

**CITY OF BIRMINGHAM
PLANNING BOARD ACTION ITEMS
OF WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 9, 2019**

Item	Page
F. COMMUNITY IMPACT STUDY ("CIS") AND PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN REVIEW	
1. 35001 Woodward Ave. (Hunter House and vacant parking lot) Request for approval of new five-story mixed use building with hotel, retail and residential uses (postponed from December 12, 2018)	2
Motion by Mr. Williams Seconded by Mr. Koseck to receive and file an e-mail against the project and supporting Hunter House dated January 2019.	6
Motion carried, 7-0.	6
Motion by Mr. Boyle Seconded by Mr. Jeffares to ACCEPT the Community Impact Study as provided by the applicant for the proposed development at 35001 & 35075 Woodward, The Maple, with the following conditions: 1) Applicant must provide a City-approved special event operations plan at the same time as completing the Final Site Plan Review process; 2) Applicant must provide mitigation strategies for control of noise vibration and dust; 3) Applicant will be required to bury all utilities on the site; 4) Applicant must distinguish an area for the separation and storage of recycling; 5) Applicant must conform to the streetscape design as outlined in the new E. Maple Rd. streetscape project; 6) Applicant provide information on all life safety issues and Fire Dept. approval, as well as details on the proposed security system provided to and approved by the Police Dept.; and 7) Applicant must address the concerns of all City Depts.	7
Amended by Mr. Share And accepted by the makers of the motion to replace 1) as follows: Applicant must submit for approval by the Planning Board at the same time as completing the Final Site Plan Application process a special event operations plan approved by the City Police Dept. after consultation with the City's Traffic Consultant.	7
Motion carried, 6-1.	7
Motion by Mr. Share	8

Item	Page
Seconded by Mr. Williams to postpone the Preliminary Site Plan for 35001 Woodward Ave. (Hunter House and vacant parking lot) to February 27, 2019. Motion carried, 7-0.	8

APPROVED

**CITY OF BIRMINGHAM
REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING BOARD
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 9, 2019**
City Commission Room
151 Martin Street, Birmingham, Michigan

Minutes of the regular meeting of the City of Birmingham Planning Board held on January 9, 2019. Chairman Scott Clein convened the meeting at 7:30 p.m.

A. ROLL CALL

Present: Chairman Scott Clein; Board Members Robin Boyle, Stuart Jeffares, Bert Koseck, Daniel Share, Janelle Whipple-Boyce, Bryan Williams

Also Present: Alternate Board Member Jason Emerine

Absent: Alternate Board Member Nasseen Ramin; Student Representatives Madison Dominato, Sam Fogel, Ellie McElroy

Administration: Matt Baka, Sr. Planner
Jana Ecker, Planning Director
Carole Salutes, Recording Secretary

Fleis & Vanderbrink ("F&V")
Julie Kroll

01-01-19

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE REGULAR PLANNING BOARD MEETING OF DECEMBER 12, 2018

Mr. Share made the following addition:
Page 4, first bullet point, insert "each of" in front of "the five lanes."

**Motion by Ms. Whipple-Boyce
Seconded by Mr. Boyle to approve the minutes of the Regular Planning Board Meeting of December 12, 2018 as amended.**

Motion carried, 7-0.

VOICE VOTE

Yeas: Whipple-Boyce, Boyle, Clein, Jeffares, Koseck, Share, Williams

Nays: None

Absent: Ramin

01-02-19

C. CHAIRPERSON'S COMMENTS (none)

01-03-19

D. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA (no change)

01-04-19

E. PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN REVIEW

- 1. 361 E. Maple Rd. (Historic Resource, Hawthorne Building)**
Addition of four stories on top of the existing one-story historic resource
(postponed from November 28, 2018 – new request to postpone by applicant)

Ms. Ecker explained the applicant intends to potentially redesign the building because there was some concern that four stories is a little much for that historic building. They have indicated that they are currently meeting with the neighbors and will reapply at another date.

