



PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
Monday, February 12, 2018 – 7:00 p.m.
City Council Chambers
23600 Liberty Street
Farmington, MI 48335

AGENDA

- 1. Roll Call**
- 2. Approval of Agenda**
- 3. Approval of Items on the Consent Agenda**
 - A. January 8, 2018 Minutes**
- 4. Discussion of 2019-2024 Capital Improvement Program and Request to Schedule Public Hearing**
- 5. Public Comment**
- 6. Planning Commission Comment**
- 7. Adjournment**

FARMINGTON PLANNING COMMISSION PROCEEDINGS
City Council Chambers, 23600 Liberty Street
Farmington, Michigan
January 8, 2018

Chairperson Crutcher called the Meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. at City Council Chambers, 23600 Liberty Street, Farmington, Michigan, on Monday, January 8, 2018.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chiara, Crutcher, Gronbach, Kmetzo, Majoros, Perrot, 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 Chiara, seconded by Kmetzo, to approve the Agenda.

Motion carried, all ayes.

APPROVAL OF ITEMS ON CONSENT AGENDA

a. December 11, 2017 Minutes

MOTION by Majoros, seconded by Chiara, to approve the items on the Consent Agenda.

Motion carried, all ayes.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

A. ACCEPT NOMINATIONS FOR CHAIRPERSON

B. ACCEPT NOMINATIONS FOR VICE CHAIRPERSON

C. ACCEPT NOMINATIONS FOR SECRETARY

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

Director Christiansen stated that this is the annual election of officers that occurs every January within the Planning Commission. The purpose of this item is to nominate a person to fill the position, have the motion seconded, the member will then accept the nomination or reject it and a vote will be taken on that nomination.

MOTION by Commissioner Chiara, supported by Gronbach, to nominate Kenneth Crutcher as Chairperson of the Planning Commission.

Crutcher accepted the nomination.

A vote was taken on the above nomination,

Motion carried, all ayes.

Commissioner Waun nominated Steve Majoros, supported by Chiara, for Vice Chairperson of the Planning Commission.

Majoros accepted the nomination.

A vote was taken on the above nomination,
Motion carried, all ayes.

Commissioner Gronbach nominated Ken Chiara, supported by Majoros, for Secretary of the Planning Commission.

Chiara accepted the nomination.

A vote was taken on the above nomination,
Motion carried, all ayes.

The 2018 slate of Planning Commission Officers were elected as follows:

Chairperson - Kenneth Crutcher

Vice Chairperson – Steve Majoros

Secretary – Ken Chiara

**PRELIMINARY PUD REVIEW AND PUBLIC HEARING – BOJI DEVELOPMENT, INC.
10 MILE DEVELOPMENT GROUP, LLC, OLD 47TH COURTHOUSE PROPERTY, 32795
TEN MILE ROAD**

Crutcher introduced this time and turned it over to staff.

Director Christiansen stated this is the preliminary PUD review and Public Hearing scheduled for the redevelopment of the Old 47th District Courthouse property located at 32795 Ten Mile Road.

He stated the Applicant, Boji Development, Inc., Ten Mile Development Group, LLC, has submitted plans, a survey, landscape plans and building elevations and an aerial photograph was included with the staff report.

He indicated there was a PUD site plan submitted as well as a letter from OHM dated January 5, 2018. He stated the Applicant was present as well as the consultants from OHM.

Christiansen reminded the Planning Commission that they had an opportunity at the preapplication conference in November to engage with the Petitioner on this proposed PUD and the first step in the process is the preapplication conference which was held back in November and the second step being the preliminary plan review and public hearing which is being held tonight. Subsequent to the Planning Commission holding the

Public Hearing they are in a position to act on the preliminary PUD plan and if an affirmative recommendation is brought forth, it would get moved forward to the City Council for their review.

The City Council has the third step in the process which is the preliminary PUD plan and if they act affirmatively on it then the final PUD plan comes back before the Planning Commission for final approval.

He stated there are Zoning Ordinance modifications also and stated he would leave that up to the consultants and the Petitioner to detail.

He indicated that OHM representatives Jessica Howard and Matt Parks are present at the meeting to go over their review with the Planning Commission.

Chairperson Crutcher called Matt Parks to the podium to go over the review letter.

Matt Parks, OHM Advisors, went over the letter of January 5, 2018 provided to the Planning Commission.

He stated on the first page of the letter is included a project site description, showing an aerial view of the site. He said on the second page of the planning review it compares the site with what is being proposed in regard to the Zoning Ordinance, the Farmington Master Plan and the Downtown Area Plan, Downtown Master Plan. He stated that comments were made on parking but indicated in general the site is in compliance with many of the plans. He stated in comparison with previous proposals submitted on this property, this one is much less dense with what had been proposed in the past. He stated in general the way the infrastructure fits, the way that everything plays out in the Downtown Area Plan, it fits with that being residential and generally supports the different plan concepts with it being less dense.

