

FARMINGTON PLANNING COMMISSION PROCEEDINGS
City Council Chambers, 23600 Liberty Street
Farmington, Michigan
October 14, 2019

Chairperson Crutcher called the Meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. at City Council Chambers, 23600 Liberty Street, Farmington, Michigan, on Monday, October 14, 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 Majoros, seconded by Chiara, to approve the Agenda.
Motion carried, all ayes.

APPROVAL OF ITEMS ON CONSENT AGENDA

A. August 12, 2019 Minutes

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

**INTRODUCTION/DISCUSSION AND REQUEST TO SCHEDULE PUBLIC HEARING
FOR PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT – CERTAINTY HOME BUYERS, LLC, 22100
HAWTHORNE STREET**

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

Director Christiansen stated he does not believe there is a representative here for this item and suggested to move this item to end of Agenda and consider the next item.

MOTION by Chiara, seconded by Perrot, to move this item to the end of the Agenda.
Motion carried, all ayes.

**SITE PLAN REVIEW FOR PROPOSED MULTIPLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL
CONDOMINIUM – LEO SOAVE, 32057 GRAND RIVER AVENUE**

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

Director Christiansen stated this is a site plan review for a proposed multiple family residential condominium for the Leo Soave property located at 32057 Grand River Avenue. The subject property is a vacant site located on Grand River, again, located at 32057 Grand River. The Applicant has submitted plans for a three-unit attached residential condominium to be constructed on the west side of the existing vacant property. The existing site is zoned C-2, Community Commercial. Multiple Family Residential uses are permitted in the C-2 Community Commercial District and require site plan review and approval of the Planning Commission.

The Applicant requested and appeared before the Grand River Corridor Improvement Authority at their August 8th and September 12th, 2019 meetings for review and discussion of their site plan for the proposed multiple family residential condominium. This site is located with the Grand River Corridor Improvement Authority District. The Grand River CIA recommended approval of the proposed condominiums site plan as revised. So there were two different times that the CIA had an opportunity to review a proposed site plan; an initial review at the August 8th meeting, some modifications were made, they reviewed a revised site plan at the September 12th meeting and then forwarded it to the Planning Commission for their review and consideration. A copy of the minutes from the September 12th meeting of the CIA is attached with your staff packet.

OHM Advisors, the City's Planning and Engineering Consultants, has reviewed the Applicant's submitted plans and has provided a planning and an engineering review letter, both dated October 11th, 2019 and they are attached with your staff packet as well.

As indicated here in the staff packet, the Applicant is here this evening to present the proposed site plan to the Commission. The requested action of the Planning Commission this evening is to review and consider the submitted site plan for the proposed multiple family residential condominium. Christiansen went on to indicate that in the staff packets there are a number of support materials provided by the Applicant and we can go through those with the Applicant.

Chairperson Crutcher called the representative from OHM to the podium.

Marguerite Novak, OHM Advisors, came to the podium. She stated that everyone has been provided of copy of their planning letter. Briefly going over the outline of the letter, the site plan is in compliance with the Zoning Ordinance, the Master Plan, the Downtown Area Plan, the Downtown Master Plan and the Downtown Parking Study.

The letter starts by giving a background of the site, a summary of their comments, and then a matrix showing the fulfillment of Land Use Requirements. It then gives items that need to be addressed according to the Zoning Ordinance and discusses compliance.

So, for Zoning Compliance, the project site is located within the C-2, Central Business District where the use of multi-family dwellings are permitted. It generally meets Zoning requirements with the exception of a number of changes that are needed to satisfy the parking, landscaping and then setback requirements.

For parking, the big thing here is was the pavement markings as well as the designated signage relative to visitor parking.

In terms of setback, the proposed design falls short of the required rear yard setbacks, providing a 12-foot setback which differs from the required 20-foot rear yard setback. Also, the front setback in the C-2 District calls for buildings to be situated right at the front lot line which this proposed design is not. The Planning Commission may allow for modification of this distance based on cohesion with surrounding land uses and their current setbacks.

So in terms of landscaping, the rear setback is short, so this design also falls short of the rear yard landscape buffer requirements on both sides, distance for that buffer, but also the number of landscaping materials used. The design also falls short of landscape frontage requirements, with a large portion of the site reserved for natural space of that wetland, the area being disturbed really is only that front part of Grand River and large trees taken out by the paved entrance which does leave little space for actual landscaping of that area.

