

**CITY OF BIRMINGHAM  
REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING BOARD  
THURSDAY, MARCH 11, 2020**

City Commission Room  
151 Martin Street, Birmingham, Michigan

Minutes of the regular meeting of the City of Birmingham Planning Board held on March 11, 2020. 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; Alternate Board Members Jason Emerine, Nasseem Ramin; Student Representative June Lee

**Absent:** Student Representative Rachel Hester

**Administration:** Jana Ecker, Planning Director  
Nicholas Dupuis, City Planner  
Laura Eichenhorn, Transcriptionist

**City Commission:** Brad Host

**Master Planning Team:**  
Robert Gibbs, Gibbs Planning Group  
Sarah Traxler, McKenna

**03-36-20**

**B. Approval Of The Minutes Of The Regular Planning Board Meeting of February 27, 2020**

Mr. Share stated that in page four, line four, the word 'will' should be removed. In line seven on page four, the word 'will' should be changed to 'must'.

**Motion by Mr. Share**

**Seconded by Mr. Williams to approve the minutes of the Regular Planning Board Meeting of February 27, 2020 as amended.**

**Motion carried, 5-0.**

VOICE VOTE

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

Nays: None

Abstain: Koseck, Boyle

**03-37-20**

### **C. Chairperson's Comments**

Chairman Clein explained the topic and procedure for the evening's meeting.

Planning Director Ecker introduced June Lee, one of the two new student representatives to the Planning Board.

**03-38-20**

### **D. Review Of The Agenda**

There were no changes to the agenda.

**03-39-20**

### **E. Study Session Items**

#### **1. Review of Draft Master Plan Document – Section B.1. Neighborhood Components (pages 85 – 139)**

Mr. Gibbs commenced the presentation of the item.

Chairman Clein asked for a pause in the presentation to allow for public and Board comment.

In reply to a question from Joan Ritter, Chairman Clein explained that some of the lots that were highlighted were areas being potentially recommended for denser housing along the neighborhood seams.

Carl Kona said that according to the draft's neighborhood delineations, his downtown condo would be grouped into a neighborhood with many larger residential homes with more property. He shared concern that his needs for his street would be outweighed by the larger contingent of less centrally-located homes with different needs.

Peggy Peterson said she does not see enough development planned in the draft for the neighborhoods on the east side of Woodward. She said she would like more destinations to which people on the east side of Woodward could walk, such as parks, coffee shops, or bookstores.

In reply to a question from Larry Bertolini, Planning Director Ecker stated that the draft proposes the creation of some cohesive zoning characteristics within each neighborhood to allow for increased neighborhood distinctiveness.

Katie Pierce said 'neighborhoods' would be potentially too divisive a phrase, and that calling the draft's proposed neighborhoods 'districts' instead would minimize that divisiveness. She said 'neighborhoods' emphasizes perceived differences in where people live in Birmingham in a potentially negative way. She said she liked the idea of a staff liaison position between the City and different districts, and that a social ambassador position could also be created to connect new residents to Birmingham resources and events. Ms. Pierce concluded her comments by saying

she shared similar concerns to Mr. Kona about neighborhood associations making decisions on the neighborhood level. She said that neighborhood associations could disagree with each other, or become cliquish, both of which would be negative outcomes of their existence.

Mr. Williams stated that the Board had previously tried to re-energize parts of Torry along Adams. He said that during that initiative there was virtually no participation from Torry residents, and that the single resident that did participate was against moving a coffeeshop, bakery, or similar small commercial destination to the area. Mr. Williams said that a method of regular communication between Torry and the City would have significantly benefited the initiative. He said that while he suspected at the time that that single resident did not represent Torry, the City had no efficient way to solicit the input of other residents in the area if they did not attend the discussions on the initiative. He advocated strongly for a liaison or some other way to reliably increase communication between neighborhoods, City government, and City boards and committees.

Mr. Share concurred with Mr. Williams's comments. He said finding more efficient ways to facilitate communication between residents and the City regarding land planning would benefit the City, and is worthwhile to consider as part of the master planning process.