Some specific comments made by OHM is that the Petitioner did provide a parallel plan, this being a PUD, they're proposing fourteen single family dwelling units and the parallel plan shows twelve plots, eleven were labeled, so a little bit added density. The positioning off of Ten Mile Road and how the proposed road swings down basically shows how it could tie into the existing school property and/or expand with similar use in the future or tie into that site and continue with either more dense development or things shown in the Downtown Area Plan.

He indicated that no specific area in the plan was set aside for stormwater management and that was stated in both the engineering and planning letter reviews. He said the

Petitioner did show a series of stormwater pipes to collect the stormwater runoff and also pretreatment and that they will require more details as far as how that will be achieved.

He said as Mr. Christiansen stated this PUD will go through a series of preliminary and final reviews and that during the final review of the PUD it will spell out the benefits that are added to the site and to the community.

He indicated at this stage it is normal not to see a drafted PUD agreement but just to show the concept on the drawing.

He addressed parking as having all the units showing standard driveways, garages, but they will need to know whether parking or no parking will be allowed on the streets and one of the questions that came up in their review is that the plans do not indicate whether this will be a public or private road so that needs to be clarified.

Comments were made on pedestrian oriented design requirements taking into consideration the Ordinance and the different plans in place, stating that connectivity is required in a residential setting and future expansion to the east would be elements the City would want to consider.

He stated that his office was not provided with dwelling unit details so that wasn't addressed but they did notice that if the landscape plan provided should be modified and other design details provided, they should be looked at during the final such as the entry sign or something of that nature.

Christiansen stated that in the plan set on what the Petitioner and Applicant, Boji Development, Inc., Ten Mile Development, LLC, is referring to this fourteen unit single family development as Liberty Hills and as indicated by Mr. Parks there is a concept plan which shows the fourteen units laid out, there are some preliminary infrastructure shown as required by the preliminary PUD, and there is some open space which is the area in the northwest corner along Ten Mile and adjacent to the Maxfield Education Center, that there is a small common area on the elbow, this is a single loaded road so it's one access off of Ten Mile and it's stubbed into the Farmington Public School Property and that's in accordance with the Downtown Area Plan for the City of Farmington adopted by the City back in 2015 which calls for residential redevelopment here on this property and that stub there is intended to be there until such time as there is the opportunity to connect.

Looking to implement the Downtown Area Plan in its entirety, this area, the 3.88 acres, the Courthouse property is really one portion of this whole area's plan for potential redevelopment but the overall goal for redevelopment for this area is residential redevelopment.

He stated that also shown in the packet is a utility plan, there was talk of stormwater management and the fact that there needs to be some clarification on the road. The City's goal for redevelopment of this type is to look to implement public infrastructure so it would be public road, public sewer, water, stormwater and what would be required to achieve that.

Christiansen also addressed the issue of on street parking which would be dependent upon roads right-of-way. He then went into the parallel plan meaning under the underlying zoning which is R-1 which is a minimum of 8500 square foot lots, 75 feet of lot width, and what is shown under the parallel plan there could be up to eleven lots with two that actually have proximity and adjacent property line share with Ten Mile Road. What's being shown in the plan is fourteen, a little bit of a different increase, but that's in exchange for a little more open space being put in, that area in the northwest, the common area of the site and the public infrastructure portion of this design.

He referenced the landscape plan that Mr. Parks referred to and the Ordinance requirements and the Applicant has indicated an intent to screen the site and landscape the site using street trees which are required and the common area and green space along Ten Mile Road as well.

Parks clarified that on the Planning side of review they looked at in particular Subarea D in the development area, in the Downtown Area Plan, and he stated what needs to be taken into consideration is to think about this site and how it's going to function independently as a standalone site and what could it be as opportunity evolves to the east which would allow for future continued development.

He stated more details need to come forward as the road comes down and ties into the parking lot, ingress and egress into the parking lot and what kind of impact the traffic would have but feels those are things that can be worked out during the final.

He indicated that overall they didn't see any deal breakers in the planning portion, acknowledging that quite a bit of details need to be worked out and ironed out during the final stages. He opened the floor to questions on the planning side.

Parks then went over the engineering letter with the Commission. He stated quite a bit of infrastructure was done by the City to process the site for redevelopment, most notably was the sanitary sewer system, the City upgraded the Twin Valley Pump Station located down below near Farmington and Shiawassee. The pumps were upgraded, metering was done, a lot of infrastructure was updated. The updates were planned in anticipation of redevelopment so infrastructure wise the sanitary sewer is good.

As far as the water system is concerned it is adequate for a development of this nature.

For ultimate build out there's a water main gap along Rafael that will eventually need to be filled in but for purposes of this site the applicant is only proposing fourteen houses, which will be fine by just bringing water down to into the site. Roadwise, Ten Mile is a Farmington Hills road, so they will have to make sure the applicants get approval from them and making sure the curb cut is acceptable noting there is an existing horseshoe driveway there now. No problems are foreseen, sight distance should be adequate.

There are nine comments on the engineering side that he felt can be worked out as the Applicant moves through the process.