Then lastly, just a few additional items, we want to get a photometric plan showing luminosity and then location of all lighting proposed for the site. Further identification of materials and colors used for the building façade should also be shown and noted on the site plan. And then location and details of waste receptacles and mechanical equipment along with any necessary landscaping screening for those items will be required as well.

We just want to reiterate that we defer to the Planning Commission on determination of the Land Use Requirements if they are or are not being met and our comments are intended to help direct discussion tonight.

Chairperson Crutcher thanked Novak and called the Engineering Consultant to the podium.

Jessica Howard, OHM Advisors, came to the podium. She stated for the engineering review, she will briefly highlight some of the major items of concern. Our letter is situated with the project and site description followed by overall comments directed towards the utilities, storm water management, pavement and grading and then general comments.

With that being said our issues with the site, typically these are detailed engineering comments but because they could affect the actual site layout or essentially increase the cost of this project, we wanted to relay those now.

So, the Applicant is proposing a 2-inch water service that's going to be 310 feet long and crossing the adjacent property to the west. In talking to the DPW on that length of a 2-inch service line is not acceptable for the City, different parameters need to be met for that, which will include actually running an 8-inch line, a fire hydrant, there's a couple options that we recommend that we know DPW will approve, it's just depending on what the Applicant wants to do, also considering a looped 8-inch water main to service this site, just because where it's at, there's no fire hydrant coverage for the site. There is no fire suppression being proposed as well as at least what's shown on the plans provided.

The other cause for concern is the proposed sanitary service is connected to what we think is an abandoned sanitary sewer main on Grand River. Quite a few years ago there was the separation of the City's combined sewer overflow and I think in that process that line was actually abandoned. And the issue with water main, there's no close sanitary in that area so you would need to provide a larger main to access that site to provide your service or consider other options for the site.

Another concern was there's a proposed retaining wall but not many details for it and we just want to make sure that the proposed grades are all encompassed on site. If there's additional grading that needs to happen off site to get those temporary easements. And then there is an existing wetlands area on the site, and they'll be impacting that, just a portion of it, so we recommend that they get with former DEQ but EGLE and get that improvement going because that could significantly impact if EGLE requires mitigation and that's an additional cost.

The storm water management calculations for the most part was pretty good, there were just a few discrepancies so I'll skip those for now, those can be ironed out if the Planning Commission approves this.

Pavement and grading just wanted some additional information listed with that. And then Grand River is MDOT owned so they'll need to get a right-of way permit for that driveway opening.

That pretty much sums up the major items from our letter. Due to those items we are not recommending site plan approval. We just want to make sure they really look into these items because they could add a substantial amount of money and the developer may decide no, we can't do this project at this time.

So, again, that's just our feedback, but you guys have the decision. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

Chairperson Crutcher opened the floor for questions from the Commissioners.

Hearing none, he called on Director Christiansen for his additional information.

Christiansen stated what he did indicate is that this property is located within the Grand River Corridor Improvement Authority District, so they've had an opportunity to look at it several times and then make a recommendation to the Planning Commission. The Grand River Corridor Improvement Authority has a Vision Plan that was adopted in 2013 that is applicable to the entire corridor. Just like the City has an overall Master Plan applicable to all land use in the City, the Grand River Corridor Improvement Authority has a Vision Plan applicable in addition to the City Master Plan, and the Grand River Corridor, just like the DDA has a Downtown Master Plan. In light of that, that had to be taken into consideration, looking at what was being proposed. And then also, too, the City has a Zoning Ordinance and this property is zoned in accordance with the City's overall zoning for the community. This is zoned C-2, Community Commercial, again, multi-family residential uses are permitted but the Grand River Corridor Improvement Authority has an overlay district. What I'm going to show you is this, quickly. This is the subject property. You see Grand River, you see on the south side, you'll note here in the blue, that is the water course boundaries for the Farmington branch of the Rouge River that runs along the north side of Grand River, traverses at the bridge, I think everybody is aware of, that's adjacent to the condominiums and comes across the street and through the east portion of this property before it then exits the property on the southeast corner and then goes behind the Winery and then across to Orchard Lake Road and then to the east. The site itself then is a water course, the Farmington branch of the Rouge, there is a flood way for the river, there is a flood plain, and there's a significant amount of wetland on this property.