Mr. Koseck said the neighborhood gathering places should be more of a focus, as opposed to the neighborhood boundaries. He said he would prefer blurring of the neighborhood zones and more seamlessness between them since boundaries often result in unnecessary politicization.

Ms. Whipple-Boyce said she agreed with many of the previous comments made by other Board members. She said she liked the idea of a social ambassador, per Ms. Pierce's suggestion. She said the social ambassador should convey information directly to residents, possibly through a platform such as Nextdoor, instead of through neighborhood associations. Ms. Whipple-Boyce stated neighborhood associations are sometimes politicized, and sometimes do not adequately represent all residents within a neighborhood. Ms. Whipple-Boyce continued that decisions such as parking on streets should not be left up to individual neighborhoods, at the risk of making the decisions contentious and politicized. She said that the City has many boards that would be better equipped to make such decisions, and that neighborhood associations should occupy a social function, not a political one.

Mr. Jeffares said he agreed with Ms. Whipple-Boyce's statement that the City should directly communicate information to residents, and also that neighborhood associations would be an inappropriate mechanism for conveying City information. He said that while it is not the City's job to facilitate social interactions, providing places where social interactions can more easily occur is a land planning issue and a worthwhile goal. He also said that the path along the Rouge River should be emphasized as one of the best ways to connect neighborhoods within the City.

Chairman Clein said that he did not think the master plan should be venturing into issues of social engineering. He said planning districts are a useful concept to consider, and could be used to make sure that City resources are distributed more equitably among household groups. Chairman Clein agreed with Mr. Koseck, however, in saying that the neighborhoods and neighborhood associations should remain untouched by the master planning process in order not to risk politicizing the differences between them. He stated that he would welcome a memo from the

master planning team recommending staff positions or voting privileges, but that it is not a matter of land use proper and should not be included in a master plan. He said recommendations regarding how far out the noticing shed should go could be useful and are a land planning issue. Chairman Clein concluded by saying he no longer wanted to engage in conversations regarding neighborhood associations within the master planning context.

Mr. Gibbs said it would be helpful to receive clarification in the future regarding the proposed boundaries of the planning districts and the City's preferred number of planning districts.

Mr. Gibbs then provided a general overview of the topic of parking in neighborhoods.

Chairman Clein invited public comment.

Mr. Kona said that there should be some areas in Birmingham with permit parking only, combined with fines for violation of the rule. He explained that the parking demand in some areas is so high that prohibition of non-permit parking is the only reasonable option.

Mr. Horowitz noted that living in a walkable urban environment comes with compromises in terms of parking. He said that one cannot expect a pleasant, walkable environment and the amount of parking that comes with suburban sprawl, and that is a choice residents should be aware they are making.

Mr. Share said he was supportive of reducing the number of parking categories, as per the draft's recommendation. He said that he was not in support of the idea of funneling parking fees to the neighborhood that raises the fees. Mr. Share noted the City has a representative democracy, and therefore it is the Commission's responsibility to allocate resources and the various other boards and committee's responsibilities to make recommendations regarding those allocations.

Mr. Koseck said that giving the money raised to individual streets also did not make sense to him. He noted that residents pay high taxes and that there must be mechanisms in the City for residents to beautify their streets if they desire.

Ms. Whipple-Boyce and Mr. Williams voiced their agreement with Mr. Share and Mr. Koseck.

In reply to the recommendation that street speeds be lowered to 20 m.p.h., Ms. Ritter said that while she agreed, she did not think she would be able to drive at such a low speed.

In reply to a question from Mr. Lee, Planning Director Ecker stated that finishing the sidewalks around the City would have great benefit for pedestrians. She also noted that it would be in-line with the City's priority of being a walkable community.

In reply to Mr. Williams' comment that he has not seen cyclists using the trial bike path on Eton Road, Mr. Jeffares explained that the path does not work because it is not appropriate to have two columns of cyclists with elbows out travelling in opposite directions because they will make contact, and that there is a lot of glass on the surface of the bike path because it cannot be accessed by a street sweeper, which is also prohibitive to cyclists' use of the path. Mr. Jeffares

said he had already sent eight articles to City Manager Valentine explaining why the kind of design being tested on Eton Road is not appropriate for bicycle paths.

