

The Special/Study Meeting of the Troy City Planning Commission was called to order by Chairman Chamberlain at 7:30 P.M. on Tuesday, February 26, 2002, in the Lower Level Conference Room of the Troy City Hall.

1. ROLL CALL

**Present:**

Starr  
 Chamberlain  
 Waller  
 Pennington  
 Storrs  
 Kramer  
 Littman  
 Wright

**Absent**

Reece

**Also Present:**

Mark Miller, Planning Director  
 Lori Bluhm, City Attorney  
 Susan Lancaster, Assistant City Attorney  
 Jordan Keoleian, Student Representative

**STUDY ITEMS**

2. DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT REPORT

No Meeting

3. BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS REPORT

Ms. Pennington stated there were three (3) renewals of walls and granted permanent variances.

Ms. Pennington further stated that the car wash next to Thunderbird Lanes requested a ten (10) foot side yard setback and the BZA granted a five (5) foot setback.

Ms. Pennington concluded stating Nextell requested a 29 foot setback on Rochester Road and the request was denied.

#### 4. CURRENT DEVELOPMENT REPORT

Mr. Miller presented the Land Use Zoning Study update.

Mr. Kramer commented on the construction next to Wal Mart and asked what's Cambridge Crossing.

Mr. Miller presented an update on the construction and stated that Cambridge Crossing is new retail.

Mr. Kramer asked about pedestrian access in the condos west of Livernois and also cross-access. He requested that it be double checked.

Ms. Lancaster summarized the Hollywood Market letter.

Mr. Starr stated that we have looked at this a number of times.

Mr. Wright stated that we don't want the third drive.

Ms. Pennington stated that she drove by the site and could see a problem with only two drives.

Mr. Waller stated that we need the ability to have internal traffic flow. It also includes regular parking and forces one way traffic. There are some problems with the site, although the traffic flow could be corrected.

Mr. Storrs stated he would not mind revisiting the site.

Mr. Chamberlain stated he had visited the site and stated that the existing, proposed and approved site plan does not provide good traffic flow. We need to take a closer look at this site.

Mr. Storrs stated that people heading west are in conflict.

Mr. Wright stated there are things on the new plan that are good, but why the third drive on Maple.

Mr. Chamberlain commented that you should just look at the site for one (1) hour and you will see the traffic coming in and out during the middle of the week. We should bring this back at our study meeting in April.

RESOLUTION

Moved by Waller

Seconded by Storrs

RESOLVED, that reconsideration of Hollywood Market's parking lot and entrance will be forthcoming at a study meeting in April.

Yeas  
All Present (8)

Nays

Absent  
Reece

MOTION CARRIED

Mr. Kramer stated we need to give direction and that angle parking would be good, but the third drive on Maple would be bad and the internal circulation needs consideration.

Mr. Storrs stated that angle parking would encourage easier traffic flow.

Mr. Chamberlain requested that Ms. Lancaster research handicapped parking.

- 5. PROPOSED PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT (PUD-1) – Proposed Troy Baptist Church/Robertson Brothers P.U.D., East side of Rochester and South of South Blvd., Section 2 – R-1D.

Mr. Miller stated that the Planning Commission tabled the PUD request to the March 12, 2002 Regular meeting. The petitioner is seeking additional input and direction from the City regarding the proposed project. At the March 18, 2002 City Council meeting, the petitioner submitted a request for input and direction regarding the PUD; however, City Council carried over the agenda item to the March 4, 2002 City Council meeting. No additional information or site plans are included in the agenda packet. The developer anticipates informal discussions with the Planning Commission to direct revisions to the PUD. Alternate proposals may be provided by the applicant at the meeting that eliminates the office use and revises the residential component of the PUD.

Mr. Clark stated that petitioners Jim Jehle, Andrew Milia and other members of the development team were present. They are looking for direction and they are somewhat confused. They stated that the broker focus group identified two (2) needs for ranch attached condos off of a major thoroughfare. Regarding traffic, retirees don't leave to go to work in the morning.

Mr. Chamberlain asked the petitioners if they had taken the PUD requirements into account. He stated that the project could meet the underlying zoning requirements without the PUD. Show us where your project meets the PUD requirements.

In addition, the problem in March 2001 was that nothing was brought in front of the Planning Commission Study Meeting. Thought we might give it a shot, but it has to be the best possible development. Our review shows that the development meets the criteria. It doesn't matter if there is a market for the product.

Mr. Storrs stated that there is still nothing new. At the first discussion, he indicated he had problems with the office element and the traffic pattern on the south being too intense and too close to the residential use and neither concern has been addressed.

Mr. Starr stated there is no integration of the uses.

Mr. Kramer stated that the PUD must have above quality of design beyond the existing ordinance. The pedestrian paths are nothing exceptional. The public should be able to enjoy the natural features. The wetlands should become an amenity.

Mr. Littman stated that the only integration is the street. The development could just stand alone. The church is a good use.

Mr. Wright stated he agreed to what has been said. Also, the office adds traffic at peak times and has concerns with south drive.

Ms. Pennington stated she agreed that it was a good church location.

Mr. Waller stated that one thing that may be done is to host a couple meetings with as many people, e.g., City Manager. Maybe they are getting mixed opinions. City should get their opinions or process organized.

Mr. Waller also stated that housing and church amenities are important and should make a statement. The problem is the office lawsuit across the street, but perhaps the office could be a buffer.

Mr. Clark stated that taking the office out hurts financially. They are the mixed uses. We asked about some higher density in the frontage. We are cooperating with Engineering to provide a 25 year stormwater detention. A PUD provides design flexibility, shopping, housing, employment, and etc. He wanted to discuss specifics.