Then to the west side of the site is a little bit of a more upland area so the grade changes, it comes up a little bit, that's the area that the proponent is proposing to develop the condominiums on. We'll take a look at that here in a minute. You'll note that west is the existing cleaners, Deluxe Cleaners, on the corner of Grand River and Brookdale. And then you'll see the residential development, the existing homes along Brookdale on the east side down to the south of this site.

This is a little bit more of an overview so you can see what I was just talking about, Grand River, the adjacent development to the west, to the south, and what's across with the condominiums on the north side. This is the Land Use Map in the Grand River Corridor Improvement Authority Vision Plan. And what this shows here is the legend, we'll show

you five different categories, the middle category of the five, mix of uses, this property is identified as mix of uses on the Grand River Corridor Authority Vision Plan, that's the Future Land Use. This is the Land Use Table that is applicable to that. If you go to mix of uses, which again is third of five, it indicates this area is planned for a mix of small to medium retail office and residential uses both vertically and horizontally. Within pedestrian areas office uses should be encouraged. These areas should be carefully planned to complement the street scape and to help create and find the public realm, development should be connected to via pedestrian network that will include carefully integrated public spaces. If you look, you'll see under the uses permitted here, that MF, Multiple Family, is identified as a permitted use in this area. Again, that's something important for you know, that it's just not the City's Master Plan in the C-2 Zoning, but it's also the Grand River Corridor Improvement Authority Vision Plan and the overlay district and that's where this comes from.

Other than that there's an application in here, and I'll just show you the site plan very quickly, but I'll turn it back over to you, Mr. Chair, and you can then move forward. I know the Applicant would like to speak to you, introduce their project and have some discussion with you this evening as well.

This is the site plan, I'll go back, this is the cover page, proposed townhomes, the property, the property we were just looking at. The development is proposed as shown here, Grand River Avenue, south side, you'll see Brookdale to the west, the cleaners is to the west. What's proposed is a single loaded, single driveway access off of Grand River. That requires the review and approval of the Michigan Department of Transportation, they have jurisdiction over development along Grand River through Farmington. Then you'll note there is an access area, a parking lot, there is then to the south, the proposed condominium footprint here and boundaries of that area, define other areas of the site. You'll note that about three/quarters, maybe even four/fifths of this site, without having those numbers in front of me, this area that is wooded, wetland. So, it's either water course, it's flood way, flood plain, wetland, and associated area. So that's shown here, too. Also, there are other items that are shown here, detention pond, etc. But I'm not going to get too much farther into it because I know the Petitioner would like to speak to you about it this evening and has some other diagrams and I'll let them walk through that with you.

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

Mark Frederick, initial designer of the project, and Donny Orlando, a representative from Soave Building, came to the podium.

Donny Orlando, a licensed real estate agent with Keller Williams in Birmingham, Michigan, came to the podium and asked to approach the dais and gave the Commissioners a handout.

He stated what he handed out and wanted to explain to the Commission is that he will be touching more on some of the esthetics of the property, design, and materials that we're using, and samples are available to bring in, such as brick samples, HARDY plank samples, hardwood flooring, granite, those can be supplied at any given point. But the complex is a three-plex condominium unit consisting of three different levels with attached two-car garage. There are three points of entry, through the garage and the service, then you have a side and a front door entry. There is the mud room on the first level off the garage. Then when you walk upstairs you have your main living area, which is more of an open floor plan design, with kitchen, dining and great room all in one. And then when you go upstairs you have two bedrooms, each having its own full bath. The exterior of the property we're going to be doing predominantly a very high percentage of brick. And if you look at some of the photographs I have on the back, I have some different brick samples. HARDY Plank, rather than using vinyl we're going to be using HARDY Plank on some of the peak areas on the second floor. There's a balcony off of each one of the master bedrooms upstairs. Each unit is approximately 1,700 to 1,800 square feet and price points may range between somewhere from the mid 200,000's to the high 200,000's, depending on when the final evaluation is made. I wanted to hand that out to give you folks a visual to see what actually we're moving forward with. I'll turn it over to Mark to give you some additional information.

