The Special/Study Meeting of the Troy City Planning Commission was called to order by Vice Chair Schultz at 7:30 p.m. on March 22, 2005, in the Council Board Room of the Troy City Hall.

1. ROLL CALL

Present:
Gary Chamberlain
Lynn Drake-Batts
Fazal Khan
Robert Schultz
Mark J. Vleck (arrived 7:38 p.m.)
David T. Waller
Wayne Wright

Absent:
Lawrence Littman
Thomas Strat

Also Present:
Mark F. Miller, Planning Director
Brent Savidant, Principal Planner
Susan Lancaster, Assistant City Attorney
Richard K. Carlisle, Carlisle/Wortman Associates
Kathy L. Czarnecki, Recording Secretary

Resolution # PC-2005-03-036
Moved by: Chamberlain
Seconded by: Wright

RESOLVED, That Members Littman and Strat are excused from attendance at this meeting for personal reasons.

Yes: Chamberlain, Khan, Schultz, Waller, Wright
No: None
Abstain: Drake-Batts
Absent: Littman, Strat, Vleck (arrived 7:38 p.m.)

MOTION CARRIED

2. MINUTES

Resolution # PC-2005-03-037
Moved by: Wright
Seconded by: Khan

RESOLVED, To approve the March 1, 2005 Special/Study Meeting minutes as published.

Yes: Drake-Batts, Khan, Schultz, Waller, Wright
No: None
Abstain: Chamberlain
Absent: Littman, Strat, Vleck (arrived 7:38 p.m.)

MOTION CARRIED

Resolution # PC-2005-03-038
Moved by: Khan
Seconded by: Wright

RESOLVED, To approve the March 8, 2005 Regular Meeting minutes as published.

Yes: Chamberlain, Khan, Schultz, Waller, Wright
No: None
Abstain: Drake-Batts
Absent: Littman, Strat, Vleck (arrived 7:38 p.m.)

MOTION CARRIED

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There was no one present who wished to speak.

4. DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY REPORT

Mr. Miller reported that the March 16, 2005 Downtown Development Authority meeting was cancelled.

5. PLANNING AND ZONING REPORT

Mr. Miller reported on the following items.

1. Rezoning Request (Z 700), Clark Service Station, northeast corner of Livernois and Maple Road, Section 27, from B-1 to H-S – City Council Public Hearing on April 4, 2005.

2. Proposed PUD #5, Maple Forest Crossing, east side of Rochester Road, south of South Boulevard – Review by the Planning Commission in the near future.

3. Big Beaver Road Corridor Study – Meetings have been arranged with the two finalists; project is forthcoming and moving forward.

(Mr. Vleck arrived at 7:38 p.m.)

6. BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS (BZA) REPORT

Ms. Drake-Batts reported on the March 15, 2005 Board of Zoning Appeals meeting.

Interpretation Request re: the issuance of a building permit to construct a garage at 3129 Alpine
The BZA postponed this item at the request of the petitioner's attorney.

Variance request, Robert Kage, 718 Eckford
The BZA denied relief of the Ordinance to maintain two covered storage structures and a lean-to attached to the existing pole building.

Variance request, Larry Frandle, 1142 Boyd
The BZA granted relief of the Ordinance to reconstruct a fire damaged home.

Variance Request, Ram A. Sharma, 2951 Homewood
The BZA denied relief of the Ordinance to maintain a porch enclosure constructed without a permit.

7. PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT (PUD 4) – Proposed The Monarch Private Residences, 209 units, 11,166 S.F. retail space and structured parking, North side of Big Beaver Road between Alpine and McClure, Section 20 – O-1 (Low Rise Office), P-1 (Vehicular Parking) and R-1B (One Family Residential) Districts

Mr. Carlisle, Planning Consultant, provided a brief review of the proposed PUD 4. Mr. Carlisle said the proposed development definitely meets the PUD criteria in terms of providing development quality objectives and a mixture of land uses. Mr. Carlisle cited the significant items to be addressed further by the petitioner, as outlined below. He believes all other issues addressed in his report can be worked out with the petitioner, including the public benefit.

Future Land Use Plan
Mr. Carlisle said a stronger direction is needed in the Future Land Use Plan for areas that are conducive to mixed-use development. Items to be addressed are (1) a comparison between developing the property fully under the low-rise office district designation and proposed mixed use residential and (2) the transition to single family residential. Mr. Carlisle said it would be unreasonable to delay the project pending a revision of the Future Land Use Plan.