The existing topographical survey, they would like a little more detail on that showing the existing slopes, in particular the wooded area where they plan on discharging water, showing the adjacent property and how that road will tie in and what's exactly adjacent to that and how that's all going to function.

OHM is recommending that eventually the plan should show a concept of how adjacent sites could or would tie in and develop, but for now the Applicant is treating it as a standalone site and that's fine, but to make sure that that road is positioned and set in a way where it can easily be turned or expanded would be a good exercise to go through as it moves forward.

Property lines, public utilities and franchise easements, right-of-ways, those are things that they would like to be see labeled at this stage and some of that information is missing but can easily be added.

The road needs to be designated as public or private and Christiansen had stated that a public road would be preferred, especially if it was going to connect through to another public road.

A stormwater management narrative is something they would like to see, it's basically a simple statement of this is how stormwater is collected, this is how it's treated and discharged, and they like to see a pre versus post calculation, so they would like to see how much impervious surface is on the site today and how much there will be when the site is developed. And depending on that net change, that really governs what kind of stormwater detention would be required. The site does not need to be brought up to full Oakland County Water Resource compliance if the site is becoming more green or if it's only slightly less green than it is today and definitely any stormwater treatment which the Applicant had noted on the plans and is willing to take care of that.

He stated where the stormwater would discharge, there's probably some outlet control structures that need to be detailed out, and again, this is probably not the right time at the preliminary stage but wants the Applicant to be aware so they know that is expected in the future.

Connections with future utilities was also something that was noted. Section C delineates all the potential future permits that will be needed, building permits, Oakland County soil erosion, water and sewer permits from the DEQ and then again Farmington Hills will need to approve any kind of connection proposed along that Ten Mile corridor.

He indicated he is sure the Applicant has answers to many of their comments and since this is the preliminary stage, he foresees many of these massaged out in the process.

Chairperson Crutcher thanked Parks and invited the Applicant to the podium.

Christiansen stated before the Applicant comes up, he would like to bring up on the screen the graphics that were provided to the City from the Applicant so he can walk the Commission through them.

Joe Boji, Boji Development, came to the podium and addressed the issue of the stub road and stated that at the current time the stub road will be addressed by stubbing it off there and not having any connectivity now to the school property, so there wouldn't be any traffic going any way, it would just be a dead end for now on that road.

He said they actually developed a plan and that is exactly where the road would need to go through to extend another thirty-eight units through that adjacent property which also preserves the Farmington sledding hill and that area.

He stated the topographical survey that was provided, was one that was provided by the City and they updated it so all of the future plans will be on the new survey and he added all the landscaping on the plan which is above and beyond what is required.

He stated the fourteen proposed units standalone, and could expand into a total of fifty-one units but that would be down the road.

Director Christiansen stated that Boji Development was gracious in working with the City and when they initially engaged the City with their interest in looking to acquire the courthouse property and working with City Council, and that City Council considered a number of developer/investor proposals for development of this site, in working with the Petitioners, City Council asked a number of questions related to the courthouse property specific and to the Downtown Area Plan and the implementation of that plan and Boji

Development cooperated and presented this to City Council as a potential possibility in accordance with those plans if and when there was an opportunity to look to redevelop that entire area and not just the courthouse property but the Farmington Public School property as well.

He clarified that this PUD is specific to the 3.88 acres of the courthouse property only and the fourteen homes as proposed.

The stub street as proposed just provides an opportunity if and when to tie into that property and may or may not ever be realized.

Parks stated that the additional information provided helps clear up some of their comments and stated the one comment on the engineering standpoint is if the road is dead ended on the school property they would need to make sure of the taper of the road and that it has adequate turnaround.

Christiansen stated that although we are looking at the courthouse property, that the developer is showing the larger picture of development through the entire area referred to in the Downtown Area Plan as Area D which involves fourteen acres and includes the sled hill and all of the school property. The goal of the City was residential and preserving the sled hill and providing amenities and facilities, there is additional parking provided, the sled hill is preserved, the stormwater management retention, a pavilion area, that this conceptual image is consistent with the Downtown Area Plan and the vision of that plan.

Majoros inquired about the location of the sledding hill and Christiansen went over the area on the screen and stated the intent in the concept plan is to have a relocation of the parking and the goal for the Downtown Area Plan was the preservation of the sled hill and the construction of a pavilion.

Crutcher opened the floor for any questions from Commissioners

Majoros asked the Petitioner if there was any more certainty as to what will drive the different sizes of homes being built and the Petitioner stated that each lot is sized to fit every house elevation so it will be on a first come, first serve basis.

Majoros then stated that there could be two extremes to that scenario, that every one of those fourteen units could be built as ranches or the other way, they all want the 2,700 square foot home and asked if there should be any concern as far as footprint and density of size or anything the Commission should be aware of if one extreme or the other is the way the dice rolls..

