FARMINGTON PLANNING COMMISSION PROCEEDINGS
23600 Liberty Street
Farmington, Michigan
May 28, 2026

Vice Chairperson Kmetzo called the meeting to order in Council Chambers, 23600 Liberty Street, Farmington, Michigan, at 7:00 p.m. on Thursday, May 28, 2026.

ROLL CALL

Present: Crutcher, Gray, Kmetzo, Majoros, Mantey, Westendorf
Absent: Perrot

A quorum of the Commission was present.

OTHER OFFICIALS PRESENT: Jeff Bowdell, Building Official; Beth Saarella, City Attorney; Kristen Hatfield, Planning Consultant OHM, Matt Parks, Engineering Consultant OHM, Brian Belesky, Director of Media, Brian Golden, Director of Media.

APPROVAL OF ITEMS ON CONSENT AGENDA

A. April 13, 2026 Minutes

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

APPROVAL OF ITEMS ON REGULAR AGENDA

MOTION by Majoros, seconded by Gray, to amend the agenda to move Public Comment from item 7. to item 5. between C and D.
MOTION carried, all ayes.

MOTION by Crutcher, seconded by Majoros, to approve the Regular Agenda.
MOTION carried, all ayes.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. None

NEW BUSINESS

A. SPECIAL LAND USE PUBLIC HEARING – 31806 GRAND RIVER AVENUE, VIBE CREDIT UNION

Weber introduced this item. Weber stated that Hunter Karam of Donna and Associates LLC applied for a special land use for 31806 Grand River Avenue, Vibe Credit Union. Hunter is the architect for Vibe Credit Union, and Vibe Credit Union would like to open up a bank with a drive-through facility at this location.

This property is zoned C2 Community Commercial District, and banks with a drive-through facility are a special land use in this district requiring Planning Commission approval. The special land use was noticed to the public in the Oakland Press as required.

Weber then asked for the representatives from Vibe Credit Union to present a brief summary of the plans. Anthony Taormina, Vice President of Building Operations for Vibe Credit Union, 31806 Grand River, and Sal Lorenzano, Architect for Vibe Credit Union approached the podium to present.

Taormina stated that their project is the remodeling of the existing financial institution building. He then stated there was a five-lane drive through that they intend to put back to use as a drive through. They will only use two lanes with the required bypass and an outside ATM. The project is a complete remodel of both the interior and exterionr. On the exterior, they are also looking to change the facade of the building, removing some brick and painting the brick that remains.They will use some of the same architectural structures and fixtures as they use in their other locations. Metal panels will surround the drive-through at the top of the building and have a green metal panel accent strip in front. There will be upgraded landscaping and exterior lighting. On the inside it's a small building, only 1200 square feet, so they are looking to employ three to four full-time employees - three full-time personnel, and then one rotating service person that will be wealth management and real estate commercial business. They will have a drive-up service and night deposit service. They will be upgrading the bathroom to meet current ADA requirements.

Hatfield then provided a summary of the special land use review letter dated May 18, 2026, which stated that they felt the plan met both the general standards and the specific standards for drive-through facilities outlined in Aarticle 12 of Farmington's zoning ordinance that regulates special land uses. Some of the most notable requirements would be demonstrating that the applicant has sufficient stacking spaces for the cars over at the drive-thru, which, in our opinion, they did on the site plan. Hatfield stated that the applicant met both the general standards for a special land use and specifics standards for a drive-through. Therefore, they recommend approval.

Kmetzo then asked for a motion to open the public hearing.

MOTION by Majoros, seconded by Crutcher, to open the Public Hearing on Vibe Credit Union, 31806 Grand River Avenue.
MOTION carried, all ayes.

Michael Smith, 22809 Lake Way Street, stated that I was there when it used to be a Comerica Bank, and I believe Vibe Credit Union would be a great asset to the community. The only thing I ask is that the drive through exit to Grand River instead of onto Lake Way Street, that they come in, maybe on Lakeway Street, or on that other side of the bank, come in, but exit to Grand River, that way the lights would be going out towards the street. Lakeway Street, right now, probably has the most traffic on it than it's had in 38 years, but the credit union would be good. Since the parking area borders residential, if there could be a barrier put down the strip there, there's nothing right now between the residential and commercial.

