

FARMINGTON PLANNING COMMISSION PROCEEDINGS  
23600 Liberty Street  
Farmington, Michigan  
November 14, 2022

Chairperson Majoros called the meeting to order in Council Chambers, 23600 Liberty Street, Farmington, Michigan, at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, November 14, 2022.

**ROLL CALL**

Present: Crutcher, Kmetzo, Majoros, Perrot, Waun, Westendorf  
Absent: Mantey  
A quorum of the Commission was present.

**OTHER OFFICIALS PRESENT:** Director Kevin Christiansen; City Attorney Beth Saarela; Recording Secretary Bonnie Murphy, Brian Golden, Director of Media Services; Brian Belesky, Audiovisual Specialist.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

MOTION by Crutcher, seconded by Westendorf, to approve the agenda.  
Motion carried, all ayes.

**APPROVAL OF ITEMS ON CONSENT AGENDA**

**A. October 10, 2022 Minutes**

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

**REQUEST FOR LOT SPLIT – DANIEL VETTRAINO, 31806 GRAND RIVER AVENUE**

Chairperson Majoros introduced this item and turned it over to staff.

Director Christiansen stated the City Administration received an application from DV, property owner at 31806 Grand River Avenue to split the existing parcel into three new separate parcels in order to create a residential building site on the north half of the property and to sell a portion of it, convey a portion of it, to the neighbor adjacent to the north located at 22801 Lakeway Street. The existing commercial parcel is split zoned C-2, Community Commercial, and R-1-P, Residential Parking. There's a copy of the zoning map attached with your staff report and I have that here as well and can put that up on the screen. The lot split request has been reviewed by City Administration and it has been determined that it will not create any nonconforming issues as it pertains to the City code. The Grand River Corridor Improvement Authority reviewed the proposed lot split at their October 20<sup>th</sup> meeting and recommended approval forwarding it to the PC for your consideration. A copy of the minutes was attached with your staff report as indicated. City Administration recommends that the Planning Commission recommend approval of

the lot split to City Council who holds the final decision in lot splits that come before the City. The application, lot split application, a survey for the subject property with both legal descriptions, aerial photos and a plat map are attached for your review so that's all in your staff packet. The Applicant, Mr. Vettraino, does have a representative, Mr. Thomas, and he's here this evening so he can certainly speak if you like, Mr. Chairman, to this. I will go ahead and just flip through a couple of items just for everybody's edification. What's important here I think is to look at the application that's here, you have that, the intention again to split the property, the owner, and it was verified that Mr. V and his group are the owners of the property. This is a certified survey for the subject property. As you are aware this property and I'm going to bring this down to size so everybody can see it here. This is a survey for the property, Grand River Avenue and Lakeway Streets, so this is a corner property located on the northwest corner. The portion of the property that fronts GR has an existing building on it and it is zoned C-2. The back portion of this property, which is the triangle shaped piece, is zoned R-1-P, so it's one site currently. However, when it was platted, when this subdivision was platted, the properties had a little bit of a different configuration. You can see the dash lines underneath; those are the individual Brookdale Subdivision and that's the subdivision that's platted for this property and this area has a series of lots that make up the commercial portion and then one lot that makes up the triangle piece. So, the lot that makes up the triangle piece it's owned concurrent with the same owner of the commercial piece, but it was a platted lot of record, a building site is what I'm saying to you, when it was originally platted. The pieces then are the lots that make up the commercial part of the property, again, platted lots of record, but were developed commercially over time. You may know this piece as the former Paramount Health Care Property, at one point in time it was an NBD Bank with a drive-thru, it was other uses before that time all the way back to a block building back in the '50s that was the Lakeway Diner, but we won't get into the history this evening of all of that, some may know that history. In any event there are two zonings on this property, and I think that's important to note so again you can see the dash lines and the commercial property and the Brookdale Subdivision lots that are part of that, you can see the triangle piece. I might also comment that there's a small portion of the triangle piece on the northwest or at the west end that is intended to be split and added as I indicated in the staff report to the property to the north. There's a little bit of an encumbrance there, there is some flat work, a little drive area, and that is being discussed between the owner of the property and the owner of the property to the north. So, in order for that piece to be realized and it's split then to take place, again the representation is that it would be added if approved to that property to the north. So, if we scroll through, again, there's that configuration, Parcel A, B, C from the parent parcel and the real parent parcel is back when it was platted but it's been this configuration for quite a long time. So, a commercial piece, Parcel A, residential piece, Parcel B, Parcel C to be added to the piece to the north. And then if we look back the additional information, this is the record indicating ownership that was verified, this is the Brookdale Subdivision, just real quick. So, what you see here and I know it's a little

