

FARMINGTON PLANNING COMMISSION PROCEEDINGS

Monday, February 11, 2008

Chairperson Gronbach called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. at the Farmington City Council Chambers, 23600 Liberty Street, Farmington, Michigan.

ROLL CALL

Present: Bowman, Buck, Christiansen, Gronbach, Ingalls, Kuiken, Pogue, Scott, Sutton.

Absent: None.

A quorum of the Commission was present.

OTHER OFFICIALS PRESENT: Building Inspector Koncsol, City Manager Pastue (arrived at 7:48 p.m.), Recording Secretary Schmidt.

Chairperson Gronbach welcomed Sarah Bowman and Tom Buck to the Planning Commission. He also welcomed back Commissioner Ingalls.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

MOTION by Sutton, seconded by Christiansen, to approve the agenda. Motion carried, all ayes.

APPROVAL OF ITEMS ON CONSENT AGENDA

MOTION by Pogue, seconded by Buck, to approve the following items on the consent agenda:

- A. Approve Regular Meeting Minutes of January 14, 2008
- B. Acceptance of City of Farmington Building Department 2nd Quarter Report – October 1, 2007 through December 31, 2007

Motion carried, all ayes.

CONSIDERATION TO APPROVE FAÇADE IMPROVEMENT – KENTUCKY FRIED CHICKEN, 20740 FARMINGTON ROAD

Mr. F. Matthew Ray, Architect for FMR, representing Van Masters Management, Inc., was present to review the façade improvement at Kentucky Fried Chicken and to answer questions from the Planning Commission. He noted there is a concrete roof with a 5-foot overhang in the front creating a challenge to make the improvement look like the new KFC prototype. He stated the 3-color façade included the KFC bright red, bronze and a band of plum. He noted the exterior accent color would be Winter White for the louvers. Mr. Ray commented the building improvement would include KFC

signage, a door with a bucket handle, which is part of the existing storefront. He added the flat roof fabric awning would be taken off and the parapet would be raised 3 ½ to 4 ft. to screen the rooftop mechanical units and allow the placement of a wall sign.

In response to a question by Commissioner Ingalls, Mr. Ray stated the sign would be illuminated from the back.

Commissioner Kuiken asked where the neon would be located and Mr. Ray responded it would be on the popup part of the façade and returns to the back and it would be red on red.

Gronbach asked if the neon was exposed and Mr. Ray commented it would be somewhat protected, but would be exposed.

Commissioner Christiansen inquired if the improvement was consistent with KFC corporate wide improvements and Mr. Ray responded that it is and the only changes would be to the façade and signage.

In response to a question by Gronbach, Mr. Ray stated they did not review the Master Plan when preparing the specifications or the guidelines, in depth, regarding exposed neon and the extensive use of the color red. Gronbach stated the Commission would rather have neutral colors and asked if KFC had an alternative plan that would be more muted and without the neon. Mr. Ray replied they could use more beige, but he would have to go to the corporate office to see if it was acceptable. He further noted the elimination of the neon would be the decision of the Commission.

Ingalls commented he did not see a problem with the red color since it was not that bright.

Commissioner Pogue did not see a problem with the neon since it was partially hidden under the façade.

Gronbach noted there were quite a few variances from the guidelines that have been used by the Commission.

Kuiken referred to Section 35-53(d) of the Zoning Code regarding building materials. She questioned the proponent regarding the composite metal panels on the west and south elevation. Mr. Ray responded the panels would be a composite on a plastic corrugated core that would have a durable plastic finish. He further responded the panels would cover a portion of the building that is brick and they did not want to paint the brick. Also the panels could be removed if the tenant moved from the location.

Commissioner Sutton stated she had no problem with a muted red, and in the past, the Commission has worked with other companies regarding colors and questioned if the beige on the south side could go all the way up to the top, which would allow the KFC image on the front of the building and would also satisfy some of the City's zoning requirements. Mr. Ray stated they could accommodate the request.

