

FARMINGTON PLANNING COMMISSION PROCEEDINGS
City Council Chambers, 23600 Liberty Street
Farmington, Michigan
June 10, 2019

Chairperson Crutcher called the Meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. at City Council Chambers, 23600 Liberty Street, Farmington, Michigan, on Monday, June 10, 2019.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chiara, Crutcher, Kmetzo, Majoros, Perrot, Waun, Westendorf
Absent: None
A quorum of the Commission was present.

OTHER OFFICIALS PRESENT: Director Christiansen, Recording Secretary Murphy

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION by Chiara, seconded by Majoros, to approve the Agenda.
Motion carried, all ayes.

APPROVAL OF ITEMS ON CONSENT AGENDA

A. May 13, 2019 Minutes

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

**SITE PLAN REVIEW FOR SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL HOME CONSTRUCTION –
FABIO CERVI, 33427 SHIAWASSEE ROAD**

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

Christiansen stated this item is a site plan review, the consideration to approve a new single-family home for the property at 33427 Shiawassee Road. As indicated in your staff report, Article XIII of the Zoning Ordinance, site plan review Section 35-162 specifies use is subject to site plan review and approval. Construction, renovation and expansion of buildings and structures with the City of Farmington's Historic District, are subject to site plan review by the Planning Commission. The Zoning Ordinance further states prior to submittal of a site plan to the Planning Commission, the site plan shall be submitted to the City's Historical Commission for review and comment.

The City received an application from Mr. Fabio Cervi to construct a new single-family residence with an attached garage on an existing vacant lot located at 33427 Shiawassee

Road within the City of Farmington's Historic District. The design and location of the new home is shown on the attached information which has been submitted by the Applicant.

The City of Farmington's Historical Commission has reviewed the plans and has provided their recommendations; a copy of those recommendations are attached with the staff packets. The responsibility of the Planning Commission is to review the site plan for the proposed new home. The Building Department has reviewed the dimensional aspects of the plan and has indicated that it meets the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance.

The materials that are attached, there is an aerial photograph, this photograph shows Shiawassee Road, the south side of Shiawassee Road and the address there is 33400, that is the Baptist Church property, and then it's actually the green space and the entryway into the parking lot. On the south side, single family properties. You see homes on 33435, 33431, Mr. Cervi's property is 33427. Adjacent to it to the east is 33423, both Mr. Cervi's property and the one to the east are existing vacant single family lots of record. And to that there's another single-family parcel, that's actually the property at the corner of Shiawassee and Farmington Road.

So, the property, subject property that Mr. Cervi is interested is building the new home as proposed on, is an existing single-family building site, a platted lot of record in the single-family zoning district on the south side of Shiawassee Road.

Site plan application has been submitted by Mr. Cervi. This is a plot plan showing the lot, Lot 14, and the proposed single-family home, and you can see the footprint of that house and the access off of Shiawassee Road. Mr. Cervi has presented and provided to both the Historical Commission for their review and now for your review a site plan packet for his new single-family home, it's a two-story home with an attached garage.

Christiansen stated he will go through the documents, but that Mr. Cervi is here this evening to present his request to the Commission. He then went to the Historical Commission's review, which was provided in their staff packet. "Dear Farmington Planning Commission: The Farmington Historical Commission reviewed the plans for the new home at 33427 Shiawassee at their previous meeting. They made a few suggestions to the builder, Mr. Cervi, and he seemed agreeable. They are to reduce the pitch of the roof to lower the overall height of this structure. Change the roof over the garage to a regular gable with possibly an arch window instead of an octagon window. Use a stained wood garage door with windows. Make the front porch deeper so it can be more useful than decorative. Use dark red brick on the lower half of the home as proposed. Reduce the number of different wall surfaces, brick, stone, clapboard shake, to just brick and clapboard. Use architectural roof shingles on all bays." The Commission was concerned the proposed building would be larger than the neighbor to the west,

however they did have some dialogue, they understand that the house as proposed does meet the ordinance requirements in terms of its siting on the property meeting the setbacks as proposed in the residential zoning district where this property is located. They were pleased that the builder planned to use Hardie fiber cement type siding, Anderson wood windows with divided lights, again proposed by Mr. Cervi shown on the plans.