tough but north is to what would be this way, my right and this screen, so what I'm showing you here on the properties in question and I'm going to walk away real quick, GR Avenue, Lakeway, this is the subject property here, the commercial portion, this lot right here, 118, that's the triangular lot. So, the interest here is to take the property which had been combined over the years and to separate them on the plat line for the property site so this can be a residential building site and that's what it was originally platted for, and these properties can remain commercial, and a small piece of this portion is intended to be split and added to 117. Just quickly, additionally, Mr. Chairman, and again these are all materials that are here and in your packet, by the way this is a 1915 plat, just so you know. So, here's the property, you can see the corner of Lakeway and Grand River, and you can see the commercial portion with the Paramount Health Care Building that is vacant and being marketed right now and the drive-thru you can see the triangle piece currently has no structures on it and then the property to the north. And I'll finish up here in a second, this is a little bit more focused aerial to the intended split is on that line that you see there between what's developed and not developed and taking that little portion of C and adding it to the property to the north. And in this here is the zoning map, and you can see this here on the zoning map and where my cursor is at right here as we go down GR, this is Lakeway Street, here's the property right there, these C-2 pieces, and this is the R-1-P to the north, so that's the current zoning, C-2 and R-1-P. And I see that Mr. Thomas is here this evening, he is representing Mr. V.

Majoros thanked Christiansen and invited the Applicant up to the podium.

Norman Thomas, 26548 Pleasant Valley, Farmington Hills, came to the podium. He stated I think Mr. Christiansen explained this in great detail. Going back to the original plats and the triangular piece, residential use fits under the existing zoning of R-1-P. I think one thing to point out is that the surveys were completed, all residential lots as well as commercial lots, fulfill all the setback requirements, so I don't believe there's any variances that are being requested. The one tail that I call it here, Parcel C, it's been requested to split because of the current use and they intend to offer that to the adjacent property.

Chairperson Majoros opened the floor for questions and/or comments from the Commissioners. Hearing none, he thanked the Petitioner and opened the floor for a motion.

MOTION by Kmetzo, supported by Crutcher, to approve the request of Daniel Vettraino, 31806 Grand River Avenue, to split the existing parcel into three new separate parcels in order to create a residential building site for the north half of the property and to sell or convey a portion of it to the neighbor adjacent to the north at 22801 Lakeway Street, subject to the recommendations of the Grand River Corridor Improvement Authority.

City of Farmington Planning Commission  
November 14, 2022  
Page 4  
Motion carried, all ayes.

**HILLSIDE TOWNES – PUBLIC HEARING AND PRELIMINARY PUD REVIEW**  
**ROBERTSON BROTHERS HOMES, MAXFIELD TRAINING CENTER, 33000 THOMAS**  
**STREET**

Chairperson Majoros introduced this item and turned it over to staff.