Kevin Shallow, 22712 Lake Way Street, stated that a big concern that people have on the street is where the flow of traffic is going to run. Are people going to pull into Lake Way, then pull into the credit union. Is there going to be an entrance established off of Grand River, or could they enter and exit from Grand River, because he lives right by Credit Union One and they enter from Grand River, but almost everybody exits onto Lake Way. Also, everyone that goes to and from the high school is speeding up and down Lake Way. It’s a very busy street to begin with for a residential street. Eventually there's probably going to be a house on that lot right behind the new bank, and they're probably going to want some kind of wall or barrier. When they're building a house there, is there going to be a little buffer between the business and the lot right behind the bank?

There were no more comments.

Kemtzo then asked for a motion to close the public hearing.

MOTION by Majoros, seconded by Crutcher, to close the Public Hearing on Vibe Credit Union, 31806 Grand River Avenue.
MOTION carried, all ayes.

B. CONSIDERATION TO APPROVE SPECIAL LAND USE – VIBE CREDIT UNION, 31806 GRAND RIVER AVENUE

Weber gave the developers an opportunity to address the questions during public hearing. Taormina stated that intent is to have the drive-through exit onto Grand River as it was in the past. All traffic flows out to Grand River. As far as entrance and exit off of Lake Way, it was always utilized that way. Our building signage, everything will be positioned in a way that you see it from Grand River, and they would hope that everyone would utilize that entrance. They plan to move forward with the landscape screen wall, but there would be some type of buffer.

MOTION by Majoros, seconded by Westendorf, to approve the special land use for 31806 Grand River Avenue, Vibe Credit Union for use of a bank with a drive-through facility because it meets the standards for approval for a special land use Section 35-152 as follows:

1. The proposed use will be compatible and in accordance with the goals, objectives, and policies of the City of Farmington Master Plan, because this special land use request is compatible with the objective of increasing commercial opportunities and promoting economic growth in the City of Farmington. **Additionally, the proposed business offers services that could be used by most residents and the site is designed to accommodate a drive-through window.**
2. The proposed use will promote the intent of the zoning district in which the use is proposed, because the intent of the C2 community commercial district is to create mixed-use neighborhood centers with retail services that provide convenient shopping for people residing in nearby residential areas. **The intent of this district is also to concentrate businesses that harmonize with the character of the surrounding uses, and to prohibit uses that might create traffic hazards, offensive noises and late hours of operation. In this case, the proposed business is replacing a bank that was previously located on the parcel. We believe the proposed business will be in harmony with surrounding uses, and we do not anticipate that it will create traffic hazards, offensive noises or late hours of operation, because the subject parcel will provide an office use that is professional in nature, while also serving as a transitional area between residential to the north and commercial to the south, and providing a buffer for residential neighborhoods and arterial roadways.**
3. The proposed use will be constructed, operated, and maintained so as to be compatible with the existing or intended character of the general vicinity, and so

as to not change the essential character of the area in which it is proposed, because the site was previously utilized for a financial institution with a drive-through, and will again be used for the same purpose.

4. The proposed use will be served adequately by public facilities and services, such as traffic operations along streets, police and fire protection, drainage structures, water and sewage facilities, and primary and secondary schools, because all of these facilities are existing.
5. The proposed use of a financial institution with the drive-through window would not involve uses, activities, processes, materials, and equipment, or conditions of operation that, in comparison to permitted uses in the district, be detrimental to the natural environment, public health, safety, or welfare by reason of excessive production of traffic, noise, smoke, odors, or other such reasons.

Motion carried, all ayes.