One thing they were concerned about is doing something that wasn't original or doing something that was not specifically historical. They didn't want anything that was faux or fake. As indicated here, they were indicating or have indicated discouragement of the use of any fake historical architectural features. They were looking for in their review and feel that Mr. Cervi is providing this, a well-built, well-designed current house here in 2019/2020 that is preferred over a copy of a historical house that's not original. So that's the comment they made here in their review in providing this to you. Their concern really was only that the house as proposed blend with its neighbors including building materials, color, mass and style and that's submitted for your consideration.

Chairperson Crutcher called the Applicant to the podium.

Fabio Cervi, 12419 Stark Road, Livonia, Michigan 48150, came to the podium. He stated as Kevin had mentioned he is proposing a single-family home on the 33427 Shiawassee site. He stated he did meet with the Historical Commission, it was a terrific meeting, they had some recommendations at that meeting from his original proposal and he addressed every recommendation that they had made at that last meeting. They requested that he reduce the overall height of the home, he did that by reducing the roof pitch. He added gables to the front instead of a reverse gable that they originally had proposed, so he has full gables with cedar shake above the garage door and the dining room or princess suite above that. He also did increase the depth of the porch, he made it five feet versus the four feet that was originally submitted to the Historical Commission. They asked that he not do a mish mash of building materials, so he removed some cultured stone or stone that they had on the front of the home to make it fully consistent of all brick. He is proposing a little bit nicer garage door, he originally had a generic architectural garage door showing, they asked to see something a little bit nicer, so he did that with a barn style type door with windows. And they did mention they would like to see red brick on the home and he did that as well.

Crutcher asked about the change in the roof pitch and Cervi replied it went from 12'10' to a 12'8' roof pitch.

Crutcher then asked about the front porch and Cervi replied that the Historical Commission had made a comment that it was a little narrow for a front porch and he agreed and increased it to 5' in depth and further discussion was held.

Crutcher opened the floor for questions from the Commissioners.

Perrot said there's two really significant properties that essentially border this property from a City standpoint, that essentially border this property. One of which is the first Post Office for the City of Farmington and it abuts up against the backyard and the church across the road. The other designed house and structures were there any features pulled from any other property and put into consideration when this one was designed because quite honestly, it's a sensitive area because of those two historic landmarks.

Cervi replied that he did try to keep it authentic to now, but some design elements were pulled that you see in historic neighborhoods, large covered porches, angled front doors, the mix of materials with the cedar shake and obviously Hardie board siding. The muttons on the windows are traditional pattern, they're not more modern, they're typical, standard mutton pattern which the Historical Commission liked. So, some elements were pulled out of the surrounding homes.

Chiara asked if the church originally owned that property and Cervi replied no, that a woman named Annabel who stated her family was one of the original farmers of Farmington did.

Chairperson Crutcher then asked if Cervi was building this home as a spec home or for himself and Cervi replied they usually build the home and then make a decision on listing it, so they don't make that decision until the home is complete.

Crutcher then asked how the size of this house compares with others on the block and Cervi replied it's similar to the most recently home on the other side of Shiawassee to the west, that home is approximately 2,700 to 2,800 square feet and it does have a finished basement, the proposed home does not initially include one. The proposed home is approximately 3,200 to 3,300 square feet. A significant amount of square feet is gained by building a closet over the garage, a lot of newer homes, builders are doing that, utilize cheap square footage because you're basically building over the garage, getting another couple hundred square feet and it's really just closet space.

MOTION by Majoros, supported by Chiara, to approve the site plan review for the new single-family home at 33427 Shiawassee Road, consistent with the feedback that was provided with the feedback that was provided by the Historical Commission and as addressed by the Petitioner today.