Mark Frederick came to the podium and stated he would like to discuss a little of what's been presented by OHM and some of the things we definitely have resolved in terms of landscape and photometric in that respect. The main issue, a little bit of a stumbling block on this property, unfortunately there is no main adjacent to the property like most developed properties have or most, especially like a main road like Grand River because of the branch of the Rouge with the Farmington, it's 300 feet away. So my client in the process of evaluating his ability in terms of how he's going to achieve that, we're going to work with the City on that, address that issue and resolve that. A couple minor points, in their letter they make a statement that in a preliminary meeting we were requested to do a handicap barrier free unit, at that point we were dealing with a five-plex unit and we changed to a three-plex unit and codes don't require a barrier free unit in anything less than five units. If we had five units, we would be required to do one, so we're not required to do one in that respect. Soil borings are coming, we will be addressing soil borings and retaining walls shortly. I think that's it, I know we're working on some things to get resolved, and I would like to know if anybody has any questions.

Chairperson Crutcher asked if you're not permitting a barrier free unit, is it going to be adaptable?

Frederick replied no, they're townhomes, they're three stories. He went on to state in terms of the setback, one of the reasons they're further from Grand River than they need to be is wetlands. The way the wetlands are shaped on the property, the wetlands approach in this direction here and in our original five-plex unit they had, had substantial wetlands mitigation required for us to proceed with that project. So that resulted in a redesign of the project at the eleventh hour and that's where we're at now. A basic three-plex unit with minimal wetlands mitigation. We know we have to still resolve some of that, but that's the reason why it's so far away from Grand River, we just could not build out by Grand River in a remotely effective manner. Ideally, we could, and we'd have a five-plex in front of you right now and two additional units for the same development costs, but we couldn't pull that off.

Chairperson Crutcher asked about the rear yard setback and Frederick replied the rear yard setback is necessary just to get the building to fit between wetlands and property.

Crutcher asked if that would require a variance and Frederick replied in the affirmative.

Commissioner Majoros stated he had a couple questions for the Petitioner. He then asked about the barrier wall, how tall it is, between the development and the wetland area and Frederick replied approximately 10 feet, basically like a basement height wall.

Majoros then said that this seems like a ton of work and a ton of engineering work, and access to water, and this and that, and this is all worth it for three units and Frederick replied that he'd have to ask the owner but that he had a building approved for this site fifteen years ago, a commercial building, and this is when the economy went bad, and it was proposed for development and it just never went anywhere. It got completely approved, DEQ had approved the mitigation.

Director Christiansen stated this site has been owned by Mr. Soave for a period of time and so he is the owner of the property, paying taxes on the property, etc. In any event there was a site plan proposed back about ten years ago and it was considered by the Planning Commission for an office building on the site in approximately the same location, the same existing conditions, circumstances, the regulations that were in place at the time that were applicable. The Grand River Corridor Improvement Authority wasn't created at that time, but it did go through the Planning Commission and the Zoning Board because there was a variance necessary at that time. The Zoning Board granted the variance and the Planning Commission approved an office building in about the same location on the

property. It was never constructed so there hasn't been any activity for about the past ten years on that site.

Frederick stated Mr. Soave did not proceed forward with that building due to the downturn in the economic trend in Michigan in the late 2000's and sat on the property until this year and had me begin some design developments to see what could be accomplished. And it's a tough site, there's no doubt about it. Commissioner Majoros was completely correct in saying it is a tough site in terms of budgeting and hitting your numbers and making it profitable, but he owns the property and the Grand River Corridor Improvement Authority was very receptive to our thoughts and our process and Leo would like to do something here, we still have a few things to resolve, we know that.

Chairperson Crutcher stated there are still some other options, even if you're approved here tonight, before you decide to proceed with this.

Frederick replied absolutely, we have to iron out the water main issue, the hydrant issue, those are unresolved issues. We have to get DEQ approval for however we encroach. We may adjust the building slightly in terms of minimizing that mitigation even still, it's a work in progress.

Majoros stated there's obviously the separation from building to wetland, you're not infringing technically on a dwelling there, but you are on wetlands and etc., etc. The flip side is there's 22820 house right there, can you just be a little more descriptive in what separates the development from the surrounding residential area, as far as walls, and I know we talked about the 12-foot setback, but is there a wall there, I see vegetation, but can you just be a little more descriptive.

Frederick stated it will be a landscape plan that will be in accordance with the City of Farmington's requirements.

Majoros then asked if there was a physical structure between this proposed development and either the residential or the cleaners bordering directly to the west.

