utilities to consider. Pfeifer thinks that it is doubtful that the applicants would gain access to the road from the association for a lot that resulted from a land division. She believes that there is a possibility that Charrington Crossing would purchase this lot and absorb it into the condominium association. This would solve the problem of access to a landlocked piece of property. It was noted that the property in question is zoned R-2 and would have to be rezoned to R-3 if it were to be become part of the Charrington condominium community.

The Planning Board will postpone discussion on the preliminary lot split proposal to allow the applicant the opportunity to submit the required information and reconsider what action they want to take to create a buildable lot.

> MOTION by Hayes, supported by Borowski, to table review and recommendation on a request for lot split at 15705 Amherst.
>
> Motion passes unanimously.

REVIEW ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON 14 MILE ROAD CORRIDOR

Wyrosdick summarized the background and process involved in the 14 Mile Road Corridor study for the benefit of the new members. The concept of the overlay zoning district was explained in some detail. The Planning Board will be provided with a draft of the full document incorporating tonight's input at the next meeting.

After completion of the corridor plan, it will be recommended to Council for review and approval. If the concept is accepted by the Village Council, the next step would be to draft zoning ordinance language that would define the overlay district. Ideas from the plan will be incorporated as design guidelines and text in the zoning ordinance.

Wyrosdick stated that the Planning Board discussed the scope of the overlay district at the last meeting. She reviewed that the board members initially looked at the entire corridor from Southfield to Greenfield Roads. Consideration was given as to whether to include only certain segments along 14 Mile Road or to include parcels from 14 Mile Road to Kirkshire in an overlay zoning district. There was a consensus that the Planning Board should focus on high quality redevelopment of property along 14 Mile Road frontage east of the SOCWA property on Madison Street to Greenfield Road. That is where there are very small lots and more of the deteriorated homes. An overlay district would permit current uses to remain and redevelop but would require landscaping and streetscape amenities to create an entranceway to the community. Higher residential densities would be permitted after special approval within currently zoned residential properties.

Board members have received a copy of a land use plan for this meeting that shows land uses changing on the corridor only from Madison to Greenfield Roads. Wyrosdick noted that the board has discussed allowing a higher density than included in the text in order to encourage high quality residential development. The material presented to the board includes photographs of different types of elements and architectural features that should be incorporated into buildings. The next step after the plan is approved is to put those concepts into zoning text ordinance.

Wyrosdick proposed a way to focus the redevelopment efforts on Madison to Greenfield Road yet address the board's interest in having a coordinated look throughout the entire corridor. The existing office uses along the corridor will remain. Because the residential character of this area is essential, any redevelopment of nonresidential uses should be required to meet a higher architectural and site design standard. This can be done within the overlay district or by incorporating the Site Development Handbook into the Zoning Ordinance.
Wyrosdick displayed a future land use plan that demonstrates her recommendation to the board. She proposes that a primary overlay district from Madison to Greenfield be carried over to the office area east of Pierce along 14 Mile Road. The primary overlay district indicates an area where the Village would like to see redevelopment as soon as the market deems it possible. The

use will not change for the office district, but including it in an overlay district will ensure that the residential character ideas in the plan for office use, including the same type of landscaping that the board wants to see in the primary area, will be implemented if the property is redeveloped. Ordinance standards can include specific architectural standards for this district. The overlay district could override the Site Development Handbook standards. If there is interest in carrying a theme throughout the corridor at a later date, there should be support for the concept shown on the plan.

Wyrosdick is also suggesting that the property fronting along 14 Mile Road from Southfield Road to Pierce be designated as a secondary overlay district. If the primary area is developed according to the plan, it would make sense to carry that theme throughout the corridor if the secondary area is ever redeveloped in the future. The plan could designate the difference between the primary and secondary overlay district and explain what this means in the text. If any rezoning is initiated by the Village or a developer, the primary district is where the Village wants to see it first. Wyrosdick encourages the board to look at the entire corridor while focusing on the most problematic area. If the entire corridor is supported in the plan, it can be redeveloped in a coordinated manner when the time comes.

There was discussion of the plan and the preferred land use alternative. The planning consultant was asked to incorporate a primary and secondary overlay district into a revised document. It was suggested that the SOCWA water tower property be included in the district on the basis that improvements can be made in terms of lighting and landscaping in the public right-of-way.

A concern was expressed that adopting an overlay zoning district could discourage property improvements. Wyrosdick related that the intent of the overlay district is not to interfere with the current underlying use. A permitted use is anything that is permitted in the underlying use zoning. However, the property can be used in a different manner when there is a demand in the market for multiple housing.

