

FARMINGTON PLANNING COMMISSION PROCEEDINGS
City Council Chambers, 23600 Liberty Street
Farmington, Michigan
November 13, 2017

Chairperson Crutcher called the Meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. at City Council Chambers, 23600 Liberty Street, Farmington, Michigan, on Monday, November 13, 2017.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chiara, Crutcher, Gronbach, Kmetzo, Majoros, Waun

Absent: Buyers

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 Waun, to approve the Agenda.
Motion carried, all ayes.

APPROVAL OF ITEMS ON CONSENT AGENDA

a. August 14, 2017 Minutes

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

PRE-APPLICATION CONFERENCE WITH PLANNING COMMISSION ON PUD PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT PLAN – OLD 47TH DISTRICT COURTHOUSE PROPERTY

Chairperson Crutcher introduced this item and turned it over to Director Christiansen.

Christiansen stated that this is a pre-application conference on a PUD, Planned Unit Development Concept Plan for the Old 47th District Courthouse property. The Zoning Ordinance Article X, the PUD Planning Unit Development, Section 35-135, approval procedure of the Zoning Ordinance, provides PUD applicants an opportunity to request an optional preapplication conference with the Planning Commission on the proposed PUD Concept Plan, for the purpose of discussion on the appropriateness of the PUD and to solicit feedback and to receive request for additional material supporting the proposal.

The Applicant, Boji Development, Inc. of Farmington Hills, has submitted a PUD concept plan for the redevelopment of the Old 47th District Couthouse property. The concept plan includes the proposed layout plan, and proposed floor plans and proposed building

elevations. Included in the staff packet is an aerial photograph and an existing condition survey of the subject property.

The Applicant is here this evening to present the PUD Concept Plan for the Old 47th District Courthouse to the Commission.

It should also be noted that the Courthouse property is a municipal property and it is a city-owned property and has remained vacant for a period of time, and there have been several developments considered over time and in accordance with the City process and the City ordinance requirements, this particular property has been guided by City Administration, City Manager's office and by the City Council to move forward as a PUD in its redevelopment as the several other proposals that have come before the City, the Commission, and has followed the same process.

The Applicant has entered into a purchase agreement for the Courthouse property with the City, as approved by the City Council, and is currently in their due diligence portion of their acquisition.

So, in light of that, and moving forward with the Applicant, the first step of the PUD process is the optional pre-application process and that is the reason we are here this evening.

This aerial photograph, I think as we're all aware so we're all on the same page, the old 47th District Courthouse property is a 3.82 acre site located on the south side of Ten Mile Road just to the west of Rafael Street, to the east of Elizabeth Court. And the property which contains the old 47th District Courthouse Building has been vacant for quite a period of time. It's been unoccupied from when it was moved, the court was moved to the new court facility in Farmington Hills for about fourteen years now. We know that the City has been actively moving forward with marketing the property for about five years and has had several interests and the Planning Commission has reviewed those proposals prior.

The courthouse building as seen here is about 15,000 square feet and has been vacant and remains such. There is a small outbuilding on the site as well and you can see the parking lot. You'll also note that directly adjacent to the east is the Ten Mile School Property which is the Maxfield Education Center, owned by the Farmington Public Schools, that property currently is used for a variety of school services including their IT program and there is also meeting space in there, you can see their parking lot in there as well. To the south of that is the Farmington Public Schools bus garage and south of that is their Central Services Office, their Administration Building.

So the purpose this evening again is to look at the Courthouse property and to receive introduction from Boji Development, Inc. and their proposed redevelopment of the Old 47th District Courthouse.

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

Joe Boji, of Boji Development, introduced himself to the Commission. He said his company was founded in 1985 in Southfield as a local land developer and that their projects have included state projects, office projects, hospitality, retail and industrial buildings, but their main focus is in residential. He stated they are proposing 14 unit single family residential project, ranging in size from 1700 to 2800 square feet, and that there will be four to five different floor plans, with both ranch and colonial in the PUD with detached condominiums.

Christiansen put the slides on the screen showing the topographic survey of the parcel with the proposed site plans with fourteen single family homes, with a rendering showing how it fits in with the surrounding community with the landscaping.

The floor was opened for questions from the Commissioners.

Chairperson Crutcher asked the Applicant who makes the determination on the floor plan and Boji responded that the buyer will.

