

Present: Chairperson Jensen; Vice-Chair Borowski; Members: Bliven, McCleary, Schneiders and Wayne

Absent: Nedley and Smith

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

Chairperson Jensen called the meeting to order at 7:31 p.m. in the Village of Beverly Hills municipal building at 18500 W. Thirteen Mile Road.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion by Bliven, seconded by Borowski, to approve the agenda as published.
Motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ITEMS NOT ON THE PUBLISHED AGENDA

There were no comments from the public.

APPROVE MINUTES

Motion by Bliven, seconded by McCleary, that the minutes of a regular Planning Board meeting held on Wednesday, September 11, 2002 be approved as submitted.

Motion passed unanimously.

REVIEW 13 MINUTE VIDEO ON THE IMPORTANCE OF UPDATED MASTER PLAN

The Board viewed a video on updating a community master plan.

DISCUSS SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR MASTER PLAN REVIEW

Bliven read a memo written by John Smith presenting the recommendation of the Master Plan Review subcommittee. The three-member subcommittee unanimously recommends an update of the Master Plan as part of a conventional five-year cycle. The subcommittee has determined that about two-thirds of the pages need modification or updating, which should be done in 2003.

Bliven suggests that the Board obtain a revised cost estimate from Birchler Arroyo for this project and request authorization from Council to proceed with the work. The planning consultant will receive a copy of the marked up Master Plan for use in preparing a fee schedule for the work.

Planning consultant Wyrosdick noted that John Smith's memo refers to an article in the latest edition of Planning and Zoning News dealing with disaster preparedness and hazard mitigation. The article describes a local mitigation plan that would make a community eligible for certain funding from the federal government. Oakland County is in the process of developing a mitigation plan and will be asking the Village for assistance. Wyrosdick suggested that Beverly Hills could note in its master plan that it defers to the County's mitigation plan.

A work plan and cost estimate for review and update of the Master Plan will be a topic of discussion at the joint meeting of the Council and Planning Board on October 9.

REVIEW OPTIONS ON 14 MILE ROAD CORRIDOR PLAN FROM BIRCHLER ARROYO

Wyrosdick provided the Board with revised pages 21-30 of the 14 Mile Road Corridor Study, which were modified to reflect discussion at the last Planning Board meeting. Board members offered a few additional changes to be incorporated into the document.

The next step in the process is to evaluate three options for implementation of the concepts and goals of the study. Birchler Arroyo proposes three different techniques to be considered by the Village including a special zoning district, an overlay district, and a Planned Unit Development. Information has been provided to the Board that elaborates on these options and provides examples of how they can be used.

Birchler Arroyo originally recommended the use of an overlay district along the 14 Mile Road corridor study area. An overlay district superimposes a different district on top of an existing zoning district. It could be used on 14 Mile Road east of Pierce to permit a higher density development on currently residentially zoned property. The overlay district technique was thought to be appropriate in this instance because it would be designed to permit residents currently living along 14 Mile Road to stay there and expand their homes if they so desired. The overlay district could encourage a developer to buy larger pieces of property and redevelop the site by providing incentives such as increased density. In return, the developer would provide better landscaping, more efficient use of driveway spacing, and other amenities.

An advantage of an overlay district in this section of the Village is that current residences could remain and not be considered non-conforming uses. If there was a market for higher density town home development, the overlay district would permit that as well. Another advantage of an overlay district is that it fills in gaps where standard controls may be ineffective. It is a simple way to allow a mixed use development.

A disadvantage of the overlay district is that it adds another layer of regulation, review, and approval. It is challenging to develop an overlay district that works well. However, this may be a limitation of any of the three options.

A Planned Unit Development (PUD) is different from the other two options in that it is a tool and not a district. A PUD is a type of land development project, which may allow a mix of two or more residential, commercial, office, institutional, and open space land uses governed by one functional site plan or master development plan. It does not require rezoning. It would require taking an idea to the Village for review and approval, and the approval is tied to the site plan presented to the Village Council.