01-05-19

F. COMMUNITY IMPACT STUDY ("CIS") AND PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN REVIEW

- 1. 35001 Woodward Ave. (Hunter House and vacant parking lot)**
Request for approval of new five-story mixed use building with hotel, retail and residential uses (postponed from December 12, 2018)

The Chairman explained the CIS is an opportunity for the developer to provide answers to questions that help the Planning Board to understand how the proposed development might impact the community. That is something the board would either accept, decline, or postpone. The Preliminary Site Plan is a separate approval. It is the first step that is needed for the applicant to move forward with the project.

Ms. Ecker clarified that the subject site has a total land area of 0.5 acres which is made up of three parcels, 35001 Woodward Ave., 35075 Woodward Ave. and a surface parking lot that is owned by the City. The sites along Woodward Ave. are owned by Select Commercial Assets Hospitality, LLC. The owner of that property is Dr. Guyare, who is the applicant tonight and who has the right to seek approval for development on the property containing both sites. As part of his request he is asking that the City consider allowing him to develop a piece of City property.

Whenever someone is seeking to use City property they also need to enter into a Lease Agreement with the City. The applicant is proposing to continue to use the City parcel that currently is rented out for parking. They are also looking to lease some property in the right-of-way from the City.

CIS

Ms. Ecker recalled from the December meeting that main thing that was outstanding was with regard to the traffic study. The City's Traffic Consultant, F&V, had not had a chance to fully review all of the traffic information. At this time the City has a letter dated January 4 from F&V indicating they would recommend that the Planning Board accept the Traffic Study with the

condition that a detailed special event operations plan be completed prior to obtaining a Certificate of Occupancy for the building. That would ensure that the hotel will have enough valets and enough time to take the cars over to a parking structure so that they don't queue up too far on Park St. and spill onto Maple Rd. If they do that it causes congestion moving onto Woodward Ave.

In response to Mr. Boyle, Ms. Ecker advised that F&V would review and approve the special event operations plan and then it would be brought back to the Planning Board as an addendum to the CIS as an offshoot of the Traffic Impact Study. The valet stand also has to be approved through the City. Any use of City parking spaces needs to be reviewed and approved by the City Commission.

Mr. Koseck inquired whether the Traffic Consultant is confident that there is a valet plan that would work. It seems to him the two parking structures that would likely serve this development are often tapped out.

Ms. Kroll answered that was one of her concerns. The Peabody and Park St. garages have been at capacity during the middle of the day. So if there was a banquet that occurred during the middle of the day there would probably be some issues. In that case she would want the hotel to outline where they propose to park their vehicles if the garages are full. For an evening event the two garages have plenty of capacity. In addition, the amount of time it takes for a valet to park a car needs to be documented in the special event plan. If they are not able to meet the plan then there is a code enforcement issue. There are only three queue spaces, so during a special event the hotel may want to ~~bag~~ **rent** the spaces on the north end of Park for queuing of vehicles.

Responding to Mr. Williams, Ms. Ecker established that the traffic signal currently located at Park / Maple Rd. / Peabody will stay but there will be changes made to the signal timing along with a signal for pedestrians as they cross Park. Maple Rd. traffic west of Peabody / Park is being reduced to a single lane.

It was discussed and Ms. Ecker affirmed that any contractual issues that the operator of the Hunter House and the owner of the land may have between themselves is a private civil matter and is not for this board or the City to adjudicate on, because there is established ownership of the property.

Mr. Kevin Biddison, Biddison Architecture, 320 Martin St. said they are working on operational procedures for queuing, such as hiring additional valets. They will do their best to keep the traffic and queuing out of the intersection. It has been noted that the underground parking that would extend out into the right-of-way might be in conflict with electrical conduits and they are reviewing that with the City. If there is an issue with the utility it is something they will pull back on, but if it is a small item it would be a monetary thing.

The proposed parking spaces that are outlined to service the new Hunter House all meet the 180 sq. ft. requirement. Mr. Biddison explained how deliveries and trash will be handled. The banquet room might accommodate 50 to 60 people at the most, as it is not a huge area. Mr. Boyle said in his opinion that isn't a particularly large space. That is an important issue in order to understand the community impact of the hotel.