Ms. Whipple-Boyce said removing the parking lane from Lincoln would be a bad idea because it is working well for the residents there. She said she was also very supportive of getting sidewalks on all the streets in the City. She said that to Mr. Lee's point, she would like to see data and counts regarding the need for cycling lanes, paths, and loops before the City invests even more significantly in that kind of infrastructure. She said she liked the idea of the sharrows, and wanted to know if they could work.

Chairman Clein noted there are hundreds of studies that show that bicycle lanes and paths increase property values, increase rental rates, reduce crash numbers with pedestrians and reduce deaths.

Ms. Traxler explained that the majority of these recommendations were coming from the City's already adopted Multi-Modal Transportation Plan, and that the master plan team only added a few items here and there throughout the section.

Planning Director Ecker explained that the counts and other data were sourced from Strava and SEMCOG and were studied by the Multi-Modal Transportation Board. She stated that both sources showed that Birmingham has high rates of cyclist activity.

Mr. Williams stated that even though the bicycle lane on Eton is not used by cyclists, it has slowed traffic on Eton, which is a positive.

Mr. Share said that attempts in Huntington Woods to lower the speed limit from 25 m.p.h. to 20 m.p.h. on their streets have been rejected repeatedly by the Michigan Supreme Court.

In reply to Mr. Share's question regarding the design of bioswales, Mr. Gibbs explained that the master planning team is not looking to provide design recommendations on the bioswales or the exact type of bicycle infrastructure that should be included. He said the goals are much broader, and more like should the City increase its bicycle infrastructure, which would be designed at a later date, and should the City clean stormwater before it goes into the Rouge River, which would also be designed at a later date.

Chairman Clein explained bioswales would be installed between the greenspace and a sidewalk, and would be in addition to or in lieu of catch basins.

Mr. Koseck said that six foot sidewalks should be put in only where absolutely necessary due to engineering constraints, and that otherwise four foot sidewalks are preferable. He noted that every foot of additional concrete takes away greenspace.

In reply to the tree and green-space recommendations, Ms. Ritter said the City should be more accommodating if residents had a good reason to want to remove City-owned trees near their property.

In reply to Ms. Peterson, Planning Director Ecker confirmed landscaping is required as part of the building design for new buildings in the City.

Mr. Koseck said he would empathetically recommend policy that requires each street tree have plans for replacement before they are cut down.

Mr. Boyle said the City should state that in residential districts there is a tree preservation policy. He noted that in the downtown developers have to replace and provide street trees, and the same should be required in residential areas at least along the sidewalks, and maybe even into people's backyards.

Chairman Clein said that maintaining greenspace and minimizing concrete wherever appropriate is also an essential part of this conversation.

Mr. Gibbs presented the character of new housing section.

Ms. Pierce explained that she and her husband were seeking a lot combination for the benefit of a bigger yard. She said that an impediment to the process is that people seem to suspect they either want to build a large mansion on the property, even though they have stated they do not, or that they will sell the combined lot to a developer who will. She said she looked into how other municipalities deal with the concern, and that other affluent communities have a tiered system for lot coverage, where as the lot sizes increase the permitted percentage of lot coverage declines. She said they also provide quantitative maximum floor area coverages tied to lot sizes. She said these kind of quantitative ordinances could ease the concerns that seem to permeate discussions of housing in Birmingham. Ms. Pierce concluded that the draft's recommendations to only have lot enlargement areas on certain streets is arbitrary, and would be unfair to residents of other streets. She noted that the ability to get a lot combination is already rare enough without an arbitrary restriction based on what street one lives on, and that if the concern is excessively large houses being built on any combined lots, the quantitative ordinances she recommends would relieve those concerns.

In reply to a question from Anne Steglis, Planning Director Ecker explained how lot coverage measurements in the City currently work.

