



City of Plymouth

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

Monday, June 15, 2020 - 5:15 P.M.
Online Meeting - Zoom

City of Plymouth
201 S. Main
Plymouth, Michigan 48170

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

1. ROLL CALL

Chair Sisolak called the meeting to order at 5:15 P.M.

PRESENT: Tim Joy (arrived at 5:20), Shannon Adams (arrived at 5:20), Adam Offerman (left at 5:55), Scott Silvers, Chuck Myslinski (left at 6:30), Jennifer Kehoe, and Karen Sisolak.

ABSENT: Joe Hawthorne, Hollie Saraswat

Also present was John Buzuvis, Community Development Director; Sally Elmiger, Planning Consultant; and Kelly O'Donnell, City Commission Liaison.

2. CITIZEN COMMENTS

None.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a) Comm. Kehoe, supported by Comm. Myslinski, made a motion to approve the May 13, 2020 regular meeting minutes, as presented.

MOTION APPROVED 6-0 WITH OFFERMAN ABSTAINING

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Comm. Joy, supported by Comm. Offerman, made a motion to approve the agenda, as presented.

MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY 7-0

5. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

Comm. Kehoe asked about the status of the Wilcox Mill PUD.

Mr. Buzuvis explained FEMA had significant additional and costly requirements the applicant would be unable to meet and still be viable. He explained the applicant would not be able to continue with the project. He explained the sale of the property was not completed and the property is still owned by Wayne County.

Comm. Joy asked if the property owner also owns the dam.

Mr. Buzuvis explained that FEMA's requirements to develop the property included improvements to the tailrace and possibly the dam.

6. OLD BUSINESS

None.

7. NEW BUSINESS

a) Public Participation Plan

Mr. Buzuvis presented a brief overview of the document. He explained it was drafted as part of the Redevelopment Ready Communities certification process.

Board Discussion

Chair Sisolak asked if a public hearing was required to approve the presented plan.

Mr. Buzuvis explained that a public hearing was not required.

Comm. Joy asked if the plan would be applicable only to the Planning Commission or if the other Boards would also be required to follow this plan.

Mr. Buzuvis explained the plan's purview is related to development, but there would be some overlap across the boards.

Comm. Joy explained that he believed the Saxton's PUD was an example where additional communication should have been required between the City, City Commission, and the Planning Commission.

Comm. Kehoe agreed with Comm. Joy. She wanted this plan to help that process in the future.

Comm. Myslinski asked about the Redevelopment Ready Communities program and worried that streamlining the development process would take approval away from the Planning Commission at a time they felt left out of the conversation/approval process.

Mr. Buzuvis explained the RRC program aims to create a predictable development process. He explained the plan as presented was aimed at formalizing public participation in the planning process.

Chair Sisolak explained the RRC program formalizes the City's processes and makes it easy to understand to a developer.

Ms. Elmiger clarified that any developer must go through all the necessary steps for approval.

Comm. Myslinski expressed concern that approval of this plan would reduce the citizens input in the planning process and would give more authority to an administrative review and approval of generalized economic development.

Comm. Silvers encouraged Comm. Myslinski to review the MEDC resources available online.

Comm. Kehoe wanted Oddfellows to be added as a service club.

Chair Sisolak suggested adding required public participation and the applicable law to the matrix. She explained for the Board to go a beyond the minimum they need to know what the minimum is. She suggested adding publish outcomes to the City's website.

Comm. Kehoe asked about tier 1, tier 2, and tier 3. It was clarified that the tiers related to the Communication Toolbox.

Comm. Joy identified a typo on page 2.

City Comm. Liaison O'Donnell expressed concern with Comm. Joy's statement that the Board was not prepared to vote on the Saxton's issue. She encouraged him to speak at the City Commission meeting to explain further.

Citizen Comments

Ellen Elliott, 404 Irvin, explained that once the City is certified as a Redevelopment Ready Community there are funding and marketing tools available to the City. She believes that those items could have been beneficial to the Saxton's project. She supported the plan and moving forward with the RRC certification.

Comm. Kehoe, supported by Comm. Offerman, made a motion to accept the Public Participation Plan, with the changes as presented.