Density
Mr. Carlisle said he would reserve his comments on density until he has an opportunity to review the Density Study that was recently provided by the petitioner.

Traffic Impact
Mr. Carlisle reported the traffic analysis is not complete. He is confident that there will be significantly less impact from the proposed residential project compared to that of an office use, in terms of traffic volume and peak times of travel.

Transition

Mr. Carlisle said the transition with the properties to the north of the proposed development is most likely the most difficult issue to address. The petitioner, at his request to more significantly address the transition, increased the setback to 20 feet and provided additional landscaping as a buffer. Mr. Carlisle said more needs to be done and suggested reducing the intensity of the buildings by stepping the buildings down; i.e., ranch style units on the ends of the buildings that would create a lower profile.

Jennifer Mooney, Bob Dudick, Tom Kafkes and John Bender of Joseph Freed and Associates were present. Also present were Gary Jonna of Whitehall Real Estate and Ron Phillips of Tadian Homes.

Ms. Mooney provided a brief update of the project and specifically addressed the following items.

- Transition to north with respect to setbacks and additional landscaping
- Off-site landscaping along Alpine and east side of McClure
- Shadow studies
- Retail court with respect to depression and perimeter hedge
- Commitment to public benefit
- LEED points

Ms. Mooney distributed the following information to members.

- Mixed-Use Projects completed by Joseph Freed and Associates
- Letter from Village Manager of Palatine, IL, regarding success of downtown redevelopment
- The Monarch February 8, 2005 Neighborhood Meeting Notes, as well as communication with residents addressing concerns

Additional items discussed were:

- Retail signage
- Sculpture
- Project timetable
- Requirements of preliminary approval; i.e., submission of finite data
- Public Hearing date and importance of public input
- Mass relationship
- Guest parking with respect to location, convenience, inclement weather

---

Vice Chair Schultz requested a recess at 9:08 p.m.

The meeting reconvened at 9:18 p.m.

Discussion continued on the setback for the residences to the north, and some members suggested a minimum setback of 30 feet. It was determined that the Planning Department would obtain photographs of the houses to the north and provide site plan overlays. The petitioner was encouraged to view the Rochester Commons development and the condominium development located at Wattles and John R with respect to setback relationships.

There was a brief discussion on the monetary contribution by the petitioner as relates to the large garage located at 3129 Alpine Street. Ms. Mooney stated that the development group contributed as a neighbor to help cover the legal expenses involved in the Zoning Board of Appeals due process. The development group felt that $5,000 was an appropriate amount based on their presence in the neighborhood.

Ms. Lancaster provided a brief summary of the appeal before the Zoning Board of Appeals relating to the issuance of a building permit for the large garage located at 3129 Alpine. She indicated that the matter has been postponed to the April meeting, and confirmed that there is no litigation at this time.

Ms. Mooney asked the Planning Commission and Planning Department to consider scheduling a Public Hearing in April for the proposed planned unit development.

8. ZONING ORDINANCE TEXT AMENDMENT (ZOTA 212) – Freestanding Restaurants in the R-C (Research Center) and O-S-C (Office Service Commercial) Zoning Districts

Mr. Miller said the proposed draft language allows for freestanding restaurants in the RC (Research Center) and O-S-C (Office Service Commercial) districts. He asked the Commission's input on (1) permitting banks and daycare facilities as stand-alone uses and (2) creating a similar amendment that would permit stand-alone restaurants in the O-M (Office Mid Rise) district.

Discussion points were:

- Special Land Use versus "by right"
- Daycare facilities with respect to outside play area
- Special Land Use to allow higher level of design and control of design
- Integration of sites
- Flexibility in parking requirements
- Negotiation with prospective use
- Relationship between buildings and pedestrian traffic
- Discouragement of strip center development

9. ZONING ORDINANCE TEXT AMENDMENT (ZOTA 201) – Commercial Recreation in the Light Industrial Zoning District

Mr. Miller said the proposed draft language (1) defines indoor commercial recreation and (2) permits indoor commercial recreation facilities by right in the M-1 district. He asked for direction and input from the Commission.

The members agreed that parking requirements should be addressed within the Zoning Ordinance text that would allow sufficient parking in relation to the activity of the facility. The members generally agreed that the use should be permitted by special use. The proposed ZOTA is a high priority item.