Frederick stated there may be some fence further down on the site adjacent to the wetlands but it's so overgrown down there you wouldn't even see the fence.

Majoros asked if the proposal was to clear all this, so this would all be new growth, new vegetation, new trees, new shrubs bordering to the south with the residents on the south side as well as the west to the cleaners.

Frederick replied yes, we have to make the site presentable.

Chairperson Crutcher asked if there were any more questions from the Commissioners.

Commissioner Perrot stated he doesn't have a question, but he does have a general comment, kind of echoing Commissioner Majoros' earlier comments. This is a really rough area, I've walked this piece of land numerous times and to say it is a wetland, it is very much a wetland, it is almost always wet. And there's two particular spots where there's almost always standing water and it's an extremely steep hill so it kind of makes the hill behind Maxfield look like a molehill. So, to put a structure up on top of it, even with a retaining wall and things like that, it just really seems like a really tall order. I'm all for development and I understand that this is his property, but it just seems like a real stretch for three units. And especially the fact that I've actually walked this property quite a few times, so the thought of building on that hill.

Frederick stated that the plan that was submitted ten years ago for commercial, the building was placed in virtually the identical spot, in fact there was a big retention wall designed on that site to go directly through the wetlands. We're minimizing our encroachment on wetlands. That one went right through the wetlands and had a raised parking area so they could meet their parking requirements. We have minimum parking requirements in residential. You know, back then they got all approved and I'm not saying it's an easy process and I know this is a hard site, there's so many aspects of that terrain that you've described accurately, it's not an easy one. Mr. Soave is willing to undertake it and that's why they have engineers, that's why DEQ will work with us to resolve what we can do.

Majoros then asked if the units are condominiums and Fredericks replied yes, not apartments, so they will be for sale. Fredericks went on to state one other issue, in terms of trash, we've talked about this in our design meetings and with Kevin, we're just going to do curbside pick-up, each unit is going to be like an individual residence and they're going to have a garbage can. We're not going to do any dumpster and I know I'm digressing away from our relevant items, it popped into my head as I'm thinking about some of the things that had been brought up earlier.

Chairperson Crutcher asked if it was the north elevation that would be seen from Grand River.

Frederick replied it's not a true north, Grand River runs on an angle. That would be the Grand River elevation, the drawing you have. But as you're driving down Grand River what you're really going to see what would be the east elevation. This is really what's going to be seen as you drive down Grand River.

Chairperson Crutcher then asked if all the wetlands and vegetation would remain, actually you wouldn't see any of it.

Frederick replied he doesn't know if that's completely true, once you put up a three-story building things change quite a bit on a piece of property.

Majoros directed a question to Christiansen, stating there's a lot to be resolved here, a lot still – it sounds like the Petitioner says there's plans and action items to intentionally make that happen, can you just give us a sense of what our next step would be because it feels like this one has a vision and the beginning of a plan but still some pretty heavy unresolved issues which again the Petitioner, you know, it sounds like there are action plans to make that happen, but a little counsel and advice for us when it comes to are these things that you think are solvable, is this the kind of thing that a firm decision would need to be made tonight? Could this be something that could be either approved or denied conditionally pursuant to subsequent plans on major issues like storm water or water service, etc. It feels like it's just a few steps away from having the certainty that we would have to say this can move forward. Does that make sense?

Chairperson Crutcher then asked if there is a sequence, do they need to get the variance before they get site plan approval?

Director Christiansen stated those are all great questions so he will try to help provide some answers, some direction, some guidance.

To answer your question on variance, if there is a variance required our process in steps would be to submit an application for any modification being sought, relief by the Zoning Board of Appeals and appeal before the ZBA prior to coming back to the Planning Commission for action on a site plan. We're here tonight and that's because this is what the Petitioner wanted to do and next steps and after recommendation from the Grand River Corridor Improvement Authority and prior to going any farther forward, to have this introduced to you and to recognize what is being proposed and this property in general. There's a lot of unique circumstances for this property. There is quite a few challenges if you want to call it that. The existing conditions are not typical on every property, we know that. You may recall we had the dialogue here a little bit earlier, the previous site plan for the office went through a series of site plan reviews and modifications and changes in addressing items, etc., along with all of the requirements that were part of what was necessary for that office complex, MDOT, MDEQ, engineering related items, and the Planning Commission as well as the variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals. Well, the same thing is the process here, and we're really at the beginning of that. As the Petitioner indicated in his comments, there is a number of items that they know they need to address and those items have been outlined by the City's planning and engineering

consultant in their review letters, the planning and engineering review letters that were reviewed this evening. Those items need to be addressed prior to the site plan being complete, and at a point to where action could be taken because there's too many unknowns at this point with respect to the questions and items raised in those two review letters from OHM.

