



Plymouth Planning Commission
Regular Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, February 9, 2022 - 7:00 p.m.
Plymouth City Hall

City of Plymouth
201 S. Main
Plymouth, Michigan 48170-1637

www.plymouthmi.gov
Phone 734-453-1234
Fax 734-455-1892

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Karen Sisolak called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Present: Chair Sisolak, Commissioners Shannon Adams, Tim Joy, Kyle Medaugh, Jennifer Mariucci, Hollie Saraswat, Scott Silvers and Eric Stalter

Excused: Commissioner Joseph Hawthorne

Also present: City Commissioner Kelly O'Donnell, Assistant Community Development Director Greta Bolhuis and Planning Consultant Sally Elmiger.

2. CITIZENS COMMENTS

There were no citizen comments

3. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Joy offered a motion, seconded by Silvers, to approve the minutes for the January 12, 2022 meeting.

There was a roll call vote.

Yes: Adams, Joy, Mariucci, Saraswat, Silvers, Stalter, Sisolak

Abstain: Medaugh

MOTION PASSED 7-0

4. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Joy offered a motion, seconded by Adams, to approve the amended agenda for February 9, 2022. The agenda was amended to address items in the following order: 7.a, 8.a, 7.b, 8.b.

There was a roll call vote.

YES: Yes: Adams, Joy, Mariucci, Medaugh, Saraswat, Silvers, Stalter, Sisolak

MOTION PASSED 8-0

5. COMMISSION COMMENTS

Sisolak introduced and welcomed Kyle Medaugh to the Planning Commission.

6. PUBLIC HEARINGS

There were no public hearings.

7. OLD BUSINESS

a. SP21-08: 885 Fralick: Westborn Market, Revised Site Plan Review for Parking Lot Expansion/Reconfiguration, Sidewalk and Landscaping

Elmiger reviewed her report on the revised site plan and the project engineer expressed agreement with conditions brought forth. Commission members asked for clarification on the landscaping plan.

Silvers offered a motion, seconded by Joy, to approve SP21-08 with the following stipulations recommended in the Carlisle Wortman report:

- Applicant is to submit paperwork to combine the parcels
- The building official is to determine barrier-free spaces behind the building in the second lot
- The building official is to determine if additional light propagation measures are required
- Eliminate tree #1MA on the landscape plan.

There was a roll call vote.

YES: Adams, Joy, Mariucci, Medaugh, Saraswat, Silvers, Stalter, Sisolak

MOTION PASSED 8-0

b. 2021 Planning Commission Annual Report

Joy offered a motion, seconded by Adams, to accept the 2021 Planning Commission Annual Report as presented.

There was a roll call vote.

YES: Yes: Adams, Joy, Mariucci, Medaugh, Saraswat, Silvers, Stalter, Sisolak

MOTION PASSED 8-0

8. NEW BUSINESS

a. PUD22-01: 100 S. Mill, Preliminary Plan for a PUD/PUD Amendment

Elmiger presented her review. Pulte representatives Joe Skore and Matthew Bush provided an overview of the preliminary plan.

Medaugh asked about the proposed landscape plan, vegetation, and if the proposed fence was intended to keep people out of the area.

Bush responded that the plan was to propose a nice-looking barrier to keep general people out of the contaminated area.

Skore clarified that it was not a barrier, but the intent was to gently dissuade foot traffic.

Medaugh asked what if any remediation was completed on the affected parcel as part of the phase 1 development.

Skore explained that the original development and brownfield agreements did not include that parcel. He

explained the brownfield funds have been used, but the TIF funds might be able to be used for this parcel.

Medaugh asked to clarify if a berm was proposed against the railroad tracks.

Bush explained that a dense landscaping screen is proposed, but that the wavering sidewalk prevents a significant berm from being established.

Saraswat asked for clarification on the proposed location of the sidewalk on the affected parcel along Mill Street.

She wanted to see the sidewalk pulled back away from the street and aligned with the new sidewalk completed as part of phase 1.

Sisolak agreed with Comm. Saraswat that she preferred the sidewalk away from the roadway.

Saraswat asked for a review of the contamination that was remediated as part of phase 1 and a description/clarification of the contamination and what remediation will occur as part of phase 2.

Skore explained that this parcel was more heavily contaminated than the phase 1 parcel, specifically the northeast portion of the parcel along Mill Street. He explained they will install vapor barriers in the units which is consistent with the construction and development of phase 1 and that if there is any excavation there would be remediation involved with that. He explained the vapor barriers and remediation of excavation was the extent of the remediation that was being proposed.