Gronbach questioned if the neon went all around and follow the south elevation all the way to the side. Mr. Ray responded it stops and does not go along the south side.

Mr. Ray passed out samples of materials to the Commission.

Pogue asked Sherrin Hood, from LSL Planning, about what could be done in a case as proposed to keep a tenant from moving out of the community, in order to abide by the Master Plan. Ms. Hood replied they try to achieve middle ground by muting the color of the building and that there not be a dominance of the red and still maintain the corporate image of the building.

Gronbach verified that the façade on the south side would be high enough to screen the rooftop units.

Kuiken stated it would be a big improvement.

Christiansen asked for clarification regarding the signage, noting there is a lot of signage. Mr. Ray stated the signage would be less than 28 sq. ft. and he was not asking for any variances in signage.

Ingalls asked if the neon could be installed and then taken down if objectionable. The proponent stated if he paid for it he would want to install it, but if the Commission did not allow the neon, he would not purchase it. The proponent stated he thought the neon would attract more customers since the business is hidden behind the gas station on the corner.

Gronbach asked Ms. Hood if it would be feasible to do a light grid pattern to make sure the neon did not go out over the property line. Ms. Hood responded she felt there would not be a lot of light produced from the neon. She noted the compromise for the neon would be to tuck it in under the 6-inch overhang. Mr. Ray replied they would tuck it up so as not to see the neon tube.

Commissioner Scott noted they were looking at something that is 180 degrees from the ordinance requirements. He felt the Commission was stifling the user's ability to make that choice. He stated the ordinance stated one thing and the Commission is approving another and he further stated that by moving forward there could be issues that could be resolved.

Sutton stated the intent of the ordinance is that the Commission wants to prohibit glaring colors that would be an eyesore. She noted an existing chain business would not be in danger of using odd, flashy colors and would not be an eyesore to the community.

Discussion followed regarding working on the wording of the ordinance and noted an improvement to the façade of KFC. John Koncsol, Building Inspector, felt everything of concern regarding the KFC improvement plan had been addressed.

MOTION by Pogue, seconded by Sutton, to approve the application for the façade improvement of the Kentucky Fried Chicken, at 20740 Farmington Road, be approved with the amendment that the beige on the south side façade be extended to replace the red and that the neon light be recessed under the trim. Motion carried, all ayes.

CITY OF FARMINGTON MASTER PLAN

- A. Review of Chapter 3, Goals and Objectives
- B. Review of Chapter 4, Land Use

Sherrin S. Hood, Senior Planner of LSL Planning, Inc., was present to reiterate some of the key goals and objectives and verify that they are still appropriate, review the conditions and give LSL's recommendations for some revisions to the future land use map to be discussed by the Commission and provide feedback to LSL. She reviewed the process of adoption of the Master Plan.

Ms. Hood reviewed goals for the downtown which included: ensuring economic viability of the downtown business district through a mixture of uses; strengthen architectural character of the downtown and encourage development and redevelopment that is in harmony with the existing character of Farmington; importantly, to cultivate a walkable and vibrant downtown with several areas of interest and activity from morning to evening; promote a mixture of land uses that support the walkable environment, provide entertainment, and offer needed services; capitalize on Farmington's location within a centralized area of the larger Metropolitan region to become a shopping and dining destination for residents from other nearby suburban communities; increase access and views to the Upper Rouge River and Shiawassee Park; improve access and circulation into and through the downtown.

Kuiken noted a typo on Page 3-3, under Community Facilities, under the last bullet, should read, "Enhance the overall environment for pedestrians to create a safe (instead of save) and desirable environment for non-motorized travel and recreation.

Ms. Hood continued reviewing goals for the Master Plan by discussing the Neighborhood and General Commercial goals to create definable neighborhood shopping nodes with unique identity. She noted LSL recommended a major change that would go from what is called "neighborhood commercial" to "neighborhood center", which could include residential.