Motion carried, all ayes.

Cervi thanked the Commissioners.

FINAL PUD SITE PLAN REVIEW – BLUE HAT COFFEE (FARMINGTON MASONIC TEMPLE), 23715 FARMINGTON ROAD

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

Director Christiansen stated this item is the final PUD Planned Unit Development site plan review for Blue Hat Coffee to be located at 23715 Farmington Road in the Farmington Masonic Temple. The Planning Commission at the March 11th meeting discussed and reviewed with the Applicant, the proposed PUD Planned Unit Development Concept Plan for the Blue Hat Coffee business to be located at Farmington Masonic Temple as well as then scheduled the required PUD Public Hearing for the April 8, 2019 meeting as requested.

At the April 8, 2019 Planning Commission meeting the Commission recommended approval of the Conceptual Preliminary PUD Plan to City Council. At their May 20th, 2019 meeting the City Council approved the conceptual preliminary PUD plan and initial draft PUD agreement subject to several revisions as requested by the Council for Blue Hat Coffee as proposed.

The Applicant, Farmington Masonic Temple Association has submitted a final PUD site plan for Blue Hat Coffee. The final PUD site plan includes a final site plan, floor plans, and building elevations. Also attached is a copy of the revised draft PUD agreement, still be reviewed and approved by City Council. So, this has actually been a coordinated project between Masonic Temple and the Applicant/Petitioner, Phillip and Cathy Jewell representing or owning Blue Hat Coffee.

The Applicant is here this evening, representatives of the Masonic Temple Association, to present the final PUD site plan to the Commission.

Commissioner Westendorf recused himself from the meeting for this item to avoid any perceived conflict of interest.

(Commissioner Westendorf stepped down from the dais at 7:19 p.m.)

Chairperson Crutcher called the representative to the podium.

Dan Blugerman, from Thomas Duke Company, came to the podium. He stated he is representing the Masonic Temple Association and would be happy to answer any questions the Commissioners might have. He stated the revisions have been made and the architect has submitted the revised plans which included the location of the dumpster

and the materials and working with City staff, they came up with an alternate location and solution and materials that are in the new proposal.

Majoros stated he is not sure if his question is for the Petitioner or Christiansen but it looks like the dumpster from what was originally proposed, if the dumpster is located as it is now, let's call that Row 1, then you have Row 2 and 3 abutting each other and then Row 4, originally it was going to be placed in Row 1 or 2 or somewhere around there. And now it is being moved to occupy what was once five spaces along Row 1, it looks like some of the curb is going to be chopped out of the to be completed Oakland Street renovation, so there is no on street parking spots lost, but three spaces of the parking there. And what we had talked about last time was the combination of the spaces in the existing structure as well as the spaces to be created on Oakland Street, felt sufficient as well as other parking other places, so essentially they're minus three but a solution that doesn't have the dumpster further east closer to the resident and set back further on the property and enclosed, is that a fair summary of where we're at?

Christiansen responded that is a fair summary.

Majoros asked if there will be a fresh pad being poured or is it going to be plopped down into the asphalt that is there now. Christiansen replied that is a good question and as you may recall the original proposal for the dumpster and you kind of alluded to the various locations it was shown over time in review, and you might recall just quickly that it was reviewed by the DDA Design Committee, the Historical Commission, the Parking Committee, the Planning Commission for preliminary conceptual, City Council for preliminary conceptual and now we're back for the final. There was a dumpster pad that was proposed in a prior iteration of the plan, but after discussion and discussion at Council and also in negotiating the PUD agreement with Council, it was requested that that not be required so it's not part of the final plan. The intention then is to provide the dumpster in the location as shown with an enclosure, that enclosure then to be stained and then gates to be provided and that dumpster to be placed on the existing asphalt surface as shown on this plan, that was an agreement of Council and that's also request in the draft PUD agreement which will be executed in final form by Council as well.