C. SITE PLAN REVIEW – 31806 GRAND RIVER AVENUE, VIBE CREDIT UNION

Weber introduced this item and turned it over to Hatfield. Hatfield discussed that the site is just over half an acre in the zone C2 Community Commercial, and it was a bank in the past. This was a straightforward site plan to review, but the areas for input or feedback from the Planning Commission include the following:

1. The proposed sheet metal roof. The Planning Commission has the discretion to decide if that is consistent with the architectural guidelines.
2. The lime green color that's proposed on the pillar of the street facing facade. The Planning Commission has the discretion to decide whether the color is consistent with City guidelines.
3. Entrances and exits. The Planning Consultant's recommendation is to consider making the eastern driveway from Grand River one way rather than two way, so the traffic is coming in, circulating around the site, and going out, and we're not having conflict between vehicles turning left and right from that eastern driveway.
4. Buffer along northern edge of property. A buffer is required between this commercial property and the residential to the north. Planning Commission has the discretion to say if that's a wall, landscaping, or a combination.

Crutcher asked the applicant if the site would feature an ATM and whether it would operate 24 hours a day. Representing Vibe Credit Union, Taormina stated that a drive-up ATM would be positioned in the second lane from the outside and would be fully operational 24 hours a day.

Westendorf asked if a continuous neon band would run along the upper perimeter of the building. Crutcher sought clarification on whether it was an LED light embedded within the metal panel. Taormina clarified that it is an LED light fixture designed to simulate a neon appearance, recessed cleanly inside the architectural metal paneling. Westendorf questioned whether neon or simulated neon-LED lighting is permitted under the current sign and zoning codes. Planning Consultant Hatfield clarified that while true gas neon tubing is prohibited, the zoning ordinance explicitly allows the Planning Commission to review and approve internally illuminated architectural bands.

Crutcher asked if the Vibe Credit Union representatives would be open to removing the decorative LED light band from the rear and residential-facing elevations of the building. Taormina agreed, stating that they would restrict the illuminated band strictly to the front and street-facing sides of the facility, noting that their standard corporate layouts do not run the lighting 360 degrees around the building.

Majoros asked the applicant if they had any objections to modifying the eastern Grand River Avenue driveway to act as an entrance-only access point. Taormina stated they were amenable to making that adjustment. Crutcher expressed concern over an entrance-only restriction, noting that forcing all exiting traffic to a single point might create an internal bottleneck, and argued that allowing vehicles to exit onto Lake Way from the east drive appeared safer for overall site flow.

Majoros asked if the Commission could move forward with a site plan approval tonight while leaving the final driveway traffic configuration to be ironed out dynamically by Administration. Planning Consultant Hatfield confirmed that the Commission could legally structure a motion making the approval conditional upon final administrative and public safety review of the internal traffic circulation pattern.

Majoros requested a more detailed description of the roof lines. Taormina explained that the vast majority of the building features a standard, flat rubber membrane roof. However, there is a small architectural bump-out area that is currently shingled; Vibe Credit Union proposes replacing those shingles with a standing seam metal roof, which they find to be significantly more aesthetically pleasing and durable.

Kmetzo asked the applicant to clarify their plans for waste receptacles, mechanical equipment, and utility screening. Taormina explained that because financial institutions generate very minimal physical waste, they do not require a standard heavy commercial dumpster. Instead, they utilize a 96-gallon rolling tote that is stored inside the employee area and rolled out on collection days. He added that the existing DTE transformer located on the property would be fully screened from public view using dense, high-quality landscaping.

Westendorf pointed out that a concrete dumpster enclosure remains in the northwest corner of the property and asked if it should be completely demolished rather than left as an eyesore. Taormina responded that they would clean up and utilize the existing enclosure structure to cleanly secure their 96-gallon rolling trash cart rather than leaving the cart exposed.

Gray noted that the planning consultant's review letter highlighted two specific areas where the submittal failed to meet basic city standards, including a deficiency in the required greenbelt plantings. Gray asked the applicant to explain their plan to bring the site into compliance. Planning Consultant Hatfield clarified that the ordinance mandates a continuous 10-foot-wide landscaped greenbelt buffer along the property boundary. Taormina confirmed that the applicant fully intends to modify their landscaping layouts to satisfy all municipal greenbelt width and planting requirements.

Kmetzo asked for confirmation regarding the physical dimensions of the proposed parking stalls. Taormina confirmed that all standard parking spaces on the revised site plan will be drawn to meet the minimum 18-foot length requirement.