She stated they want to allow commercial frontages to be maintained for compatible commercial uses, but still protect the quality of surrounding neighborhoods. She noted this should be a priority.

Gronbach, referring back to the downtown, inquired if it was mentioned to promote residential as part of the mixed use for the downtown.

Discussion followed about including the mixed use for the downtown and Hood noted it could also be reinforced in the goals for the downtown.

Buck questioned under goals for the Downtown, bullet 4, why "cultivate a walkable and vibrant downtown," was limited to evening. Hood stated she would rework that section to reflect a walkable and vibrant downtown with several areas of interest and activity.

Kuiken suggested under goals for downtown, bullet 10, to read "that promotes an atmosphere of comfort, safety and interest for people."

Buck referred back to bullet 4, on page 3-1, regarding "from morning to evening." He felt if that wording were eliminated it would change the nature of the statement. He stated he felt the City wanted activity all day long and if a period is placed under activity it could mean any part of the day or part of the week. He suggested "throughout the day and throughout the week." Discussion followed regarding daytime and evening activity under bullet 4. Hood stated LSL would rework the wording of the last sentence under bullet 4 that would promote both daytime and evening use.

Ms. Hood reviewed Housing and Neighborhood goals which included ownership through conversion of rental properties to condominiums or infill redevelopment with condominiums; continue to maintain the historic character of neighborhoods and try to infill where appropriate; sound housing and neighborhoods that provide for a quality residential community; and provide for proper pedestrian links between residential uses and other destinations like the area parks or downtown.

Buck inquired if they should encourage redevelopment in the neighborhoods by the owners updating their homes as another goal.

Gronbach noted they need to be careful about the Historic District. Discussion followed regarding redevelopment in neighborhoods. Hood noted a common theme would be to maintain the current character, and stated LSL may touch on it vaguely in the goals and address it more specifically in the narrative portions of the Master Plan.

Scott stated there should be concern regarding how much a person could add onto their homes, and not to discourage people about updating whereas they would leave the community. Hood stated she would review the situation with Jeff Purdy and felt the homeowner needed to consider their whole block regarding new infill development.

Christiansen noted there is a two-part process to what they do: (1) planning and (2) zoning. He stated the planning part is the road map and the guide. He commented they are working on the guidebook at present and incorporating goals, objectives, ideas and focus that are to be implemented in order to handle redevelopment. Hood stated they would be reviewing the ordinances after they get through with the Master Plan.

Hood reviewed the Industrial goals: encourage continued redevelopment and building renovation, to generally improve the sites; relocate non-conforming industrial uses from commercial districts to areas specifically designated for industrial use in the City and surrounding area; ensure that light industrial uses fit within the context of the community; allow for a mixture of consumer service uses that are industrial in nature, such as automotive repair, home/garden supplies/contractors, and self-storage, which would be less compatible with other commercial areas; and ensure proper transitions and buffers between industrial uses and other non-commercial uses.

Christiansen stated he felt Hood's comments were important since industrial areas that are in the City are shop-type industries. He noted there has been some infiltration in the 9 Mile corridor area, and that it seems to work. He commented that having these industrial uses is important from a tax basis prospective and its redevelopment needs to be encouraged.

Hood reviewed the Community Facilities goals: create an integrated network of parks, schools and other civic uses that are strongly linked to neighborhoods and the downtown; provide open public spaces that enhance the City and provide a source of civic pride and artistic expression; provide open public space, plazas and landmarks as sites develop or redevelop, such as at the entrances to the City; and enhance the overall environment for pedestrians to create a safe and desirable environment for non-motorized travel and recreation. She asked the Commission if they wanted to encourage more use of the SMART bus system? She noted that goes hand in hand with walkability.

Sutton stated that encouraging residential areas along a bus route is limited since Farmington is a developed community. Hood replied that some of the mixed use in some of the commercial buildings could be redeveloped as a mixed-use building and provide residential in upper stories. She also stated additional mother-in-law apartments or above garage apartments could be used to encourage mass transportation use.

