

**CITY OF WIXOM
49045 PONTIAC TRAIL
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
MONDAY, DECEMBER 2, 2019**

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Day of the Planning Commission at 7:30 p.m. at which time allegiance was pledged to the American flag.

PRESENT: William Day (Chairman), Joe Barts, Peter Sharpe, Ray Cousineau and Sandro Grossi
ABSENT: Phillip Carter (Excused) and Anthony Lawrence (Excused)
OTHERS: Carmine Avantini (CIB Planning) and Nancy Fisher (Recording Secretary)

Determination of a Quorum:

A quorum of the Planning Commission was present for this meeting.

Agenda:

No additions or changes were made to the agenda.

Approval of the October 28, 2019 and November 6, 2019 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes:

MOTION and seconded by Commissioners Sharpe and Cousineau to approve the October 28, 2019 and November 6, 2019 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes.

VOTE:

MOTION CARRIED

Correspondence:

November 26, 2019 City Manager Update

Call to the Public:

There were no comments made by the public.

Unfinished Business:

There was no unfinished business listed on the agenda for this meeting.

New Business:

1. PUBLIC HEARING FOR CITY OF WIXOM MASTER PLAN ADOPTION

Mr. Avantini noted that the Commissioners have before them tonight a draft of the Master Plan dated December, 2019. The changes that the Commissioners requested Ms. McIntyre make at the last Planning Commission meeting have been incorporated into this draft and the City is eager to see it adopted. There is a whole laundry list of zoning amendments and they would like to have the Master Plan in place to support those changes. Key items include the Ford Assembly plant and the northwest corner of Twelve Mile Road and Beck including alternate uses of those sites. He noted that the changes discussed in the workshop session for Twelve Mile Road and Beck were never made in light of economic conditions at the time. Uses other than retail were originally discussed; however, after some thought, it was decided not to do that.

Call to the Public:

Michael Dornan, 2192 Heddingham Boulevard, Wixom. He went to the City's community development department and received a copy of the proposed Master Plan document today. He appreciates that. He has two comments regarding the proposed Master Plan. On page 19 under the paragraph which begins "Housing Unit Type" (next to the table), he thinks the sentence "consists of a strong mix of single-family detached homes and multiple-family communities" could read better.

Delete the word 'communities' and add an S to 'apartments' so it reads "detached homes and multiple family apartments"; however, he will defer to Mr. Avantini in this regard. Chairman Day noted that certain homeowners associations might disagree. Mr. Dornan noted that then they should be reoriented. Chairman

Day noted that he does not have a problem with the way that it reads currently. Mr. Dornan noted that the Commissioners and the staff have done a great job with the documents and he thinks they are well done.

On page 20, under 'Objectives', the first bullet, they should distinguish between the five levels of residential density. He noted that there are six levels of residential with two multi-family categories. Page 42 discusses four single-family classifications along with RM-1 and RM-2 multi-family. That clarification just cleans it up and makes it more accurate. Mr. Avantini noted that there are four single-family residential which includes mixed use and then the multi-family. Mr. Dornan noted that two of those are multi-family. He suggested distinguishing between the six levels of residential density—four single-family and two multi-family categories. Mr. Avantini noted that the reason that was dropped is that when you translate over to the Zoning Ordinance, there are only a couple tiny locations where there is R-4 and they wanted to make sure that the residential districts translated over to the Master Plan. If the City is ever challenged, that makes it easier to defend. That is why that was done. They dropped it to three instead of four.

Chairman Day asked for clarification as to the differences between RM-1 and RM-2. Mr. Dornan said that it is seven units. He noted that RM-1 accommodates seven units per acre and that RM-2 accommodates maybe 12 per acre. Commissioner Barts noted that page 42 lists RM-1 and RM-2. Chairman Day suggested including MH—3 for the manufactured homes. Mr. Dornan noted that is a good point. Chairman Day said that if the City were ever challenged it would be a good idea to increase it to seven levels of residential density—four single-family, two multi-family and one manufactured. Mr. Avantini noted that the question is are there any additional areas that are not developed that are designated multiple-family residential other than the VCA which is totally different. Chairman Day asked whether it matters if there are any to be developed if they already have them in terms of a distinction between the different levels of what we have. Mr. Avantini noted that if someone were to tear it down and rebuild, then it would matter. Commissioner Cousineau noted that that is an important issue and that if they change it to reflect the different zoning categories (RM-1 through RM-4), they would have to make corresponding adjustments to the Master Plan itself. Where would RM-1 be and where would RM-2 be on the Master Plan? Mr. Dornan said that the map has multiple-family with one color so it accommodates two uses. Mr. Avantini noted that they do not want to overcomplicate things with single-family residential. He noted that they want a clear connection between the Master Plan and zoning and he thinks that they have accomplished that. Chairman Day suggested utilizing different colors for RM-1, RM-2 and mobile homes on the Zoning Map. Mr. Avantini noted that the changes being discussed do not change the intent of the Plan but instead clarify it.