The Petitioner also indicated they're still looking at some additional modifications that may change a little bit of the layout, the site circumstances, other elements of the site, whether it's building or site related elements that affect the overall site plan. So those need to be addressed and taken into consideration. So, answering those questions, responding to the items and addressing them in the OHM planning and engineering review letters, determining the definitive location and whether a variance for the rear yard setback of 20 feet is necessary or not, and then making and preliminarily addressing those items related to wetland and MDEQ, now EGLE, and MDOT, should be done prior to coming back to you if this is where this goes and what action is taken this evening to address those items. So then the Planning Commission can plan to do what it wants, certainly you can always act on something and put in place any conditions that you want. It just I think is a situation here, in light of everybody's input, the consultants input, what the Petitioner said, what you have asked here, there's a lot of things that need to be addressed before we would get to a site plan that's complete that would allow you to have answers to questions you posed this evening and then understand what really is being proposed and what certainly is not a complete site plan.

So what you certainly can do is take action with any conditions you want or if you're so inclined you may wish to consider tabling any action, you'd be tabling this site plan as proposed, to a subsequent meeting when the Petitioner is ready to bring it back to you and we'll work with them to that end.

Hearing no other questions or comments from the Planning Commission, Chairperson Crutcher called for a motion.

MOTION by Waun, supported by Perrot, to postpone further site plan review for 32057 Grand River, Farmington, until such time Applicant revises their proposal to include the items outlined in the OHM letters, dated October 11, 2019, and secured by necessary variances.

Motion carried, all ayes.

**INTRODUCTION/DISCUSSION AND REQUEST TO SCHEDULE PUBLIC HEARING
FOR PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT – CERTAINTY HOME BUYERS, LLC, 22100
HAWTHORNE STREET**

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

Director Christiansen stated the Applicant has submitted a Planned Unit Development, PUD application, to redevelop an existing residential property located at 22100 Hawthorne Street. The existing legal nonconforming multiple family use property is currently zoned R-1, single family residential. The subject property is identified as a single family residential on the current City of Farmington Master Plan on the Future Land Use Plan Map.

The Applicant is proposing to redevelop the property for multiple family residential condominiums. A public hearing and recommendation to City Council on the proposed conceptual preliminary plan is required. The purpose of this item this evening is to introduce this item to you and to discuss the proposed PUD and to schedule the required Public Hearing as requested for the November 11, 2019 Planning Commission meeting.

Just quickly, this is the aerial photo of the subject property shown here in red. Hawthorne Street, this is on the east side of Hawthorne, 22100 Hawthorne, and you'll note to the south is Grand River Avenue, commercial property along Grand River Avenue, the A & W Restaurant in Farmington is directly adjacent to the south of this property. The Petitioner submitted a PUD application, he's also submitted then a warranty deed for the property just to verify ownership. This has been recently acquired by the Petitioner and he's also attached a discussion or, if you will, answer to the PUD questions related to the basis for the PUD request as applied for as proposed. Also attached here are some preliminary plans for your information and in fact, if I may, I'm going to escape out of this real quick, I'm going to go ahead and do this so you can see them. I'll go back and then I'll turn it back over to you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson Crutcher called the Applicant to the podium.

Vincent Coleman came to the podium. He stated initially on this project they were looking to rezone the property and we pretty much provided the preliminary information that's presently in the package, the drawings, the elevations and rough site plan and so forth. We, in consultation with Kevin and the Legal arm of this committee, we decided we would go the PUD route. And the reason why we made that decision is because we felt it was more in partnership with the City, it's a lot more comprehensive and any variances that might be required, rather than going through the many steps of rezoning and so forth. So we did resubmit with a PUD approach to developing the property. The property as I

mentioned initially is presently zoned R-1, but it's been used for multi-unit under a grandfather clause since the '20s. These are older structures on that facility. There are three buildings, they are presently, there's an initial building out front which is the more attractive building which looks more like a home. It contains two one-bedroom unit, and then you have the two structures that are adjacent to the wall south with A & W Restaurant. Those are actually not foundational facilities. My understanding is when they originally put those up, they actually were to house the seasonal workers at the Go Cart facility across the street, that's what I was told back in history. But they've been used for affordable units for all of these years.

