

**CITY OF BIRMINGHAM
 PLANNING BOARD ACTION ITEMS
 OF WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 11, 2015**

Item	Page
PUBLIC HEARINGS	2
1. TO AMEND ARTICLE 03 SECTION 3.09 (B) (1) TO REQUIRE GLAZING IN THE TRIANGLE DISTRICT BETWEEN 1 FT. AND 8 FT. ABOVE GRADE ON THE GROUND FLOOR;	
AND	
TO AMEND ARTICLE 04, SECTION 4.83 WN-01 (WINDOW STANDARDS) TO SPECIFY THAT THE REQUIRED 70% GLAZING IS BETWEEN 1 AND 9 FT. ABOVE GRADE ON THE GROUND FLOOR IN ALL ZONE DISTRICTS	2
Motion by Mr. Boyle	3
Seconded by Mr. Williams to accept the amendments to the Zoning Ordinance as follows:	
<i>Article 04, section 4.83 WN-01</i>	
A. Storefront/Ground Floor Windows: Ground floors shall be designed with storefronts that have windows, doorways and signage, which are integrally designed. The following standards apply:	
1. No less than 70% of the storefront/ground floor facade <u>between 1 and 8 ft. above grade</u> shall be clear glass panels and doorway.	
6. <u>Blank walls of longer than 20 ft. shall not face a public street.</u>	
<i>Article 03, section 3.09 (b) (1)</i>	
B. Windows and Doors	
1, Storefront/Ground Floor, Ground floors shall be designed with storefronts that have windows, doorways and signage, which are integrally designed and painted. No less than 70% of the storefront/ground floor facade <u>between 1 and 8 ft. above grade</u> shall be clear glass panels and doorway.	
Motion carried, 7-0.	3
UNFINISHED BUSINESS	5
1. Preliminary Site Plan Review	
2400 and 2430 E. Lincoln St., vacant property	
Birmingham Senior Living	
Application for Preliminary Site Plan Review to allow construction of two new attached single-family homes (postponed from October 14, 2015)	

Item	Page
<p>Motion by Ms. Whipple-Boyce Seconded by Mr. Share to approve the Preliminary Site Plan for 2400 and 2430 E. Lincoln subject to the following conditions: 1) The applicant must provide a detailed analysis of the glazing provided based on area at final site plan review to verify that the requirement has been met; 2) Applicant must submit specs on all mechanical equipment and lighting; 3) All improvements in the right-of-way receive approval from the Engineering Dept; 4) Applicant must provide a detailed photometric plan at the time of Final Site Plan Review; 5) Applicant must provide screening wall details at the time of Final Site Plan Review; 6) Applicant must provide material and color samples at Final Site Plan review; 7) Applicant add street parking on Lincoln St. subject to Engineering Dept. approval; 8) Applicant score the concrete in the fire lane at the northeast corner to look like a sidewalk; 9) Applicant provide a canopy on the Lincoln St. entrance; 10) Applicant provide a connection to the west park area; and 11) Applicant provide a seating area in the lower parking peninsula.</p> <p>Amended by Chairman Clein and accepted to add that street parking is subject to Engineering Dept. approval.</p>	7
<p>Motion carried, 6-0.</p>	8
<p>FINAL SITE PLAN REVIEW 1. 1193 Floyd St., vacant building (former salon) Application for Final Site Plan Review to allow construction of a new 12 unit residential building</p>	8
<p>Motion by Temporary Chairman Boyle Seconded by Mr. Williams to postpone this discussion on Final Site Plan Review to January 13, 2016 and take into account the comments that have been made. He personally is concerned about the issue regarding accessibility. Staff is asked to take this to the appropriate departments and when the developer comes back make sure the board is aware and clear as to what the circumstances would be regarding accessibility. Therefore, the City has an issue regarding the easement, and the developer has an issue regarding accessibility.</p>	12