Christiansen replied what they should be concerned about is making sure whatever the Commission looks favorably upon since the plan, the layout and all elements and aspects thereof, that they look at the building sites, that they get comfortable with the maximum building envelope. He stated that the Commission should have in their final planning is what the Planning Commission will support as far as the maximum envelopes on the site. As mentioned earlier by Mr. Parks, the PUD process is a flexible zoning technique which allows for some modification to traditional zoning so the straightforward spatial requirements, setbacks, lot coverage, lot size, density, lot width area, etc., and that is all achieved through the PUD Plan and the PUD Agreement and that Agreement is an instrument in the end of City Council so it's really the agreement for all aspects of the project, infrastructure, layout, lot size, units, and everything else and all legal questions. All of those things are part of the Commission's responsibilities and will be complete if the Commission is supportive of this project in the final plan and the PUD Agreement.

Boji stated that what they are proposing is a 43-foot wide by 60-foot feet envelope so all the homes fit within that envelope and all setbacks are based on that envelope.

Christiansen put on the screen the Downtown Area Plan that the City put together with OHM Advisors back in 2014 and completed in 2015, with some amendments made and the final version which got acted on in 2016 because of the changes. This particular plan looks at specific areas in the downtown and areas surrounding it. He detailed the different tools the City utilized to put together a Vision Plan and focus areas and stated that the Downtown Area Plan looks at each area in more detail and the areas around it.

He stated in response to Mr. Majoros' question, the Downtown Area Plan has five subareas, Subarea A is the property along Grand River from Warner Street, east to School Street. Subarea B is the Maxfield Training Center. Subarea C is Community/Shiawassee Park, Subarea D is the Farmington Public Schools property and the 3.88 acres are the Old Courthouse property, Subarea E is an area along Grand River from the east end of downtown, twelve properties all the way up to Power. What is addressed in the Downtown Area Plan are concepts for these areas and the concepts for Area D, unique medium density residential development that integrates existing natural features and areas that enhances the characters and connections within the Shiawassee Road corridor, medium density residential uses and maintain existing sledding hill, wooded area, greenspace connections to natural areas in Shiawassee Park, improve the intersection to create a gateway, a context sensitive design. He pointed out the concepts on the screen to the Commission.

He stated the developer has worked very closely with the City to look to try to achieve a level of implementation of Subarea D on the courthouse property.

Chairperson Crutcher opened the floor for questions from the Commission.

Waun stated that most new communities have requirements, whether it's by the city or the owner, that the same house elevation cannot be built side by side or directly across the street so that every house is not the same, and asked if there was a plan in place to avoid having fourteen identical houses in the development.

The Petitioner stated they will work closely with the City, that they don't want fourteen of the same houses next to each other. They can propose that their plan includes not building exactly the same house being built next to each other.

Christiansen put on the screen the plans submitted by the Petitioner and stated that the plans proposed fit within the City requirements through the PUD process and being in the preliminary plan process

Boji went on to state that they typically offer seven different elevations of the same home and depending on how each different one is varies. Different elevations can be utilized and each homeowner has the opportunity to select different materials, seven different kinds of bricks, eight different colors of siding and four or six different shingle colors so there can be a variation to each home.

Christiansen stated that that differentiation of the City's requirements can all be spelled out in the final PUD agreements.

Boji pointed out on the screen examples of ranch homes built in other communities, stating that all five homes were the same with different elevations so they all looked different.

Crutcher asked Boji if the buyer would have to choose from the Petitioner's set of plans or can they bring their own and Boji stated they have to choose from his plans.

MOTION by Majoros, supported by Chiara, to open the Public Hearing.
Motion carried, all ayes.

(Public Hearing opened 7:50 p.m.)

PUBLIC HEARING

Buzz Holschnick, lives on Elizabeth Court and his home backs up to the property. He stated he is pleased to see this project after looking at some of the other proposed developments but has a question regarding sewage and where will the sewage line run.

Parks responded by saying the Petitioner is proposing a gravity sewer within the development, that the previous developer obtained an easement from the existing site but will run the gravity sewer cut through there and tie in off of existing cul de sac so there will be minimal disturbance. He stated in the Development Agreement they will make sure there are provisions in there that state where that's done, how that's done and how it will be restored and how to get the side yard put back in good order. From there it goes along the existing sanitary sewer line all the way down to the Twin Valley Pump Station, so basically everything goes to the bottom of the hill to the river and is pumped up the hill and actually goes up to Warner Street and all the way up the hill and then goes to Grand River.

Christiansen stated that Mr. & Mrs. Holschnick were present this evening and they are the owners of the second house, so between their house and the house to the south is where the easement has been obtained and where that sanitary sewer as proposed is intended to go. He stated this is something that they have been working on for quite a time and he appreciates they are here this evening.

Holschnick responded they are a little bit doubtful, questioning, and they would like to be assured that everything is going to operate well and that they're going to run that line through there and bury the pipe and not destroy the surface and that it's going to operate for fourteen homes.