Silvers asked about the location of the detention basin in the contaminated zone and what affect that might have on birds and local animals. He asked what the nature of the contamination was.

Skore was unable to provide a detailed description of the contamination and remediation activities, but he understood the contamination to be a solvent degreaser. He did not expect any harmful impact to wildlife.

Bush explained that the detention basin location was selected intentionally away from the "hot zone" along Mill Street.

Silvers asked if the city had been made aware of the environmental impact studies conducted.

Skore explained that environmental reports have not been submitted for phase 2, but he could not speak for what was submitted during phase 1.

Bush explained that the environment reports that were done as part of the original development included the exception parcel (phase 2 parcel).

Skore explained the brownfield was approved through the city's brownfield authority.

Silvers asked that the submission to the brownfield authority be submitted as part of the site plan approval.

Sisolak asked if the contamination mitigation only included the parcel that was part of phase 1 or if it included the entire site. She asked what has been completed on this parcel to mitigate contamination.

Skore did not believe any mitigation or remediation happened on the remaining parcel as Pulte Group was not the owner of the parcel.

Sisolak asked how the Planning Commission knows that additional remediation is not required, besides the vapor barriers.

Adams agreed with Chair Sisolak and did not believe the Planning Commission had gotten the level of confidence needed that proves the site has been properly evaluated so that it does not cause harm in the future.

Silvers felt that the Commission had two choices: allow the contamination to remain forever or it becomes remediated as part of the public benefit of the PUD approval.

Adams believed that the remediation of the hazard should be part of the public benefit, but he did not believe any remediation was going to be done other than use a blighted site.

Sisolak asked if the study said no remediation was required, she wanted to see that study.

Skore clarified that remediation would be conducted in conjunction with the environmental consultant's recommendations. He explained that most of the contamination that will be left in place is the groundwater contamination, which is not inconsistent with the entire site. He stated that further information on exactly what they plan to do could be provided to the Planning Commission.

Adams explained the Commission wants to know what the hazards to people living there and what the possible effects those hazards may have on health.

Elmiger explained that when a brownfield is requested the city has its own environmental consultants reviewing the information and the burden is not entirely on the Planning Commission's shoulders. She suggested that any information that can be provided to the Planning Commission to allay their concerns should be provided.

Skore stated it was his understanding that the approved brownfield plan did not include the phase 2 parcel, but that they do intend to request TIF funds be transferred to the phase 2 project for remediation efforts. He stated they do not intend to go through the brownfield process again for phase 2.

Sisolak asked if there would be enough room for the end unit (#94) to back out and turn around if snow is piled up in the dead end.

Silvers offered a motion, seconded by Adams, to table the preliminary site plan review process until the issue regarding the environmental aspect is resolved or further information is offered.

There was a roll call vote.

YES: Yes: Adams, Joy, Mariucci, Medaugh, Saraswat, Silvers, Stalter, Sisolak

MOTION PASSED 8-0

b. 2022 Annual Goals

City Commissioner Kelly O'Donnell reviewed the recently adopted five-year strategic plan. There was a discussion about items in the strategic plan that could be addressed by the Planning Commission.

Saraswat offered a motion, seconded by Silvers, to establish the following goals for 2022:

- Address ordinances pertaining to R-1 fences and the height of residential structures
- Begin the preliminary process for the 2023 master plan revision in the fourth quarter

Joy requested the following friendly amendment to the list:

- Explore an impervious surface ordinance

Silvers requested the following friendly amendment to the list:

- Audit the current zoning ordinance and identify an approach for implementing form-based codes.

Saraswat accepted both friendly amendments.

There was a roll call vote.

YES: Yes: Adams, Joy, Mariucci, Medaugh, Saraswat, Silvers, Stalter, Sisolak

MOTION PASSED 8-0

9. REPORTS AND CORRESPONDENCE

O'Donnell gave a report on the February 7, 2022, City Commission meeting. She invited members to a joint study session on parklets on Tuesday, February 15, 2022.

Bolhuis said there would be a Redevelopment Ready Communities (RRC) presentation at the April 7, 2022, City Commission meeting.

10. ADJOURNMENT

Joy offered a motion, seconded by Adams, to adjourn the meeting at 9:01 p.m.

There was a roll call vote.

YES: Yes: Adams, Joy, Mariucci, Medaugh, Saraswat, Silvers, Stalter, Sisolak

MOTION PASSED 8-0