Item	Page
<p>Motion carried, 4-1.</p>	<p>12</p>
<p>PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN REVIEW</p>	
<p>1. 885 Redding Rd.</p>	<p>13</p>
<p>Application for Preliminary Site Plan Review to allow construction of two new residential condominiums, each with attached garage</p>	
<p>Motion by Mr. Share</p>	
<p>Seconded by Mr. Koseck to approve the Preliminary Site Plan for 885 Redding with the following conditions:</p>	<p>14</p>
<p>1) Applicant submit a landscaping and a photometric plan that complies with all ordinance requirements;</p>	
<p>2) Applicant must provide material samples at Final Site Plan Review;</p>	
<p>3) Applicant address the concerns of all City Departments;</p>	
<p>4) Applicant must move the building back not more than 7.25 ft. from front to rear;</p>	
<p>5) Applicant study the potential relocation of the HVAC units and reduction from four to two.</p>	
<p>Motion carried, 7-0.</p>	<p>14</p>

**CITY OF BIRMINGHAM
REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING BOARD
WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 11, 2015
City Commission Room
151 Martin Street, Birmingham, Michigan**

Minutes of the regular meeting of the City of Birmingham Planning Board held on November 11, 2015. Chairman Scott Clein convened the meeting at 7:30 p.m.

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

Absent: Board Member Gillian Lazar; Student Representatives Scott Casperson, Andrea Laverty

Administration: Matthew Baka, Senior Planner
Sean Campbell, Asst. Planner
Jana Ecker, Planning Director
Carole Salutes, Recording Secretary

11-217-15

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE REGULAR PLANNING BOARD MEETING
OF OCTOER 28, 2015**

Motion by Mr. Williams

Seconded by Ms. Whipple-Boyce to approve the Minutes of October 28, 2015 as presented.

Motion carried, 6-0.

VOICE VOTE

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

Nays: None

Abstain: Share

Absent: Lazar

11-218-15

CHAIRPERSON'S COMMENTS

On this Veteran's Day the chairman thanked the veterans for their service.

Ms. Ecker introduced Sean Campbell, Asst. Planner, who started with the City five weeks ago.

11-219-15

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA (no change)

11-220-15

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. **TO AMEND ARTICLE 03 SECTION 3.09 (B) (1) TO REQUIRE GLAZING IN THE TRIANGLE DISTRICT BETWEEN 1 FT. AND 8 FT. ABOVE GRADE ON THE GROUND FLOOR;**
AND
TO AMEND ARTICLE 04, SECTION 4.83 WN-01 (WINDOW STANDARDS) TO SPECIFY THAT THE REQUIRED 70% GLAZING IS BETWEEN 1 AND 9 FT. ABOVE GRADE ON THE GROUND FLOOR IN ALL ZONE DISTRICTS

Chairman Clein opened the public hearing at 7:34 p.m.

Mr. Baka recalled that at the October 14, 2015 Planning Board meeting the board discussed the issues related to the current window standards and the recurring need for applicants to seek variances from the Board of Zoning Appeals ("BZA"). Although it was acknowledged that additional changes need to be made beyond what is currently proposed, it was determined that there should to be further study on certain aspects of the standards before additional changes can be recommended. It was decided however, that the standard of measuring the percentage of glazing on a site should be consistently measured between 1 and 8 ft. above grade. Accordingly, the Planning Board set a public hearing for November 11, 2015 to consider amendments to the window standards contained in the Zoning Ordinance.

The first floor glazing standards are inconsistent throughout the zones. In the Downtown Overlay the 70% requirement is only applied between 1 and 8 ft. above grade. In the Triangle District and window standards of section 4.83, the 70% requirement is applied to the entire first floor. The result of this difference is that outside of the Downtown Overlay it requires a significantly larger amount of glazing to satisfy the requirement. A lot of developments are having a hard time meeting this standard. In order to provide consistency throughout the ordinance and still achieve the pedestrian and public interaction intended by the standards, the Planning Division recommends amending the first floor standards in the Triangle District and Section 4.83 to require 70% glazing between 1 and 8 ft. above grade. Staff believes that the addition of this provision to these two sections will significantly decrease the frequency of variance applications, while still achieving the intent of the standards.

The other proposed standard to be added to section 4.83 is that blank walls of longer than 20 ft. shall not face a public street.

There were no comments from the public at 7:36 p.m.

