



# Plymouth Planning Commission

## Regular Meeting Minutes

### Wednesday, July 14, 2021 - 7:00 p.m.

---

City of Plymouth  
201 S. Main  
Plymouth, Michigan 48170

[www.plymouthmi.gov](http://www.plymouthmi.gov)  
Phone 734-453-1234  
Fax 734-455-1892

#### Online Zoom Webinar

#### 1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Karen Sisolak called the meeting to order at 7:09 p.m.

Present: Chair Sisolak, Vice Chair Jennifer Kehoe, Commissioners, Hollie Saraswat, Scott Silvers, Joe Hawthorne, Tim Joy (arrived at 7:14)

Excused: Commissioner Shannon Adams, Adam Offerman

Also present: Assistant Community Development Director Greta Bolhuis and Planning Consultant Sally Elmiger.

#### 2. CITIZENS COMMENTS

There were no citizen comments.

#### 3. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Silvers offered a motion, seconded by Kehoe, to amend the June 9, 2021 regular meeting minutes to include the finding of fact for the fence screening and to add that the city would handle any noise ordinance violations.

There was a roll call vote.

Yes: Hawthorne, Joy, Kehoe, Saraswat, Silvers, Sisolak

MOTION PASSED 6-0

#### 4. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Silvers offered a motion, seconded by Kehoe, to approve the agenda.

There was a roll call vote.

Yes: Hawthorne, Joy, Kehoe, Saraswat, Silvers, Sisolak

MOTION PASSED 6-0

#### 5. COMMISSION COMMENTS

Joy suggested revisiting PUDs that came before the Commission to gather opportunities for improvement and lessons learned.

Silvers suggested reviewing completed PUDs and cross-referencing completed PUDs to the Master Plan.

Joy suggested developing clearer guidelines for potential PUD developers.

Elmiger explained that each developer goes through a pre-application meeting and is vetted for compliance with the ordinances and necessary deviations are noted. She reminded the Board that each PUD is a negotiation and consideration of the deviations and for the proposed public benefits.

Sisolak suggested revisiting the list of transitional properties and reassess the Master Plan.

Kehoe suggested that form-based codes would assist with producing desired development.

Silvers explained he emailed Comm. O'Donnell to inform her that many no parking signs were nailed to street trees, and he suggested a better way to post necessary signage.

## **6. OLD BUSINESS**

### **a. Mixed-Use High Density Ordinance Discussion/Comments**

Sisolak explained she met with Comm. O'Donnell and Mayor Pro-Tem Moroz to discuss funding availability and next steps related to rezoning, this proposed ordinance, and form-based codes. She explained that through the Redevelopment Ready Communities program there is an opportunity to utilize technical assistance funding and that Bolhuis was meeting with the RRC Planner in early August to discuss available funding further.

## **7. NEW BUSINESS**

### **a. Michigan Association of Planning Training Video Discussion: Roles and Responsibilities & Making Motions**

Saraswat believed there was a lot of valuable information that was glossed over. She found the conflict-of-interest topic and boundaries when conversing with applicants to be informative.

Silvers found the information on sub-committee purview and discussion helpful.

Kehoe agreed that she liked the clarification on sub-committee work. She liked that it was recommended to have a joint meeting with the City Commission to discuss goals. She liked that it clarified that appointed and elected commissioners should not communicate directly with the applicant when that commission will be voting on the applicant's project.

Saraswat appreciated the discussion on how to craft a good motion. She wished there was more information on the socio-economic history of zoning.

Sisolak liked the suggestion of reviewing the Annual Report in a joint session with the City Commission.

Silvers wanted the motion making guide to be included in each packet.

### **b. Michigan Association of Planning Training Video Discussion: Planned Unit Development**

Silvers reiterated that the PUD process was a negotiation and that the agreement had to be an improvement of what the existing zoning allows.

Saraswat agreed but was concerned that the Board doesn't know what a proposed PUD development should be compared to.

Sisolak wanted the Planning Commission to consider performance guarantees in future PUDs.

Elmiger explained that a performance guarantee is typically a letter of credit or deposit so that if the developer does not implement the site plan as proposed the city would have the resources to build the proposed project. She explained that they are typically written in the zoning ordinance.

Sisolak suggested revisiting the PUD ordinance to close some loopholes and make the process easier for the applicant.

Comm. Hawthorne left at 8:09 p.m.

Silvers suggested investigating where the ordinance is failing which is prompting a PUD. He suggested checking if the ordinance failures were a repeating.

Kehoe reiterated that a PUD ideally would be used to combine properties with multiple zoning designations.

## **8. REPORTS AND CORRESPONDENCE**

Kehoe explained she attended the City Commission meeting where the Starkweather School PUD was considered.

She explained the City Commission upheld the Planning Commission's original approval and conditions.

Bolhuis stated the meetings would be on Zoom through the end of the year.

## **9. ADJOURNMENT**

Joy offered a motion, seconded by Kehoe, to adjourn the meeting at 8:23 p.m.

There was a roll call vote.

Yes: Joy, Kehoe, Saraswat, Silvers, Sisolak

MOTION PASSED 5-0