When we purchased the property initially, we are investors, a group of investors, we purchase homes, facilities, throughout the State. As we get into a little description of this property, we've got a number of these condominium units, we have the same structure pretty much approved for Clinton Township and a more extensive forty-unit redevelopment. My partner who was here the last time with me was unable to be here, he's in Traverse City on another project. He is really our construction end of the partnership. He's done hundreds of these units including custom homes, so we do have a very capable team. There's three of us, myself, Joe who was here before, the construction end of it, and I have another partner on the financial end, the investment end of the partnership.

What's being proposed is to raze those buildings. Initially when we purchased the property, we actually purchased it with one of our – we do wholesale properties, too, to a lot of small investors. We had an investor that wanted to – actually we had a letter of intent with that investor who wanted to come in and renovate the existing structure. That fell through, I won't go into the details of that. We looked at it from a renovation standpoint and determined to really renovate those facilities could have been somewhat cost effective over a period of time, but really it was very little, very skinny. So we decided we would raze and do a development.

Because the property is presently being used, it has been for decades for multi-family as I mentioned, there was an exception made, it is technically zoned for R-1. Now, if you're aware of that whole strip on Hawthorne, R-3 is not unusual because if you go further down crossing Nine Mile on the same west side of Hawthorne you will note on the Farmington side there are single condominium type units, I think it's somewhere around eight to ten units. And then of course on the Farmington Hills, there is the long fence of concrete wall, and you have a forty, fifty-unit development there that's been there for --- it's an older development.

We also with our property, the borderline here you're probably aware, the borderline here is the dividing line for Farmington/Farmington Hills. When we considered doing this

redevelopment, we did approach Farmington Hills because we actually have an option on these properties and this adjacent property. Our development could actually go into Farmington Hills or we can go this way and keep it with Farmington. However, with the existing site we are looking at eight to twelve units, we put twelve units on the application but in the event that this existing site, not obtaining this existing unit, we can accommodate eight units. We would like to do twelve.

The structure is a beautiful brick four-plex, so there are four individual units per building, these are four-plexes. Two are end units and the two middle units. Each of the units has single car garages, they each are three-bedrooms. When we do these units sometimes we do them as two bedrooms with just the first floor level or you have the option of doing a second floor where you can actually do that with two bedrooms on the second floor and a Jack and Jill full bath. Or you can with a large master unit with a more extensive master bath suite and do two smaller bedrooms on the first floor. But we have proposed presently for three bedrooms to do the second floor. The reason behind that is because it's quite a demand in Farmington for large three bedrooms, full bath, open floor plan, more of contemporary amenities.

We studied the 2009, 2013 Vision Plans of the City and so forth, we have a great feel for what the City is looking to accomplish. We did quite a bit of study, feasibility study on the profitability of this kind of project and we are very sure that it will be very profitable. It is a demand involved. The price of the units are actually going to be quite well in that the price point will be in the \$220,000, \$260,000 area.

When you look at the City, there are townhome type condominiums, not many in this one level or stretch of non-townhome design with four-plexes. Those blend in much nicer in a neighborhood community type of environment. We've done that quite a bit and the times that we've done this project and it will actually be a complement to the existing community neighborhood.

The other point here is that these are condominiums for home ownership, they're not rental units. So we know that that will be a financial advantage to the City, you're dealing with homeowners versus renters, you're obtaining residences in the City, you'll have the financial advantage that comes along with those eight to twelve units versus the existing. And actually I was going to approach the assessment of that property if we had to keep it because it's over assessed, the value of it, and we're paying too much property tax on that property. It's not valued correctly and assessed correctly. But even at the present assessment, you know, it's miniscule compare to what you would receive with this development.

Additionally if you read the two-page description that I personally did, I actually added more to it when I did the rezoning, it really is a project that will advance the City in many, many ways. There is some high points I feel happening on that far end of the City, such as the medical facility there on Orchard Lake, it was really done nicely, and I think this would be a good motivating start for other opportunity on that far end of Farmington.