Director Christiansen stated this item is a public hearing and PUD, Preliminary Planned Unit Development Plan Review with the Planning Commission on a proposed PUD Planned Unit Development Plan for the redevelopment of the former Maxfield Training Center. There's history, we've been through this history, you had an opportunity, the Applicant, Robertson Brothers Homes, had asked that the option preapplication conference be held with both the DDA Design Committee since this property is in the downtown and that was held and that took place back prior to an engagement with the PC, and then in May the Applicant, RBH, appeared before the PC and they took advantage of the optional opportunity there, the optional preapplication conference with the PC and so the project was introduced to you at that time. Since that time and again, it's all here in the staff report, there was a meeting in October with respect to the PC review of the PUD, that was subsequent to a review by the DDA Design Committee of the preliminary plan, they forwarded their comments on to you at your October meeting. You were introduced to the project then formally, the preliminary plan, you reviewed the comments of the DDA Design Committee and you scheduled the required public hearing for this evening. As indicated, the Applicant, Robertson Brothers Homes of Bloomfield Hills, Michigan, has submitted there preliminary PUD plan for the redevelopment of the former Maxfield Training Center site, we won't go through the history of the RFQ and selection by Council and where we're at right now, we're in the PUD process after going through all the steps that are in place and have been necessary to have RB here this evening with respect to the Public Hearing as required before the Planning Commission. This is Step 3 in the City's PUD process. The materials this evening in your packet, this was also presented to you at the October meeting, are a PUD site plan package, application and all the support materials from Robertson Brothers Homes, a PUD site plan, planning and conceptual design and review letter from OHM, that letter dated September 13<sup>th</sup>, a letter from OHM engineering, reviewing the engineering and conceptual design in accordance with the City's engineering requirements and that was a letter dated September 26<sup>th</sup> and again the DDA Design Committee's minutes, their comments from their September 27<sup>th</sup> meeting regarding the preliminary plan and the Pathways Committee, the City Pathways Committee reviewed the preliminary plan and they made comments and their draft minutes from their November 9<sup>th</sup> meeting are included in your staff packet as well. The Applicant is here this evening to present the preliminary PUD to the Commission. What I will tell you is that this plan set which is fairly

detailed and I'm going to try to get to an overview drawing and that's the Public Notice that was required that was published that was sent to property owners within 300 feet. There are also three correspondences from Rick and Jane Gundlach which are included in your packet, one that was submitted and reviewed at the meeting back in October and two then that were presented for this meeting, so both of those are in your plan review packet for this meeting. There was also an email that was sent to me today at about 4:00 this afternoon and I made a copy of that email, that email was from Mr. Kevin Gromley and as indicated I went ahead and printed it out and provided individual copies of that email that Mr. Gromley submitted today. Those were the only communications that we did receive from the Public Notices that were sent out. The plan package again, it's got a lot of information in here and this is what I wanted to get down to and then I'll turn it back to you, Mr. Chair. This is Maxfield Training Center site, approximately three acres with a 60,000 square foot; about ten, twelve years vacant, former school building. And the city purchased this property from Farmington Public Schools with a purpose of intending to move forward with redevelopment and in accordance with the City's long-range plans, the City Master Plan, the Vision Plan, the city as a whole and the Downtown Master Plan and the City then moving forward with their RFQ process selected RBH for a 59-unit condominium development, owner occupied, single-family, attached condominium project. This project as submitted, these materials with the application, show a total of 54 units on this site in this configuration. These units are three story units, they have a single-loaded rear access garage, they're accessed from the front, you go up into a second level which is your main living level and then to a bedroom level above, so three stories above grade, approximately 16 feet wide and different attached configurations. The units themselves are about 1,350, 1,400 square feet in size, so all that is included, all the materials are included, elevations and other elements but I wanted to show you this. We've had some recent dialogue with representatives of Robertson Brothers Homes and Mr. Tim Loughrin who is the director of land development is here this evening and he's been here before you on previous occasions for this project, has indicated there's a modification that has become necessary in light of the utility service to the property. So, to provide the utility service necessary to serve the property, they've coordinated with DTE on what it might take to bury lines in and to this site and through this site. And they've indicated to the city that it's just not something that in their business plan with this project is going to be able to be achieved with the cost that they would incur to do that. In light of that with overhead lines that could lay along Thomas Street, there's a need to create an easement and with that easement there's a need to have a certain separation distance for the fronts of those condominiums that are along Thomas Street, you can see that on the graphic here. In light of that, the whole project has to be adjusted, they've got to move it up into the site. And in doing so, they have eliminated another unit, they've eliminated Unit 29. And Mr. Loughrin has some plans to that effect, I'm going to let him speak to that, Mr. Chair, but I wanted to make sure everybody understood that. And also, too, creates a situation and there's been some concern expressed about the

City of Farmington Planning Commission

November 14, 2022

Page 6

proximity on the north to the residential property lines that are in the adjacent Historic District residential development. In adjusting this project because of these circumstances, again and their consideration, is going to create an additional setback so they're going to be farther away from that lot line as a matter of having to eliminate Unit 29 to make these adjustments. I'll let Mr. Loughrin explain that in more detail if you like. Again, the purpose this evening is the public hearing and if the Commission so chooses to move forward with the preliminary plan to the City Council.