Chairman Day asked whether high-density residential would be added. He noted that he does not see it on the map. Mr. Avantini said that he will double check. He noted that the staff does not create the maps internally. Chairman Day noted that the Village Center Area (VCA) is non-residential. Mr. Dornan noted that the map legend is messed up and that it may have been a mistake that the VCA was designated high-density as opposed to traditional residential. Chairman Day noted that perhaps there should be a mixed use category for the VCA and that it is really incorrect to call the VCA non-residential. Mr. Avantini suggested getting rid of the Residential and Non-Residential designations and putting them in terms of density in descending order. Chairman Day suggested adding another one since Non-Residential does not make sense. Mr. Avantini suggested getting rid of the headings. Suburban Residential would be the first, then it would work down to Industrial and Power Lines. Chairman Day suggested getting rid of High-Density Residential.

Mr. Dornan suggested using the designations on page 42. The next would be Medium Residential instead of Traditional Residential. Commissioner Cousineau asked whether they are saying to amend the Master Plan to match up with the classifications on page 42. He noted that generally there will be a difference between multi-family and the manufactured communities. Chairman Day noted that there are already three of the four except for the low-density residential if there is no low density residential of 20,000 square feet or less. He suggested getting rid of it in the document if that density does not actually exist in the City. He does not believe that low density would be planned in any area. Mr. Avantini agreed and said maybe it is still six but low density should be removed. He suggested adding two categories of multi-family and the mobile home park, then use the multi-family, suburban and traditional in the map's legend.

Commissioner Cousineau noted that the Master Plan is a guide and that they still fall back on the Zoning Map which details the classifications and their location. Mr. Avantini emphasized that they need to make that

connection. Commissioner Cousineau noted that Mr. Avantini said that if there is a piece of property master planned for multi-family and someone purchased it and demolished it and wanted a higher density use, the City would follow the Master Plan. They would not know if it was RM-1 or RM-2. Mr. Avantini noted that they are

fixing that time to make sure it is clear. It is changing the map categories. Commissioner Cousineau asked whether RM-1 is listed in the Zoning Ordinance. If so, it may be appropriate to leave it in there but identify that there are no RM-1 properties in the Master Plan. Mr. Dornan suggested keeping it simple so that the labels on page 42 are consistent. He noted that they are so close to finalizing this.

Mr. Avantini noted that schools are not necessarily being zoned for Public since they sometimes do not stay in operation as a school. They want to make sure that it is covered by a specific zoning district. The purpose is to let people know what is there.

Mr. Dornan noted that he thinks page 38 reads well. The last sentence on that page outlines their position on the Assembly Park property. However, the way the Master Plan reads, the color designation is purple which is an IRO classification; but what does the cross hashing mean? Mr. Avantini noted that it is hard to tell from the map legend. They intended to convey the hashed portion as IRO for land use and zoning rather than Industrial. He acknowledged that the hashing which is mixed use under the power lines is confusing. He will remove the color so that it is obvious that it is mixed use. He noted that Menards is also hashed and is zoned General Commercial. Within their development agreement, certain types of uses are limited. They allow specific uses and not others so it goes beyond IRO. They use the intent of the Master Plan description to guide them through a development agreement with the owner of the property or future property owners if it is subdivided to restrict certain uses. That is still to be determined since they have not received any feedback from them. They are aiming to provide an IRO district with some flexibility to developers while simultaneously protecting the City's interests.