Crutcher asked if the parking lot is going to be repaved and Christiansen replied there is still discussion how that is going to be handled, not part of the Planning Commission's responsibility of the PUD, there is a parking agreement that the City has had in place with the Masonic Temple Association. It is a license agreement for utilization of the parking lot that includes maintenance and the City is working with the Masonic Temple Association on some modifications to that agreement as well as the final PUD plan right now so that item, resurfacing, restriping, is being worked through the City Manager's office and with Council.

Blugerman stated at this time the proposed agreement which they're all in favor of is for the City to continue maintaining the sealing, striping, paving, maintenance of the lot including where the dumpster is. So the City is taking over that. The tenant for the Mason's will do the snow and ice but the City will do all the physical parts of it, so the City is in charge of upkeep of the asphalt.

Christiansen stated that that agreement is in place right now and if there are any modifications to that agreement, that decisions rests with City Council. The Planning Commission's responsibility this evening is the final PUD site plan and there's four elements to that: it's the barrier free facility for access on the north side of the building, it is the elevated patio area on the south side of the building, it is the signage that is proposed and it is the dumpster, its location, and its screening, those four elements are what are now reflected as the PUD elements here on the final site plan and the items that I just alluded to and what Mr. Blugerman was reflecting on, the agreement, the parking agreement, and the final PUD, again are under consideration for a final decision or action by City Council.

Chiara asked if the Planning Commission is charged with sending this to City Council and Christiansen replied no, that the final PUD site plan and process of the fifth step, and the final site plan will rest with the Planning Commission. The PUD agreement rests with City Council. At their last meeting as indicated in the staff report, they approved the conceptual preliminary plan, that's the fourth step, and the draft PUD agreement with some revisions and those revisions still have to be finalized. The fifth step, the final for the site plan, rests with the Planning Commission.

MOTION by Majoros, supported by Waun, to approve the final PUD Planned Unit Development for the Blue Hat Coffee located at Farmington Masonic Temple, 23715 Farmington Road, consistent with the inputs as delivered in this staff packet from City Council packet and the final PUD.

Motion carried, all ayes.

(Commissioner Westendorf returned to the dais at 7:26 p.m.)

REQUEST TO SCHEDULE PUBIC HEARING FOR SPECIAL LAND USE AND SITE PLAN REVIEW FOR PROPOSED BURGER KING – PARAMOUNT HOME CARE, INC., 31806 GRAND RIVER AVENUE

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

Director Christiansen stated this item is a request to schedule the required Public Hearing for Special Land Use and Site Plan Review for a proposed Burger King with a drive-thru at the former Paramount Home Care, Inc., located at 31806 Grand River Avenue.

The Applicant has submitted plans for a 3,065 square foot one-story restaurant building with a drive-thru to be constructed on the commercial portion of the property. The existing commercial site is zoned C-2, Community Commercial. Drive-thru establishments are a special land use in the C-2, Community Commercial District and require a Public Hearing and site plan review. A Public Hearing and a site plan review are responsible for consideration and action by the Planning Commission. The purpose tonight is the request to schedule the Public Hearing for Special Land Use and Site Plan Review as well as an opportunity for the Applicant to introduce their project to you. The Applicant requested and appeared before the Grand River Corridor Improvement Authority at their May 9th, 2019 meeting for review and discussion of their site plan for the proposed restaurant building with drive-thru and other improvements to the existing site. A copy of those minutes from that meeting are attached with your staff packet. The CIA Board recommended forwarding the submitted materials included in the CIA packet at their June 10, 2019 meeting. So the CIA has forwarded their materials for their consideration at their May 9th meeting to you this evening for your consideration.

OHM Advisors, the City's planning and engineering consultant has reviewed the Applicant's submitted plans and has provided a planning and engineering review letter dated May 3, 2019. A copy of that letter is attached with your staff packet.