MOTION by Majoros, seconded by Westendorf, to approve the Site Plan 31806 Grand River Avenue by Credit Union, conditioned upon completion and approval of the items contained in OHM'S site plan review letter dated May 18, 2026, and conditioned on:

1. Work and approval by the appropriate city departments on the Lake Way egress with the primary objective being to prevent exiting to northbound Lake Way.
2. Removal of the dumpster enclosure, which may have also been noted in OHM's letter if it is not used by the Vibe Credit Union.

Motion carried, all ayes.

D. PUBLIC COMMENT

None Heard

E. SITE PLAN REVIEW – 33224 GRAND RIVER AVENUE, FARMINGTON VILLAGE PLACE

Weber introduced the item and stated that it is a review of a site plan for 33224 Grand River Avenue, known as Farmington Village Place. The development is located within the Thomas and Warner focus area of the Farmington Forward Master Plan 2025 and aligns with the vision for a mixed-use redevelopment featuring ground-floor retail and upper-story residential units. Included in the meeting packet is the focus area documentation from the Master Plan.

Weber then stated that because this mixed-use development is located within the Central Business District, it requires a review by the Downtown Development Authority (DDA) Design Committee. The DDA Design Committee reviewed the development, and draft committee minutes are included in the meeting packet. The applicant subsequently addressed their recommendations in revised plans submitted for OHM review. It was noted that, due to the compressed timeframe between the Design Committee meeting and the current Planning Commission meeting, the updated information had not yet been formally resubmitted to the DDA Design Committee. So, any motion that might be made later, should require a follow-up with the DDA Design Committee to clear their review comments.

Weber then requested that the developer and architect present a summary of the plans. Ben Tiseo, architect of record and developer for the project approached the podium.

Tiseo stated that the initial vision for the project was based on the DDA market study for the property and the building's current footprint aligns closely with what the DDA study proposed. It has been improved to satisfy the criteria requested by the DDA Design Committee.

Tiseo explained that the four-story structure will be mixed-use, with the first-floor being commercial. The drawings indicating six retail spaces, but it could be more or less. The three stories above will house condominiums, 11 units per floor for a total of 33 units. Six units per floor will face Grand River Avenue and five will face Thomas Street. The architectural design includes a high parapet wall intended to fully screen any rooftop mechanical equipment.

Kimberly Lapinski, project architect, then stated that the design of the building took into consideration the scale for the development, since it is located in a downtown. They specifically looked at breaking up the big mass with different materials and openings. The development also utilizes low-to-no-maintenance exterior building materials to eliminate the need for regular painting or upkeep. She noted that it was design-critical to visually distinguish the commercial ground floor from the upper residential floors. A prominent exterior sign band was integrated into the rendering to establish this transition. Additionally, the storefront entrances are deeply recessed to provide a wider pedestrian walkway for customers, and the residential balconies are completely recessed to shield occupants from inclement Michigan weather. Lapinski noted that they used as much glass as possible to provide natural light. She also noted that the east and west sides of the building are built on the lot line and must act as firewalls and under building codes can't have any window or door openings on those sides.

Tiseo added that following local feedback objecting to the word "Village" in the project title, the development has been formally renamed "The Farmington."

Weber then turned the presentation over to Planning Consultant Kristen Hatfield. Hatfield stated that planning staff informally reviewed the initial submissions to provide guidance, and the document currently before the Commission represents the formal site plan review letter dated May 21, 2026. She stated that the applicant proposes demolishing the existing Village Shoe Inn structure at 33224 Grand River Avenue to construct a four-story, approximately 60,000-square-foot mixed-use building with a basement, which is a permitted use in the district. The plan shows the building abutting Grand River Avenue from the east to the west property lines, with vehicle carports arranged in a parking lot directly behind the structure.

Hatfield stated that the applicant will require a front yard setback waiver from the Planning Commission to position the building more than three feet from the front property line. This design adjustment was recommended by the DDA Design Committee to prevent a flat facade, creating architectural depth while highlighting the commercial storefront entryways.

