

FARMINGTON PLANNING COMMISSION PROCEEDINGS  
City Council Chambers, 23600 Liberty Street  
Farmington, Michigan  
July 11, 2016

Chairperson Crutcher called the Meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. at City Council Chambers, 23600 Liberty Street, Farmington, Michigan, on Monday, July 11, 2016.

**ROLL CALL**

Present: Chiara, Crutcher, Gronbach, Kmetzo, Majoros

Absent: Buyers, Waun

A quorum of the Commission was present.

**OTHER OFFICIALS PRESENT:** Director Christiansen, Inspector Koncsol

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

MOTION by Gronbach, seconded by Majoros, to approve the agenda as submitted.

Motion carried, all ayes.

**APPROVAL OF ITEMS ON CONSENT AGENDA**

**a. Minutes of Regular Meeting – June 13, 2016**

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

**PUBLIC HEARING – 2016 RECREATION PLAN**

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

Christiansen stated this is a Public Hearing for the 2016 Recreation Master Plan for the City of Farmington. He indicated it was discussed and reviewed by the Planning Commission and the final draft was presented at the last meeting of June 13th and the preliminary draft prior to that. He indicated it is a project that the City of Farmington has been moving forward with and that last fall a committee was created and he described the make up of the committee. He said they are holding the required Public Hearing in order to make a recommendation on the proposed plan. He stated that the City's planning consultants, LSL, and Josh Penn from LSL will go over the condensed executive summary.

Crutcher called Penn to the podium.

Penn thanked Christiansen for the intro and stated they have been working with Kevin on this plan for some time now and that he is present to go over the condensed executive summary and overview of the plan for those attending the Public Hearing. He

welcomed questions during his presentation from attendees.

He described the Executive Summary as pages that were taken out of the Recreation Master Plan, three main parts consisting of the overview, the inventory and the analysis section and the action plan which is the driver of the document.

He quoted the verbiage from the document, stating its purpose being a guide for development ideas for the future. He stated there were a lot of people involved in making this document, the committee, the community, commissioners and Director Christiansen, all providing feedback that has been directly incorporated into the Master Plan and will represent the priorities for the City of Farmington.

He stated the City of Farmington is uniquely situated as it is amidst a number of regional parks, five county parks and three state parks within ten miles of City Hall. He said this regional connectiveness is outstanding for a community of this size and is an important theme for the document.

He stated there is a map at the bottom of the page that shows all of the parks within the City and what it doesn't show is facilities nearby, i.e. Farmington Hills per the Intergovernmental Agreement that exists between the two communities.

He went on to discuss Shiawassee Park and its significance to the community. He indicated the Downtown Area Plan played a big part in the recommendations they are making for this park in the future. What they wanted to add to that in the analysis that new playground equipment was a priority, upgrades to the ball field, all which are listed on Page 9. He stated the City itself does not own Shiawassee Park, but leases it from Farmington Public Schools and they suggest acquiring the property themselves.

The next park discussed was Drake Park, and one of the things heard that was needed was upgrades to baseball fields, with the park holding a lot of potential. He stated they discussed a concept design of an upgrade to the ball fields.

He went on to Womens Park and thanked the committee for their report, expressing its thoroughness. He highlighted a few recommendations, a low maintenance landscape plan, orientation of park benches, improving lighting, and a recommendation of considering to upgrade park signage indicating its historic significance.

He said for Memorial Park they addressed how can they draw more attention to that park and encourage more usage, indicating a crosswalk to facilitate greater usage and to connect to the 911 Memorial and how to incorporate commemorative plaques more representative of the range of military service that residents have participated in in more recent years.

Downtown Riley Park is the center of the downtown and is included in many of the plans for the downtown area. Plans are to continue upkeep and regular maintenance.

Flanders Park is the newest park, not yet done, which was part of Riverwalk and donated back to City. Old playground equipment from the school will be brought back and a walking trail and fitness path will be included.

He then went on to the next section, Parkland and Service Area Analysis and the various tables contained therein. Table 4-2 showed Farmington scoring well, with two areas of slight deficit in acreage being a slight deficiency in mini parks and community parks.

He pointed out on table 4-3, facility analysis, an area of deficiency being an 18-hole golf course which isn't really relevant because of the shared services with Farmington Hills and stated the City is well taken care of in terms of recreational facilities.

He then moved on to Section 5.3, Specific Recommendations and detailed plans for the Upper Rouge River & Grand River Corridor Plan, a non-motorized trail network called Riverwalk which originated with the Grand River Corridor Vision Plan and indicated the project will be implemented in phases as additional resources are attained. He stated system-wide recommendations would include upgrades and improvements to current parks and recreation facilities and services, design improvements to include updates to current park signage to identify as being part of Farmington's park system with uniform design themes in the lighting, benches, waste receptacles, bike racks and other amenities that represent Farmington parks.