Kuiken asked what the benefit would be to strengthen the transit system. Hood responded it would be a very broad benefit and reducing the dependency on the automobile and providing other alternatives to the automobile. She noted it provides for a more urban atmosphere.

Gronbach noted that City Council had reviewed the issue of continuing the bus service and asked City Manager Pastue what the City planned on doing in the future regarding continuation of the bus service. Pastue replied he felt that was the context of Livonia opting out of SMART and Farmington Hills looking at the benefit of participating with SMART. He noted Farmington showed use on Grand River and that the City is limited to Grand River and Orchard Lake where SMART serves. Buck replied that the end of Farmington and Farmington Hills is the end of that line. He stated a person from the City could not get on a bus and go to Twelve Oaks. He noted there would be more riders if residents were able to take a bus to Twelve Oaks or to Kensington Park. Buck commented he thought there might be more mass transit usage due to the high gas prices. He commented SMART has a new route that stops in Farmington, goes up to the malls and up to 14 and Orchard Lake Road and then comes back and goes down to the Eight Mile Founders Park. Buck noted the new route is not used a lot and is not well known to the public.

Gronbach stated since Grand River is a main trunk line they would want to support mass transit. He felt it would be a way to provide an alternate way of transportation and promoting walkability would be a part of that. Discussion followed regarding working with SMART to improve bus stops and whether the busses were bringing people to the City to shop.

Ingalls commented on a pedestrian safety issue that cars don't stop at the light at Alta Loma and Farmington Road. Hood replied there should be a redesign of that location. Kuiken noted the crosswalk by Starbucks. Gronbach noted the DDA Walkability Committee and the Design Committee had reviewed these issues and they are incorporating consistency and standards for whenever it is redone. Pastue stated he had some information and would work with Hood regarding this issue.

Christiansen asked if in reference to the Master Plan, had LSL linked other plans like the Downtown Development Plan, and design guidelines for Downtown by referencing them in the Goals and Objectives section or in some other part of the Master Plan document indicating they are part of the overall Master Plan. Christiansen wanted to make sure the Planning Commission's goals were the same as the DDA or enhances them. Hood stated LSL would reference the material, but they do not want to present it in detail. Christiansen wanted to make sure all of it was tied together. Buck questioned if it required a separate category and Hood responded it might not fit in the goals, but they could incorporate it in the downtown section. Christiansen suggested referencing multiple documents in an index at the back of the Plan and also reference them in the text portion of the Master Plan.

Ms. Hood reviewed the Transportation goals: prioritize pedestrian comfort and safety; provide easily accessible, identifiable and convenient parking to serve the downtown; close unnecessary driveways, or those not adequately spaced from intersections or other driveways, along major commercial corridors to preserve street capacity and promote safety.

Hood noted the goals were a draft and suggestions from the Commission and revisions could still be made.

Ms. Hood reviewed Land Use in Chapter Four. She showed the existing Land Use Map for reference and the Future Land Use Map shows most of Farmington is developed. Hood noted LSL had some recommendations for some revisions and she reminded the Commission of the general mix that is in Farmington. She stated Farmington has a higher percentage of multiple family, higher density residential than some of the City's surroundings, less vacant land and more recreation land than some of the outer areas.

Hood stated when LSL developed the Future Land Use Map and strategies they considered the Existing Land Use and wanted to discuss the relationship of uses. She noted they wanted to discuss the Farmington Health Care System in the text of the plan.

She commented they wanted to consider the natural features of the community, the existing Master Plan and the goals the Commission has set for themselves, that the infrastructure is still going to be viable and support the uses recommended by the Commission, consider market conditions, discuss desires of the City and consider the regional influences of some of the surrounding communities.

Christiansen noted on page 4-1, the Road Rights-of-Way figure of 20.3% under Percent of City, seemed incorrect. Hood noted the number under Total Acres might be wrong and she would check on the numbers.

