

FARMINGTON PLANNING COMMISSION PROCEEDINGS  
City Council Chambers, 23600 Liberty Street  
Farmington, Michigan  
August 10, 2015

Chairperson Bowman called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Farmington Public Library, 23550 Liberty Street, Farmington, Michigan.

**ROLL CALL**

Present: Bowman, Buyers, Chiara, Crutcher, Gronbach, Majoros

Absent: Babcock

A quorum of the Commission was present.

**OTHER OFFICIALS PRESENT:** City Manager Murphy, Director Christiansen, Building Inspector Koncsol

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

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

Motion carried, all ayes.

**APPROVAL OF ITEMS ON CONSENT AGENDA**

**a. Minutes of Regular Meeting – July 13, 2015**

MOTION by Buyers, seconded by Crutcher, to approve the Consent Agenda as amended.

Motion carried, all ayes.

**PRE-APPLICATION CONFERENCE WITH PLANNING COMMISSION ON PUD  
PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT PLAN – ORCHARDS PHASE II,  
33300 SLOCUM**

Bowman introduced the agenda item and indicated that included in the Commissioners' packets was a staff report along with a brochure and turned it over to staff for discussion.

Christiansen stated this item is a continuation of a pre-application conference, this will be the second discussion and review with the Planning Commission on a proposed PUD Planning Unit Development Concept Plan for the development of Orchards Phase II. The applicant previously appeared at the June 8, 2015 meeting to present his initial PUD concept plan to the Commission. He indicated that Article X, PUD, Planned Unit Development, Section 35-135 of the Zoning Ordinance, approval procedures, provides PUD applicants an opportunity to request an optional pre-application conference with the Planning Commission on a proposed PUD concept plan. The purpose of such is to discuss the appropriateness of the PUD and the concept plan, to solicit feedback and to

receive requests for additional materials supporting the proposal. An applicant desiring such a conference shall request placement on a Planning Commission Agenda. He stated the Applicant has done so for a second time at tonight's meeting.

The Applicant, Fabio Cervi, of Cervi Construction of Livonia, Michigan, has submitted a revised PUD concept plan for the development of Orchards Phase II, located on Slocum. The revised concept plan now proposes an eleven unit three-story townhouse style apartment building, each unit with a one-car garage and a driveway for parking. The revised concept plan includes a conceptual preliminary layout site plan and a conceptual preliminary building elevation. An aerial photo of the site is also attached with the staff report.

Christiansen indicated that the first phase of the Orchards is a 16-unit condominium development that was built in the mid 2000's, a little bit before the recession. And subsequent to that the second phase was not constructed and the second phase was actually separated from the first phase, both the second and first phase infrastructure, the sewer, the water and the access road, single loaded access road was put in to accommodate Phase I, and then prepared for construction of Phase II, which, unfortunately was not constructed so that portion of the property has sat vacant for a period of time and the DDA had the opportunity to purchase Phase II and did so and was actively marketing Phase II for a period of time through an RFP. He stated the Applicant, has been working with the DDA, has submitted a purchase agreement, and has moved forward with several different designs, some alternatives reviewed with the DDA, who had actually supported the plan the Planning Commission reviewed on June 8<sup>th</sup> and that plan was a 15-unit apartment plan, and did not have garage configuration, with all of the parking being on the street.

He stated the Applicant has been working with staff and as such has come up with a revised plan, reducing the number of units from fifteen to eleven, and creating garages for each one of the units and also an additional parking space.

He reviewed the plans with the Commission.

Christiansen then stated there is a four step process in the PUD, the first step is an optional pre-application conference, the Petitioner wanted to come back with a revised plan base on comments made by the Planning Commission and also having an opportunity to appear before a work session of a Special Meeting of Council and get their feedback as well, and in light of all those comments, he has come back with a revised plan and requested the Planning Commission review this plan and to set the required public hearing.

Bowman thanked Christiansen for the introduction and invited the Applicant to the podium.

Fabio Cervi, Cervi Construction, 12419 Stark Road, Livonia, Michigan 48150, came to the podium. He thanked the Commission for having him back and stated the new plan reflected the feedback received from the Planning Commission and detailed the changes. He thanked the Commission for their input.

Bowman opened the floor to questions from the Commissioners.

Crutcher inquired about the window in the flex room and upon questioning the Applicant stated it is strictly an egress window.

Buyers inquired of the benefits the City will reap by way of the PUD process.

The Applicant replied that the quality of materials proposed are exceptional, probably the most expensive building materials that you can use, it is a full brick building incorporating a more expensive metal roof with the accent, which is upper end finish, and the roof was changed from a gable to a hip roof which is more expensive to build. He addressed the green space and stated that Nowacki did a great job on the landscape plan, stating they felt they exceeded what was installed.

Gronbach asked staff if the DDA had reviewed this plan and Christiansen responded in the affirmative.

Gronbach then indicated that this a tremendous improvement over what was initially proposed and glad to hear the DDA has reviewed it and that it's moving in the right direction.

The Applicant responded that the changes were based on the Planning Commission's feedback.

Gronbach then asked what the overall height of the three-story building is and the Applicant stated it is consistent with Phase I.

Majoros questioned staff about parking and further discussion was held. He then asked about parking restrictions on the north side of Slocum.

Crutcher inquired of staff if there is any arrangement currently to use parking in the bank and Christiansen responded in the negative.

There being no further questions from the Commission, Bowman thanked the Petitioner.

MOTION by Majoros, supported by Chiara, to move that the Planning Commission approve to move forward for a public hearing the PUD concept plan for Orchards Phase II at the scheduled September 14<sup>th</sup> Planning Commission meeting.