The next chart, Timeline & Projects, was reviewed and he indicated all of the priorities set for these parks will be determined by estimating costs, funding sources, timing and other opportunities for partnerships with other organizations.

Christiansen turned the item back to the Chair.

Chairperson Crutcher inquired if anyone wanted to entertain a motion to open the Public Hearing.

MOTION by Gronbach, supported by Kmetzo, to open the Public Hearing.  
Motion carried, all yes.

(Public Hearing opened at 8:37 p.m.)

### PUBLIC HEARING

Kathy Fruechtenicht, 32306 Valley View Circle, stated she just moved to Farmington and really likes it and is curious about the Riverwalk, she had never heard of it before and would like to know more about it.

Christiansen welcomed her to Farmington and thanked her for coming to the Public Hearing. He stated the Rouge River Nature Trail is a project that came about during the Grand River Corridor Authority Vision Plan where a lot of dialogue was generated about

natural features, specifically to the Rouge River, and how to link it to Grand River and the community. He stated a student group from U of M worked for the past year with the Authority and have just completed their report and it is available to review online.

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

(Public Hearing closed at 8:45 p.m.)

The floor was opened up for questions from the Commissioners.

Kmetzo questioned if the numbers on Page 5 for the estimated cost for Shiawassee Park included the acquisition of it.

Christiansen responded that is a separate issue and stated that the City has worked together with Farmington Public Schools on other projects and that currently the City maintains Shiawassee Park but doesn't own it, it is leased from them for a small monetary amount.

Chiara inquired about grant money being available for the switchback.

Christiansen stated there had been discussion about low grade switchbacks providing better access than the current bridge and stairs and that access is part of the downtown area plan. He indicated the first step will be with the redevelopment of the Maxfield Training Center and providing access down into the park but the City will have to seek financing as the timing of that grant has expired.

MOTION by Gronbach, supported by Chiara, to move to approve and accept the 2016 Recreation Master Plan Update as presented and forward it to City Council for their review and consideration.  
Motion carried, all ayes.

Christiansen stated it is a very comprehensive plan and thanked Josh Penn and Michelle Foster from LSL for their hard work on the project.

### **FINAL SITE PLAN REVIEW, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT – SUBURBAN COLLECTION 37175 GRAND RIVER**

Crutcher introduced this agenda item and turned it over to staff

Christiansen stated this is a final site plan review for the PUD proposed by Suburban Collection located at 37175 Grand River for the construction of a one-story vehicle prep building. He gave the history of the project and indicated that Suburban Collection has submitted a final site plan for construction of the building at the now Freedom Plaza site. He described the evolution of the four parcels of the PUD in detail.

He indicated the Council has received two review letters that were submitted, one by LSL and one by OHM and that Chris Gruba, consultant planner with LSL, is present and he will present theirs, and Jessica Howard will present OHM's. He indicated the petitioners were present as well.

Chairperson Crutcher called Chris Gruba from LSL to the podium.

Chris Gruba came to the podium He went on to say this is the final portion of the PUD, the other parcels have been completed or started and we are now here for Suburban Collection's site plan for a vehicle prep building and vehicle storage and that the generalized concept plan has changed a bit, but tonight basically he needs the Planning Commission's feedback on some of the items. He said it is a good plan but there are minor things that need to be addressed.

The storage on the property for the vehicles, 900 plus cars, there was a discrepancy between the number from the architect and the number from the engineers as well as the square footage of the building, the numbers were not consistent.

He stated one of the access road to the site is being closed off and others are shifting. The PUD stated there would be landscaping around the perimeter of the site to shield or screen the view of storing the cars. Also, the PUD contained language to add eighteen cherry trees and the masonry walls on south and east would be brought up to six feet tall and repaired and that the Planning Commission has the authority to raise the south property line from six feet to eight feet.

Things noticed on the plans that were more outstanding, the landscaping shown falls short of zoning ordinance requirements of the greenbelt and buffer zone to the east and south adjacent to the property. The Planning Commission can waive or modify the landscape requirements in the zoning ordinance.

On the proposed landscape plan indicates 18 cherry trees are required along Grand River, there are 12 to 14 with more on the main drive on Grand River, with a total of twenty-two. He stated the PUD required 18 along Grand River and needs guidance from the Planning Commission on that.

One of the other things is there is a missing portion of landscaping around the perimeter of the northwest of parcel 1, small portion, 200 feet, that has a masonry screen wall 5 feet tall and also a small space might be worthy of small landscaping

He stated they are asking for a typical truck turning template be added to accommodate entrance and exit onto the site.

He indicated part of the PUD agreement it was stated that the sidewalk be extended along Freedom Road frontage. The applicant has proposed installing a sidewalk along the parcel right up here and the sidewalk would end right where the exit for the trucks to

leave. The frontage along Freedom Road that dead ends, and he is asking for direction from the Planning Commission on that as it may be challenging because of the grades and costly and may not be completely effective in reaching the destination.