Chairman Day asked whether that should be reflected on the legend for purposes of clarity. Mr. Dornan asked how far mixed use goes. Commissioner Grossi asked whether the hashing means it is mixed use or flexible. Chairman Day said that it is potentially subject to a development agreement. Mr. Avantini said the hashing means that it is part of planned unit (PUD) zoning as an overlay. He noted that the color designation is supposed to be white underneath Mixed Use and not red and it should have the same line thickness in the map legend. Chairman Day confirmed with Mr. Avantini that the hashing on the map represents Mixed Use.

Commissioner Barts noted that the designation for the location of Wixom Elementary School is incorrect. It is on the wrong side of the street and should be corrected. Chairman Day asked whether the Master Plan needs to come back before the Planning Commission to incorporate the

changes suggested tonight. Commissioner Barts suggested proceeding with the idea that the changes will be incorporated into the Master Plan. Chairman Day suggested that the Commissioners could make a recommendation to City Council contingent upon tonight's suggested edits being made. Mr. Avantini said that he will have the changes made and send them to the Commissioners within the next week. It will then be placed on the agenda for sometime in January. Commissioners Cousineau confirmed that it would not be ready for City Council's next meeting on December 10th. Mr. Avantini noted that the staff member responsible for updating and correcting the map just left for a 3-week vacation and that this is likely to come before Council on January 28, 2020. He can bring this back before the Planning Commissioners at their January 27, 2020 meeting.

Mr. Dornan noted that they started the Master Plan updates in the spring of 2016 and that this has taken a lot of work. He thinks it is now a good document and looks forward to seeing it approved.

MOTION and second by Commissioners Barts and Cousineau to recommend that City Council adopt the updated Master Plan dated December, 2019 contingent upon the changes discussed tonight and reflected in

December 2, 2019 Planning Commission meeting minutes were made and that this matter will come back before the Planning Commission on January 27, 2020 before going to City Council.

VOTE: MOTION CARRIED

2. DISCUSSION OF EMERGENCY ORDINANCE AMENDMENTS

Mr. Avantini noted that he is disappointed that the revised Condominium Subdivision Approval document that the Commissioners have before them tonight is not the strikethrough version. He noted that he changed the approval process from a four-step to a three-step process in order to make it more user friendly and less duplicative. They are taking the preliminary plan through the normal process where it goes to Planning Commission, then City Council. The preliminary plan fixes the size of the lots, housing appearance and setbacks. Then the applicant would come in with the final plan including things like materials, lighting and landscaping. That is what the Planning Commission deals with in a site plan. They are dropping the second review at the City Council level—they have already approved the project layout and the streets. This takes City Council out of the final approval; this is at Council's request. He has heard no opposition from anyone regarding this change in the approval process. He noted that most communities do not have a four-step process and that some do not even involve City Council but deal strictly with the Planning Commission. He will email the Commissioners the redlined version of the Condominium Subdivision Agreement.

Commissioner Cousineau noted that under the new plan City Council would see the preliminary plan but not the final plan. Who makes the determination if there are changes between the preliminary and final plans? Mr. Avantini noted that there is a process for both major and minor changes. An example of a small change would be moving a pathway which does not change the general layout and lot configuration. Commissioner Cousineau confirmed that City Council would see still changes in density. Mr. Avantini noted that City Council does not concern themselves with the details. They deal with bigger policy decisions to be concerned with. The Planning Commission handles the details (building materials, type of pavement, landscaping, etc.) while City Council would be involved with rezoning. Commissioner Cousineau asked whether the applicant would be required to have final engineering approval. Mr. Avantini noted that the engineering review is based on the preliminary calculations and preliminary information. Then after approval they come in with the full engineering drawings. If there are significant changes to the lot layout or configuration, it has to go back through the review process. He noted the City wants to have input on things like fences around detention ponds and that applicants cannot just arbitrarily make decisions of that magnitude.

Mr. Avantini noted that another Ordinance amendment involves the new law governing fireworks which gives more control to communities from a safety point of view. They had a team meeting with police, fire, the Building Official, the City Manager and Planning. They decided to look at all temporary uses and special events and created a new category. They are now differentiating between special events and temporary uses. The Building Official will review special events and the Planning Commission will review temporary uses. Currently temporary uses are reviewed by the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA). He thinks that the Planning Commission is the more appropriate body to review temporary uses. The Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) looks at particular criteria because of aesthetics. It is a two-step process. Temporary events no more than 7 days in duration can be approved by the Building Official. Is the temporary use in a location that could create an unsafe condition?; i.e., the middle of a parking lot. It could be next to a major driveway which may not be designed for that; i.e., a plant sale, circus or American Legion fundraiser. Chairman Day asked whether special events are defined. Mr. Avantini said that it is. He noted that applicants seeking temporary uses last no more than one year but they can apply for an extension if needed. If it not located in a parking lot, a traffic review by the traffic consultant is not required. If it is, it must be reviewed by the traffic consultant since it could alter the traffic flow and create safety issues.