Furthermore, the building as proposed will require a one-foot height variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA). The district zoning ordinance sets a maximum building height of 45 feet but permits up to an additional six feet for architectural parapet walls; the proposed parapet exceeds this exemption by one foot.

Regarding parking calculations, Hatfield explained that because the downtown district has adjacent public and on-street municipal facilities, the standard calculation drops from two spaces per unit to 1.5 spaces per unit, requiring 50 spaces for the residential portion. She noted that if the City completes its ongoing parking ordinance updates to reduce requirements to 1.0 space per unit, the baseline requirement for the 33 dwelling units would drop to 33 spaces. Hatfield then asked if the Planning Commission had any questions.

Westendorf stated that he had a lot of questions about the development. He started off by stating that the the project aligns with the Master Plan and that a mixed-use four-story building is exactly what the Plan is calling for. Westendorf's biggest question related to the fact that the building is 150 feet long, whereas the surrounding buildings are 20-30 feet wide. He asked the development team if they had considered incorporating further horizontal articulation or stepping the building back so that it does not appear out of scale with the surrounding sites.

Lapinski responded that because the exact divisions of the ground-floor retail spaces remain undetermined, they kept the storefront architecture flexible. For the upper residential floors, they sought to maximize interior square footage for residents while maintaining a balanced, symmetrical exterior appearance. She noted they did not deeply explore stepping the materials back and forth, opting instead to mirror the established materials found on the north and south elevations while navigating strict fire code constraints on the east and west walls.

Westendorf inquired if truck-turning movements had been plotted. Lapinski stated that turning templates were completed and submitted to the City on May 27 or 28.

Westendorf asked if the dumpster enclosure could be relocated elsewhere on the site to prevent the elimination of seven public parking spaces. Tiseo responded that due to the tight configurations of the property, there is no other viable location that allows proper clearance and turning radiuses for a commercial refuse truck to access and lift the dumpster. Lapinski added that an existing retaining wall along the eastern boundary further constrains vehicle movement.

Westendorf asked if any existing street light poles would be removed. Tiseo replied that he would cross-reference the site data but noted that the official land survey does not show any municipal light poles situated on the north side of the lot. Westendorf then asked if the light poles on the west side of the development belonged to the adjacent property. Tiseo confirmed those lights sit within their own property boundaries and would be properly angled to illuminate the drive aisle.

Westendorf asked if the pedestrian sidewalk in front of the building could be designed with greater public accessibility, rather than relying strictly on a ramp on one side and stairs on the other. Tiseo explained that a 2-foot, 10-inch grade difference exists across the frontage, and the current design is necessary to ensure the storefront doors swing and operate correctly. Crutcher added that stepping the interior floors of contiguous ground-floor retail spaces is structurally impractical for this type of development. Tiseo then stated that what really drove the engineering was the back of the property and having a level area back there. If they did not make the decisions they did, they would have very steep ramps going from their aisles to the other public aisles and problems going to the street and back.

Westendorf next asked if the building was planned to go from lot line to lot line. Tiseo stated that it is planned to be built to the lot line on the west. On the east, there is a three-foot buffer space exists between the proposed structure and the adjacent Cottage Inn property line.

Westendorf asked about the specific brick selection detailed on the elevations; Lapinski clarified that a dark-toned four-inch brick accent will run above and below the areas where composite decking accents are shown. Ben stated that the stone would be full as well.

Westendorf asked if the development team had considered designing an occupied green roof or an outdoor terrace for the residents. Tiseo stated that while they initially considered a rooftop deck, it was eliminated due to cost constraints, strict safety liabilities, structural load demands, and municipal insurance constraints.

Majoros asked if a four-story footprint represents the minimum viable product for the developers, or if the top story could be stepped back or halved to soften the building mass. Tiseo confirmed that four full stories are economically required, and implementing upper-level step-backs would compromise too many units to keep the project financially viable. Tiseo also stated that this project is exactly what the marketing study, completed on behalf of the DDA, recommended.