Commissioner Chiara stated that years ago there was a much larger building proposed on the site and the question of sewer lines came up in that discussion.

Boji stated that there is an easement in place to the west of the site addressing that issue.

Christiansen stated there is an engineering survey for the property which shows boundaries and that an easement for sanitary sewer through the rear and side yard of the third house on Elizabeth Court was put in place a couple of years ago.

Christiansen further described the survey drawing down to the southwest corner down to the bottom to the left, there is an area of contoured lines, and that's the area where stormwater management is going to be accommodated and incorporated, that water is available to the site and access is available off Ten Mile Road, and that there is the horseshoe drive that provides access to the court building and to the school property, the

Ten Mile School, the Maxfield Education Center, and also to the drive between the two properties, the Courthouse building and the Ten Mile School, Maxfield Education Center, that's all to be abandoned.

The parking area in the back of the courthouse property is going to be redeveloped. The bus garage will be maintained at this point, the school, access will be modified along the perimeter of the property and there will be some adjustment to that but that was also done as part of the prior project on the site.

The Site plan and the rendered site plan was put up on the screen and he noted that the access on the property is a single loaded access off of Ten Mile Road as proposed, it traverses the site, all units front on this street and you'll note that the street does stub at the east property boundary so it is proposed to be connected to the adjacent school and property if and when that it is to be redeveloped.

Commissioner Gronbach asked if initially it will be a dead end and Christiansen responded that it will be stubbed until connected.

Majoros inquired if that was mandatory and asked what if subsequent developers don't like where that road comes out.

Christiansen responded then they'll have to find a way to incorporate how that's going to work because one of the ways that is certainly in the City's interest is laid out in all of our long range plans, our Master Plan, and provided for in our Downtown Area Plan and that development area D is connectivity so that would be up to the Planning Commission and to the City Council if there is a PUD process invoked for the school property and that would be to look at the existing conditions, new development conditions in this case and that stub and look to provide that connection as laid out in all those plans.

Majoros asked if the City defines connectivity as walking connectivity or vehicle connectivity and Christiansen responded there is a duality to it, both motorized and nonmotorized and one of the things they are cognizant about is traffic volumes and capacities on Ten Mile and Rafael and surrounding area so the more curb cuts you have and the more traffic you put on the roads instead of the internal circulating, you kind of in a way create some points along then where you put those accesses, or as people traverse traffic volumes to be certainly at a peak or use those areas, so if you disburse your traffic more internally, you have an opportunity to disburse some of that volume so that is why internal circulation is very, very important in connectivity to the portions of the property. But again, if you look at the Downtown Area Plan, it shows in there that kind of connectivity and it's explained in the plan but it would be through the planning process that you would achieve that connection.

Gronbach asked if the school property is continuing operate it and have not put it on the market yet and Christiansen stated at this point it is not on the market but that they have had a lot of discussion on the issue and are looking towards working with them on the repurpose of the property.

Gronbach expressed his concerns with the continuing operation of the parcel to the west of the school property and asked if there should be consideration given of a barrier or fencing or greenscape between them.

Christiansen responded that when Balfour Care was looking at the property, it actually provided for the eastern property boundary and southeast corner to be modified to instead of just a free flow two-way traffic which is currently the case, what the Planning Commission did through the approvals and the design was to allow for one-way traffic and took the southeast corner and created an encroachment by the school back onto the Courthouse property softening that radius on the southeast corner allowing for accommodating a one way traffic flow.

Waun stated that in the description the Applicant stated these were single family homes and that they are detached condos and asked for clarification from the Applicant if they are actually site condos where the homeowner would maintain their property.

Boji responded they are still in the process of determining whether they will be site condos or detached condos.

Chairperson Crutcher asked about the open space in the northeast corner and how would it be addressed if they were site condos.

Boji responded if they were site condos they would delineate a lot for each home and then outside of that lot there would still be an association that would maintain the common areas so that would be part of the common area.

Christiansen responded to Waun's question by saying that there are a couple of different ways that the Petitioner has talked about approaching the creation of this development and how legally it is structured. One of the ways is the traditional plat, and you platted the property and the subdivision under the Land Division Act of the State, you create individual lots of record and establish the subdivision and then you have public infrastructure.

