



Plymouth Planning Commission
Regular Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, September 13, 2023 - 7:00 p.m.
Plymouth City Hall 201 S. Main

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, Vice Chair Scott Silvers, Commissioners Shannon Adams, Zachary Funk, Joe Hawthorne (arrived at 7:11) Tim Joy, Kyle Medaugh, Holle Saraswat, Eric Stalter

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

2. CITIZENS COMMENTS

Laurie Golden, 1260 Linden, spoke about the impact of a neighboring development has on her property.

Tom Doran, 1191 Linden, spoke about the proposed Brookside development and its impact on Joel and Sheridan St.

3. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Joy offered a motion, seconded by Silvers, to approve the minutes for the August 9, 2323, meeting as presented.

There was a voice vote.
MOTION PASSED

Joy offered a motion, seconded by Funk, to approve the minutes for the August 14, 2023 working session meeting as presented.

There was a voice vote.
ABSTAIN: Medaugh, Saraswat
MOTION PASSED

4. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Adams offered a motion, seconded by Joy, to approve the agenda for September 13, 2023.

There was a voice vote.
MOTION PASSED

5. COMMISSION COMMENTS

Saraswat said citizens are feeling the effect of development that impacts the character of neighborhoods and the ability of seniors to downsize and young people to purchase homes. She suggested adding this as a goal next year to address this issue.

Adams said the direction of building in the city concerned him.

Silvers said the city has a limit on open excavation and the resident should contact the building department.

Hawthorne said he agreed with the previous comments and said a circle driveway had been rejected recently due to the impervious surface ordinance. He said he was interested in exploring a 60% building rule, meaning an addition or teardown could only be replaced with something no more than 60% larger.

Sisolak said the phone survey results would provide statistically accurate data that would be helpful in updating the master plan, and that those who weren't contacted by phone could complete the survey online after September 18.

6. PUBLIC HEARINGS

a. SP23-09 – 1020 W. Ann Arbor Rd., Special Land Use and Site Plan Review

Mike Devine, a representative of the applicant, reviewed the project and answered the questions presented in the Carlisle Wortman report. He said the business would be open seven days a week from 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 a.m. as a full-service restaurant with live entertainment and music and an expected ratio of 70% food and 30% alcoholic beverages.

Sisolak opened the public hearing at 7:27 p.m.

Rob Mendall, 1293 S. Harvey, asked about the takeout window and preventing it from becoming a drive-through. He also asked if they could switch the outdoor patio to have Harvey frontage.

Sisolak closed the public hearing at 7:29 p.m.

The Commission discussed the plan and how it fits into the Ann Arbor Road Corridor (ARC) district. Several members expressed their concerns about the parameters of the ARC district. They requested additional information about lighting, a dumpster enclosure, siding, a sidewalk, plans for refuse and landscaping.

Silvers offered a motion, seconded by Adams, to postpone SP23-09 at 1020 W. Ann Arbor Rd. for a special land use and site plan review until the applicant is ready to submit a plan to address items in the Carlisle Wortman report and items discussed at the meeting.

There was a voice vote.
MOTION PASSED.

7. OLD BUSINESS

a. Master Plan discussion

It was agreed that a significant amount of work went into the zoning audit and that once the final implementation plan of the audit and results of the current survey are available, the group will form a subcommittee to make recommendations for updates to the master plan.

8. NEW BUSINESS

a. Projections into setbacks ordinance amendments (generator placement edits)

Bolhuis reviewed the Zoning Board of Appeals request to amend the ordinance due to a significant number of variance requests. She recommended changing "not permitted" to 3 feet from the property line in the rear yard setback and from "not permitted" to 4 feet from the property line in the side yard setback.

There was discussion about noise dampening as it relates to proximity to neighboring properties. Silvers said he was working on writing a separate ordinance for generators and that he would send a draft to Bolhuis for review at the October meeting.

9. REPORTS AND CORRESPONDENCE

Bolhuis said the Planning Commission training would be at Northville City Hall at 7 p.m. on September 19. She said there was a community session with Doug Griffiths on December 5 and more information was to come on the event.

Commission Liaison Kelly O'Donnell said there had been a ribbon cutting at the Saxtons lot and that the patio policy was still under review.

Sisolak provided information from the Mayors and Chairs meeting on September 5 and invited all to attend an informational meeting about the parks and recreation millage on September 21.

10. ADJOURNMENT

Joy offered a motion, seconded by Sisolak, to adjourn the meeting at 8:38 p.m.

There was a voice vote.