Motion by Mr. Boyle

Seconded by Mr. Williams to accept the amendments to the Zoning Ordinance as follows:

Article 04, section 4.83 WN-01

- A. Storefront/Ground Floor Windows: Ground floors shall be designed with storefronts that have windows, doorways and signage, which are integrally designed. The following standards apply:**
- 1. No less than 70% of the storefront/ground floor facade between 1 and 8 ft. above grade shall be clear glass panels and doorway.**
 - 6. Blank walls of longer than 20 ft. shall not face a public street.**

Article 03, section 3.09 (b) (1)

B. Windows and Doors

- 1, Storefront/Ground Floor, Ground floors shall be designed with storefronts that have windows, doorways and signage, which are integrally designed and painted. No less than 70% of the storefront/ground floor facade between 1 and 8 ft. above grade shall be clear glass panels and doorway.**

No one from the audience wished to comment at 7:37 p.m.

Motion carried, 7-0.

VOICE VOTE

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

Nays: None

Absent: Lazar

The chairman closed the public hearing at 7:38 p.m.

11-221-15

COURTESY REVIEW OF PUBLIC PROPERTY

- 1. Chesterfield Fire Station
Birmingham Fire Dept.**

Ms. Ecker introduced Chief John Connaughton from the Birmingham Fire Dept. Chief Connaughton then introduced Mr. Stacy Peterson, Principal Architect from Sidock Group of Novi. Mr. Peterson noted the replacement fire station will be located on the north side of Maple Rd. between Chesterfield and Fairfax where the present Chesterfield Fire Station presently exists. It is approximately 8,900 sq. ft. which allows for potential development and use of the adjoining site. The building is set back so that the longest piece of apparatus can leave the building and not cross the sidewalk. Right down the property line on the east side there is an 8 in. combined sanitary and storm sewer. The placement of the building will allow that sewer to remain without having to relocate it. Mr. Peterson went on to describe the building. They have elected to go with a blend of a commercial and residential style design for the station using a brick facade and shingled roof.

In response to questions from Mr. Williams, as to what is expected in this type of review, Ms. Ecker indicated that Planning Board should provide their comments with regards to the site plan including the placement of screen walls, the placement and design of the building, layout etc. as they would on a private development. Mr. Peterson established there is 200 ft. from the eastern portion of the building to Fairfax. There are two residences on the north property line. Mr. Williams noticed the houses are not shown on the picture that was provided. Ms. Ecker advised there has not been discussion at the City Commission regarding the use of the vacant parcel to the east.

Mr. Jeffares noted there is 70 ft. of blank wall along Chesterfield, and on the side there is one lone window. The City seems not to hold itself to the same high standards of architecture as it does for private developers. Mr. Williams commented that Chesterfield is quite heavily traveled and Fairfax is wide open.

Mr. Koseck offered the following comments:

- The dumpster is in a bad location. He would make it less visible.
- All elevations of the building need to be designed with some sensitivity.
- The renderings do not show context of the project.
- The west elevation is not attractive. He asked if the building could become a mirror image so the blank wall would be facing the green space.
- There is no screen wall along the parking lot on Chesterfield.
- In his mind there is nothing unique about this fire station, as there should be because it is a civic building.
- The pedestrian entryway seems dwarfed.
- A drive to nowhere comes in off of Fairfax.

Ms. Whipple-Boyce said she feels the board doesn't know what they are supposed to do for a courtesy review. Civic buildings should be held to the same standards as all of the other commercial architecture that the Planning Board reviews. She hopes the City Commission will recognize this time around that a better process is needed for these courtesy reviews.

Mr. Williams questioned how much additional cost there would be to relocate the sewer and water lines to the east. The board would never let this happen with a private developer, particularly with no plans for the east portion of the property.

Mr. Share asked what impact the generator has on the neighboring businesses and residences when it runs. Mr. Peterson answered they have minimized the impact as best they can. It runs once a week. Mr. Share noted further:

- He is troubled by the unbroken mass on the side so close to Chesterfield.
- The parking lot that butts up to Chesterfield without a screen wall and landscaping is a concern.
- Where public buildings are not held to the same high standards as private, there should be a good, well articulated, reason.

Mr. Boyle expressed his opinion that this building is not good enough for Birmingham.