Mr. Williams asked Ms. Kroll to comment on existing traffic on Maple Rd. at peak times, leaving the hotel. Ms. Kroll said that presently traffic going westbound on Maple Rd. does not back up

into Woodward Ave. Eastbound, it does back up. Mr. Williams did not agree with that analysis because the traffic backs up between Old Woodward Ave. and Peabody, as the lights are not coordinated. The stacking at Peabody and Park is fine but the traffic moving west past Park and past Peabody stacks up. Ms. Kroll said that when an evaluation study for the hotel was made, they evaluated the future conditions with the two-way operations on Park.

Mr. Koseck questioned if there are any tweaks that Ms. Kroll would recommend that would make a better development from a traffic impact standpoint. Ms. Kroll replied her biggest concern is that they really only have space for three vehicles to queue up. During peak times that may not be enough storage space. Ideally if the hotel was located on the Hunter House corner, it would provide better queuing. Further responding to Mr. Koseck, she said that people going south on Woodward Ave. turning onto Hamilton and making a left turn into the Hunter House site is a condition that currently exists. Ms. Ecker pointed out there is no interior connection to get to the hotel site from the Hunter House parking lot. Mr. Koseck thought that generally people would not know that and may turn in to park there.

Chairman Clein opened up discussion from members of the public at 8:05 p.m.

Mr. Kelly Cobb said he is one of the owners of Hunter House along with his mother, Susan, who was also present. Hunter House is one of the oldest businesses in Birmingham as they have been in operation for 67 years. Some of their issues are not in the Planning Board's purview but he highlighted a couple that he thinks are.

To establish background, Mr. Cobb explained he transferred the property to the applicant, and as a part of that transfer there was a purchase agreement outlining certain rights that he retained. That agreement has not been furnished to the City as it is not necessarily within their purview. The agreement gives Hunter House sole discretion and approval rights over what their space looks like and the municipal lot. They have not approved the space, as it was submitted to the City without their knowledge.

Ms. Ecker clarified that regardless of what the agreement says, Hunter House does not have sole discretion over what happens on the City's property.

Mr. Cobb went on to say they have concerns and questions about parking, the same as the City has with traffic. He would appreciate if the City would contract with F&V to come up with a better study than the one proposed. The study assumes that Hunter House needs only 14 spots. Not accounted for in the study is that it would be fair to presume that Hunter House would need to use another 15 spaces or so in surrounding parking decks. Also not accounted for in the study is the Peabody development. The Peabody assumed a shortage of 57 spots between the Park and the Peabody decks. Add that to the 15 that Hunter House will need and that comes to a deficiency of 87 parking spots.

This raises concerns for them because they already have parking problems. People park in their lot and walk to Downtown. They are also concerned about traffic circulation. Their customers already loop around until they can get a spot to pick up the food from their phone in orders. That activity will increase if their parking shrinks and there is a severe deficiency within the broader area.

There is a statement in the CIS that it appears the Hunter House is not historic, as they have not been registered historic. They believe that they are, and he raised that as a concern for them.

Ms. Ecker clarified on the historic issue that the site or the building is not designated historic within the City of Birmingham, nor have they received an application from either the current or previous owners to consider designating it as such.

Mr. Koseck inquired how Mr. Cobb would change the proposal to meet his needs. Mr. Cobb indicated they have certain minimums of what they are guaranteed in the space, certain discretion on the shape of their building, how the layout would be, and all of those things. They are working with Mr. Biddison to find a solution to that and have not reached agreement over what the space looks like.

Mr. David Hart said he represents Hunter House. He stated the agreement between the two parties is part of the public record at the Oakland County Register of Deeds. It has been recorded since 2007 and perfects the interest of Hunter House.

Ms. Theresa Pelovocian from Bloomfield Hills said she believes that Hunter House is very special to everyone. People can remember countless times going to the Hunter House with their sons or daughters to celebrate some accomplishment. On another note, her daughter has been employed by Hunter House for four years and it has been a phenomenal place for her to work. The kids make good money, pick up great work ethics, and learn to handle themselves with the public. Hunter House is a great place for the community to go.