One of the other items he would like direction from the Planning Commission on is the applicant is proposing a decorative fence and there is no detail and I'm not sure if the Commission wants to make any comments on what kind of decorative fence.

He stated the light levels in the plan were slightly high and we would recommend bringing these to meet ordinance requirements.

The minor issues include the building being located further out on the site, the ordinance requires 20 percent of window on that side for esthetic purposes but there will not be a lot of people seeing it.

No future signage is shown on site plan.

Other minor things on the site plan is that some potential variances may be required. Sidewalk connectivity is one, none of the lightpoles in the parking lot are located in landscaped islands, there is lack of species diversity in the landscape plans for screening.

As a recap, he said there must be discussion of sidewalk along Freedom Road, the eighteen cherry trees along Grand River Avenue, deficient landscaping except the cherry trees, but that can be waived by the Planning Commission, and raising the wall from six feet to eight feet.

He thanked the Commission for their time.

Crutcher thanks him.

Jessica Howard from OHM was present to go over their letter.

Chairperson Crutcher invited her to the podium.

She highlighted the issues contained in the letter, stating there were no details provided for the five foot wall. She indicated the wall on the east side between the Tile Shop and Jamestown was not structurally sound and was fixed and it was noted that Suburban is to fix their wall on their property as well and that is not in their plans. No sidewalk is being proposed along Freedom Road in their plans though the PUD had it. The truck access easement for the truck route needs to be shown going through The Tile Shop and Digital Terrain's property. The trash enclosure proposed on the site with no details showing what type of enclosure it's going to be, walls around it, the fencing and concrete padding to be extended.

She stated that an Oakland County Drain goes through the site so repaving over it may be an issue. Also, details of the decorative fence along Freedom Road are not included, also utilities do not like trees to be planted over so the roots don't grow over, sanitary sewer should be shown on the plans and that they are asking for two parking spaces to be removed in order to allow easier access to the existing hydrants.

Crutcher invited Stanley Tkacz, owner and operator of Studio Designs – ST, to the podium. He indicated that he has been in this business for forty plus years and does not like going into a meeting and being blindsided by documents that he's never seen before. He stated that 90 percent of the deficiencies stated in the letters are on the plans. He demonstrated some of the items shown on their plans and indicated he doesn't know how to approach it.

Christiansen stated that the electronic set of plans included those documents but not the ones provided to the Planning Commission and OHM and LSL. He apologized for the oversight. He then explained the review letters and their purpose.

Tkacz responds that this site is not open to the public, there will be no customer parking. Truck layout was changed by moving it back into the site to make it swing better. He stated that the lighting is all on motion sensors.

Christiansen confirmed that the site is not open for public use and is intended to be used by SC for their vehicle preparation operation. He stated the main concern of the PUD was several fold: access was very important; screening was very important vegetatively and also to the wall; and the lighting was talked about with the building being adjacent to residential with the apartments, and to the east and to the south, single family.

Tkacz addressed the lighting poles, in the original plans they had landscape islands and we were told not since it was not a public parking lot.

Christiansen stated one comment he heard there is a requirement for sidewalks along the perimeter of properties. There was discussion

Christiansen indicated one comment made by consultants is the city has unique areas where we don't have pedestrian pathways but through Complete Streets they are trying to do it. He indicated it is a five foot concrete walk.

Christiansen asked to talk about the west property line and Tkacz detailed the material they were going to use. He then asked about the existing walls along the east and south and Tkacz reported they will be repaired.

Further discussion was held about the metal fence along the west side.

Tim Leroy from the Suburban Collection expressed concern about the landscaping on the back wall being destroyed.

The wall replacement and details of it were discussed further.

The plans were further gone over and demonstrated to the Planning Commission and He indicated the truck route was adjusted for better flow as the building was pushed back into the site and to the west.

The issue with signage is to be complied with in terms of City ordinance requirements.

He stated access and easement requirements will be done comprehensively.

Christiansen stated he discussed with Public Safety with respect to emergency access into that site that it was reviewed with Public Safety and they are comfortable with it.

He indicated the photometric plan is an important aspect, and it is important there is no spillover on adjacent properties.

Discussion was held on the color schemes on the building and samples were presented to the Commission.

As far as utility, the whole site ties in with stormwater management .

Christiansen stated most of the old Kmart storm sewers and grease interceptors will remain and if need be adjusted.

Gronbach stated he sees no reason that they can't approve this plan as long as they follow the PUD and coordinate with Administration

MOTION by Gronbach, supported by Majoros, to move to approve the PUD site plan as submitted by Suburban Collection, 37175 Grand River, with the acknowledgement that it meets guidelines as specified in the PUD plan and Administration coordinate details with regard to the review letter from OHM dated July 8, 2016 and the review letter from LSL dated July 5, 2016.

Motion carried, all ayes.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

None heard

### **PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS**

Chiara inquired if there is anything going in to the former Goodyear facility on Grand River.



**ADJOURNMENT**

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

The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Secretary