Ms. Steglis said she would be more supportive of bike paths than of bike lanes in order to allow many cyclists to ride together at once. She said that neighborhoods are defined by the people who live there, and not by the boundaries around it or homes within it. She said she would also like the idea of a social ambassador to increase social neighborhood cohesion.

Mr. Bertolini said that a one-size-fits-all approach to setbacks would be inappropriate due to different lot sizes throughout the City. He said a maximum building height is also a good idea, but allowing a third floor should be considered with some restrictions.

Ms. Steglis returned to say that all properties should have retaining walls to ensure that one home's water runoff remains on its own property. She said that she would like to see a truck fee charged to any construction or teardown projects so that there are sufficient resources to repair the damage done to streets by truck traffic.

Mr. Williams commented that it might be worth it to have different max lot width standards for new construction and for the expansion of current homes without a teardown. He said the latter category could often allow for aging-in-place through allowing expansion for first floor master bedrooms.

Mr. Koseck said that the design of single family houses is very complicated, and that a lot of the concerns being voiced would be alleviated less by specific size restrictions and more by different aesthetic choices. He cautioned that the topic of single family home design should be studied carefully and in detail in order to capture the nuances of the process.

Ms. Whipple-Boyce concurred with Mr. Koseck, and said this section of the draft overall identified appropriate places to commence that kind of detailed study.

Mr. Share suggested that the draft should recommend that the mass of homes be appropriate for lot size and for the neighborhood, instead of requiring greater setbacks. Mr. Share also stated that Marin County, CA has an ordinance that requires that as a home increases in size it must meet or exceed the requirements of the International Energy Code by a certain factor. He said that while it could not guarantee that houses would remain smaller, it may have an impact on house sizes and would also be more sustainable.

Mr. Jeffares cautioned that overly trying to restrict or interfere with what the market wants could have negative unintended consequences in the long-term. He explained that increasing the setbacks as the draft recommends, for instance, could result in the loss of \$100,000 in value in certain circumstances for someone looking to sell their home. He continued that if that person were looking to move into assisted living, the \$100,000 difference could be very significant for them. He said that did not mean he was against any restrictions, per se, but just that they should be considered carefully in terms of their potential ramifications.

Mr. Lee said he agreed with Mr. Jeffares completely, explaining that Birmingham would become less desirable over time if the housing stock largely becomes older and new homes become too difficult to build due to City ordinances. Mr. Lee suggested that perhaps new homes could be built without such great setback requirements as long as the building design were to fit the character of the neighborhood.

Chairman Clein said that it would be helpful if the conversation focused more on the intent of the recommendations, and whether they are desirable for Birmingham, rather than on the recommendations themselves. He said, for instance, it would be more helpful at this point to know whether the City wants to allow for ways of expanding existing homes in order to support aging-in-place than it would to specifically decide at this moment how that would be done.

Mr. Boyle said the issue was less the character of the homes and more the affordability of the homes. He noted that Birmingham is becoming less affordable in part, it seems, because of the scale of the new homes that are being built on lots. He said he was interested in incentivizing expansion of homes over teardowns, given that teardowns seem to be such a huge concern among so many of the residents. He said that while aesthetics and character are important, the underlying concern is what kind of housing market should exist in Birmingham.

Ms. Whipple-Boyce agreed with Mr. Boyle's assessment that character is not actually the underlying issue. She said while the specifics could be discussed down the line, it does seem that Birmingham should not be as supportive of new builds as it currently is. She said that she would be supportive of promoting the expansion of existing houses since it comes up so often as a topic.

Chairman Clein said that while he did not disagree with Ms. Whipple-Boyce and Mr. Boyle, many comments the City received regarding homes did address massing, setbacks, and height of buildings. He said that the cost of homes is not the only concern, and that there is a parallel concern about whether the size of new homes being allowed in Birmingham are excessive. He said the Board needed to clarify whether they thought there should be additional limitations added to the sizing of new homes, which is separate from the question of cost. He concluded by saying this section of the draft, overall, jumps topically too often and needed to be pulled together by the master planning team.

Mr. Gibbs said the streamlining would come from integrating the Board's recommendations as to what the priorities included in the draft should be. He said that certain topics would remain and others would be excised as the Board and other City decision makers request it.