Chairperson Majoros opened the floor for comments or questions from the Commissioners. Hearing none, he invited the Applicant to the podium.

Tim Loughrin, Robertson Brothers Homes, came to the podium. He stated it is good to see everyone again, this is probably the third time I've been in front of you, and I'll go through this quickly but I also want to hit some salient points to bring to your attention. He said last time we were here for a review we went through the main considerations and points that we wanted to discuss. Things have changed a little bit since we had the meeting and we wanted to obviously bring those up during the public hearing. I think that Kevin made a lot of the points that I was going to make in regard to that. One of the biggest concerns that we had is really working with DTE which is sometimes difficult to develop around. As you know there are existing power poles along Thomas Street. Our original plan was to relocate those to the south side of the road, that is not something that is possible, just from an infrastructure standpoint and there's a very large cost with it. What's probably even more concerning to us is their solution and their only solution to relocating is to essentially bring the lines down Warner across Grand River in front of the park. Those would be new lines that would be relocated basically away from Thomas Street and in front of Riley Park, so that is not something that I thought that the City would be interested in, it's not something we're interested in. So, what we've kind of done is taken a step back and said okay, so what can we do with this. There are certain distance requirements from a pole length, there's an arm length that we have to adjust to around 12-feet, so that did necessitate the need to move a unit back to make that separation. So, we've done that, it provides a better front area if you will, setback to Thomas Street, so that is one change that you're going to see from when we last spoke. The other one is Unit 29 as I mentioned, I met with the neighbors, I know it's been a concern of theirs, and we just felt it was good practice to remove that unit as well. What we did is we combined a couple of buildings to kind of give it some symmetry and in doing that we went from 7.5 feet to about 35 feet there, so I think that's an important step, hopefully the neighbors will appreciate that. We think it's overall a better plan, we've gone from 59 down to 53 now which is a concern from the city, obviously the city wants more people in the downtown area, we want more people, we want more density, there's only so many things we can do. I'm going to show you the plan that you saw last time, this is the one with 54 units, as you can see along Thomas Street. I don't know the distance that we had, we've moved those back, Unit 29, you can see that's pretty close to the property.

City of Farmington Planning Commission

November 14, 2022

Page 7

There is no house there, but it is their property and it is a concern that the neighbors had and we understand it. The new plan removes 29 and also added in a walkway that was mentioned at the Planning Commission as well as the DDA and the neighborhood mentioned that. So, we're trying to make everybody happy like we have from the very beginning but I think this is a better plan overall and honestly there is no other option with the DTE. It is either we do this development the way we're showing it or we don't do it all, what I'm saying is there is no option to work with DTE. We've had conversation with them, it was very disappointing to be honest, so they did not give us a quote on the undergrounding of it, converting those lines underground, but we have no area to convey regardless. So, that is our proposal to move forward and hopefully it meets satisfaction. Just a little site plan, what the City wanted was to make sure we had conveyance from the downtown area down to the Shiawassee Park area which is a component of the RFP but that's been really a main component of the project from the beginning. We are providing an entering promenade. The city owns two houses here, as part of the RFP we would be removing those two houses, putting in a pedestrian promenade and then this is open to the public, the public would have access to walk through the property, this would convey back to the city and then from Thomas Street through we would provide a public walkway open to the public, we have a Master Deed that would have that this would always be open to the public through the Master Deed. So, it's been a component of the city, something that we feel very important, we embrace and it's not something that we typically do in a for sale owned community to have a public walkway through it but we know that that's an important component for the city. The pedestrian promenade is not open to traffic but there is an access for food trucks, for art vendors, people that want to set up in the area for a festival type event. The DDA would be in charge of programming this, we would just be building it as part of the project. These little X's, these would be tents, nothing that's permanent, just something from discussions with the DDA brought about. So, it's more of a pedestrian conveyance more than anything but it's also open up to events and that sort of thing. And then as you can see some of the details, we have benches and what we try to do is copy a lot of what the city already has in the downtown area, so we used a lot of those components, we do matching as much as possible. There will be movable bollards here, we're going to try to match as closely as possible, those would be removed just for vendors and again it goes through our property and then out, you can see the stairs here so you can have conveyance from downtown to Shiawassee Park. So, in summary this is about three acres, just under eighteen units per acre, it is zoned CBD so it's a PUD request, planned unit development, 53 total, all owner-occupied units and as Kevin mentioned they're single-family townhomes, nobody lives on top of each other, they're basically attached units, three stories, about 1,300 square feet and tonight we are seeking recommendation from you and approval. It's very expensive to build single family homes these days, there is a lot of demand, obviously the market has softened quite a bit, but just from an affordability standpoint these will be attainable for people that want to live in a downtown area and don't really want the yards and upkeep. We think this will be a catalyst for future development in the downtown area. You have