10. ZONING ORDINANCE TEXT AMENDMENT (ZOTA 216) – Additional Retail Along Major Thoroughfares in the M-1 (Light Industrial) Zoning District

Mr. Miller reviewed some issues associated with the concept of adding retail uses within existing industrial buildings along major thoroughfares. An overhead drawing of the Beaute Craft Building located at 600 W. Maple Road was used to illustrate potential site plan issues.

Discussion points were:

- Parking, landscaping and setback requirements
- Existing retail vacancy along Maple Road
- Existing buildings along Maple Road in need of extensive remodeling vs. torn down and completely reconstructed
- Potential mixed-use development; i.e., artist colony
- Global solution needed; not a building-by-building solution
- Relation of retail use between Maple Road frontage lots and interior street lots
- Setting precedence with respect to setback requirements
- Future land use planning

Mr. Miller summarized that the majority of existing buildings along Maple Road are at a 50-foot setback line, and it appears retail use would not be feasible because too many problems would be created. Mr. Miller suggested further strategic planning to arrive at short-term fixes and creativity in future land use planning.

11. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mike Baxter and Kim Duford of 3141 McClure, Troy, were present to speak on the proposed The Monarch Private Residences (PUD 4). Their home is directly north of The Monarch project.

Mr. Baxter voiced opposition to The Monarch as currently proposed and displayed on the artist rendering. Mr. Baxter said they have had discussions with the petitioner and details of the project have not been clear. Mr. Baxter addressed the building setbacks. He suggested a 50-foot minimum setback. Mr. Baxter said the 22-story tower would definitely impact them because they would have no privacy. They currently have one neighbor, and the project would give them over 200 neighbors. Mr. Baxter said the project is taking all of their property without any compensation. He indicated they have offered to sell their home to the petitioner, and to date the petitioner has not responded to the offer. Mr. Baxter informed the members that the minutes of the neighborhood meeting provided by the petitioner do not convey the hostility of the neighbors. He said one or two neighbors spoke positively of the project but they live further into the subdivision. Mr. Baxter addressed concerns relating to vehicular lights directed toward their bedroom and drainage. Mr. Baxter said he feels the density of the project is too high. He also addressed the existing vegetation between the properties to which the petitioner refers. Mr. Baxter said the existing vegetation between the proposed development and their home is called a cyclone fence.

Ms. Duford expressed concerns with construction noise and dirt and the affects of the development on their home; i.e., constant opening and closing of 55 garage doors, lights from the individual garages and porches, etc. Ms. Duford said she believes their property value as well as their neighbor's will decrease the minute the construction begins. She said the lack of privacy would take away from the existing neighborhood character. Ms. Duford addressed the trees, flowers and other vegetation that would be destroyed to allow the development. Ms. Duford said they suggested to the petitioner that a bigger buffer to the subdivision providing additional landscaping, berm, or park area could be provided with the purchase of their property. She indicated the disadvantages in the potential sale of their home. Ms. Duford welcomed the Planning Commission members to their home, so they could envision the close proximity of the development, and the view of the back side of the proposed development. She addressed the concerns she has with the density of the project in relation to an office development.

Mr. Baxter and Ms. Duford were encouraged to provide the Planning Department a written list of their concerns for the record and to attend all public hearings and meetings with respect to the proposed development.

GOOD OF THE ORDER

Mr. Vleck said it would be very interesting to get the full public comment on the proposed PUD 4.

Mr. Chamberlain said he personally requested of the City Clerk's Office to provide the City Council with only his name and no personal and confidential information. He suggested that any other member who shares his concerns to personally advise the City Clerk's Office of his/her wishes. Mr. Chamberlain suggested a site visit of the proposed PUD 4.

Mr. Miller said he would discuss scheduling a special meeting and site visit of the proposed PUD 4 with the Chairman.

Ms. Lancaster said it was good to see all the members again.

Mr. Miller reminded the members of the Special Joint Meeting of City Council and Planning Commission on March 28, 2005 at 7:30 p.m. at the Police/Fire Training Facility.

Vice Chair Schultz briefly reviewed the discussion items and intent of the Special Joint Meeting. He said the open meeting would be moderated by the City Manager, and asked that any member not able to attend to please advise the Planning Department.

ADJOURN

The Special/Study Meeting of the Planning Commission was adjourned at 10:54 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

_____

Robert Schultz, Vice Chair

_____

Kathy L. Czarnecki, Recording Secretary

G:\Planning Commission Minutes\2005 PC Minutes\Final\03-22-05 Special Study Meeting_Final.doc