Mr. Koseck said 2A, prevent runoff onto adjacent sites, should be struck because it is illegal not to prevent runoff onto adjacent sites. He said that the issue should be resolved by the City enforcing the present restrictions regarding the issue, instead of adding a new one that merely echoes the current policy. He continued that while character is a different consideration from cost, if Birmingham wanted to maintain a similarity of character between homes that should have been decided on thirty years ago. He said he could not see from this point a way that similarity between homes across the City could be enforced. He said that having more mature trees in the neighborhoods would be one way to soften the differences between homes. He also noted that the desire for greater setbacks in order to reduce home size and the desire to allow for expansions of existing homes in order to allow for aging-in-place are conflicting goals.

Mr. Gibbs said the overall question for this section is whether the City wants to have an increased say in the design of single family homes. He said there were legal ways to do that in the planning world, but also that the draft could strike those considerations if that is what the City would prefer. He said the master planning team was just seeking guidance as to which way the draft should go.

Chairman Clein said his personal opinion was that the City should not get more involved in the design of single family homes. He noted that the Building Department already reviews homes for their adherence to the City's ordinances. He said that while ordinances could be changed regarding matters of glazing, space between homes, massing, setbacks, height, or other topics, he did not think the Board should review every single family residential home.

Mr. Gibbs said the master planning team would include in the draft whatever the City directed them to. He said there were also questions as to whether individual neighborhoods should have different design ordinances, and that maybe neighborhoods could decide on what home design ordinances within their neighborhood they would want in place.



Ms. Traxler added that the implementation part of the plan has still not been completed. She said the current section may have some ideas that may more appropriately be included in the implementation chapter. She stated that under the Michigan Planning and Enabling Act, the Planning Board is charged with preparing the master plan and making the recommendations to the City Commission. She explained that Mr. Gibbs was correct in saying that the master planning team would implement the Board's guidance, and just reminded everyone that implementation would be further discussed in the future.

Mr. Share stated that while some of the recommendations in this section are valuable, he would like to see the section be more conceptual rather than prescriptive.

In reply to Mr. Lee, Mr. Gibbs explained that the master planning team was recommending a possible single family home review process because the master planning team perceives that a number of homes that have been built are out of character for Birmingham. He explained that many residents voiced similar concerns, and that is why a review process was being proposed.

Mr. Gibbs reviewed the accessory dwelling unit (ADU) recommendations and why ADUs are being considered.

Chairman Clein summarized that there is a missing segment of housing in Birmingham in terms of cost. A regional study says that there will be an increase in demand for all housing, including for the currently missing middle segment. He explained that allowing for ADUs where the main dwelling is owner-occupied would be one way of increasing the stock of missing middle housing in Birmingham if the City is so inclined.

Mr. Williams said that should be explicitly stated in the draft. Mr. Boyle concurred.

Mr. Boyle said he was frustrated that these sections are not being introduced with a bit of policy and clearly written bullet points. For this section, he said a simple overview of the housing situation in southeast Michigan, an explanation of where the demographics are going, and an explanation of why many older residents are finding it prohibitive to remain within the community if they want to downsize their homes would be beneficial. As a specific example, Mr. Boyle explained that if he were to sell his residence on Wimbledon Drive at this time, he would be unable to afford to remain in Birmingham. He said ADUs would be one way of allowing people like him to remain in the community, and added that the Pointes are making similar changes in their communities. He said the reasoning for these approaches should lead these sections, which are then followed by the more specific policy proposals.

Chairman Clein invited public comment, asking if based on what they heard regarding demographic trends they believed Birmingham should add additional housing units to the community.

Ms. Steglisch said that the City should do more to protect one story homes in order to allow new families to move into Birmingham or older people to downsize. She said ADUs should be taxed as additional dwelling units. She noted that while the argument is that ADUs would be more cost accessible for older people, in reality older people would not live in the ADUs because they would not be able to climb the stairs and there would be no elevator.

Chairman Clein noted that the question is not only about ADUs, but also about the potential benefits of two- or three- unit buildings along the neighborhood seams.