Pastue referenced the item where there are special conditions or relationship of uses regarding Farmington Health Care Center, and asked if there would be something referenced in the Master Plan that would note something special other than what is contained in there. Hood replied nothing had been drafted yet, but she felt what needs to be discussed is the Health Care Center situation and the possibility of that occurring again with non-conforming uses, and expanding to a point where the Commission might need direction as to when expansion is going too far. She commended the Commission in the way they addressed the Farmington Health Care situation. She noted the relationship needs to be discussed and what the specials are going to be. Pastue referred to the 3 parcels off of Thomas Street that are in limbo. Pastue stated City Attorney Schultz suggested that at some point, identify those as part of the Master Plan and designate a special provision that if there is any development or redevelopment that may trigger that use.

Hood noted they should discuss the issue of redevelopment of non-conforming types or expansions.

Kuiken suggested on Page 4-4, bullet 2, that it should read "Five percent more (instead of less) land in Farmington is dedicated to commercial and office uses than in the comparable cities."

Hood noted focus areas for redevelopment and that there be more detailed study on redevelopment strategy. She referred to the former courthouse site, the West Grand River Corridor, Drakeshire, the Kmart Plaza, Grand River and Power, Grand River and Orchard Lake, and on south Farmington Road. She noted these areas were considered when developing the Future Land Use Map.

Hood reviewed Future Land Use recommendations and noted that a key component of the Master Plan is to focus on maintaining and enhancing the stable downtown. She stated one of the changes LSL made was to encourage more Mixed Use throughout the community. She noted Mixed Use is intended to accommodate both commercial and residential uses in a fashion that is mutually complementary. She noted more Mixed Use areas as shown on the map. She stated they are looking to focus the Local Commercial into Neighborhood Centers in order to accommodate other uses besides Commercial.

Hood stated that part of the Master Plan is to prepare for redevelopment and are discussing Mixed Use component as one of those ways to encourage redevelopment, but also through potential planned unit developments that is not as cut and dry.

Hood noted they are looking at protecting the Rouge River by using a greenway overlay on either side of the Rouge River on the eastern part of the community.

Pastue noted that the PUD can be a cumbersome process for a developer and asked if LSL can streamline it to make it less costly to the developer. Hood replied it depended what is pictured as a PUD. Pastue verified that PUD, in a generic sense, is for flexibility purposes rather than a process.

Pogue stated he thought one of the advantages of a PUD is the fact that it can't be changed once it is developed. Hood replied it is a different way to frame another area.

Christiansen stated if there is a PUD it is an overlay or an ordinance that is approved, and in order to change that it would have to be amended by whatever body. He noted that it also allows taking a larger piece of property or several pieces together in a Mixed Use development.

Hood reviewed Residential and noted the Single Family Residential needed to be maintained, provide infill, encourage home ownership in multiple family areas and maintain the downtown in a compact fashion.

Hood discussed Neighborhood Centers and by shifting from Regional Commercial Centers to Neighborhood would help provide a more walkable destination, encourage less vehicular travel, insure the architecture and uses are still appropriate regarding the surrounding neighborhoods, to expand the permitted uses in the Neighborhood Center areas to allow some of that residential infill and to encourage some Mixed Use buildings within some of those Neighborhood Centers to obtain some Mixed Use.

Hood noted the General Commercial and they want to maintain a commercial dominance in those areas. She stated through the Planned Unit Development Mechanism to allow for limited residential. She noted General Commercial sites are generally more remote from the residential and not as integrated as the Neighborhood Centers.

She stated they want to incorporate more Mixed Use projects and used the Kmart site as an example.

Hood reviewed the Mixed Use area and noted it is a new item on the map. She stated the Mixed Use areas on the map are generally on the south side of Grand River just west of Orchard Lake, also on the south side of Grand River just east of Drake Road and at the Kmart Plaza as the Mixed Use areas on the Plan. She stated they see some opportunity for redevelopment into sort of hybrid of commercial and residential. She commented they want to promote a walkable community in these areas and also to allow for some of the regulatory flexibilities. She noted they need to consider the commercial, the appearance and design of the commercial, its incorporation into the neighborhood, and what the needs of the Residential might be.