Motion carried, all ayes.

**REQUEST FOR SITE PLAN AMENDMENT APPROVAL – EXXON MOBIL SERVICE STATION, 32410 GRAND RIVER AVENUE**

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

Christiansen stated that at the October 13, 2014 Planning Commission Meeting they approved a site plan proposing several changes, improvements, and upgrades for the existing building and service station site located at 32410 Grand River Avenue, the former BP Service Station, for a new service station, Exxon Mobil. The approved changes included interior modifications to the existing service station building and exterior changes to the existing building façade and service station site. The exterior changes included building façade improvements, parking lot upgrades and improvements and site landscaping modifications and required the review and approval of the Planning Commission. No changes regarding building dimensions or other site improvements were proposed with respect to that upgrade.

The Applicant/Petitioner is requesting to amend the approved site plan and has submitted the revised building elevation plan modifying the approved site plan elevation. The amended plan calls for eliminating the approved parapet roof extension above the entrance to the existing building, the approved site signage also has been modified. The Applicant/Petitioner no longer intends to install a new ground sign at the corner of the existing service station site but instead has repurposed or refaced the existing site sign. The Applicant did indicate that they would be at tonight's meeting to present the amended site plan to the Commission but had not yet arrived.

Christiansen then went over the attachments included with the Commissioners' packets on the screen.

He stated to date what has been done is the interior modifications to the existing building have been completed. The Petitioner has been working on the façade improvements and has also worked on the canopy improvements with new signage, is working on the site landscaping, and has not moved forward with crack sealing, seal coating or restriping the parking lot as of yet, nor has he moved forward with the new dumpster enclosure. The Planning Commission is aware that once a site plan is approved by their body, the Applicant, the property owner in this case, has a year in which to implement the approved site plan under the permits based upon the site plan. That year time period is fast approaching and so in light of that and in light of the fact there is partial implementation, the Petitioner has a request to move forward with a modification to the elevation indicating that he's not able to accommodate that parapet extension due to the building and its access and how it would have to be constructed.

He stated that the Petitioner, after having put together their engineering construction plans based upon the existing sidewalk in front of the entrance, the drop down from that and the area where traffic travels in front of the building, it was going to conflict with the traffic and not able to be accommodated and has now asked to modify this and not have to do the parapet extension. Cultured stone will still be utilized along the base and a

new exterior façade with color and new roofline will be constructed as well but no longer a parapet extension above the entryway any longer as the Petitioner indicated he is no longer able to accommodate that.

Bowman asked the Petitioner to come forward.

Ziad El-Baba, engineer for the project, came to the podium. He apologized for the lack of progress on the site and cited bad communication between the contractor and the owner as the reason. He briefly described the revised site plan indicating the materials will be the same as presented previously. He stated the landscaping around the sign will be installed as indicated on the site plan.

Bowman opened the floor for questions from the Commissioners.

Crutcher inquired about the door that is shown on the site plan but not included on the elevation and El-Baba stated it will be removed from plan and not put in.

Buyers asked about the bay doors and El-Baba stated there are two existing and one more will be put in. He then inquired about the rationale for the alteration of the plan and El-Baba stated it is economically driven and spoke about the fact that banks are not lending money to gas stations as readily as before.

Buyers then asked about the timeline for the completion of the project and El-Baba stated he spoke to the owner about same and he estimated it would take approximately a month to finish.

Gronbach asked staff if approval was given for the amended site plan if it would lengthen the deadline for the completion of the project and Christiansen responded that the timeline would remain the same from the original site plan approval process.

Gronbach then asked what deadline the Applicant would be working under for the completion of the work from an ordinance standpoint and Christiansen responded it would fall under that one year period.

Crutcher asked about the requirements for an extension and Christiansen responded that would have to be worked out with administration and staff but he does not anticipate that happening based on promises made by the Applicant as to completion.

El-Baba stated he feels two months is an adequate timeframe for completion.

Buyers clarified the requirement of the Applicant that all work should be completed prior to the expiration of the one year and not just commenced and El-Baba responded that he understands that and that it should not be a problem.

Bowman thanked the Applicant.

Buyers asked staff to elaborate on the repercussions of noncompliance, and Christiansen responded that the City could retain completion monies, bonds, and that there are ordinance provisions that require action at a certain level by a certain timeframe, that there are mechanisms in place to address that issue.

Gronbach inquired of the ownership of the business and Christiansen responded it is under the same ownership.

MOTION by Chiara, seconded by Crutcher, to move to approve the amended site plan for the Exxon Mobil Service Station at 32410 Grand River.

AYES: Bowman, Buyers, Chiara, Crutcher, Majoros

NAYS: Gronbach

Motion carried 5 -1.

Bowman wished the Petitioner good luck and stated the Commission is looking forward to the completion of this project.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

None heard.

### **PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS**

Chiara commented that he was very pleased to see that the Planning Commission's input was incorporated into the changes on the Orchards Phase II project and that they did an excellent job on revising the plan.

Bowman asked the other Commissioners if they had been to the Cottage Inn as of yet and stated they are a welcome addition to Farmington.

Chiara asked about the status of the historic houses across from the Dress Barn.

Gronbach inquired about Fresh Thyme's progress.

Buyers asked about the Dunkin Donuts site.

Gronbach asked for a progress report on the Grand River/Halstead project.

### **STAFF COMMENTS**

None heard.

**ADJOURNMENT**

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

The meeting was adjourned at 7:57p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Secretary