an obsolete property, and this project is also a mechanism for building that pedestrian promenade we talked about and we've been around a long time and I do think that's important. If you ask around, I think Robertson Brothers Homes has a good reputation, we strive for that. What that means to you is that you have a partner here who is going to stand by what they say and do what they say so I think that's an important fact there. This was the original response to the RFP and it's between us and an apartment builder, again, we're for sale units which I think the city wanted to see. You can see it's evolved quite a bit, we had 59 units here and a real basic what we call this level of traffic, there's a reason we thought that was a really good idea with parking but the city didn't want that so we kind of moved here which is current plan that I showed you, you can see it's evolved quite a bit from when we first came in. And then probably most notably here, this whole building went away and it went away because if we built it it would have literally gone away down the hill, so we've done a lot of work to figure that out, that probably took a lot of the time that the delay that you've seen. But what we've figured out is if you build on the area we proposed, eventually the building would fall down. So, we had to build outside of that area which is why that building got removed and I know we talked about that last time in detail. I just want to point out this is what changed from last time, it's a little difficult to read, but the last time we showed you the plans that are in front of you, there was 7.5 feet, you had a couple neighbors that mentioned that. The new plan shows just over 30 feet, 33.9 feet to that same line. I did a couple other calculations here, the 22 feet, 22.5 feet, that's to this corner to this property line here. This is actually zoned single family even though it's part of the church parking lot so there's 30-foot requirements, the deviation would go from 7.5 feet to 22.6 feet, so that would one thing when we move to the final PUD, we change that from 7.5 feet to 22.6. and then really it's 36 to where there's a property line for single family, so I wanted to point that out. And these are all concepts for the site or projects that we've built in other cities and it's just for ideas, of course, we want to make sure what we're building is what Farmington wants. When we showed this at the DDA, when we showed it you, I think most people gravitated with the bottom left, so that's something that we're building and we didn't want to propose the exact same thing so what we did is we looked at some of the things that you mentioned what Farmington is about and this is the latest, you've not seen this, this is what we're proposing as far as elevations. It's all Hardee, there's no vinyl on this, coordinated brick, all of this is brick, like a gray brick. This is all gray Hardee and this is actually Hardee board as well, it's finished in kind of a wood tone that's very attractive, that gives it a little bit of difference. The last version you see that I think you have in your packets shows the downstairs patio. What we wanted to do since it's more of a public walkway through, we wanted to provide some privacy for the future homeowners and give them a little bit of an outdoor statement, that's why we went with that kind of look, that was not something that was well received here or at the DDA. And I get it, I don't think it looked very good as well. So, we came back and we downscaled it a little bit, it's just kind of a continuation of brick and we capped it off with a front patio just for some privacy but not overbearing. I'm happy to hear any discussion on it but this is our proposal at this point, and I do think the