Gronbach suggested not showing the Central Business District all one color, but to enlarge it and show more detail to include Mixed Use, etc. He further suggested the Central Business District be blown up to reflect that Mixed Use is allowed. Hood replied she would have to see how to address that issue on the map. She noted they would rely on the DDA Plan to direct the focus for the Central Business District. She stated they would refer to the Downtown Plan.

Gronbach asked if there was a map that showed different classifications on the Master Plan. Pastue replied it shows areas that are proposed for redevelopment, such as the Training Center. Gronbach voiced concern that if a person were looking at the map they would miss the whole point, that the focus of mixed use is downtown and it is not indicated on the map. Hood stated they would figure a way to address that issue.

Hood reviewed the Central Business District and noted this is where the mix of uses comes in. She stated they want to encourage upper floor office and residential uses, renovation of buildings, and remain pedestrian friendly. She noted a bit of an expansion on the map of the CBD boundary to include some of the areas on the former plan that were shown as multiple family.

Hood reviewed the Office areas and stated they want to discuss the redevelopment of those areas. She noted various commercial designations include office uses intermixed with commercial, an area has been designated exclusively for office uses.

Hood reviewed the Industrial part of the Plan stating they want to maintain the tax base of that Industrial area and for the most part they are maintaining the existing Industrial districts. She noted the north side of Nine Mile Road, just east of Farmington Road, they have changed the size of some of those parcels, the recent demand for the redevelopment of those parcels and also the history of redevelopment is the reason they are calling for a Neighborhood Center located as a triangular piece on the map. She stated LSL felt it was more appropriate, in terms, of attracting redevelopment for those smaller parcels than attracting Industrial redevelopment. She noted that is the one site of one area that they took out of the Industrial category, but the rest they want to maintain the tax base. She commented they want to allow for more uses than are currently allowed in order to encourage that redevelopment even though Industrial uses are not in high demand.

Hood reviewed Public /Quasi-Public part of the Plan and noted they are going to look at the former courthouse site as potential redevelopment. She commented the PUD would be a good approach for this type of redevelopment. She stated they want to consider the surrounding uses for the public since they are likely to be residential.

Hood showed changes on the map. She noted they had discussed the Neighborhood Centers and changing what is shown as Neighborhood Commercial to Neighborhood Centers and noted the location of Neighborhood Centers on the map.

Ingalls noted the color of the key is not the color on the map itself. Hood replied they didn't put different colors on the map, but they show up differently. She will check with the City Assessor, who made up the map, to see why this happens. She stated they would have to make enough contrast between the colors.

Sutton asked why the area at 9 Mile and Farmington Road was changed from Industrial to a Neighborhood Center when there are no neighborhoods there. Hood replied it could provide additional opportunities for redevelopment into a Mixed Use building.

Gronbach noted a retail store and Cable Studio offices are there. He stated he didn't feel it should remain Industrial, but asked if it could be Mixed Use. Sutton stated that area is not near one and not in a transitional area since the borders are the expressway, etc. Hood asked if it should be General Commercial. Scott commented there is an opportunity in the General Commercial and they would have to go to a PUD for Mixed Use. Kuiken asked if there was a definite definition of "Mixed Use". Hood replied Mixed Use is on Page 4-11, and stated Mixed Use is intended to accommodate both commercial and residential uses in a fashion that is mutually complementary. Retail uses could take advantage of exposure to Grand River. She stated that area is surrounded by other commercial uses.

Pastue felt what happened was, just as a practical matter for that area to redevelop, it developed into a C-2, but it is functionally more in a Commercial area as opposed to a Neighborhood.