Kmetzo asked if a market study had been commissioned to analyze the financial viability of a four-story building versus a smaller two- or three-story structure on this parcel. Weber stated that Integra conducted a comprehensive feasibility study in October 2023, which concluded that even a four-story development would be very difficult from a financial feasibility standpoint under then-current market conditions, estimating it would be roughly $600,000 to $700,000 underwater. The 2023 study had recommended pausing development until broader economic factors improved.

Majoros asked Administration to clarify how the community's master plan addresses projects of this scale. Specifically how the master plan and other planning tools represent thorough, considerate, deliberate, and thoughtful input from the public, who had multiple opportunities to weigh in on the master plan and other planning documents. Weber noted that a four-story building has been envisioned for a long time in our zoning. The central business district has allowed four stories for over 25 years. The master plan that was recently completed featured focus groups. It featured specific studies, community outreach published in the paper and at farmers market events for people to weigh in. There were charettes done, and this was the type of project that came out of that process. Also, the marketing study that was done in 2023 suggested a similar type of development. Weber stated that it's difficult to build in the downtown and to make a viable product, and a product of this size is what financially works. Tiseo stated that he tried a dozen different schemes and they failed every time.

Kmetzo asked if there was any historical precedent where a four-story building proposal brought before the City of Farmington had been denied. City Attorney Saarela noted that while past plans for the Castle Dental site were tabled due to parking layout issues, the proposal for 33224 Grand River Avenue complies with the permitted uses for downtown parking under the ordinance and adheres to standard zoning guidelines governing height and story limits.

Kmetzo asked City Attorney Saarela if it is within the Planning Commission's purview to call for a public hearing on this item. City Attorney Saarela stated that because this is a standard administrative site plan review and does not involve a special land use or rezoning, a formal public hearing is not legally required or scheduled.

Kmetzo asked the development team about their neighborhood outreach efforts. Tiseo replied that they directly approached the adjacent property owners during the initial phases to see if they wanted to assemble the parcels into a joint development, but the neighbors declined. He noted they have since shared their verbal vision of the development with those immediate neighbors.

Majoros asked if windows could be added to soften the blank brick expanses on the east and west sides. Tiseo re-emphasized that building codes mandate solid firewalls with zero openings when building directly on a zero-lot-line boundary.

Westendorf asked if the interior square footage of individual apartments could be shrunk slightly to allow the upper floor plate to step back from the street. Tiseo explained that stepping a building back creates complex structural flashing and enclosure issues, leaving the building vulnerable to water penetration and snow accumulation. He stated that a meaningful step-back requires a depth of five to eight feet, which would eliminate critical living spaces and render the project financially impossible. He also stated that they have had a lot of concessions, including losing 425 square feet of retail space when the DDA Design Committee asked them to move the first floor of the building back.

Westendorf asked how the official building heights were calculated, from the high side or low side. Lapinski stated that their measurements are taken from the finished floor of the first floorto the top of the roof, because that is consistent. Planning Consultant Hatfield confirmed that planning staff utilized the same measurement methodology and would coordinate with Building Official Bowdell to evaluate the exact height exceptions allowed for the parapet wall, confirming that the current plans appear to track at one foot over the limit.

Westendorf asked about the mechanical equipment on the roof necessitating a seven-foot parapet wall. Tiseo explained that the height of the parapet wall was a deliberate architectural choice designed to achieve a specific aesthetic proportion and visual scale along the streetscape.

Majoros asked Hatfield if any items within the OHM planning review letter required further delay or extended investigation before a vote. Hatfield clarified that while there are standard technical adjustments to resolve, there are no outstanding planning issues critical enough to warrant delaying the Commission's review or withholding administrative approval.

Majoros asked if the Commission could address the parking requirements next.

Weber clarified that a previous set of plans had been reviewed by the DDA Design Committee, which offered a recommendation. Revisions were subsequently made and submitted to OHM for review. Tiseo noted that a newly revised plan set was delivered today to address the questions raised in the OHM planning and engineering letters. Tiseo explained that changes included adding a protective fence barrier along Grand River Avenue because tables were too close to the roadway and breaking up a 20-foot bench into smaller eight-foot seating sections on the sides of the front property. Architect Kimberly Lapinski added that facade calculations for materials and openings were also appended to the elevations as requested.