DDA did want to see the elevations again and they did want to see the promenade again, so those are still things we need to go in front of them for after we've gone in front of you and the Council. So, you see what we've got, this is what they are, the first-floor garage and what we all the Zoom room or flex room, it's like a downstairs mancave if you will, slash library, slash living room, slash family room, whatever you want. The second floor is more open, living, dining, kitchen, and then the third floor are two bedrooms, two bath. So, I just wanted to speak to the PUD a little bit. For a PUD which is a planned unit development, you have to meet three of this number of qualifications. We feel we meet all of them but one, so why don't we go through this quickly because I think it's important to note that we're asking for a PUD which is more of a specialized zoning district that's conducive to, basically the PUD is approving the site plan you're showing so there's some give and take, but you have to meet certain criteria. One of the requirements of a mixed-use development in residential or nonresidential uses. Obviously, we're not mixed use but what I would say to this though the thing that is missing when you're downtown is people, so we consider we're part of a mixed use overall in the downtown area. I think that's not a stretch, but some people might say it is. Redevelopment of a Brownfield, obviously this is a Brownfield site, it's basically a building that is well past its useful life. Pedestrian designed with buildings leading to the sidewalk, that's what we're dealing with directly on Thomas which is very important. With high quality architectural design, extensive landscaping, preservation, enhancement of restoration of natural resources, we've got the slope, we're keeping the trees, it's very important to keep the trees so that slope stays intact, so certainly we do not have any historic resources that are remaining, so obviously we don't need that one. Tradition of open space, we're putting in a promenade, efficient consolidation of poorly dimensioned parcels and difficult site conditions, it's a very difficult site, it's taken us a long time to figure out what to do with it. Effective transition between current and future uses, we feel the use of townhomes is really the perfect transitional use from the existing residential to really your core commercial, I think it is the best use possible. I think apartments would be a little too dense and overpowering and certainly single-family homes doesn't work in that configuration, so we think we are the right transition. Shared access between properties, we have been working with the adjacent church, there are easements in place, we will need to have another access agreement based on whatever plan gets approved, but we've had a good relationship with them over the past year and a half, so those are ongoing discussions. Stormwater in general in this area will become much better because we are doing an underground catch system so that's certainly a good impact on both facilities. And then this last one, we do build above code, we are putting in electric vehicle chargers in all of our garages, we'll have electric cable chargers in some of the parking spaces for guests. So, we do a lot of these things and I just wanted to point these things out because there are members of the public who have never seen us before, what we've done and where we're at, so I think this is my last line and I'm happy to answer any questions you have.

City of Farmington Planning Commission

November 14, 2022

Page 10

Chairperson Majoros opened the floor to the Commissioners for comments and/or questions.

Commissioner Crutcher asked if car chargers were going to be in garages and guest parking spaces and Loughrin replied they are wired for electrical vehicle chargers so the homeowner will have a choice of whatever car they choose, it would be pre-wired for that but we do that in all of our garages and typically we put in electric vehicle chargers in the parking areas, so I know we've selected a couple locations for that.

Majoros asked if there was any concern with traffic flow, two-way traffic, the circulation traffic with the change in the power lines and the flow of vehicular traffic and Loughrin replied no, everything was just pushed back, nothing was narrowed.

MOTION by Westendorf, supported by Crutcher, to open the public hearing.

Motion carried, all ayes.

(The Public Hearing was opened at 7:45 p.m.)

### **PUBLIC HEARING**

Rick Gunlach, 23700 Warner Street, shares over 200 feet of property line with the Maxfield Training Center north boundary so we were initially very concerned about the short setback between the building that contains Unit 29 and so this news tonight is very welcome to us. I've spent a lot of time trying to understand with the PUD ordinance and the CBD ordinance and see how they fit into what we're seeing proposed and so this change is very welcome to me and my wife. Sorry about the circumstances but glad that happened with DTE because it certainly will help us a lot in accepting this new plan. Now we can say we're very pleased that Robertson Brothers is building this complex and we thank you for all the time and effort you put in to design something that's going to be really good for our community and we feel it will be much better to have the townhome design rather than an apartment complex. So, I want to thank you for that, Tim, and I'm sorry for all the writings I submitted and tried to defend the position we had, so thank you. I did want to make one additional comment if I can. Because we live right along that pathway from Warner Street to the stairway to the park, and our yard is relatively open we see a lot of people walking back and forth between the park and Warner Street, some people with dogs, sometimes it's kids, but a lot of people just walking. So, we feel that preserving that pathway from Warner Street to the stairway to the park is important. And I noticed in your plan that you've added a sidewalk now to the north of that building that contains units 20-28. So, this sidewalk we feel is important and that it fits in with the Master Plan, the idea that you're going to have this pathway that directs people to the park, so we think it's really important to preserve this and maybe extend it all the way to Warner Street. And I sent you another writing about the parking lot because I understand that the Robertson

