



City of Plymouth

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, July 8, 2020 - 7:00 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 7:02 P.M.

PRESENT: Hollie Saraswat, Tim Joy, Shannon Adams, Adam Offerman, Scott Silvers (arrived at 7:15), Jennifer Kehoe, and Karen Sisolak.

ABSENT: Joe Hawthorne, Chuck Myslinski

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. Joy, supported by Comm. Adams, made a motion to approve the June 15, 2020 regular meeting minutes, as presented.

MOTION APPROVED 6-0

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Comm. Kehoe, supported by Comm. Joy, made a motion to approve the agenda, as amended, to change agenda item #6 SP20-01 from New Business to Public Hearing.

MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY 6-0

5. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

None.

6. PUBLIC HEARING

a) SP20-01: 555 Forest, Zoned B-2 – expansion of a liquor serving establishment

Ms. Elmiger presented her review. She explained the project requires site plan review and special land use review because the project includes expansion of a liquor serving establishment. She requested clarification on standing area adjacent to the bar and if there would be changes to the occupancy. Ms. Elmiger explained the proposal meets the special land use standards and recommended approval.

Dean Rovinelli, applicant, presented the project. He explained the standing area is 50 to 60 square feet to the left of the bar.

Public Hearing

Chair Sisolak opened the public hearing at 7:13 PM.

There were no public comments.

Chair Sisolak closed the public hearing at 7:14 PM.

Board Discussion

Comm. Kehoe asked about the sequence and timing of the Planning Commission approval and construction project.

Mr. Buzuvis explained that prep work and interior demo may occur prior to Planning Commission approval.

Comm. Kehoe expressed concern with the calculation of the existing parking spaces. She asked for clarification on the five unmarked parking spaces and if parking in those unofficial spaces would make the remaining 29 traditional spaces inaccessible.

Mr. Rovinelli explained that the parking lot is only accessed by the alley because the gates off Main Street remain closed. He explained by closing the gates they gained approximately six parking spaces.

Comm. Kehoe was concerned that those additional spaces were unmarked and unable to be used by patrons. She did not believe they counted as usable spaces.

Mr. Rovinelli agreed the additional spaces could be marked.

Comm. Kehoe asked if they qualified as legal parking spaces according to the ordinance.

Ms. Elmiger explained the approximate sizes of the spaces and she believed there was enough space to properly mark them.

Mr. Rovinelli explained that he could provide an exact gross floor area, if necessary, to calculate the number of parking spaces required.

Comm. Joy asked if the Planning Commission could require the applicant to purchase additional parking spaces.

Ms. Elmiger explained that there is a specific number of parking spaces related to the business that must be provided on-site and it was determined to be 34.

Comm. Offerman clarified that gross area for each business that uses the lot could be calculated and fewer spaces could be required.

Ms. Elmiger explained that the lot as it is currently striped accommodates 29 spaces, where 34 spaces are required based off estimated gross floor area.

Mr. Rovinelli believed that the required spaces would be reduced. He asked if there was any priority given to their business because it was established five years ago.

Comm. Adams explained the Planning Commission may approve a reduced number of spaces, but that the City Commission may not approve their reduction.

Comm. Saraswat explained the Commission considers parking requirements intentionally and with much thought.

Comm. Silvers asked about the standards for bars and about upgrades to ADA compliance.

Ms. Elmiger explained ADA compliance is not handled by the zoning ordinance but may be required in the Building Code.

Comm. Silvers wanted a more flexible review of the required parking space because the business that existed there prior to the proposed expansion utilized the same lot.

Mr. Rovinelli explained that with the expansion, Barrio is adding approximately eight additional seats.

Comm. Kehoe, supported by Comm. Offerman, made a motion to approve SP20-01 for site plan and special land use with the condition that the parking lot is appropriately striped and that the Building Official's approves the striping job and that the appropriate number of spots for the floor plan is met, to be reviewed administratively.

MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY 7-0

7. OLD BUSINESS

a) PUD 15-01: 550 N. Holbrook, Zoned PUD – amendment to add eight parking spaces

Ms. Elmiger presented her review. She explained the project adds eight parking spaces onto the green space, which was approved as one of the public benefits. She did not believe the amendment was consistent with a single-family residential PUD.

Mark Menuck, applicant, presented the project. He believed the greenspace was enhanced by the addition of the parking and other landscaping proposed. He asked for clarification why the project did not meet the 15-foot buffer requirement, as 20 feet was provided.

Ms. Elmiger explained that the parking spaces would be on land used for residential, and as such would not meet the requirements.

