

FARMINGTON PLANNING COMMISSION PROCEEDINGS
City Council Chambers, 23600 Liberty Street
Farmington, Michigan
June 11, 2018

Chairperson Crutcher called the Meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. at City Council Chambers, 23600 Liberty Street, Farmington, Michigan, on Monday, June 11, 2018.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chiara, Crutcher, Gronbach, Kmetzo, Majoros, Perrot, Waun

Absent: None

A quorum of the Commission was present.

OTHER OFFICIALS PRESENT: Director Christiansen, Recording Secretary Murphy

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION by Chiara, seconded by Majoros, to approve the Agenda.

Motion carried, all ayes.

APPROVAL OF ITEMS ON CONSENT AGENDA

a. May 14, 2018 Minutes

MOTION by Majoros, seconded by Chiara, to approve the items on the Consent Agenda.

Motion carried, all ayes.

**PRE-APPLICATION CONFERENCE WITH PLANNING COMMISSION ON PUD
PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT PLAN - SAMURAI STEAKHOUSE
RESTAURANT – 32905 GRAND RIVER AVENUE**

Chairperson Crutcher introduced this agenda item and turned it over to staff.

Christiansen stated this item is a pre-application conference, discussion and review, with the Planning Commission on a proposed PUD, Planned Unit Development Concept Plan, for the redevelopment of the former Ginger's Café site, located at 32905 Grand River Avenue in the Central Business District. Article X, PUD, Planned Unit Development, Section 35–135, approval procedures of the Zoning Ordinance provides PUD applicants an opportunity to request an optional pre-application conference with the Planning Commission on the proposed PUD concept plan. The purpose of the pre-application conference is to discuss the appropriateness of a PUD and the concept plan and to solicit feedback and to receive requests for additional materials supporting the proposal. An applicant desiring such a conference shall request placement on a Planning Commission Agenda.

The Applicant has submitted a PUD Concept Plan for the redevelopment of Ginger's Café, located at 32905 Grand River Avenue. The Concept Plan includes an existing

condition survey of the site, a proposed layout site plan, proposed floor plans and elevations perspectives of the proposed building. Also attached are three aerial photos of the site, showing the property from different proximities and the surrounding properties are also shown on the aerial photographs as well.

The Applicant is here this evening to present the PUD Concept Plan to the Commission and there are attachments with your staff report. Christiansen put one of the three aerial photographs attached with the staff report and pointed out the details of the picture on the screen. He pointed out the subject properties and the adjacent properties. He stated that next door to the former Ginger's Café site, is the former Grand Cleaners which became the Grand Bakery and Café, which also has residential units upstairs. That has been closed for a period of time now, has been marketed, and actually has been acquired by the Petitioners and they have worked with City Administration, with the Economic and Community Development Department, and the City's Building Official, to acquire permits for interior modification to establish their new sushi bar restaurant, Samurai Sushi, in the former Grand Bakery site. He stated that permit has been issued and that work is going on now.

What's proposed this evening is an expansion of that area, the adjacent property, Ginger's Café site, and a proposed PUD for Samurai Steakhouse which is intended to enjoin the Samurai Sushi which is new being repurposed in the former Grand Bakery and Café site. Adjacent to the west is a parking lot and then there is the Groves Retail Center, the east side of the Groves Retail Center is where Great Lakes Ace and Earned Not Given Crossfitter are at currently, and the Farmington West Apartments to the south here and you see the adjacent retail development which includes Mother Mary's Toffee and then development down back to the east down Grand River. Across to the north is Village Commons and Farmington Place Senior Center and then properties that front along Grand River just to the west of School Street. He stated this is a broad based view.

He described the next aerial photograph is in a little bit closer, 32905, Ginger's Café site, the Grand Bakery and Café site to the east, and Great Lakes Ace to the west and Farmington West Apartments. He stated all of these properties are in very close proximity, share property boundaries, and are such to where they've been developed for quite a period of time. So with this we are looking at repurposing, redevelopment of this site but we also have to be mindful of what we are looking at that exists on adjacent properties.

The last aerial is the site in question here, the site has an existing home, a former Victorian type home that is going to be removed to accommodate the redevelopment of the site. The historic barn is depicted that exists on the site, the Petitioner has worked very closely with the City, with the Downtown Development Authority and with interest to obtain that barn and what is actually happening is the owner has coordinated the dismantling of the barn and the packaging of that barn and the moving of that packaged barn to an historic property in Pontiac. There was also a former gazebo on the site that has been removed. So they are in the process of cleaning up this property and staging it for its redevelopment.