Ms. Peterson agreed with Ms. Steglish, saying that there is a lot of affordable housing on the east side of Birmingham that is being bought up by developers and then torn down.

Mr. Bertolini said it would be possible to have younger people rent out the ADUs and older people live on the main level.

Mr. Kona said he was concerned about enforcing the resident supervision of ADUs, since his neighbors have one and also travel frequently. He explained that in that case they could go out of town while their ADU is being rented, meaning that they would not be present to provide that supervision. Mr. Kona noted that while that specific ADU was intended for an elderly family member, when younger people live in ADUs more parking will be necessary. He said that large lots with enough parking do not encroach on neighbors if they have ADUs, but that is not the case in more tightly spaced areas.

Mr. Gibbs clarified that the ADUs would not be intended for relatives, and instead would be intended for rent. He also reiterated that the owner of the property would have to live on-site. Larger setbacks, landscaping, and other mitigation measures would be included as part of the ADU recommendations.

Ms. Pierce said that while ADUs are a creative, progressive solution to the need for more cost attainable housing in Birmingham, she would be worried about high resident turnover in rentals since she has young children. She said overall ADUs are probably worth pursuing, but a lot of thought should go into the details of safety and other issues.

Ms. Ritter said she liked the diversity of housing within Birmingham and that she would be supportive of ADUs.

Mr. Koseck agreed with Ms. Pierce that the details of how ADUs would work would need to be reviewed very thoroughly.

Chairman Clein summarized that residents are intrigued by ADUs, but that they would need more best practices and guidance as to how they would be implemented.

Mr. Gibbs confirmed the master planning team would return with more information on ADUs. He then presented the section regarding housing along the neighborhood seams.

Mr. Williams asked if some of these neighborhood seams would be inserted behind existing commercial development. He said that neighborhood seams to the east and west of Woodward between Lincoln and 14 Mile could represent significant intrusions to single family areas. He said he would expect numerous objections to such a proposal. He said that very clear definitions of seams and mapped seams would be critical for that reason. Mr. Williams continued that the boundaries between single family residential and commercial in those areas are already not well-maintained.

Ms. Ritter said that she was in support of the types of housing being proposed for neighborhood seams, and that it would be another way to provide cost attainable housing in Birmingham.

Joan Heinike asked where the people living in these more dense neighborhood seams would park.

Chairman Clein confirmed that parking would be a factor in allowing any of these more residentially-dense buildings to be built.

Ms. Peterson said higher density residential on the east side of Woodward would be a vast improvement compared to all of the commercial buildings being built in that area.

Ms. Whipple-Boyce said she was enthusiastic about the neighborhood seams. She said she was a little surprised to see how many areas were being recommended for this treatment by the map on page 88, and said that maybe those areas could be reduced or an explanation could be included detailing why so many areas are proposed for inclusion. She said an explanation of the lot combination areas would also be helpful.

Mr. Koseck said he was also in support of the neighborhood seams. He asked if these would actually make housing more affordable, however, or if they would just create more profit, citing brownstones at Brown and Southfield that go for upwards of two million dollars each.

Mr. Share said he was also in support of neighborhood seams. He noted that on Southfield between Brown and Frank on the east side of the street there is a fourplex that seems to be working well and could be a model for housing in the neighborhood seams in Birmingham.

Mr. Boyle echoed Mr. Koseck's comments, saying that the direction could be set in the plan but implementation would need to be done very carefully. He noted that Minneapolis, MN tried to add more cost attainable, dense housing and ended up with similarly expensive, smaller units. He said Birmingham would have to be careful to figure out how to avoid a similar outcome. He recommended that Birmingham could preliminarily try these ideas in a few areas to see how it works before expanding it across the City.

Mr. Jeffares said he was in support of the neighborhood seams as well.

Chairman Clein said that the feedback seemed largely in support, with caveats regarding the placement of these more residentially dense structures and a way to ensure that their costs do not rival those of single family homes in Birmingham.