MOTION PASSED

Bolhuis, Greta

From: Kerri Collins [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, September 11, 2023 12:15 PM
To: Group - Planning Commission
Cc: Buzuvis, John; Bolhuis, Greta
Subject: Agenda Item 6 - SP23-09: 1020 W. Ann Arbor Road

My name is Kerri Collins and I am a property owner at 730 Penniman Avenue.

I am submitting this email to be included as part of the record of the 9/13/23 Planning Commission Meeting.

I oppose how the parking calculation was conducted for the application for the proposed restaurant use located at 1020 W. Ann Arbor Road. I have two specific issues.

1. The parking calculation for the shopping center use excludes almost half of the square footage as "unusable floor area". As a traffic engineer who has performed many parking calculations on behalf of developments, I know that storage areas and other accessory use areas support the business and should not be considered "unusable floor area". Unless this area is literally used for nothing associated with the business and is inaccessible to the business, it should not be excluded from the parking calculation. The standard of practice when calculating parking demand is to include all area associated with the business. The ITE Parking Generation Manual does not exclude areas. Also, when you grant a parking variance based on a current business's use of space you fail to consider that the business can change and a new business opens in that space, using more of the floor area. In many cases, the new business has no need to appear before the Planning Commission or Zoning Board if the business is allowable under current codes. Approving a variance based on how a current business uses space is shortsighted and can create a parking issue in the future.
2. The parking calculation for the proposed restaurant does not appear to include all of the outdoor seating space (although it is difficult to tell based on the information provided). There are several outdoor seating areas shown on the plan – an outdoor bar area, an outdoor patio and an outdoor covered patio. Are these seats included in the total number of seats (144) shown for the parking calculation? The City of Plymouth should be including outdoor seating areas in parking calculations. Many cities include these seats in the calculation. They produce sales and induce demand for parking. They are used for at least several months a year and just because they are not permanent and may not be available throughout the entire year, does not mean that the parking demand that is created for those 3 to 4 months should be ignored. All of the cities I have worked in, include outdoor seating in parking calculations.

With parking supply continuously being scrutinized and with consideration being given to charging for parking in Plymouth (which I support), I think the Planning Commission should be ensuring that the correct amount of parking is being provided or making sure the applicant is providing the correct amount of fees in lieu of parking based on more appropriate parking calculations. The City supplies and maintains public parking that supports businesses downtown. The taxpayers fund the parking supply and maintenance. The businesses should provide the required parking or pay in lieu so that an unnecessary burden is not placed on taxpayers.

I. PARKING REQUIRED : 109 SPACES (79 REST. + 30 SHOPPING CNTR)

ESTABLISHMENTS FOR SALE / CONSUMPTION
OF ALCOHOL / FOOD - ARC DISTRICT 79 SPACES REQ'D

1 SPACE / 2 PERSONS ALLOWED PER MAX. OCC. ESTABLISHED BY LOCAL,
COUNTY, OR STATE FIRE, BUILDING OR HEALTH CODES

SEE "RESTAURANT 'OCCUPANCY' DIAGRAM" + "RESTAURANT SEATING
CAPACITY PER BUILDING CODE" NOTE

150 occ. / 2 = 75 TOTAL SPACES REQ'D

OR (WHICHEVER IS GREATER)

1 SPACE / 2 SEATS + 1 SPACE PER EMPLOYEE OF LARGEST SHIFT

144 SEATS / 2 = 72 SPACES REQ'D

1 EMPLOYEES @ LARGEST SHIFT = 7 SPACES REQ'D

79 TOTAL SPACES REQ'D

SHOPPING CENTERS - ARC DISTRICT 30 SPACES REQ'D

1 SPACE / 200 SQ. FT. OF USABLE FLOOR AREA

13,500 GROSS SQ. FT. x 80% = 10,800 USABLE SQ. FT.

NOTE: SEC. 18-163(a)(5)d. OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE STATES "In the case
of shopping centers, usable floor area shall be based on 80% of the
sum of the gross horizontal floor area. . . . However, if floor plans and
calculations of usable floor area are submitted which demonstrate
otherwise, usable floor area maybe adjusted accordingly.

SEE "SHOPPING CENTER 'USABLE FLOOR AREA' DIAGRAM"

5,995 SQ. FT. / 200 = 30 TOTAL SPACES REQ'D

II. PARKING PROVIDED : 109 SPACES (104 SPACES + 5 B.F. SPACES)

8 SPACES ON SITE + 101 SPACES VIA
"PERMANENT CROSS-EASEMENT
AGREEMENT", EXECUTED 03/30/1992

Kerri M. Collins, PE, PTOE, LEED AP
Principal

BEACON
PLANNING & ENGINEERING

TBPE Firm Registration No. 22342