Motion by Mr. Williams

Seconded by Mr. Koseck to receive and file an e-mail against the project and supporting Hunter House dated January 2019.

Motion carried, 7-0.

VOICE VOTE

Yeas: Williams, Koseck, Boyle, Clein, Jeffares, Share, Whipple-Boyce

Nays: None

Absent: Ramin

Mr. Williams announced that he has come to a different conclusion than the Planning Dept. or than F&V. There are a couple of concerns in their report that should be highlighted:

- Based on the parking analysis there is no capacity in either the Park or Peabody parking garage during the day;
- Any vehicle queues that extend beyond a four vehicle storage area will impact the operations of Maple Rd. and potentially the intersection at Woodward Ave.

Missing from the analysis is the single lane traffic heading west on Maple Rd. to Old Woodward Ave. which backs up frequently to beyond Peabody during busy hours. Therefore Mr. Williams said he is not inclined to approve the CIS or the project with this many unanswered traffic and parking issues. Further, he is not satisfied that the issues that the chairman highlighted at the last meeting have been answered adequately.

This situation is exacerbated because the City has to recognize the difficulties of building on this site, most importantly the traffic in this very confined area.

Mr. Koseck observed that anything that is developed on this site will bring in more traffic and have an enormous impact. He was curious how a hotel fits.

Mr. Share observed he is not hearing that the Traffic Consultant needs to do any more work. Secondly, he has never seen in a CIS the suggested condition that the applicant provide a City-approved special event operations plan prior to obtaining a Certificate of Occupancy. He would accept the CIS without that suggested condition but he has some extremely serious reservations about a site plan for this project because of the danger to public safety that the special event use and the valet operation create.

Mr. Boyle was in favor of deleting the requirement in the CIS for a special event operations plan. The appropriate place for that is in the Site Plan Review, along with concerns about traffic movements. He explained that by accepting the CIS it does not mean that the Planning Board is tacitly accepting this development. Chairman Clein added that he also doesn't want it inferred that by accepting the CIS the board is accepting the Traffic Study because they are clearly not.

Mr. Jeffares said that the Master Plan Downtown calls for a sister building to the Greenleaf Trust building on this site. If they were to develop an office building there would be the condition of many people leaving at the exact same time, all trying to get out onto Woodward Ave. If that is the alternative, to him that use would be far worse.

Motion by Mr. Boyle

Seconded by Mr. Jeffares to ACCEPT the Community Impact Study as provided by the applicant for the proposed development at 35001 & 35075 Woodward, The Maple, with the following conditions:

- 1) Applicant must provide a City-approved special event operations plan at the same time as completing the Final Site Plan Review process;**
- 2) Applicant must provide mitigation strategies for control of noise vibration and dust;**
- 3) Applicant will be required to bury all utilities on the site;**
- 4) Applicant must distinguish an area for the separation and storage of recycling;**
- 5) Applicant must conform to the streetscape design as outlined in the new E. Maple Rd. streetscape project;**
- 6) Applicant provide information on all life safety issues and Fire Dept. approval, as well as details on the proposed security system provided to and approved by the Police Dept.; and**
- 7) Applicant must address the concerns of all City Depts.**

Amended by Mr. Share

And accepted by the makers of the motion to replace 1) as follows: Applicant must submit for approval by the Planning Board at the same time as completing the Final Site Plan Application process a special event operations plan approved by the City Police Dept. after consultation with the City's Traffic Consultant.

No one from the public wished to comment on the motion at 8:40 p.m.

Motion carried, 6-1.

ROLLCALL VOTE

Yeas: Boyle, Jeffares, Clein, Koseck, Whipple-Boyce, Share

Nays: Williams

Absent: Ramin

The chairman noted that a number of issues have been raised during the CIS process that make him uncomfortable with moving forward with the Preliminary Site Plan this evening.

Mr. Williams agreed. The Planning Board has pointed out the unresolved issues that need to be addressed. Additionally, he feels that the Parking Assessment District with its impact on this particular property requires City attention. However, this problem exists whether this or any other significant development goes through.