Mr. Robertson stated the key element is the zoning ordinance doesn't meet the buyer's needs. R-1T promotes townhouses and younger buyers. If residential goes up front to Rochester Road, the higher density isn't necessary. They don't want four (4) stories. They want to build a product that is not currently provided in Troy, a master bedroom downstairs. We have been trying for 25 years to build this. Future buyers don't mind the reduced setback. Their layout is not allowed by the zoning ordinance.

Mr. Chamberlain asked how much have you talked to Mark Miller, the Planning Director. We are hitting loggerheads down this path. We really rely on planning experts. Maybe we need to all listen better. Looks like you, the developer, is trying to get any opinion regarding project. It appears that the majority of opinions of Planning Commission is to recommend denial of the PUD request. The petitioner needs to get more involved with the City Staff to hammer this out. The PUD must be exceptional. This project is not.

Mr. Clark stated he has not heard concurrence of what should be done. He also stated that Troy has great Single Family Residential, but what about the infill projects.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that all need to sit down and discuss the issues.

Mr. Miller commented on a few items.

Mr. Clark stated that the City can have input regarding color and architecture. It is not a bad PUD.

Mr. Kramer stated that maybe it is the way the site plan looks. The point is that the PUD is not being integrated. There are virtually two separate sites demonstrated by folding the site plan in half. It is a great church location and the other side is nice architecture features, but what about meeting the density.

Mr. Clark stated that the potential buyers want this product and are willing to live with the density.

Mr. Storrs stated that he had missed the emphasis of the target market being retirement oriented.

Mr. Miller replied yes, this project has always been a retirement, empty nesters product.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that problem is the cost. People do leave because of the cost.

Mr. Clark stated mid 300,000's.

Mr. Littman stated we should allow for this type of development.

Mr. Kramer asked what it would take to put together the plus and minuses of the project. Perhaps coordinate both opinions.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that the petitioners need to sit down with the Planning staff and sort out the plus and minuses. The office use is questionable.

Mr. Waller stated that maybe a list of attributes, benefits, and concerns would be valuable. This PUD is #1, so we need to look at this closely. Please help the Planning Commission understand the developers' mind-set.

Mr. Starr stated remove the office and get creative. Ranch is good, but costly.

Mr. Robertson asked the chairman what should be in place instead of the office.

Mr. Johnston of Troy Baptist stated there are too many opinions.

Mr. Chamberlain stated no office and no commercial.

Mr. Johnston asked for specifics and when are we going to meet again.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that Mr. Miller will sit down and hammer it out with you. Show both sides of the story.

Mr. Robertson asked if they could get some feedback regarding the frontage, perhaps R-1T densities. We could build \$350,000 homes up front.

Mr. Chamberlain disagreed. Please sit down with the Planning Department. We need options.

Mr. Waller stated it should be a synergistic effort to get a project completed.

Ms. Pennington agreed.

Mr. Wright agreed.

Mr. Littman stated no retail or office. In 25 years did Robertson bring forward an ordinance to get the development. Finances of project self-fulfilling prophecy. A church would be great at this location.

Mr. Starr stated delete the office and rethink this development. Look at rearranging the uses. Think outside of the box.

Mr. Storrs stated rethink what you could put in place of the office. Reconsider moving the church forward. Put residential on the south side. It would be good to have residents near the church.

Ms. Lancaster stated that we do not have a design function and that Mr. Chamberlain has a good idea in working with Mr. Miller of the Planning Department.

Mr. Miller agreed to work with the developer.

## 6. ORDINANCE REVISION DISCUSSION

- Fence & Walls adjacent to Natural Buffers
- Stormwater Detention Basin Slope & Fencing

On behalf of the Planning Commission, the Planning Department has invited Steve Vandette, City Engineer, to attend the study meeting to informally discuss walls, detention basins and storm water management.

Mr. Miller stated that there has been a death in Mr. Vandette's family and this discussion would be delayed.

## 7. SPECIAL USE APPROVAL STUDY

### Zoning Ordinance Revisions

Mr. Miller stated the Planning Commission reviewed in previous study meetings all of the Zoning Ordinance, Uses Permitted Subject to Special Use Approval. A worksheet highlighting each of the uses identified by at least one Planning Commissioner for elimination is included in the agenda packet. Consensus regarding each of the proposed amendments to the Zoning Ordinance is the goal of this study meeting.

Mr. Chamberlain stated we need to attempt to get consensus to eliminate. We may also need to do some R-1A through R-1E, public schools. We need to review:

1. The Zoning Ordinance revisions
2. Special Use recommendations
3. Finalize the changes

8. SMALL / "IN FILL" RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Chamberlain stated that this item will be taken up at a later meeting.

9. FUTURE STUDY ITEMS

Mr. Chamberlain handed out a list.

10. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Bob Schultz, 883 Kirts, commented on and summarized the Johnson Report on the Civic Center Conference Center.

Ms. Bluhm, City Attorney, stated that the Civic Center will be discussed at the next Downtown Development Authority meeting.

Mr. Littman stated that Urban Overlay District sounds like a PUD.

Mr. Storrs commented on Planning/Zoning News article on runoff. Also, that Las Vegas has a wetlands park.

Ms. Pennington commented on the Cranberry House.

Ms. Lancaster stated that enforcement will occur and will work with the Building Department.

Mr. Waller commented on the approach on west Big Beaver Road, there are barrels near the whole project.

RESOLUTION

Moved by Wright

Seconded by Pennington

RESOLVED, that Mr. Reece be excused from attendance at this meeting.

Yeas  
All Present (8)

Absent  
Reece

MOTION CARRIED

March 5, 2002 meeting, Mr. Kramer and Mr. Littman will be absent.

March 12, 2002 meeting, Mr. Chamberlain will be absent.

10. Meeting was adjourned at 10:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark F. Miller AICP/PCP  
Planning Director