Parks responded it definitely will. Since they are at the preliminary stage they can make sure everything is laid out right and make sure that the easement is in place and they have enough width but a lot of math calculations need to be done. For the fourteen houses, it doesn't require a very large diameter sewer at all and should be no problem. For the overall development that the Applicant showed as a concept, if that were to all come to fruition there would likely be another sewer that would probably run to the south out of Shiawassee and down to Twin Valley, but that would all have be figured out and would be based on grades and what not, but he is confident that fourteen single family residential houses would be able to fit in a sewer of very small diameter and then head downstream and the City has spent a good amount of money on improving the pump station so there wouldn't be any back-up.

Christiansen stated that any sort of disruption as a result of construction, any disruption of private property in this case on the Holschnick's property, there is an easement for this sewer but if there is any impact and disruption that restoration would take place, so that anything that would happen at surface or as a result thereof would be addressed and would be restored and again all the agreements have to be in place to make sure all of this happens but that is through the engineering process and throughout all the permits and easement agreements the City makes sure that happens.

Sue Schwartz asked how deep is the invert and Parks responded that right now the topographic survey does not provide the data but he would assume it's deep enough and with the floor plan the Applicant is providing he wants to make sure that the sanitary sewer they connect to is at least 10 feet deep.

Jim Duffy, who lives on Elizabeth Court, raised a question on the natural area with all of the trees, and asked who is responsible for the trees because he recently experienced that there was a storm and a tree blew over landing in his backyard and he called the City and they came in and chopped the tree up and cleared it up because it was City property. He questioned if it was no longer City property who is going to maintain the wooded area.

Christiansen responded that is a great question and that currently the City owns the property and when a sale is consummated and the City no longer owns the property, then it will be the responsibility of the new property owner. And if it is the developer, Boji Development, Inc., Ten Mile Development, L.L.C., then they would be the responsible party. If the project moves forward and the development is approved, and the development then is permitted and implemented and is complete, depending upon the structure on how this development is established, there is likely to be a Homeowner's Association and then the owners of the property become the homeowners, like a condominium association. This property is what is called a single family detached site condominium and so there's likely to be an association, master deed, bylaws and the association is responsible for maintaining all common elements.

Duffy stated that anybody near that has that risk, because of the amount of trees on the site and Christiansen responded that it becomes a matter of the owner of the property being responsible for the impact of their property on themselves and others.

Duffy stated that nobody owns that and Christiansen responded that right now the City does and they are responsible and Duffy stated if there is an easement in the back, who maintains that.

Christiansen responded that once the property is sold it becomes the developer's complete responsibility, everything about it and then if the development comes to fruition,

it's the owner of the development, in this case the Homeowner's Association, and it's from property line in, so they own up to the property line.

Duffy stated that is not his question. When the other house gets built there is no access to that easement.

Christiansen responded there is no easement there now as far as he can tell.

Duffy stated that between the tree line and the property there is.

Christiansen stated there is a utility easement in the back of his property for stormwater, and there is a storm sewer line underneath. He stated that there looks to be a storm sewer on the back of his property and asked if there were any catch basins or any facilities in the back of his lot but that there seems to be an easement on his site and is the responsibility of whoever has the responsibility for that easement.

Duffy asked Administration to give thought to it in the final plan how it is going to be maintained. He stated if he needs to maintain it he doesn't have a problem and cited previous problems with maintenance of the site and Christiansen responded that is why Parks made a comment earlier about making sure there is a survey that shows existing conditions that's accurate and complete. One of the things looked for on instruments like that are all the infrastructure facilities including easements, so whatever exists along this property line will have to be part of engineering review and whether there's easements or not there are responsible parties, depending on what the easements lay out and that will all be part of this final planning process.

Donald Schwartz, 24158 Elizabeth Court, questioned about the tearing down of the courthouse and if there is any asbestos or any radon in the ground. He stated he actually had his house tested for radon and it was slightly above the 4.0 and stated if there was any disturbance of the ground for the basements in the new development, and how it impacts his current residence.

He also addressed the issue of utilities, if they would be above ground, below ground and the Petitioner responded they would be below ground, and Schwartz stated that the easement between the properties was for cable and telephone and electrical, he stated there were four cable companies on the pole.

He then questioned the Petitioner if he is going to call the development Liberty Hill would he have another street called Liberty.

Christiansen responded that per ordinance structure and street naming provision there would not be another street called Liberty.

Christiansen thanked Schwartz for his comments and stated the site itself has had a very thorough investigation and the existing almost 15,000 square foot courthouse property has been vacant for fourteen years and has been evaluated and that the building is to be demolished by anybody who purchases the property in accordance with the City's purchase agreement and any sort of environmental remediation when they do the demolition they have to come into the City to get the demolition permit and the City evaluates the existing conditions and they make sure the permit lays out what is required as far as what demolition has to take place. Then there is remediation, if there is anything that needs to be removed, special consideration, asbestos, etc., that is done as a matter of the demolition and until you have a clean site you can't redevelop the property. That will be done with the building and also the small block garage, storage building, that will have to be removed itself.