Majoros pointed out that while smaller items were addressed, major foundational issues remained unchanged in the letters, noting that the building size has not been reduced and parking holds at 40 spaces where 116 are required. Majoros questioned whether the

Commission was comfortable approving a building with a large 76-space discrepancy, while acknowledging that because the site is in a downtown district, public parking is available. Majoros also referenced the parking study that was completed within the last year that showed there is enough parking availabitlity to make up for the delta between the required and provided parking.

At the request of Administration, Hatfield reviewed Section 35-105. She explained that the Planning Commission may reduce the residential parking requirement to 1.5 spaces per unit and noted that the ordinance allows for waivers if a site is within 500 feet of public municipal parking facilities. Hatfield further highlighted that a failure to provide on-site parking constitutes an acknowledge and acceptance of a benefit, such that if they establish a special assessment district to fund the construction, operation, and maintenance of public parking that will serve the property that property owner agrees to become part of such district.

Majoros raised concerns regarding neighboring public parking spaces, asking if the adjacent time-restricted spaces (such as three-hour parking) which businesses rely on for for their customers would be occupied by residents and weekend guests.

To address this, Hatfield asked the applicant to clarify how the on-site spaces would be allocated between retail users and residents. Tiseo replied that 33 spaces are dedicated to residents (one per unit) and 7 spaces are un-timed and available for retail or other use, bringing the on-site total to 40 spaces. Tiseo added that each space will be prepped for future EV chargers.

Crutcher expressed concern over the 7 extra spaces, noting that if they are left un-timed and open to the general public, people might park there all day. Crutcher suggested discussing making them time-restricted like the rest of the downtown public spaces. Tiseo clarified that the 7 spaces are intended for the property's retail users and residential guests rather than the general public. Kmetzo noted that unless the spaces are actively timed, it would be difficult to prohibit the general public from parking there.

Westendorf then asked if the applicant had considered eliminating the carports entirely to turn the lot into open public parking, similar to other downtown apartments located above businesses that do not have designated parking. Tiseo responded that it would be highly difficult to sell the luxury condo units without a dedicated, covered parking spot. Crutcher agreed, noting that this 33-unit project operates on a completely different scale of parking need compared to smaller downtown buildings with only two or three apartments.

Weber then asked the engineering consultants to discuss items contained in their engineering letter.

Matt Parks, representing OHM on the engineering side, provided an overview of their preliminary review letter. Parks stated that public utilities are available and the plan is straightforward from an engineering standpoint. He noted that OHM's recommendations focus heavily on pedestrian safety and maintaining sidewalk continuity along the back and west sides of the building, ensuring a proper connection along Thomas Street from Maxfield to downtown. Parks stated that the plan isrecommended for approval, and that there would be several items reviewed during detailed engineering including utilities, service leads, and turning radius templates to demonstrate proper vehicle movements for the carports and the dumpster enclosure.

Weber then discussed different types of motions that the Planning Commission could make.

Majoros commented that a tabling motion could be made, but that parking was not going to change, the building dimensions were not going to change, the footprint was not going to change, and that the smaller items would be reviewed by the appropriate departments to ensure that everything would be addressed from OHM’s letters, the parking waiver, the zoning board variance, etc.

Kemtzo then asked for a motion.

MOTION by Crutcher, seconded by Mantey, to approve the Site Plan for 33224 Grand River Avenue and the parking waiver, conditioned upon the following:

1. Completion and approval of the items contained in the OHM Planning and Engineering review letters dated May 21, 2026.
2. Approval by the Zoning Board of Appeals of required height variances.
3. Final review and confirmation by the DDA Design Committee that all their design recommendations were adequately addressed.

ROLL CALL
Ayes: Crutcher, Gray, Kmetzo, Majoros, Mantey
Nays: Westendorf
MOTION carried.

UPDATE - CURRENT DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

Vice Chairperson Kmetzo asked for an update on current development projects. Weber noted there was no update at this time.

PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS

None heard.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION by Crutcher, seconded by Gray, to adjourn the meeting.
MOTION carried, all ayes.

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

Respectfully submitted,

____
Secretary