The Applicant is in attendance this evening to present their Special Land Use and proposed site plan to the Commission. Again, the requested action of the Planning Commission this evening is to schedule the required Public Hearing for the July 8, 2019 meeting.

Chairperson Crutcher called the Applicant to the podium.

Ron Nadis, from Cousens, Lansky, came to the podium stating he is an attorney and he represents Carrol, which is the party proposing this development of a Burger King at the northwest corner of Grand River and Lakeway. He is here tonight with Amanda Aldrich who is the real estate manager for Carrols, who is spearheading the application process for Carrols and Mark Mathe from Mannik, Smith group, their engineers and he is spearheading the technical aspect of the development, has prepared the site plan that you've been given and is going to step up and more formally present the plan to you. As you've heard, we're proposing to replace the Paramount Home Health Care Building, which is essentially vacant now. It was formerly a bank building with a drive-thru that hasn't been used in a number of years. Tonight we're just presenting the plan and requesting the Public Hearing for our site plan review and approval for the Special Land

Use permit. At this time I would ask the rest of our team to come on up and explain a little more about the proposal, why we think it's a good proposal for the City of Farmington and why we think it would fit right in with this neighborhood and be a benefit for the area.

Amanda Aldrich, real estate manager for Carrols, came to the podium and stated they are the largest Burger King franchise in the country and are hoping to build this Burger King in Farmington and are excited about the opportunity to present it to you.

Mark can help with all the technical aspects as far as how we are removing an access point on Lakeway so that we're strictly facing the commercial zone, Grand River Avenue. We will be adding a tremendous amount of landscaping, more than is required as far as going above the ordinance. Providing a landscape buffer up along Lakeway and in the rear and not disturbing a whole lot of the landscaping or the natural trees in the back. I'm going to let Mark speak, he's a better speaker than I, quite frankly, but also, he's an engineer so he can tell you all the technical aspects.

Mark Mathe, project engineer from Mannik Smith Group, came to the podium. He stated he works out of the Monroe office, but their Columbus office handles a number of Burger King sites across the Midwest. He then asked Director Christiansen to put the landscape plan on the screen. He stated he also brought a 3D rendering which he can provide to Mr. Christiansen as a PDF file at a later time. It shows a view of the site and how it fits in with the existing landscaping and the existing conditions in the area. This is on the northwest corner of Lakeway and Grand River Avenue. It is replacing an existing building. He stated the proposed building is essentially in the same location as the existing building. It is a little bit nearer and as near to the Grand River right-of-way as they can be. They're proposing to reuse the two existing approaches off of Grand River Avenue, have two-way traffic in this parking lot with a one-way drive-thru and this being an out only driveway on this side following the drive-thru windows. There is concrete pavement within the vicinity of the drive-thru and dumpster enclosure which will have screened walls on three sides which will be built out of materials that will complement the building. There was an existing approach on Lakeway that they're proposing to close and not utilize any longer. The intent behind that is to minimize traffic that may find its way onto Lakeway and focus that traffic onto Grand River as best we can.

At the rear of the site and it's not really shown on this plan, but generally speaking this diagonal portion of the site, about as wide as my hand, is the C-2 zoning district. The rear portion being the R-1-P, Residential Parking District. As much and all structures on this site are being kept in the C-2 District. The only site improvements being constructed in the R-1-P are circulation areas, new parking spaces, a few areas of pavement and then some buffering along the rear of the site to supplement and complement the existing natural buffering that already exists in the rear of the R-1-P District. There is a shrub line, brush line in the rear of the site. There's some tall, 24- or 36-inch existing trees in the

rear of the site that they're proposing remain. They will be constructing a masonry wall beyond the limit of the parking area. That masonry wall will also complement the dumpster enclosure and the proposed building. And on the back side of that 4-foot wall will be another row of landscaping and trees to just soften the appearance of that wall from the residential district to the north.