Pastue noted the area on Orchard Lake on the northeast corner, near the high school, he remembered looking at this area as a Neighborhood Center and wondered what that served since there are 5 lanes of Orchard Lake to cross, surrounded by the school and the DTE station is on that corner. He stated it was an odd thing to do a Special Land Use because of its designation that is what required it. He commented it was an odd commercial area in the middle of the school property. He felt calling it a Neighborhood Center was not the right classification. Hood replied it was a Neighborhood Center since they don't want to see those uses get more intense and that the Neighborhood Center is more in line with the Neighborhood Commercial Uses. Kuiken stated she did not want it to be General Commercial. Discussion followed regarding the type of use in that area. Pastue stated what triggered it was to go through the Special Land Use requirements for a training after school program. He noted it was a Neighborhood Commercial District and that it would be an intense use, but in reality it is separated from Residential Use.

Hood highlighted areas of significant change; the western portion of the City, Mixed Use area and the Drakeshire Plaza. She noted the addition of Mixed Use at Halsted and Grand River. She stated they wanted to provide an opportunity to allow for redevelopment and provide a Mixed Use and have a buffer from Grand River to those Residential uses.

Pastue suggested moving the redevelopment area further south on Drake Road.

Gronbach questioned why the area on the west side of Drake Road is Multiple Family. Koncsol replied there is a single house there and it was intended that some duplex type housing could be built there. He stated it is now Single Family zoning, but since it is such a large parcel that Multiple Family might work there on a small scale. Hood suggested that area to be incorporated in the Neighborhood Center destination to provide for Mixed Use to provide for the existing Neighborhood Commercial.

Gronbach asked if a condo unit were to be built, would they have to have it rezoned. Hood replied the Zoning Ordinance could allow for any number of those uses on their own or together. Gronbach stated since it is Residential now to leave as is and if someone wanted to change it they could apply for approval.

Hood asked for clarification of the area south of Drakeshire and wondered if the Commission was thinking of incorporating that into the Neighborhood Center or into a Mixed Use. Discussion followed regarding changing that corner to Mixed Use.

Hood noted the changes in the Central Business District, which included the addition of the Greenway. She stated they envision it to be 100 ft. wide, protecting 50 ft. on either side of the river through a tier buffering system. She commented it will allow for use of the corridor, but restricts cutting of vegetation within the closest tiers to the river. She stated as they get further from the river it could be used for paths or as a lawn and the Greenway in that area would be an overlay on top of the land that abuts the river.

Sutton questioned if LSL measured out from various areas of the river to see how it would affect redevelopment of an area such as the Winery. She wondered if the Commission adopted this, are they prohibiting the redevelopment of some areas along the river that they wanted to use as an accent. Hood responded they did not measure the areas. Sutton felt it should be considered and to look at how that would stand in the way. Sutton agreed with the concept that the area needs to be maintained, but one of the goals of the Commission was to use the Winery area as an asset to the property. Hood stated they have not done that yet, but they plan to.

Gronbach commented LSL has done some site plan review of the Soave proposal. In response to a question from Gronbach, Hood stated it would affect the proposal. Gronbach stated they want to coordinate regarding the Soave Site Plan Review. Sutton disagreed and stated it was a perfect opportunity for one piece of land and if he gets in before the ordinance changes that is what the Commission wants. Discussion followed regarding the Soave site and the Greenway Corridor. Pastue stated the issue with the Zoning Board of Appeals regarding the Soave issue was the dumpsters.

In response to a question by Gronbach, Pastue stated they had not heard if Soave had received written approval from the DEQ or MDOT, just verbal.

Scott verified the 50 ft. on either side of the river and stated it prohibits a visual asset due to weeds, etc. and felt LSL was conflicting itself. Hood responded it is not a hard and fast rule and she needs to explain it in more detail in the text. She stated the general rule of thought of protection of rivers through the buffering system is that the larger the buffer the better the water quality is that is being protected. She stated in areas where parks are and where there is additional use by residents, providing access to the river is important in those areas. She commented that where clear cutting is done up to the river's edge, it would provide in other areas a much larger buffer. She stated she would clarify it in the text.