Mr. Jeffares commented that the amount of time required to get into a deck is significantly longer than it used to be because of the queuing. A valet would have to wait behind people who are having trouble getting through with their card.

Ms. Whipple-Boyce expressed her concerns:

- She would like to see an internal floor plan for the retail level in order to better understand how the banquet area will be used. She thinks a lot more than 60 people will be using that space and that has a direct impact on the queuing of vehicles that are arriving;
- She wondered if keeping the Hunter House building has ever been considered because it is such an iconic structure.

Mr. Boyle made a couple of points:

- The board should know what the City intends to do in that area. He wanted to see the plan for turning Park into two-way, what the parking will be, and how long cars are going to wait;
- He is frustrated that so much emphasis is being placed on parking and designing around parking. This is not how it should be done. Also, the Hunter House states they need parking, yet they take four spaces in their lot to park their vans. Why not shift them farther away and release the parking spaces? They could also make arrangements to shuttle people back and forth for an event and include that in the plan.

Mr. Share observed that on Page 3 of the developer's December 31 traffic report, it states that the banquet facility will have a capacity of 150 to 200 guests.

Mr. Koseck did not think the site plan goes far enough beyond the limits of the site. His further thoughts were:

- Whether turning Park into a two-way street is still the right thing today just because it was someone's idea 20 years ago in the Downtown 2016 Master Plan. If he is going south on Park, where is he going;
- The 20 ft. parking zone will need a variance, but also it is a planning issue and he will have to be convinced that it is good planning.

Motion by Mr. Share

Seconded by Mr. Williams to postpone the Preliminary Site Plan for 35001 Woodward Ave. (Hunter House and vacant parking lot) to February 27, 2019.

Motion carried, 7-0.

VOICE VOTE

Yeas: Share, Williams, Koseck, Boyle, Clein, Jeffares, Whipple-Boyce

Nays: None

Absent: Ramin

01-06-19

STUDY SESSION ITEMS

1. Renovation of Commercial properties

Mr. Baka explained that questions have been posed as to the procedure for determining what level of board review is required for the renovation of a building or construction of a new building. Currently there are three boards that review proposed modifications to buildings: the Planning Board, the Design Review Board ("DRB"), and the Historic District Commission ("HDC").

Article 7, section 7.25 requires site plan review for new development of all historic properties by the HDC and the Planning Board. Meanwhile site plan review for new development of non-historic properties is required by the Planning Board.

Article 7, section 7.08 states that for all new non-historic construction projects, the Planning Board is responsible for conducting both the site plan review and design review. All plans for projects not requiring site plan review or HDC review such as exterior alternations, lighting, signs, equipment or other structures that substantially alter the exterior appearance of the building shall be reviewed by the DRB. Article 7, section 7.08 also states that all Special Land Use Permit ("SLUP") reviews will be conducted by the City Commission, with recommendations from the Planning Board.

The DRB is responsible for conducting design reviews for new construction and the alteration of existing buildings when no site plan is required. However, City policy has been to require proposals that add square footage to a building or make changes to a site that would affect vehicle or circulation patterns to obtain site plan approval. Proposals that are limited to modifying the exterior of the building but do not expand the building or alter the site are required to obtain design review.

After several study sessions the board came up with a formula for which they felt it would be appropriate to require site plan reviews by the Planning Board for expansions or alterations of buildings, not including the addition of new interior mezzanines if two specific requirements are met:

- a. Reconstruction of visible exterior walls of existing buildings exceeding 33.3% of the total visible wall area;
- b. Any alteration to an existing building and / or site which significantly alters the vehicular and / or pedestrian circulation as determined by the City Planner.

Board members made the following comments about changes to the proposed ordinance:

- The Planning Board doesn't want to look at the tear down of over one third of a residential wall.
- It is not right that the Planning Board does not review City projects.
- That issue has not been discussed at joint meetings with the City Commission.
- At times with a project that said they would not tear down more than 33% of walls, they end up taking out 75%. That is against their approved design review and therefore site plan review would be required. Construction could be held up because a Stop Work Order would be imposed.
- Ask the City Attorney if that needs to be clarified and if so, what language would he suggest.
- It makes sense to swap numbers 1 and 2 in the proposed ordinance and the same thing with the matrix.