Chairman Clein added his comments:

- No screen wall is called out on the site plan along the north property line. Mr. Peterson said the plan is for an 8 ft. high masonry screen wall.
- He is deeply troubled by the sheer size of the curb cut; it must be doubled from existing.
- This site plan as submitted by a private developer would never be passed. There are too many things related to screening, screening adjacent to residential, placement of the building, massing, windows, connection to the street - in addition to the design elements that Mr. Koseck talked about. Perhaps the City Commission should require all buildings to go through site plan review.

The chairman took comments from the audience at 8:15 p.m.

Mr. J.C. Cataldo, 271 Chesterfield, was concerned that there has been no public notification for a publicly funded project of this size. He would like to know what sets this project apart from all privately funded projects that have to go through multiple levels of scrutiny, as this project does not appear to have satisfied even the basic standards of design. Mr. Cataldo wondered why the Architectural Review Committee wasn't included at the design phase. He questioned if this is the best we can do with a building that will be viewed by thousands per day and admired by future generations? He suggested this project be reviewed with the same requirements and the same attention to detail as all projects of this magnitude.

11-222-15

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Preliminary Site Plan Review 2400 and 2430 E. Lincoln St., vacant property Birmingham Senior Living

Application for Preliminary Site Plan Review to allow construction of two new attached single-family homes (postponed from October 14, 2015)

Mr. Williams announced he has a conflict of interest and will recuse himself from this review.

Mr. Baka noted the subject site, 2400 E. Lincoln St., has a total land area of 3.78 acres. It is located on the south side of E. Lincoln between S. Eton St. and the Grand Trunk Railroad right-of-way.

The applicant is proposing to develop the vacant site with a four-story senior living center, two surface parking lots, a detention basin and nearly 84,000 sq. ft. of landscaped open space. The proposed development will consist of two connected buildings. The east portion is one story and the west portion is four stories. The development will provide 122 residential units (83 assisted living and 39 memory care units) along with building amenities for residents such as a community room, beauty salon, and wellness suite.

The site is currently zoned MX and lies within the Eton Road Corridor Plan area. The applicant was required to prepare a Community Impact Study ("CIS") as they are proposing a new building containing more than 20,000 square feet of gross floor area.

On September 30, 2015 the Planning Board voted to accept the CIS and on October 14, 2015 the Planning Board postponed the Preliminary Site Plan review to allow the applicant additional time to strengthen or redesign the drop-off area at the front of the building. The applicant has redesigned the front of the building and moved the drop-off area to the interior of the front parking lot. The capacity of the front parking lot has been reduced and now includes a roundabout and porte cochere that provides a covered drop-off area. The plans now indicate additional spaces along the back of the building. The project is required to have 68 parking spots and the applicant is proposing 69.

The height of the building roof deck has been reduced to 45 ft. and the building has been moved forward to 3 ft. from the frontage line. The plan now meets the Zoning Ordinance requirement based on the interpretation of the Building Official.

The newly revised plans indicate there will be a pedestrian entrance located on the front elevation adjacent to the vehicular drop-off in the front parking area. Article 04, section 4.76 SS-08 (A) (5) states that all buildings shall have their principal pedestrian entrance on the frontage line. As currently designed, the entrance on the frontage line does not incorporate elements commonly associated with a "main" entrance.

The Fire Marshal has indicated that the 20 ft. access road is not required to provide full vehicular access around the building. The revised plan has been designed based on the guidelines given by the Fire Marshal. The Fire Marshal has stated he would like to see the northern road come down an additional 75 ft. in order to provide access within 150 ft. to any point on the building.

Design Review

The new building facades are composed of brick, wood-look fiber cement siding, fiber cement panels, glass, and metal trim. The plans state that the north elevation first floor has 70% glazing to meet the requirements of section 4.83 of the Zoning Ordinance. However, it appears that the calculation was done based on the amount of linear glazing provided, not 70% of the area of the first floor. **The applicant must provide a detailed analysis of the glazing provided based on area at Final Site Plan review to verify that the requirement has been met.**

Material details have not been provided at this time, but will be required at the time of Final Site Plan Review. The proposed building appears to be compatible with the buildings in the immediate neighborhood. Architectural standards and design related issues will be discussed at the Final Site Plan and Design Review.