Wyrosdick was asked what triggers a change in zoning to a higher density. She responded that rezoning can occur in two ways. A developer could request to develop property according to the ideas in the corridor plan. The Village would have an overlay district in place. The developer would request rezoning, which may be permitted after special approval within currently zoned residential properties, and then proceed through the site plan review process.

Wyrosdick continued that the Village could initiate rezoning of the primary area in anticipation of redevelopment when the market calls for quality multiple residential dwellings in this area. The property can be continued to be used as single family until the market demands change. It is a more proactive approach for the Village to implement the plan.

In answer to an inquiry, Wyrosdick explained that the figures in the text reflect the density that was initially discussed by the board. The document will outline the planning process that the board went through to reach its final conclusions. It is appropriate to show that the board looked at low density and then decided that it made more sense to go higher to attain the architectural detail that the Village is looking for and which is outlined in the land use recommendation portion of the plan. The board is now considering higher densities, which are represented in the example overlay district standards. A density of 15-20-25 units will be included in the recommendations. The exact number that will occur in this district will be defined when the Village starts drafting ordinance text.

Jensen displayed photographs of multiple residential buildings with quality architecture. He described a concept called terrace units where the units would face each other (east-west) separated by a court yard open space with the end units facing 14 Mile Road. Turning the units inward would create a better approach and more valuable units.

Wyrosdick commented that additional examples could be included in the plan. She emphasized that the goal of this study is not to site plan this area. The role of this plan is to interject these design concepts into the plan as the ideas that the Village wants a developer to incorporate into a site plan for this corridor. Photographs are an effective way of demonstrating how a development should look.

MOTION by Tillman, supported by Borowski, that the planning consultant provide the Planning Board with a revised 14 Mile Road Corridor Plan incorporating suggestions made at this meeting. The document will be reviewed at the next meeting prior to recommending the plan to Council for review and approval.

Motion passes unanimously.

Council liaison Downey indicated that he will communicate this process to Council.

REVIEW SAMPLES OF PROPOSED VILLAGE ENTRY SIGNS
Jensen suggested discussing the proposed Village entry signs at the next meeting. The sign company has provided two prototype signs in different colors and in sizes larger than the Village identification sign hanging in front of the municipal building. The examples are on display in the meeting room. This will be a topic of discussion at the next meeting.

PLANNING BOARD COMMENTS
Tillman welcomed the new Planning Board members. Smith asked the two new members to briefly outline their occupational backgrounds.

Smith asked that the Village request two documents from the Southeast Michigan Council of Governments (SEMCOG) and make them available to the Planning Board: 1) 2025 Regional Transportation Plan for Southeast Michigan; 2) Water Quality Management Plan, Tools for Local Government. This document suggests ordinances and topics that should be covered with regard to air and water pollution.

BUILDING OFFICIAL COMMENTS
Byrwa commented that the Village staff is updating the municipal code book for new members. They will receive a copy for the next meeting.

Byrwa reported that a Certificate of Occupancy was issued to the a house on Elwood at Evergreen.

PLANNING CONSULTANT'S COMMENTS
The Pathways Plan is scheduled to be addressed by the Village Council at its Monday night meeting. Wyrosdick will give a presentation on the plan at that time.

Wyrosdick addressed a problem with respect to the turn around time needed to prepare information for Planning Board meetings. Preparing revised and additional information within the time frame needed for distribution when meetings are two weeks apart is proving to be difficult when the board is involved in a major study. There are only four days to incorporate board discussion on an issue and develop new material.

The Southfield Road Corridor Study will be coming up next. She proposed that plan elements be discussed at every other meeting when the board is involved in this type of work program to allow the planner additional time between meetings to study the topic, revise sections, and write new sections of a plan. Wyrosdick believes that this will help the process flow better and allow her to bring as much information as she can to the table. The board concurred with this recommendation.

PUBLIC COMMENTS
Council liaison Downey welcomed Schneiders and Woodrow to the Planning Board. He congratulated Jensen and Borowski as the new leadership of the board for the next year.

MOTION by Tillman, supported by Hayes, to adjourn the meeting at 9:38 p.m.
Motion passes unanimously.

<u>Carry over items:</u>
1 - Entranceway signs (10-27-99)
2 - Fourteen Mile Road Corridor Study (10-11-00).
3 - Opinion from legal counsel on current ordinance definition of family (01-24-01).

Motions made by Planning Board to be acted upon by Council:

01/24/01: Recommendation that the issue of the residential design study "Big Foot" not be pursued any further at this time.

01/24/01: Recommendation that the Council approve the Pathways Plan.

06/27/01: Recommend denial of Kensington Academy request for parking revisions to approved site play for gymnasium addition.

David Jensen, Chairperson
Planning Board

Ellen E. Marshall
Village Clerk