Mr. Gibbs commented that the population of 64-74 year old people in Birmingham is set to increase by 70% in the next 15-20 years. He said that many people in that demographic would take advantage of these higher-density residential areas.

Mr. Gibbs then reviewed neighborhood destinations.

Ms. Steglisch said that neighborhood destinations would not inherently increase interactions between residents, explaining that people frequently enter the same places of business and do not interact.

Mr. Bertolini said that the master plan should not designate specific locations for these neighborhood destinations.

Mr. Boyle said the priority of the plan is not detailing exactly where these neighborhood destinations should be. Rather, the goal is to lay out the City's intent to eventually have neighborhood destinations that are walkable for many or most homes, and that the draft needs to lay that goal out for residents referencing this plan 20 or 30 years down the line.

Mr. Williams agreed with Mr. Bertolini and Mr. Boyle, saying that designating neighborhood destinations within the master plan would be a mistake because it could affect the market values of properties the City does not own.

Chairman Clein said he wanted to make sure that all residences in Birmingham would be within walking distance of a neighborhood destination as part of the plan.

Mr. Gibbs commented that not all of the neighborhood destinations would be commercial, and that some of them would be recreational instead. He said he was concerned about not designating neighborhood destinations because it would stymie the development of those destinations, and he noted that many of the proposed destinations are already on City-owned property.

Ms. Traxler added that not designating the neighborhood destinations could also lead to concerns about overdevelopment in the neighborhood. She explained that purpose of choosing destinations was to show how modest they would be, and how walkable with the radii depicted.

Mr. Share said he would remove the statement that the Community Foundation / Fund be established in a timely manner, develop civic programming as part of the monthly neighborhood loop events, and develop additional regular civic events to continue engaging the community from the master plan, as they do not have to do with land use.

Chairman Clein agreed. He said the community foundation fund sounded like a policy matter that the Commission could decide but was outside the land use purview of a master plan. He said the master planning team should feel free to supply a memo to the City Commission with any non-land use related suggestions, but that they should not be included directly in the master plan.

Ms. Traxler commented that the downtown shopping district tends to receive more City funding for events than potential events in the neighborhoods, and that could be shifted with changes in ways of administering funds.

Mr. Jeffares, speaking in support of neighborhood destinations and what they can do for the community, noted that his neighborhood's regular event has been sponsored by their neighborhood destination for many years.

Chairman Clein noted the end of the evening's master plan discussion, and thanked the public for its participation.

### **03-40-20**

#### **F. Miscellaneous Business and Communications:**

##### **a. Communications**

##### **b. Administrative Approval Correspondence**

##### **c. Draft Agenda for the next Regular Planning Board Meeting (March 25, 2020)**

- **Rezoning for 469-479 S. Old Woodward**
- **35001 Woodward, postponed from 2/27/20**
- **Lutheran Church of the Redeemer proposing changes to the front portion of their building**

##### **d. Other Business**

City Planner Dupuis said there was one question for the Board regarding the Daxton Hotel.

Chairman Clein stated that he would have to recuse himself from the discussion because of a business relationship between his company and the developers of that site. He left the meeting at 10:44 p.m.

Vice-Chairman Williams took over running the meeting at 10:44 p.m.

City Planner Dupuis explained the Daxton owners wanted to remove a required light pole that is close to the canopy the hotel was going to build. He noted the canopy would be illuminated, and would illuminate that area at least as well as the light pole. Ms. Ecker noted that the City Commission would make the final decision as they previously approved the streetscape design. Mr. Dupuis stated the Daxton was also seeking to remove six parking spaces from the underground parking for a mechanical room.

City Planner Dupuis confirmed that the Daxton would still have surplus parking available even with the removal of the six spaces.

The Board concurred that they were comfortable with both of the proposed changes.

### **03-41-20**

#### **G. Planning Division Action Items**

##### **a. Staff Report on Previous Requests**

##### **b. Additional Items from tonight's meeting**

**03-42-20**

**H. Adjournment**

No further business being evident, the Vice-Chairman adjourned the meeting at 10:48 p.m.

Jana L. Ecker

Planning Director

APPROVED