Mr. Sean Havera, Mr. Ron Hughes and Mr. Don Bailey were present with Hughes Properties, along with Mr. Matt Boons with CA Ventures, joint venture partner; and Ms. Chauncey Hoffman with Harley Ellis Devereaux, the architect. Mr. Havera indicated they took a hard look at the comments that were made at the last meeting and made the changes.

Ms. Chauncey Hoffman described that the pocket park to the right of the drop-off area will contain seating and plantings.

Mr. Koseck received answers from the applicant as to several requests:

- The fire lane can be scored as a sidewalk so it will not be like a street.
- The street tree spacing can be adjusted so it doesn't look like one is missing.
- Lincoln would look complete by having parking on either side as opposed to just on one side. Therefore he suggested widening the street. That would make the sidewalk more pedestrian and mirror the development to the north.
- The canopy can be extended to wrap the corner and add pedestrian scale to the entrance.

Mr. Boyle said he is looking for the way the pedestrian connects to the west. Ms. Hoffman said a crosswalk at the southwest corner of the building will be incorporated for the next iteration. Mr. Boyle thought a few tables and chairs would be a great addition to that area.

At 8:45 p.m. the chairman noted there was no one in the audience that wished to comment.

Motion by Ms. Whipple-Boyce

Seconded by Mr. Share to approve the Preliminary Site Plan for 2400 and 2430 E. Lincoln subject to the following conditions:

- 1) The applicant must provide a detailed analysis of the glazing provided based on area at final site plan review to verify that the requirement has been met;
- 2) Applicant must submit specs on all mechanical equipment and lighting;
- 3) All improvements in the right-of-way receive approval from the Engineering Dept;
- 4) Applicant must provide a detailed photometric plan at the time of Final Site Plan Review;
- 5) Applicant must provide screening wall details at the time of Final Site Plan Review;
- 6) Applicant must provide material and color samples at Final Site Plan review;
- 7) Applicant add street parking on Lincoln St. subject to Engineering Dept. approval;
- 8) Applicant score the concrete in the fire lane at the northeast corner to look like a sidewalk;
- 9) Applicant provide a canopy on the Lincoln St. entrance;
- 10) Applicant provide a connection to the west park area; and
- 11) Applicant provide a seating area in the lower parking peninsula.

Amended by Chairman Clein and accepted to add that street parking is subject to Engineering Dept. approval.

There were no final comments from the public at 8:50 p.m.

Motion carried, 6-0.

VOICE VOTE

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

Nays: None

Recused: Williams

Absent: Lazar

11-223-15

FINAL SITE PLAN REVIEW

1. 1193 Floyd St., vacant building (former salon)

Application for Final Site Plan Review to allow construction of a new 12 unit residential building

Mr. Share and Chairman Clein recused themselves from this review **due to a conflict of interest** and Mr. Boyle took over as temporary Chair for this hearing.

Ms. Ecker advised the subject site contains an existing building that is currently vacant along with the associated parking lot. The 0.23 acre site is located on Floyd St. two blocks west of the E. Lincoln and Woodward Ave. intersection. The applicant is proposing to demolish the existing building and construct a two-story, 12-unit multi-family residential building and parking facility.

On July 8, 2015, the Planning Board approved the Preliminary Site Plan review with several conditions.

The Final Site Plan Review provides the required and proposed bulk, area, and placement regulations for the proposed project based on O-1 provisions, as the City Commission did not rezone the property to TZ-2 as proposed by the Planning Board.

In order to meet the screening requirement, the height of the mechanical equipment screenwall must be greater than or equal to the height of the proposed mechanical unit. ***The applicant will be required to increase the height of the plantings to fully screen the mechanical units or obtain a variance from the Board of Zoning Appeals ("BZA").*** The applicant has advised that they will increase the height of the plantings to meet the requirements.

The lighting as originally proposed in the photometric plan exceeded the maximum level of 1.5 fc at the north lot line. The applicant is also proposing one Lithonia DSX1 LED cut-off fixture to be mounted 16 ft. from the ground on a pole within the parking lot. The fc illumination levels in the circulation area as originally submitted have a maximum to minimum ratio of variation of 25.5:1. Article 4, Section 4.21 (F) (3) states the maximum to minimum ratio of variation of luminance in the circulation areas must be no greater than 20:1. The applicant advised that they will downsize the size of the bulb in the proposed parking lot fixture. The applicant has submitted a revised photometric plan that meets all requirements.