Onsite there will be sanitary sewer water servicing the building, enclosed storm sewers throughout the site, which will lead to a shallow detention basin to the rear of the site, which will then be metered out and run through a mechanical treatment structure like Aqua swirl or some kind of technology like that to remove sediment and meet with the Federal Phase II Storm Water Guidelines and then outlet to the public storm sewer in the right-of-way.

That's basically a preliminary introduction unless there are specific questions.

Chairperson Crutcher stated there are a number of comments from OHM and asked whether those are reflected in this package or have they been addressed?

Mathe replied the comments they received from OHM per planning and engineering perspective, they are prepared to respond to and address. None of those comments in that letter do they have any issue with, but they really wanted to get the presentation before the Commission and get your supplemental thoughts before they start to make changes so they're not doing things twice. They want to make sure everything is incorporated at one time. So, no, those comments are not shown in this set, but will easily be accomplished.

Crutcher asked if any of the recommendations caused any problems and Massey replied no.

He then opened the floor up for questions from the Commissioners.

Nadis then said he has one other comment if it is in order. He said as you consider the proposal, they just wanted to make sure that their thought process is reflected in how you consider it. One of the key elements is that this is the C-2 District in front. This is a project that fronts Grand River. Beyond the natural buffering at the north end of the site there is residential, and then sort of kitty-corner, next to this site is a credit union and then beyond that there is residential. And part of the contemplation of the site plan is that this sort of ultimately be a site that faces Grand River and is really separate from the neighborhood area. And the way they've done that is by sort of encircling the site with the landscaping features. Of course the wall, and then beyond that, the natural buffer, the northern end, so that they can as much as possible separate this from the community and have it be an element that is part of the Grand River Thorofare, not part of Lakeway. Cutting off the

entrance from Lakeway was part of that and wants that to be part of the contemplation process and that the Commission consider the proposal.

Chairperson Crutcher asked if with the drive-thru there is some kind of communication system to place orders and where is that located?

Mathe replied essentially there are two boards that are part of the ordering system for Burger King. There are a few pre-order boards but the actual speaker itself is located right here and it does have an overhang over it because it does have an order confirmation screen so that guests can see a confirmation of what they actually ordered. One thing is important to note, the speaker system is part of Burger King's system. It senses the ambient noise such that if it is louder in the area it will automatically be a little bit louder but when it's quiet in the evenings, it will reduce that sound. But in knowing that would that sound reach any of the property line, I know that is one of the requirements of the Special Use, that there is a 50-decibel limit at a commercial property or a neighboring property and a 30-decibel limit at a residential property line. Both of those values would be significantly lower using the system that Carrol's has in place.

Crutcher then asked if the speaker itself would be pointed where and Massey replied it would be angled a little in this direction towards the corner of the property just based on how the cars will be in the line.

Crutcher asked if the signage is lit and Massey replied yes, backlit internally. Crutcher asked what the height of that is compared to the building and the wall and landscaping that is going to be at the north of the property.

Aldrich asked if he meant the menu board and Crutcher said yes, his concern is that the residential neighborhood north of there, the lights on the menu board will be on at night and is there anything that would block the light from the neighboring properties.

Aldrich replied the buffer wall will block a lot of the light. They will be LED so they don't throw light.

Crutcher asked if there is something between and Massey replied there is the existing hedge row on the north property line and then the proposed landscaping.

Crutcher asked if they have an illustration of what that section will look like and Aldrich said she could bring it to the Public Hearing.

Mathe stated that offhand it does not know the height of the trees, in the landscaping plans they refer more to the caliper of the trunk, but he would say they would be 8 to 10 feet tall trees.

Crutcher stated that in looking at the light and the sound, if those are going to be issues as the neighborhood is always concerned, and ways to mitigate it, so anything that can be between the building and the neighborhood helps to mitigate it, so the landscaping, something dense, some kind of barrier wall is usually what works the best. He stated an illustration of what that looks like with the lighting on the signage and the order board relative to the landscaping and screening they are proposing, showing how that works.

Crutcher then asked about the sidewalk on the south, where is that compared to the existing sidewalk and Massey replied what is shown on the drawing is the existing sidewalk.