Jensen expressed the view that a PUD may not be a viable concept in that it would not provide continuity or control over how the improvement area would ultimately look. This technique could potentially result in a number of dissimilar products with different values. PUDs work well when one developer controls the property. An overlay district requires the community to spend time being prescriptive about what it wants and setting up guidelines. There will be more similar products resulting from an overlay district.

Wyrosdick concurred that a PUD would not be her first choice for this redevelopment area. PUDs work well when they can be applied in many different areas on larger pieces of property. They are used mostly for mixed use developments where there is residential property with a small commercial or office component.

The third option is a conventional zoning district whereby the study area could be rezoned to “Entranceway” zoning that would allow only town homes at a certain density to be built in that district. A single family home would be considered a non-conforming use of the property, and expansion would not be encouraged. The rezoning would encourage redevelopment for town home use. A conventional zoning district would change the land uses. There would have to be two zoning districts, one dealing with residential and one with non-residential uses (office).

Wyrosdick was asked to comment on the advantages and disadvantages of rezoning versus overlay zoning. She responded that a disadvantage of conventional rezoning is more towards the existing residents, whose homes would become a non-conforming use. There would not be an incentive to enhance or enlarge property. If a land assembly requirement were imposed, property could sit vacant until redevelopment occurred. Wyrosdick remarked that the Village adopts ordinances that allow rezoning to occur, but it is often the property owner and not the municipality who initiates rezoning.

An overlay district would permit the Village to be more flexible in what may or may not occur on the improvement area. The Planning Board’s role is to anticipate what might happen and to encourage some type of land use or redevelopment that meets the goals that are set out in the corridor study. Another benefit of an overlay district is that it can be overlaid onto an existing office use and have it speak to architectural design for any redevelopment.

There was discussion of the three options considering the pros and cons of each redevelopment technique.

Wyrosdick recommends leaving the three implementation options in the plan. Language will be added to the plan indicating that the Planning Board considered the use of a Planned Unit Development and disregarded the technique as not being the most appropriate method of addressing the goals of this study. Reasons will be included in the report.

Jensen suggested that both the overlay district and rezoning alternatives are viable and should be studied further. The Planning Board will research how these options would work and what makes the most sense. Implementation options will be discussed in more detail before the Board makes a recommendation on how to proceed.

DISCUSS ISSUES AND PREPARATION FOR JOINT COUNCIL/PLANNING BOARD MEETING OF OCTOBER 9, 2002

Planning Board members suggested topics to be discussed at the joint meeting with Council scheduled for October 9. Proposed agenda items are as follows:

- Discuss pros and cons of Planning Board versus Planning Commission.

Dave Birchler and Brian Murphy have been asked to speak to this issue and address questions from Council.

- Review Southfield Road Corridor proposed plan, vision and goals, and discuss candidates for facilitator.
- Review 14 Mile Road study update.
- Review proposed revisions to the Master Plan and related costs.
- Discuss status of site development handbook and adoption into zoning ordinance.
- Discuss minor changes to the cluster option ordinance to comply with the State of Michigan open space requirements.
- Discuss Evergreen Road sidewalk recommendations.

PLANNING BOARD COMMENTS

Bliven referred to the September 11 Planning Board meeting minutes and asked for clarification of a statement made by the consultant that the Planning Board must review its master plan **by** 2003 to meet the five year requirement. The most recent Master Plan was adopted by Council in July of 1998. Wyrosdick stated that the Village technically has until July of 2003 to review the Master Plan. She noted that the Planning Board review and updating of the Master Plan is already in progress.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments from the public.

Motion by Bliven, seconded by Tillman, to adjourn the meeting at 9:20 p.m.

Motion passed unanimously.

David Jensen, Chairperson
Planning Board

Ellen E. Marshall
Village Clerk

Susan Bernard
Recording Secretary