In accordance with accessibility requirements of Section 1107.6.2 of the Michigan Building Code, a number of the dwelling units will need to comply with accessibility standards. As proposed, none of the units comply as they are all accessed by stairways.

Design Review

Material samples were provided along with digital images of the materials. The materials proposed are as follows:

- Grey, "Capitol Iron Spot" smooth brick and grey, smooth lap fiber cement panels for the majority of the building elevations;
- Aluminum and glass windows;
- Grey, laser cut, decorative metal screen panels for rooftop screening and balcony railing;
- Stained, western red cedar wood doors for the dumpster area; and
- Wood stained cedar lap fiber cement panels on balcony walls.

Motion by Mr. Williams

Seconded by Mr. Jeffares to accept for filing an e-mail from Dana Markus and a second e-mail from Scott Markus.

Motion carried, 5-0.

VOICE VOTE

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

Nays: None

Recused: Clein, Share

Absent: Lazar

West (Floyd St.) Elevation: The front elevation of the building is proposed to be primarily constructed of grey masonry brick and grey fiber cement siding. There are two upper-floor balconies and nine clear glass windows proposed. The front elevation signage will display the word "Floyd" in grey metal/acrylic letters that are illuminated.

East Elevation: The east elevation is virtually identical to the west elevation, excluding the overhang with signage.

North (parking lot) Elevation: The north elevation is proposed to be constructed primarily of grey fiber cement lap siding and grey masonry brick and has 16 clear glass windows. The other half of the proposed address signage is located at the far right edge of the north elevation and will display the number "1193."

South (park facing) Elevation: The south elevation is proposed to be constructed primarily of grey fiber cement lap siding and grey masonry brick. There are sixteen 8 ft. x 8 ft. windows on the eight upper level units and each of the four garden level studios has two 8 ft. x 3 ft. sliding windows that sit just above the ground.

Signage: An 8 in. high metal wall sign, 6 ft. in length that displays the address is proposed at the northwest corner of the building for a total of 4 sq. ft. of signage. The grey metal/acrylic letters will be illuminated at no more than .08 fc. Address signs are

permitted provided they are 8 in. in height or less. Therefore, the proposed sign complies with the Sign Ordinance.

Mr. Williams thought if there have to be modifications to the layout of the building for the purpose of accessibility the design will change. Ms. Ecker said that one of the options is adding elevators to make sure one or more units are accessible.

Mr. Koseck noted if this project was adjacent to private property rather than a City park, a firewall would be needed.

Mr. John Skoke and Ms. Elise Beatrice with McIntosh Paris Associates represented the architect. Mr. Chuck DiMaggio from Burton Katzman was also present to represent the property owners. Mr. Skoke noted there are nine total fixtures in the photometric. There are four condensing units on the side of the building to service the lower level apartments. The upper eight apartments have through-wall units. The sidewalk along the west side of the building will be re-paved. An 6 ft. access easement is currently being negotiated with the City along the park side for maintenance as well as for construction access.

Mr. Chuck DiMaggio explained the 6 ft. easement along the south side of the property will serve a number of purposes. They propose to put the cable lines underground in the park. They also need a temporary construction easement for that side of the building and a permanent maintenance easement for cleaning.

Mr. Skoke said there is no firewall requirement for this project with its current adjacencies even though they are building at the property line. With respect to elevators, this building is not large enough to require elevators. ~~Therefore,~~ **since** they are separating the building into four smaller components with three structurally independent units per component. Each component uses one entry door for its three units. This creates a vertical separation of the building.

Mr. Koseck received clarification that the garden level unit is not considered a story. To not qualify as a story, more than 50% of the floor-to-floor dimension must be below the ground, and more than 50% of the lower floor is below ground.

Mr. Skoke explained the through-wall air conditioning units are located on the side wall of the balconies. These are less expensive and easier to maintain than units placed on the roof. The four units on the ground are not on the roof for that same reason. Ms. Whipple-Boyce responded that she starts to worry when the design of a project is being compromised by the budget.