The site itself has had quite a bit of investigation. There used to be an old heating oil tank, an underground storage tank for the courthouse property. That tank was identified a number of years ago and it was removed in accordance with state requirements and procedures. There was an environmental investigation, that tank was removed, the remediation took place and there was a closure by the State with respect to that tank removal.

There was a Phase I environmental done which is a first stage environmental investigation into the site and soil investigation. There was a Phase II done because of the building, the age of the building, there is some asbestos in the building because of the old infrastructure heating system and that addressed everything that was at issue on the site.

There was a follow-up Phase II that was done with that as well, so those investigations are all part of the record of existing conditions identifying any environmental concern and the demolition will address that.

There was a second Phase II done and looking at the survey drawing in the southwest corner where the ravine is at, to the east of that there is a small stockpile area and that stockpile area that is an area of spoil material that had been placed on the site over time and there was an environmental specific to that pile and for its remediation. He indicated the City has taken time to make sure all of the investigations have taken place working with prior developers and investors and now Boji Development to make sure existing conditions are completely understood on the property.

MOTION by Gronbach, seconded by Majoros, to close the Public Hearing.
Motion carried, all ayes.

(The Public Hearing was closed at 8:08 p.m.)

Chairperson Crutcher stated that the next step for the Planning Commission is to consider the Petitioner's request to approve the preliminary PUD and site plan review and make the recommendation to move it forward to City Council for their approval.

MOTION by Majoros, seconded by Kmetzo, to approve the preliminary PUD and site plan review for Boji Development, Inc., Ten Mile Development, L.L.C., for the Old 47th District Courthouse property located at 32795 Ten Mile Road, with the plans submitted by the Petitioner for Liberty Hill, and the preliminary PUD plans submitted December 4, 2017, conceptual site plan, and in accordance with the planning and engineering review letter for Liberty Hill submitted by OHM dated January 5, 2018 and incorporating the comments made during the Public Hearing and have the Planning Commission move the preliminary PUD plan forward to the City Council.
Motion carried, all ayes.

SITE PLAN REVIEW AND APPROVAL FOR BUILDING ADDITION – CONTRACTING RESOURCES, INC., PROFESSIONAL PAVILION, 23133 ORCHARD LAKE ROAD

Crutcher introduced this agenda item and handed it to over to Christiansen.

Director Christiansen stated that the City has been working with the new property owner, Professional Pavilion located at 23133 Orchard Lake Road regarding a proposed building addition to the existing building and site. The proposed addition is a 13,000 square foot medical office building as well as changes to the existing site including parking lot and walkway improvements, a new dumpster enclosure, new site landscaping and lighting and new signage.

The existing building and site is located on a C-2 Community Commercial District and requires review and approval by the Grand River Corridor Improvement Authority and the Planning Commission. No other changes to the existing site are proposed.

The Applicant has submitted a site plan for the proposed two-story medical office building and the proposed site improvements. An aerial photograph was attached with the staff report as well as a site plan review letter from OHM Advisors dated 1-3-2018.

The Grand River Corridor Improvement Authority reviewed and recommended approval of the site plan to the Planning Commission at their January 4th meeting and a draft copy of the minutes are attached with the staff report.

As indicated earlier, Jessica Howard, with OHM Advisors, is present with Matt Parks this evening to present their review.

Christiansen stated that one of the steps in the site plan process allows for interested applicants and petitioners to request work type session meetings with the City Administration as well as Boards and Commissions prior to coming before a Board or Commission with a formal request and in this case the Petitioner, Mr. Jim Varnas, did take advantage of that and there was a work session that was held with members of the Planning Commission as well as members of the Grand River Improvement Authority and City Administration and staff and consultants.

He put the aerial photograph on the screen and pointed out the location indicating the property is surrounded on three sides by public rights-of-way, and showing the existing two-story medical office building, professional building, approximately 12,000 square feet per floor, representing a 23,000 square foot building. The existing parking field was also pointed out as well as access off of both Mooney Street and Orchard Lake, the sidewalk around the perimeter around Mooney Street, around Shiawassee and a little bit around the curve there at Orchard Lake Road.

Jessica Howard, from OHM Advisors, stated that she is present to discuss the Farmington Medical Office Building Addition and Site Improvements. She stated the Applicant is proposing a 6,500 square foot building addition as well as site improvements to the parking lot and lights and sidewalk. They are also adding a six-inch fire suppression lead to this addition as well as some storm and sewer improvements for roof drain collection.

She stated they have seven comments that don't really impact the layout of the site so they are recommending approval of the addition.

She indicated that what the Applicant did to offset some of the impervious surface is creating islands in the parking lot which is the parking improvement to offset that green space, so they are slightly lowering their overall impervious surface of the site even with this addition.

She stated they spoke with the Applicant last Friday and went over their comments with him and they are already working on adjusting the items in the comments.

She stated their concerns were with being consistent with some of their existing parking lots and lights and proposed lights, that they were not sure if they were salvaging and/or removing them and replacing them and providing more detail for the City as to what lights they are proposing for the parking lot.