An alternative is under the Condominium Act of the State is to create a single family detached site condominium and that would be where there would be individual lots, units, in the condominium, and the owner of the home would own the home and would own their

unit and anything outside of that if it was private, like an open space, infrastructure, roads, storm water management, signage, access points, those would all be part of the maintenance responsibility of the homeowners association that would be created through a Master Deed that would then be part of the PUD and would be part of the site condominium.

A third alternative is to do it as a straightforward condo, like where you have an attached condominium and the buildings and the buildings and the units, the condos, are owned by the individual homeowners and everything outside of that is all common element and would be maintained by the association. So that's the differences here and the developer is still considering which way specifically to go but as we've had dialogue with the City Attorney, we have the ability through our PUD process to make sure the right structure is in place and all the legal documents that would be required.

Boji stated either way the city is going to look the same it just depends on how we distribute the responsibilities between individual homeowners and the association. We've done projects where we do it where it's a detached condo where there's very little maintenance for an actual homeowner to do, and we've done the other way where it is a site condo and we maintain it just like a regular platted sub.

Christiansen cited the Flanders redevelopment, Riverwalk of Farmington, is a detached site condominium so all the homes and the units, the lots that the homes are on, are owned and maintained by the homeowner and everything outside of that is common element except for the public infrastructure and that is maintained by the association. It's just a different form of maintenance and ownership how it's structured but in the end it's detached single homes.

Majoros asked Christiansen to explain the city rationale, if this project is consistent with the city's plan as far as density, if it fits with the Master Plan, etc., because those are current issues that the city is addressing and there is a lot of emotion involved with land use and asked if the City is supporting it and recommending it because they feel it is consistent with the plans noted before and Christiansen responded in the affirmative.

Majoros then addressed the Petitioner and asked if he was comfortable as this project gets developed about the water management on Elizabeth Court and Boji responded that won't be an issue as the water management will all be on site.

Majoros then asked if there was a forecasted marketing plan for this project and does he envision that it will attract retirees with no children, families, and what is the desired tenant they're looking to attract and bring into the development.

Boji responded that they are expecting a wide range of a complete mix of all different ages and family structures. Farmington not having many new neighborhoods he sees a strong interest by all.

Majoros then asked if there was a minimum threshold for the larger homes, that if the first fourteen buyers all wanted the smaller homes if that would cause a problem with the project.

Boji responded that he does not foresee that happening as people all have different needs for space but that even the smallest unit has 1700 square feet with the same size basement with three bedrooms and two baths and that that could accommodate any kind of family.

Chiara stated that the Petitioner better be able to move quickly on this project because the houses in his neighborhood are selling in two to three days for more than the asking price.

Christiansen responded to Majoros' earlier question regarding if this project is consistent with the City plans by saying 2012 a Vision Plan was developed for looking into the future with respect to the City's development and redevelopment and put together a series of vision initiatives and action items to implement those vision initiatives and has been moving forward with the implementation quite successfully on the four focus areas identified in the vision plan. They then went another step forward and took another one of those focus areas, the Maxfield Training Center and along Grand River, and basically looked to expand that focus area and identified five sub areas in that focus area. The Downtown Area Plan of 2015 identifies them as development areas and one those development areas, Development Area D is specific to the courthouse property and to the school administration property and lays out the framework for future redevelopment, residential. The City moved forward with several different proposals over time, one of them was a duplex project back in about 2005, 2006, that wasn't realized at that time. Another was the Balfour Care 73,000 square foot 88 bed assisted living memory care facility that didn't move forward for its own reasons after PUD approval. And then several interests moving forward with residential development that was multiple family oriented but didn't move forward. The City Council working together with interested developer investors and with our broker, Thomas A. Duke and Mr. Blugerman, marketed the property consistent to City Council's interests and direction to the community which was for a lower density residential detached with comprehensive architecture, high quality

materials, interior design, basement and two car garage options, and that was the direction that Council was moving forward with with all of the interests including working with the broker and had a lot of interest and Boji Development, Inc. developed this project in accordance with Council's interest and direction so it is in accordance with the City's plans, goals and objectives.

Christiansen indicated that the purchase agreement is under Ten Mile Development, LLC. He stated no action is required on this item this evening and that the next step in the process will be to schedule a Public Hearing for the preliminary plan and a review by the Planning Commission of the preliminary PUD.

Chairperson Crutcher thanked the Petitioner.

DISCUSSION OF 2019/2024 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Crutcher introduced this item and turned it over to Director Christiansen.