It was noted the YMCA runs a day camp in that general area of the park.

Ms. Ecker read two letters into the record, one from Dana Markus and one from Scott Markus, suggesting that the proposed development be denied.

The temporary Chair called for comments from members of the public at 9:40 p.m.

Mr. Fidon Taki, 632 Ruffner, explained most of the residents living in this neighborhood are young families with kids. This building is not designed for families and is a negative for their community.

Mr. Tom Alochefski, 631 Ruffner, said the proposed building doesn't seem to fit in with the community environment. In his opinion it is an urban loft type style that contrasts with its surroundings. Additionally, he is concerned that the City may give up public park space.

Mr. Jess Ruud, 457 Catalpa, thought the development doesn't belong in this neighborhood. Low-cost housing such as this will decrease their property values. It is a bad design in a bad location. Most of the neighbors are strongly opposed. Therefore he thought the board should reconsider.

Ms. Meredith Carol, 520 Catalpa, expressed her opposition to the proposal and named others who wrote letters that generally indicated the proposed development doesn't seem to be a good fit for the neighborhood.

Mr. Michael Poris, 527 Graton, spoke as a resident of Birmingham. The majority of the units are 800 rather than 600 sq. ft. More than 50% of household residents in the U.S. are singles. These apartments make Birmingham a homogenous place. In response to Mr. Jeffares, Mr. DiMaggio said the rent structure will run from \$1,500 to \$2,000/month.

Mr. Jeffares noted the dearth of affordable apartments in Birmingham and that this project offers something the City doesn't have.

Mr. DiMaggio stated the property is zoned O-1 Office and that permits residential units. They meet all of the Zoning Ordinance requirements at it relates to that. Burton Katzman will do a good job maintaining the building and they know the City will be proud of it.

Ms. Whipple-Boyce said she had hoped to see a true townhouse, not an attempt to be a townhouse so as not to have to conform to the Disabilities Code. She was especially disturbed by the below-grade garden level and the small size of the units. She feels this site and this area deserves better.

Mr. Koseck noted this project contains a lot of oddities that concern him:

- Someone's window is a foot and a half from his public park.
- The City would be giving away rights to public property and for what purpose.
- The project is out of place in this neighborhood. It should be in the Rail District.
- The lower-level apartments are a basement.

Ms. Ecker was asked to read a list of permitted uses for this zoning. Mr. Jeffares thought some of them were less desirable than this.

Mr. Williams stated the fact of the matter is that the zoning permits this type of development. However, an explanation on the barrier-free aspect has not been resolved. If the board is to proceed on this project he would like the Building Official to

attend the next meeting. Additionally, he agrees with the comment about the City's position on the park. The City should decide first if it wants to give up rights that it has in the park. After the City has made this decision he will vote one way or the other on the project. He won't vote on anything assuming the City will agree.

Motion by Temporary Chairman Boyle

Seconded by Mr. Williams to postpone this discussion on Final Site Plan Review to January 13, 2016 and take into account the comments that have been made. He personally is concerned about the issue regarding accessibility. Staff is asked to take this to the appropriate departments and when the developer comes back make sure the board is aware and clear as to what the circumstances would be regarding accessibility. Therefore, the City has an issue regarding the easement, and the developer has an issue regarding accessibility.

There was no public comment on the motion at 10:15 p.m.

Motion carried, 4-1.

VOICE VOTE

Yeas: Boyle, Williams, Jeffares, Koseck

Nays: Whipple-Boyce

Recused: Clein, Share

Absent: Lazar

11-224-15

PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN REVIEW

1. 885 Redding Rd.

Application for Preliminary Site Plan Review to allow construction of two new residential condominiums, each with attached garage

Ms. Ecker explained the subject site is a 0.39 acre parcel located on the south side of Redding Rd. between Lakeside Dr. and North Old Woodward Ave. in the R-4 Zoning District. The applicant is proposing to demolish the existing residential structure and build a new two-unit condominium building on the 16,988 sq. ft. parcel. Both of the units are approximately 3,100 sq. ft. in size.

The plan proposes removing the existing concrete approach and driveway on the west side of the parcel and constructing a new 11 ft. wide vehicular driveway on the east side of the parcel. Vehicles will access the site via the new driveway which leads to the two-car attached garages as well as covered porch entrances for both units.