Crutcher then asked if there is signage proposed in the front and Massey replied there will be a monument sign proposed on the front of the building, that will be out of the right-of-way but is not reflected in the rendering right now.

Aldrich stated they are not asking for any variances for signage.

Crutcher then asked if there were any other questions or comments from the Commissioners.

Kmetzo asked what the hours of operation for the Burger King and Aldrich replied typically 6:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m., not a 24-hour operation.

MOTION by Majoros, supported by Chiara, to formally schedule the Public Hearing for the Special Land Use and Site Plan Review for the proposed Burger King Restaurant at the site of the Paramount Home Care, 31806 Grand River Avenue, to take place at the July 8, 2019 Planning Commission Meeting.

Motion carried, all ayes.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Joe O'Connor, 33431 Shiawassee, stated he lives next door to the lot where at 33427 Shiawassee, where Mr. Cervi is going to build, and he stated it would have been nice to have received contact of what is being proposed prior to and not after the approval.

Commissioner Majoros asked staff of the legal requirements to notify the public and Christiansen replied that it depends on the issue and circumstance. For the existing single-family site of record, so what was required was a courtesy review by the Historical Commission and then by ordinance a site plan review formally by the Planning Commission which was done this evening. Under the current processes in the City there is not a requirement for public notification in a residential district, unless there was a

Special Land Use or variances requested, notices would be mailed out to people within the 300-foot radius would be notified.

The following people spoke on the proposed Burger King at 31806 Grand River Avenue:

Mike Smith, 22809 Lakeway
Mark Baltrasz, 22712 Lakeway
Don Kenely, 23101 Lakeway
Hallie Bard, 22738 Lakeway
John Castine, 22658 Brookdale

PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS

Commissioner Majoros stated he would like to make two comments, one to Mr. Christiansen and one to the public.

He stated to Mr. Christiansen that we have found meetings to be more productive when the Applicant comes in and proactively addresses the issues raised here today. We've done that before with Maxfield and he stated it would be prudent during the public comment when there's presentations with any revisions, that issues that were brought up proactively addressed by the Applicants, so we're not rehashing the issues that we've heard a number of times.

Number two, he stated his request to the public is you're well prepared and well organized, and the Planning Commission is, too, they've read their letters, they've been through this three times now, they had a quasi-public meeting hearing today, they're going to have another one, and asked the public to be respectful of your time and their time and efficient with the process because the more time they have with the Applicant, he thinks the better off they'll be. He said they're very clear what the issues are, they don't need to have them reiterated, and that they're coming to this prepared.

Director Christiansen replied that Commissioner Majoros' points are ones that have made before, they certainly do convey any concerns or questions to any Applicant or Petitioner at any point in time in the process so they're aware. The processes of the City are to be transparent and as seamless as possible. He stated that the Petitioner's representative is still here in attendance this evening and has heard the comments that were just made and they're aware of them and are on record.

Director Christiansen stated that the Planning Commission at their meeting last week, subsequent to your consideration and scheduling of the required Public Hearing for the City of Farmington Master Plan Update 2019, you may recall at the last meeting to

schedule the required Public Hearing for the August 12th meeting, the 63-day statutory response period, notification and response period is commencing. Council went ahead at their meeting last week and approved as you forwarded to them scheduling of the Public Hearing, the distribution of the proposed Master Plan, so now that 63-day period is going to commence. For all those interested, the City's Master Plan Update is in accordance with the Michigan Planning Enabling Act and that Update then draft or proposed Master Plan which has come out of the steering committees of five steering committee meetings and open houses now moves forward for distribution to adjacent communities, to public utilities, to County, to region, to State and is available to the public online. So anybody that wants to look at that draft Master Plan Update and provide their comments, they're welcome to do so within the next 63-days prior to the Public Hearing scheduled for August 12th, 2019.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The meeting was adjourned at 8:16 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Secretary