Mr. Avantini noted that an example of a special event would be The Drafting Table could do four separate events involving a tent. Instead of them coming back four different times for the exact location and type of activity, they do not have to come back each time except for the tent permit. They would get one permit for the year as long as it is for the same location. They want to be more user business friendly. Mr. Avantini would

like to call for a public hearing on these emergency amendments. He noted that they are not calling for a public hearing regarding the temporary uses since no one typically shows up for those. If the applicants do not comply with the original conditions of approval, they can be shut down at any point.

Mr. Avantini noted that the last emergency zoning amendment involves the Office and Research district and the Industrial district. There shall not be more than one truck dock per 10,000 square foot building. Romulus uses the metric of 8,000 square feet. He is not sure that 10,000 square feet is enough. He would like feedback from the Commissioners regarding this. If someone puts in a big building (100,000 square feet), he does not want them to employ 5-10 people. Otherwise, it is a warehouse and puts a lot of truck traffic on Wixom Road

which is already congested. It also does not bring in much tax revenue; however, they are consuming public services. That is not what the City wants to see. Mr. Avantini noted that with a 1 million square foot building that is still a lot of truck doors. He would go even higher than the 10,000 square foot figure. Chairman Day noted that 25,000 square feet sounds more reasonable for a 100,000 square foot building. Commissioner Barts noted that the thought is to get ahead of the truck traffic. Why let it get worse if you are changing the Code? Just put the safeguards in there. Mr. Avantini noted that they have been very open with what they would like to see on the Assembly Park property. They have told the developer that they will work with them but they will not allow a major truck distribution facility which does not employ a lot of people. Chairman Day asked how large the UPS building is and how many loading docks does it have? Mr. Avantini said that he does not know. Chairman Day said that there is a lot of traffic moving in and out; he does not know how many truck docks there are. Commissioner Grossi asked whether U.S. Food is located in Lyon Township. He noted that it is all loading docks on Napier Road. Commissioner Cousineau suggested that they research what kinds of uses they want to encourage and decide which uses are favorable. Chairman Day said they do not want a mechanized Amazon warehouse with no employees and a lot of truck traffic. Mr. Avantini suggested using a high number. It is in a planned unit development (PUD) and they can always grant a waiver. Chairman Day suggested using a figure of at least 25,000 square feet. Mr. Avantini said they are looking at two options with that property: rezoning it to IRO and changing the land uses to make it more business friendly although there has been no feedback from the property owner regarding this or keeping it IRO as it is currently. If there are uses they want, they can be put in the development agreement. He does not feel comfortable without feedback from the property owner to start changing the zoning district. Chairman Day said that the suggested changes make sense to him. Mr. Avantini noted that the next step would be to schedule a public hearing and get it published. The meeting could take place as early as January. While Chairman Day does not know whether it will generate a lot of public interest, he would prefer the hearing be held in late January away from the holidays in order to afford residents the opportunity to attend and offer their input.

Staff Comments:

There were no comments made by the staff.

Commission Comments:

Commissioner Cousineau noted that he has repeatedly asked for language in the Zoning Ordinance which would compel applicants to provide colored renderings and building material samples when they come before the Planning Commission for approval. He does not want that to get lost in the process. Mr. Avantini noted that is definitely high on the priority list. Chairman Day agreed that this should be a requirement when applicants come before the Commissioners. Mr. Avantini noted that this is being done administratively. There is currently a company he is working with whom he told he needs that now before it even goes before the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Grossi noted that he sees nothing regarding signage under special events and temporary uses. Is that covered under the current Sign Ordinance? Mr. Avantini said that it is.

ADJOURNMENT:

This meeting of the Planning Commission was motioned and adjourned at 8:37 p.m.

Nancy Fisher
Recording Secretary

APPROVED January 6, 2020