Ingalls asked who enforces the rules and Hood responded that general code enforcement would be regulated by calls from people seeing cutting along the river.

Sutton stated she agreed with the theory, but was not sure how it would be put into practical effect since the community is so developed. Hood replied most of the greenway runs through the parks and there can be efforts to restore that area. Sutton stated that one of the features of the park is access to the river. Hood stated that Farmington is an urban area and as a planner she tries to remember that sometimes a natural environment is sacrificed for the human environment. Sutton asked for more information about this issue.

Gronbach stated they should coordinate with what is being done regarding a grant for improving the park.

Hood stated they are looking at the greenway on the east side and correcting some of the uses.

Pastue asked if LSL was planning on leaving the area behind the river as Mixed Use, and Hood responded even though there is Residential in that area it could be incorporated into the Mixed Use. Gronbach asked if there would be a problem by changing that area to Mixed Use and Hood and Pastue stated it would not be a problem and there is a Mixed Use in that area.

Hood stated the south end would be changed from Neighborhood Center to Mixed Use or General Commercial. She noted that is the biggest change in the south end.

Buck asked if Thomas and Grand River was considered Public or Quasi/Public. Hood replied that on the Future Land Use Map it is shown as Quasi/Public or Public. Buck noted the Training Center is shown as Public or Quasi/Public and wondered if it could be considered as a Mixed Use. Pastue stated on the Downtown Master Plan it is designated for future redevelopment. Gronbach stated that is a reason why the 2 maps need to be coordinated. Buck asked how far they could go into the green area that is school system property and asked if they could go uphill on the other side. Hood replied it could be designated on the Future Land Use. Pastue stated the school system was not opposed to the concept of selling some of their property. Discussion followed regarding which use was recommended. Buck felt the area where the school bus parking lot is located is under utilized at the top of the hill.

Hood asked that the Commission let her know of any other changes to be made.

Hood recapped the changes: change the area on the north side of Nine Mile Road showing the triangle; expanding the Central Business District and include the area north of the church; expanding the Drakeshire Plaza to be included in the Mixed Use and a little more land to the south; take a look at the Mixed Use area at the Winery site; research other potential uses at the school site; fix the color scheme; refer to the Downtown Planner to somehow identify that the CBD is a Mixed Use environment on the map; discuss other ways to recommend expansion of existing homes that are not in the Historic District; the Commission wants to support mass transit, but not in an aggressive way and LSL could include in the text to encourage additional amenities provided by SMART; address the crossing at Alta Loma and Farmington Road and at the crosswalk at Starbucks; discuss potential redevelopment of the Thomas Street parking; discuss and reconsider the greenway recommendation whether or not it is appropriate.

Hood stated the next step would be to talk about the redevelopment strategy, scenarios for those Mixed Use areas, to identify a few more sites to see if they need to get more specific with Thomas Street and some other non-conforming sites. She noted they will draft the Plan and give to the Planning Commission for their review and then there will be a Public Hearing for the adjacent communities.

Gronbach thanked Ms. Hood and commended her on her presentation.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no public comments.

COMMISSION COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

John Koncsol, Building Inspector invited the Planning Commission members to meet on Friday, February 15th at 10:00 a.m. at the DPW building and stated Apple Printing has been sold and the new owners want to do a façade remodel. He stated he would be meeting with the architect on the 15th and any commissioners who can attend.

Koncsol stated Crossroads wants to do a remodel to the entire center and adding to the building adjacent to the old A&W. He commented a prospective 50's diner tenant is looking at that site and details are being worked out with the Center regarding sq. ft, etc.

Kuiken commented there is a similar diner in South Lyon.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION by Pogue, seconded by Bowman, to adjourn the meeting. Motion carried, all ayes.

The meeting adjourned at 9:34 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Secretary