Another issue was some of the storm sewer count being exceeded and how to address those issues with the site and they did come to a solution with the developer's engineer and got clarification on their plans with some sheets calling out for additional removal of the sidewalk improvements and then other sheets not showing those.

She stated they were very minor comments for a site plan removal and they do recommend the approval and in the last part of their letter they delineate they will have to get their City building permits, they need to do their soil erosion permit, and she opened the floor for questions from the Commission.

Chairperson Crutcher thanked her and called the Petitioner to the podium.

Jim Varnas, from Contracting Resources, came to the podium on behalf of the Applicant.

He gave a quick history of the project stating the building was built in the '70s and the building was purchased in the mid 2000's by a real estate investment trust out of Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Since then they really haven't done too much to the building, it has actually gone down in quality, tenants have moved out so it's roughly 50% vacant. He stated he noticed the opportunity and has it under contract, it is not purchased yet, but the intent is to have a couple leases signed and close within the next six weeks or so.

Beaumont is one of the major tenants in the building and they are planning on expanding their pediatric group. In addition to that, Beaumont has requested some potential additional space which isn't currently in the facility so that was the impetus in looking at the building addition.

One clarification is that it is a 13,000 square foot, not a 6,500 square foot, and he presented a letter from their engineer addressing the items that were brought up by OHM and basically they've accepted the items and they will be clarified to bring it to closure.

Director Christiansen stated they have worked closely with Mr. Varnas with his interest from the onset and has appreciated all of his efforts. They have from the beginning sat down together and looked at the existing conditions and moving forward with what his interest and plans are, again the work sessions they have had, the work with the Grand River Corridor Authority, and stated it might be helpful to go through the detail of some of

the plans and get to the elevations so they can show everybody what Mr. Varnas' intent is with this redevelopment.

Varnas stated the building is roughly 21,000 to 22,000 square feet and is 21,000 square feet leasable, there's a partial basement in the building.

Christiansen put up on the screen the existing building condition survey, where you see the building and the parking field from the 1970's construction, the standards that were in place and what was approved at that time didn't have much in terms of internal circulation, modifications, adjustments or any break up of the parking lot so you don't see the islands, you don't see the landscaping, you don't see a sidewalk on Orchard Lake Road, and those are some of the items that the Petitioner has addressed here.

Varnas stated a lot of the issues with the building which is almost 40 years old are being corrected with this plan, site circulation, the paving areas, the lack of landscaping, what is there is overgrown and needs to be cut down. He pointed out the landscape plan which they are totally re-landscaping the total facility.

He stated he is an architect and his belief on developing is that architecture sells, it needs to be a good quality product which brings good quality tenants which brings a longlasting development for years to come. He went over in detail the plans that they are proposing, highlighting the retaining wall that identifies the name of the building and features a welcome to Farmington gateway signage as well.

MOTION BY WAUN, supported by Chiara, to approve the building addition at 23133 Orchard Lake Road, in accordance with the OHM review letter dated January 3, 2018 and referencing the recommendation from the Grand River Corridor Improvement Authority.

Motion carried all ayes.

ACCEPTANCE OF MODIFICATIONS TO 2016 DOWNTOWN MASTER PLAN

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

Christiansen stated this item is a request for a review and acceptance of modifications by the Planning Commission to the updated City of Farmington Downtown Master Plan.

He indicated at the January 4, 2017 meeting, the Downtown Development Authority, the DDA Board, approved to forward a resolution which is attached to the Planning

Commission to adopt the Downtown Master Plan, the updated Downtown Master Plan 2017.

The Planning Commission reviewed the plan at their December 12, 2016 meeting and adopted it at their January 9, 2017 meeting. However, Walker Parking Consultants created an updated parking study since the adoption of the updated Downtown Master Plan 2017 back in January by the Planning Commission and as such at their September 6, 2017 meeting, the DDA Board accepted changes to the Downtown Updated Master Plan incorporating the 2017 Walker Parking Study and those minutes are attached.

The purpose of this item this evening is to consider acceptance of the modifications to the Updated Downtown Master Plan as part of the overall City of Farmington Master Plan and Comprehensive Planning Program.

MOTION BY MAJOROS, supported by Chiara, to approve the amendment to the Downtown Master Plan inclusive of what Mr. Christiansen referenced as the 2017 Walker Parking Study to be included in the updated version of the Downtown Master Plan. Motion carried, all ayes.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None heard.

PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS

Chairperson Crutcher welcomed Geof Perrot to the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Chiara inquired as to the naming rights of new streets in the City.

Christiansen stated that the goal of the City in many of the redevelopment areas, in particular to areas of residential redevelopment, the City's goal is to have a complete and current and contiguous and continuous system of infrastructure, and that is roads, sewer, water, stormwater management, etc. So having these as public facilities, through the review and approval process and the engineering review and then permitting and construction, the City is able to achieve that continuity and consistency with its infrastructure and bringing them online as public facilities ties them into the existing system. So they look to do that where it makes sense and where it works for the community.