Christiansen stated this item is a discussion of the 2019/2024 Capital Improvement Program which is being kicked off now at the end of 2017 in preparation for the next budget cycle and is now being scheduled in terms of the process involved in order to put this together and to move forward with the 2019/2024 Capital Improvement Program for the City of Farmington.

A schedule was attached with the staff packets which is the first step in the next six-year CIP. He stated the City just went through a Capital Improvement process for the 2018/2023 Capital Improvement Program and what the city has put together is a structure for the CIP that involves City Management, Department Heads, City Administration and various boards and commissions including the Planning Commission and the City Council. It also includes other City boards, authorities, like the Downtown Development Authority, the Grand River Corridor Authority and boards and organizations so that the City can come up with a comprehensive CIP for the six-year CIP cycle.

Christiansen put the current Capital Improvement Program on the screen, the 2018/2023 City of Farmington Capital Improvement Program. He stated that Capital Improvement Programs for municipalities are created by statute and are required as part of the City's Master Planning or Comprehensive Planning process. The Planning Commission is the commission, board, in a community that is responsible for the Capital Improvement Program since statutorily the Planning Commission is responsible for the City's Master Plan and part of that includes the Capital Improvement Program. It is a tool, an instrument that requires input from all the stakeholders in the community and City Council as well as they are the policy makers and also decide the budget, approve the budget for the

community. So the CIP guides the budget process. The City Administration asked all the city boards and commissions, including the Planning Commission, to appoint one commissioner to serve on the Capital Improvement Program Steering Committee. So they are requesting that be done again for the 2019/2024 CIP. He stated that Commissioner Majoros served on the most recent one and was very instrumental in moving the Planning Commission's interests forward and also an integral part of the CIP Steering Committee for that program.

He reviewed the steps taken for the 2018/2023 Capital Improvement and went over the information on the screen stating that the Capital Improvement Program is a short term plan for identifying and categorizing large and very expensive projects and big ticket items and to find funding for projects.

He stated that with the 2019/2024 CIP, they are not looking at sunseting everything from the 2018/2023 Program, but to see what is still of value and important to the City and on the radar in terms of the goals and objectives for its municipal projects and capital acquisitions and projects and to see what is needed to continue to move forward with as well as remove things that are no longer valid.

He detailed the upcoming schedule of the Capital Improvement Program and the timeline with the Commission.

Following discussion by the Commissioners, a motion was made by Waun, supported by Chiara, to nominate Steve Majoros to serve as the Planning Commission's representative.

Commissioner Majoros accepted the nomination.

A roll call vote was taken on the foregoing motion by Waun, supported by Chiara, with the following result:

AYES: Chiara, Crutcher, Gronbach, Kmetzo, Waun

NAYS: None

Motion carried, all ayes.

Christiansen thanked Commissioner Majoros for accepting the nomination.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None heard.

PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS

Gronbach inquired about the large donation containers that were at Drakehire Plaza and Koncsol responded that the issue is being addressed in court.

Kmetzo asked for an update on the gas station at Nine Mile and Farmington and Koncsol responded that it is being refurbished.

Crutcher asked if it was still for sale and Christiansen stated that the City had to move forward with code enforcement violations and there was discussion on it including selling it, tearing everything down or refurbishing it and the owner has decided to refurbish it.

Crutcher then inquired about the vacancy on the Planning Commission and Christiansen stated that he had received an email from Commissioner Buyers stating that he was in the process of moving to Novi, thereby would no longer be eligible to serve but that Christiansen will follow up with the Commissioner and keep everyone informed.

Christiansen then distributed Planning and Zoning News from the Oakland County Road Commission which he stated was valuable in providing insight into state law.

Kmetzo asked if electronics were approved to bring to meetings and Christiansen encouraged the Commissioners to do so.

Majoros asked Christiansen that the Planning Commission be given advanced notice when the Maxfield Training Center is coming back before them so that they can have dialogue as to how it should be presented to the public.

Christiansen stated that is a great point and the City is well aware of that and they are continuing to work with the Petitioner as well as Farmington Public Schools, trying to incorporate all of the feedback from the second public hearing so when it does come back it will be complete with all of the details consistent with the PUD process.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION by Gronbach, seconded by Majoros, to adjourn the meeting.
Motion carried, all ayes.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Secretary