City of Farmington Planning Commission

November 14, 2022

Page 11

Brothers are going to be somehow involved in refurbishing that parking lot, but you have an opportunity I believe to increase the number of parking spaces in the parking lot if you reconfigure the parking spaces that are there and you should still have room for a walkway from Warner Street all the way to behind the Robert Brothers Homes complex to the park. So, I would encourage whoever is involved in making those decisions to try to find a plan that would work that would preserve that walkway.

Kevin Gromley, 23626 Warner Street stated he sent the email earlier and all of his concerns are allayed at this point. It looks like a great plan and my concerns were the same that we're one house further north from the property and we were worried about the setbacks. I would also echo Rick's sentiment, we do get a lot of foot traffic going to the park so if it is possible to preserve access from Warner Street, that would be great.

Doug Peterson, 33209 Oakland Avenue, requested to keep the sidewalk and to continue it from Warner that would be great.

David Judge, 23708 Warner Street, stated I'm happy with everything you did, it looks nice, I like the Hardee siding, that's nice to hear about, the design, everything looks very nice, the sidewalk and everything. My question and/or concern is I noticed that with the construction on Farmington Road people are cutting through the TJ Maxx and you get a queue of cars we've never had before. So, we're going to have possibly more traffic in the area, it's going to come down here and go down Warner Street and the reason this sticks in my head and I'll just tell you I had a conversation with the former City Manager years ago and he stated I think we're going to need a traffic light either here on Grand River or here on Warner. I know we were looking at apartments going in at that time, so I don't know if that holds true but I wanted to put that in your head because I do know that taking my son to school in the morning, we used to be able to leave a certain time and now we're leaving ten minutes earlier just to try and get through the line that is trying to turn right onto Shiawassee Street because of the traffic on Warner Street that's picked up and I was wondering if that was talked about. Other than that, I think it's good, but just to reorient the parking spaces to where the walkway would be, you can really fit a lot more parking in that spot.

Reverend Anthony Hood, 33112 Grand River Avenue, stated they are certainly happy with the adjustments made in the plan and have no concerns and will certainly have dialogue about extending the walkway all the way to Warner Street and on how to better use our parking lot but just want everyone to be sure, it is our parking lot. So, while we continue to have this relationship with the city that we're going to continue, we certainly want to be mindful of both the situations and both parameters for our congregation, especially when we begin the construction process where we're going to be really confined around Thomas Street and where that equipment is going to be parked so that we still have access to our parking on Sundays and during our special services.

Estelle K., 26052 Pleasant Valley in Farmington Hills, asked the approximate price range of the condominiums

Loughrin replied what we're building in a similar community these would start in the \$300,000, we'll try and be in the low \$300,000 but with the Hardee and all the costs involved don't hold me to it.

MOTION by Crutcher, supported by Perrot, to close the Public Hearing.

(Public Hearing closed at 7:58 p.m.)

MOTION by Kmetzo, supported by Crutcher, to recommend submission of preliminary pud plan to move forward to City Council for their redevelopment of the former Maxfield Training Center on the condition that the developer plan incorporates comments made by the DDA Design Committee, OHM design review letters dated September 18<sup>th</sup> and 26<sup>th</sup> and also comments made by the Pathway Committee noted in their November 9<sup>th</sup> minutes and in addition to all the other changes made in tonight's meeting.  
Motion carried, 5-1 (Westendorf).

### **UPDATE – CURRENT DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS**

Director Christiansen gave an update on the continuing development projects.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

None heard

### **PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENT**

Kmetzo said it's important that voices are heard on projects

Christiansen thanks Commissioners and public and wished everybody a Happy Thanksgiving

Majoros thanked Kevin and the full staff.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

MOTION by Crutcher, supported by Perrot to adjourn the meeting.  
Motion carried, all ayes.

City of Farmington Planning Commission  
November 14, 2022  
Page 13

The meeting was adjourned at 8:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Secretary