Mr. Baka added that the new number 1 would state that site plan reviews by the Planning Board as referenced in section 7.25 (1) of this section are also required.

01-07-19

H. PRE-APPLICATION DISCUSSION

1. 203 Pierce St., Toast Birmingham

Mr. Tony ~~Manicilli~~ **Minicilli**, Director of Operations for Toast, was present with Mr. Chris ~~Gadelka~~ **Gadulka**, Executive Chef, and Ms. Reagan **Regan** Bloom with Toast. Mr. Manicilli said they are looking to change the required hours of their Special Land Use Permit ("SLUP") to 7 a.m. to 3 p.m. Monday through Friday and 8 a.m. to 4 p.m. on week-ends. They want to eliminate dinner and do special events in the evenings such as cooking classes and private parties.

Ms. Ecker advised they are required under their SLUP to serve breakfast, lunch, and dinner. To change that condition they would have to amend their SLUP. They can do one of two things to correct the violation:

- Start serving dinner again; or
- Go before the Planning Board and City Commission to get approval to strike the condition that they must serve dinner.

Ms. Ecker explained if they just wanted to have a restaurant with regular dining and no alcohol they would not need a SLUP. At the time this SLUP was approved the Planning Board and City Commission didn't feel a bistro license should be issued if the street would not be activated in the evenings. Mr. ~~Manicilli~~ **Minicilli** said on week-ends their customers generally have about an hour wait. During that wait, most people are in the City and walking around. Even if it is during the day and not at night they are adding to activity on the street.

Board members requested that in Toast's application for a change in their SLUP they include details on their special events and average customer count after 3 p.m. over the last six months or so.

Mr. Williams pointed out there are three other restaurants on Pierce and that are open at night and none are open for breakfast. So he would be inclined to go forward with this request.

Mr. ~~Manicilli~~ **Minicilli** responded for Ms. Whipple-Boyce that they have had 15 special events in the evening through December. He anticipates seeing an increase in pop-ups, cooking classes, or other events. He described a pop-up as an invitation for another chef to come in and set up a temporary restaurant with a different menu other than theirs for a one night event. The purpose is to receive an indication of whether to invest in opening a new restaurant.

Ms. Reagan **Regan Bloom** opined that increasing competition has had something to do with their declining dinner crowd.

Mr. Jeffares said these people have tried everything to get people in for dinner and it has been a valiant effort. They do quite a few events in the evening and he didn't think the board should try to force anybody to lose money.

01-08-19

I. MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS AND COMMUNICATIONS

- a. Communications (none)
- b. Administrative Approval Requests
 - 1589 W. Maple Rd., First United Methodist Church, wants to add a landscape feature in their front yard along Maple Rd. It is a paved round structure at grade with plantings that is meant as a quiet meditation area. On December 12, 2018, the consensus of the Planning Board members was to approve the proposal.
 - 505 N. Old Woodward Ave., Salvatore Scallopini – Revised seating from four barstools and 60 dining seats to six barstools and fifty-eight dining seats.
- c. Draft Agenda for the next Regular Planning Board Meeting of January 23, 2019
 - The entire site at Southfield and Brown for the addition of a duplex on Brown;
 - 469-479 N. Old Woodward for rezoning.

Chairman Clein suggested that the small vacant portion of the Brown site was split off into its own condominium unit and so is not part of the larger parcel anymore. Therefore, the larger parcel that has already been approved is not under discussion. It was decided to get an interpretation from the City Attorney on this matter.

01-09-19

J. PLANNING DIVISION ACTION ITEMS

- a. Staff report on previous requests (none)
- b. Additional items from tonight's meeting (none)

01-10-19

K. ADJOURNMENT

No further business being evident, the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 9:26 p.m.

Jana L. Ecker
Planning Director