Additionally it is walkable to the Grand River. I did read the Grand River Vision Plan as well and it seems to be wanting mixed use, the advantage of walkable residents to the businesses there, all of that will be the case with this particular development.

I would say actually going the PUD route, really the way our plans, if we would have went forward with the rezoning, if that were to be granted because it makes so much sense especially with the fact that it's being used presently really multi-unit R-3 right now, but we went with the PUD once again because we feel we're all working in concert with the City versus rezoning and then going through each step individually it really is more in our opinion cumbersome and we hope to also be available to do other things with the City in the future.

So, that's kind of the generality, we're here in this initial meeting so that we can have and schedule the more extensive hearing. James Scott is our engineer, he will of course be doing so much more detail, this is just a preliminary, visionary packet that we've provided here. We understand that the next step will be the hearing, we will be meeting with City engineering, the firm that represents the City of Farmington to discuss more details and requirements and so forth.

Chairperson Crutcher asked if they are looking to schedule a Public Hearing for the next meeting and then asked if they have a site plan ready for discussion and the Petitioner responded yes.

Chairperson Crutcher stated he was just looking at the number of units, dimensions on the site, parking.

Coleman responded that they will be making a decision on the eight versus twelve at that time but he's sure they'll accommodate eight units.

Crutcher stated that just looking at what's presented here, you know, the drawings not being to scale and not showing much of the site other than some building footprints, it's hard to understand how this is going to work at all, whether it's eight, twelve or six units, whatever fits in there.

Frederick replied that his partner that handles that part has already done some preliminary investigation and they are prepared, actually with James Scott, their engineer, he has already done some preliminary, he's just waiting for the go ahead, our next step would be to meet with the City engineer and to be able to present it, it's really not a complicated site plan.

Chairperson Crutcher stated it's really not complicated at all, they just don't really see what they're presenting.

Frederick replied to answer your question, yes, we know, and we'll have that available for the November 11th hearing.

Crutcher stated his question to staff is can we schedule the meeting without actually seeing a site plan on what they're being proposing?

Christiansen replied yes, absolutely. That the Chair and Commissioners might recall that the PUD is a five-step process. An optional pre-application is the first step, you may recall that we looked at the rezoning discussion, that was the initial and that was pretty much that. The next step then is the conceptual plan, discussing that with the Planning Commission and scheduling the Public Hearing, that's what's taking place this evening. And the only requirement is a concept plan which the Applicant has submitted. Without detail at this point which is something that has been typical of concept plans here in the City and is and that's what's been provided, an application submitted, fees paid, concept plan and a little bit of support material and the request to schedule a Public Hearing. The next step is the Public Hearing and the preliminary conceptual plan, that requires with the site plan requirements for the PUD and that is twenty specific items. That plan will have to be prepared and presented and will be the plan that moves forward with the Public Hearing. The request is to have them doing that as they're doing that right now as indicated by the Petitioner in preparation for the November 11th Public Hearing.

The next step after that is the City Council conceptual preliminary after the Planning Commission's consideration, any action and recommendation and what accompanies that is a preliminary or a draft PUD Agreement and then the next step back to you for the final site plan.

Commissioner Kmetzo asked how much information does the public get before the Public Hearing?

Director Christiansen responded that the Public Hearing is Noticed in the newspaper of general circulation, it will be noticed in the Farmington Press as is required for the PUD statutorily and in accordance with the City requirements for PUDs and then it's also been

provided to as far as public information available here at the City, once noticed, once published, Notice is posted, all that information is available to the public.

Kmetzo then asked if the site plan that is being presented for November 11th would be also the same time the public is notified?

Christiansen replied the Notice is posted, published and that information then which is required is available here for public review.

Chairperson Crutcher asked for clarification if that, calendar wise, is two weeks from now and Christiansen replied about that time.

MOTION by Majoros, seconded by Perrot, to schedule the Public Hearing for the Planned Unit Development for Certainty Homebuyers, L.L.C., for the property at 22100 Hawthorne Street, for the next Farmington Planning Commission meeting which is scheduled for November 11, 2019.

Motion carried, all ayes.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following people spoke on the proposed development at 32057 Grand River, Farmington.

Karla Aren, 22814 Brookdale
James Aren, 22814 Brookdale
Paul Aren, 22814 Brookdale

PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS

None heard.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Secretary