MOTION APPROVED 5-2 WITH JOY AND MYSLINSKI VOTING NO

Comm. Offerman left the meeting.

b) Multi-Modal Transportation Policy

Mr. Buzuvis presented an overview of the policy.

Chair Sisolak explained the policy is the first step to approving complete streets.

Ms. Elmiger believed the policy should reference the complete streets section in the Master Plan.

Comm. Kehoe wanted crosswalk improvements and upgrades to be added, rather than just providing for maintenance of the existing crosswalks. She wanted additional crossing signals to be added. She wanted increased level of service to be added for lanes and crosswalks.

Comm. Silvers asked if the document was a guideline for how to proceed or if it was framework.

Mr. Buzuvis explained it was a commitment by the City to multi-modal transportation.

Comm. Kehoe asked if a road diet should be included as part of the list.

Chair Sisolak had suggested road diet be removed from the list as the list includes things that should be created or done, and a road diet is a method for how the things can be completed. She explained the road diet is how complete streets are accomplished, not a desired multi-modal item.

Citizen Comments

None.

Comm. Kehoe, supported by Comm. Myslinski, made a motion to forward the Multi-Modal Transportation Policy to the City Commission, with the changes as presented.

MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED 6-0

c) Rooftop Seating Ordinance

Mr. Buzuvis presented an overview of the ordinance changes. He explained the next step in the process would be for the Planning Commission to have a public hearing.

Comm. Kehoe expressed concern with outdoor seating in general and its impact on available parking. She believed that outdoor dining constituted a change of use and was not equitably enforced. She asked how the City can prevent three or four seasons seating from occurring.

Ms. Elmiger suggested requiring exactly 42" wall or fencing.

Comm. Myslinski was concerned about potential architectural changes which may include temporary roof structures and exaggerated parapet walls.

Ms. Elmiger suggested reevaluating the height overlay requirements.

Mr. Buzuvis explained there was an additional layer of approval required for aesthetics by the Historic District Commission.

Comm. Myslinski was concerned with potential increase noise in neighborhoods and the look of temporary coverings which may be rolled up or down for use.

Ms. Elmiger suggested adding specific requirements for temporary and permanent structures and absolute height including any coverings relative to what is around it.

Comm. Kehoe thought the time restrictions were too late, she felt that limitations on area should be included, and that restrictions on coverings should including sides.

Comm. Joy suggested requiring the removal of any roofing or sides on November 1.

Comm. Adams asked how rooftop safety was going to be handled. He asked about umbrellas on the roof and potential liability of flying umbrellas.

Ms. Elmiger did not believe restaurants should not have to choose between rooftop dining and sidewalk cafes.

Comm. Myslinski believed that outdoor dining impacted parking and wanted to be mindful of any additional impact on the parking supply.

Comm. Kehoe explained that patios have the advantage because they do not have the 50% parking requirement.

Chair Sisolak wanted the Board to consider and address the permanency issue and the aesthetics and potential changes to building character.

Comm. Silvers explained the Building Code does have requirements for safe rooftop dining. He believed that rooftop dining might provide additional socially distant dining options should the pandemic continue.

Comm. Kehoe wanted the rooftop dining to be treated like any other restaurant space. She explained they were temporary in nature and any permanency should be handled differently.

Comm. Myslinski suggested using "parapet" instead of "wall".

Comm. Silvers agreed and explained that form-based codes could be a solution to the possible concerns over aesthetics.

Mr. Buzuvis explained he would make the necessary changes and presented them to the Board next month.

Comm. Myslinski left the meeting.

Citizen Comments

Ellen Elliott, 404 Irvin, was concerned about parking. She appreciated the Board's consideration of temporary structures.

8. REPORTS AND CORRESPONDENCE

Mr. Buzuvis told the Board to stay tuned for next month's meeting. He stated the meeting may be on Zoom, it may be in a local park, or it may be in the Commission Chambers.

Chair Sisolak asked if there were any conflicts with attendance of the July 8 meeting.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no further business, a motion was made by Comm. Joy, supported by Comm. Kehoe to adjourn the meeting at 6:45 PM.

MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY 5-0