Christiansen stated he is aware it was an involved meeting tonight with a number of items, and that they had talked about where things are and going to and they're very pleased that they have the opportunity to see some of these redevelopments, the courthouse property, and in addition the Professional Pavilion, that is very significant in the City and it's quite a bit of medical office space and it certainly supports what's taking place along the Grand River Corridor at the Botsford Focus Area which is now Beaumont which is one of the four focus areas in the Grand River Corridor Vision Plan results in a demand and a need for medical office space and facilities and that he is pleased to see the City can accommodate that.

He stated there are other redevelopment projects on the horizon and they're still continuing to work with the Applicant regarding the Maxfield Training Center.

Now that the Planning Commission has moved forward with the updated 2016 Downtown Master Plan incorporating the Walker Parking Study, that then completes the updated Downtown Master Plan and the next step is moving forward with an RFP for the City Master Plan and incorporating all of the tools that were created to do so.

What is being seen here in the City with the addition at the Professional Pavilion, taking an underutilized parking area and absorbing that and turning that over to bricks and mortar construction with a building addition, there has been quite a bit of interest in some of the City's larger commercial centers that have a significant amount of parking, some of which is underutilized itself to possibly construct out buildings, outlots, and they are working on that.

On a staff note, Christiansen stated that Walt Gajewski, market manager, had fallen ill and was wished a speedy recovery and that he is in their thoughts and prayers.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION by Chiara, supported by Waun, to adjourn the meeting.
Motion carried, all ayes.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:43 p.m.

\

Respectfully submitted,

Secretary

**Farmington Planning Commission
Staff Report**

**Planning Commission
Date:** February 12, 2018

**Reference
Number
5**

Submitted by: Kevin Christiansen, Economic and Community Development Director

Description Discussion of 2019/2024 Capital Improvement Program and Request to Schedule Public Hearing

Background

This item is a discussion of the 2019/2024 Capital Improvement Program and request to schedule a public hearing. The Capital Improvement Program Steering Committee and City staff have been diligently updating the program to incorporate into the upcoming City Master Plan update and are requesting the Planning Commission to schedule for public hearing at the March 12, 2018 meeting. The final draft 2019/2024 Capital Improvement Program will be available for your review on the City's website February 25th. The link to the current 2018/2023 program on the City's website for reference is <http://farmgov.com/City-Services/Economic-Community-Development/Planning-and-Redevelopment/Capital-Improvement-Program-2018-2023-Draft.aspx>.

Calendar for Fiscal Year 2019-24 Capital Improvement Program Process

October	Planning Meeting to discuss calendar Kevin, Lisa, David, Chris
November	Planning Meeting to discuss possible revisions to CIP Kevin, Lisa, David, Chris
November	Department Heads meet to discuss CIP Program at Department Head Meeting.
December 4	City Council meets to discuss CIP Program and to appoint representative to CIP Steering Committee. Items must be submitted by January 3.
December 6	DDA Meeting to discuss CIP and appoint Kate or a Board member to Steering Committee. Items must be submitted by January 19.
December 14	CIA Meeting to discuss CIP Program and appoint representative to CIP Steering Committee. Items must be submitted by January 19.
December 11	Planning Commission meets to discuss CIP Program and appoint a member to serve on the committee. Items must be submitted by January 19.
December 13	Department Head meeting to discuss new CIP Program. Items must be submitted by January 19
January 3	City Manager's Office to schedule 3 meetings in January/February for CIP Steering Committee.
January 3	Council submits CIP requests.
January 3	DDA to formalize items for submission to CIP Steering Committee.
January 8	Planning Commission to formalize items for submission to CIP Steering Committee
January 11	CIA to formalize items for submission to CIP Steering Committee.

January 19	Department Heads submit CIP requests. CIA submits CIP requests. DDA submits CIP requests. Planning Commission submits CIP requests.
January 26	Draft Schedule of Capital Improvements circulated to CIP Steering Committee.
Jan 29 – Feb 9	CIP Steering Committee meets to create CIP..
Feb 12 – Feb 16	Draft CIP created.
Feb 21	E&CD advertises Public Hearing for FY 2019-24 CIP on February 25 and posts plan on website on February 23.
March 12	Planning Commission meets to hold public hearing regarding CIP and possibly approve plan.
April 9	Planning Commission meets to approve CIP if not already approved on March 12.
April 16	City Manager submits CIP along with proposed budget to City Council.
April 23	City Council Budget Review Session & Review of DDA Budget.
April 24 - May 25	City Council reviews and adjusts proposed budgets.
May ???	2 nd Council Review Session, if necessary.
May 21	City Council schedules budget and millage public hearing for June 19.
June 7	City Clerk advertises Public Hearing for FY 2017-18 Budget.
June 18	City Council holds Public Hearing regarding FY 2017-18 Budget and Millage Rate, and considers adoption.
June 19	City Clerk publishes summary of adopted budget.

Planning Commission
 Department Heads
 DDA
 City Council
 CIA