The public sidewalk is proposed to remain in its current location along Redding Rd. Pedestrians will be able to enter each unit through the enclosed garages as well as the covered porch entranceways adjacent to each attached garage. In addition, there is an entrance with a covered porch on the front (north) elevation facing Redding Rd. While there is no direct walkway from this entry door to the public sidewalk, there is a walkway that connects the entry and porch to the driveway in front of the building.

Design Review

A complete design review will be conducted at Final Site Plan Review. However, the applicant is currently proposing the following materials:

- Aberdeen Brick – main building face material;
- Course Texture Stucco – accents and trim;
- CertainTeed 'Driftwood' Roof Shingles – roof of building;
- JELD-WEN windows in Chestnut Brown.

Motion by Mr. Williams

Seconded by Ms. Whipple-Boyce to accept for filing an e-mail from Fred Capaldi dated November 9, 2015.

Motion carried, 7-0.

VOICE VOTE

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

Nays: None

Absent: Lazar

Mr. Boyle was pleased this building fits in under the current zoning.

Mr. Share was concerned about the location of the mechanical units in relation to the single-family house next door.

Mr. Rick Wiand with Hunter Roberts Homes was present with Jessica from his firm and Mr. Jeffrey Klatt with Krieger Klatt Architects. These units are intended to be occupied by empty nesters who are downsizing. In response to a request from the adjacent neighbor, Mr. Wiand stated that they propose to move the building back 7.25 ft. They will also try to find a location in the rear for the air conditioning units, which they will try to reduce from four units to two.

Ms. Ecker read the letter into the record from Fred and Barb Capaldi which supported the project.

Chairman Clein took comments from the public at 10:34 p.m.

Mr. Mike Minna, 857 Redding, was concerned with the flipping of the driveway. He thought that his driveway and the applicant's driveway on the common lot line would create drainage issues. Additionally, several large arborvitaes will be taken out because of the driveway. He also noted his home is 61 ft. from the sidewalk and the applicant is proposing 25 ft. He appreciates they are in compliance but this building will stick out much further than his home and the other homes on both the north and south side of Redding.

Mr. Wiand said that in designing the driveways they took advantage of allowing southern light and western light into the units. For that reason he prefers not to change the location of the driveways. He hopes to come back with a screening plan that will be

acceptable to Mr. Minna. Additionally, they will work with Mr. Minna to make sure they are not draining on his property.

Motion by Mr. Share

Seconded by Mr. Koseck to approve the Preliminary Site Plan for 885 Redding with the following conditions:

- 1) Applicant submit a landscaping and a photometric plan that complies with all ordinance requirements;**
- 2) Applicant must provide material samples at Final Site Plan Review;**
- 3) Applicant address the concerns of all City Departments;**
- 4) Applicant must move the building back not more than 7.25 ft. from front to rear;**
- 5) Applicant study the potential relocation of the HVAC units and reduction from four to two.**

There was no discussion from the public at 10:45 p.m.

Motion carried, 7-0.

VOICE VOTE

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

Nays: None

Absent: Lazar

11-225-15

MEETING OPEN TO THE PUBLIC FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA (none)

11-226-15

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS AND COMMUNICATIONS

a. Communications (none)

b. Administrative Approval Correspondence

- 33588 Woodward Ave. - Change building color from 'Fatigue Green' to B.M. 2134-10, 'Night Horizon'; and placement of an ice box and propane cage under the canopy against the building. Ms. Whipple-Boyce was disappointed that the ice and propane were placed at the front. She felt these things should either be in the store or in the back.

c. Draft Agenda for the Regular Planning Board Meeting on December 9, 2015

- 856 N. Old Woodward Ave., Preliminary Site Plan and Community Impact Study

d. Other Business

- Mr. Baka advised that Comerica Bank has an approved plan to screen the HVAC units on the roof, but they have not pulled permits to do the work.

11-227-15

PLANNING DIVISION ACTION ITEMS

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

11-228-15

ADJOURNMENT

No further business being evident, board members motioned to adjourn at 10:50 p.m.

Jana Ecker
Planning Director

APPROVED