Mr. Menuck explained the parking spaces meet the size requirements now. He explained the specific changes to the size of the park, the parking area, and the proposed landscaping.

Citizen Comments

None.

Board Discussion

Comm. Kehoe asked about the plan to connect to Hines Park.

Mr. Menuck explained that he has provided the area as an easement for 20 feet, but Wayne County is the entity who would ensure the connection (access) to the parkland.

Comm. Kehoe did not believe the proposal allowed for the open park area like was originally intended and functioned more as a path or accessway to Hines Park.

Comm. Saraswat asked who the park is intended to serve. It was confirmed the park is intended to be used by the single-family residents. She asked why that was considered as a public benefit in the original proposal.

Comm. Kehoe explained the public benefit was really to provide access to Hines Park.

Mr. Menuck explained he could not build on the county property even if he wanted.

Comm. Kehoe explained that the usability and versatility of the park would be lost if it was only a path. She worried that it would not be usable because it was not visible from the street.

Comm. Saraswat did not believe the original park plan was a public benefit and that it should not be treated like one.

Comm. Silvers explained the area is primarily the grassy space over the required stormwater retention area. He explained the area would be used by and for the development, not for the public at large. He believed that the proposal moves where people would potentially congregate from the side yard to the rear yard. He preferred having a larger, contiguous area of land at the rear of the property to accommodate a future connection to Hines.

Comm. Saraswat was not concerned about losing this amenity as a public benefit because there were still two other public benefits with the project. She asked for the guidelines to amend a PUD.

Ms. Elmiger explained that a PUD amendment should be consistent with the approach or purpose of the original PUD and should meet the PUD standards. She recommended having a public hearing.

Comm. Silvers asked for renderings that show what the gateway would look like.

Ms. Elmiger explained that the information needs to be provided on paper for the public hearing, so the Commission has an accurate record of what is being requested.

Comm. Saraswat, supported by Comm. Joy, made a motion to set a public hearing for 550 N. Holbrook PUD amendment with the condition that the Planning Commission be provided complete renderings to review including a view of the proposed gateway.

MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY 7-0

b) Rooftop Dining Ordinance

Chair Sisolak asked about the parapet definition.

Comm. Silvers suggested defining walls and parapets because they are different.

Chair Sisolak asked which zoning districts would permit rooftop dining. It was clarified that the B-2 district was the only district where rooftop dining was a special land use, which would be limited to downtown.

Mr. Buzuvis explained that the hours of operation might not be able to be restricted via ordinance because it

located on private property. He explained that hours of operation are governed by the Michigan Liquor Control Commission (MLCC).

Comm. Silvers asked how the Commission felt about provision “g” related to live music.

Comm. Kehoe worried that allowing live music would increase the noise coming off rooftops.

Comm. Adams agreed and explained he hears everything from Kellogg Park.

Comm. Saraswat suggested restricting the hours of live music on the rooftop.

Ms. Elmiger explained the noise ordinance should cover most concerns about loud, live music.

Comm. Silvers suggested allowing the MLCC to control whether live music was permitted on the rooftop.

Comm. Kehoe asked for clarification about the allowed height of 42 inches.

Mr. Buzuvis explained the intent is to prohibit a 6-foot-tall privacy fence from being installed.

Comm. Silvers did not agree with that provision. He believed it was too limiting. He wanted to see a minimum established for safety but did not want it to be only 42 inches.

Ms. Elmiger suggested amending the language to say the rooftop dining must be enclosed by a building wall or a parapet or fence that is a minimum of 42 inches tall.

The Board discussed the meaning of the “open side” and enclosure of the rooftop by adjacent taller buildings.

Mr. Buzuvis explained he would confirm that 42 inches is acceptable by the Building Code.

Chair Sisolak explained next step would be to set a public hearing and she requested administrative confirmation about the hours of operation from the MLCC and changes to the height minimum, as discussed.

Comm. Silvers, supported by Comm. Adams, made a motion to set a public hearing for the rooftop dining ordinance with the changes, as discussed.

MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY 7-0

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.

Comm. Kehoe asked for an update on the Saxton’s project.

City Comm. O’Donnell explained the PUD rezoning and PUD agreement was approved at the Monday, July 6 City Commission meeting.

Comm. Joy asked about the parcel owned by Mark Wira.

Mr. Buzuvis explained it is not impacted by or included in the sale of the property.

Chair Sisolak reminded the Board the Pulte Open House is Saturday, July 18.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no further business, a motion was made by Comm. Joy, supported by Comm. Offerman to adjourn the meeting at 8:54 PM.

MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY 7-0