He put the application on the screen as well as the elevations submitted by the Applicant showing the Grand Bakery Café site which is now Samurai Sushi, which is going to be on the first level, and the second level which is three apartment units and that currently exists. What is also shown on the screen is an outdoor seating area, that enjoins the existing building and the proposed building, and then the proposed building which is a complementary building to the existing Grand Bakery and Café in its style, architecture and design and that is intended to have the Samurai Steakhouse on the main level and three apartments upstairs.

He stated that using the existing Grand Bakery Café building, now Samurai Sushi, and connecting it with the outdoor seating area and connecting the access and the parking together to create a comprehensive property that will include both the sushi bar and the steakhouse.

He put the plans on the screen for the Commissioners and stated that he would let the Petitioners go through them and explain what their proposal is.

Crutcher thanked Christiansen and called the Petitioners to the podium.

Michael Kemsley, one of the Petitioners, came to the podium. He thanked the Commissioners for their help since obtaining the properties and trying to assist with what he is proposing.

He went through the pictures that were put on the screen showing what they are proposing next to the Grand Bakery. He pointed out the existing Grand Baker and also where the Victorian Style and historic barn are currently. He stated what they are proposing is to put their second restaurant in the main floor of the "future building" and the additional parking spots below. He pointed out the patio area that was on the rendering and indicated there is a pass-through existing and he is working with the owners of that building to allow access for a pass-through to the parking lot.

He put on the screen a depiction of the new building, pointing out the hibachi tables, with the seating at about 120 seating capacity. He pointed out the outdoor patio with tables and chairs and they would also like to put an outdoor hibachi table outside as well if the City allows it.

He pointed out the residents' entrance for the additional floor above and indicated they actually reconstructed it to make four apartment units in that upstairs floor. He showed where the elevator was located as well as the bar area. He said the four units will be 800 square feet to 1,000 square feet, very modern, that they are currently redoing those units and invited the Commissioners to come by and view them.

He put the outside elevations on the screen and stated that the colored renderings depict what they are trying to accomplish.

He stated he would be open to questions from the Commissioners.

Chairperson Crutcher opened the floor to questions from the Commissioners.

Chiara asked how many parking spaces are on the site and the Petitioner asked Christiansen to respond.

Christiansen stated one of the challenging issues in any downtown is infrastructure and vehicular parking. He said within the built environment of the City they try and look for and find parking and utilize parking, they certainly try to do that. He said that the existing Grand Bakery and Café has fourteen spaces available on the site for the user of the building and for the three residential units upstairs. Based upon the parking requirements in the Central Business District, there is a deficiency with respect to the number of spaces required for the residential with the sushi bar. The sushi bar is somewhat limited based upon the parking available and with the number of tables. Parking for restaurants in the downtown are based upon the number of chairs. So, it's one space for every three chairs in a restaurant and the residential is two spaces for every unit. One of the things in the Central Business District that is unique is that there is public parking. There is public parking throughout the various locations in the City. He said the Groves Retail Center and the downtown Farmington Center, they utilize the public parking that is out front adjacent to Riley Park/Sundquist Pavilion, all of that parking is public parking and that is utilized through the CBD regulations how parking is provided, so there is a shared parking scenario there and can be counted in for those uses. He stated that the City went through a test program to reduce some of the lanes on Grand River and that includes the curb lane in front of these properties and that there is now a provision of on-street parking where there used to be a travel lane, so some of that can be calculated in.

He stated with that and the parking on site for the sushi bar. For the steakhouse there is parking provided with twenty-one spaces being proposed, and based upon the number of seats for the tables, plus the outdoor seating, and with the sushi bar, the parking provided there, what's being provided at the steakhouse site, there is still a deficiency in parking. He indicated right now the owners are working with the adjacent property owners to find opportunities for additional parking, shared parking, reciprocal parking agreement that includes the adjacent property to the west, which is the Great Lakes Ace property and what the Petitioner indicated, there is a proposed connection creating an opening between the two properties and connecting the two parking areas and sharing parking so there's opportunity for the steakhouse to utilize shared parking on the Great Lakes Ace site. That is a work in progress with the owners and that is intended to be put in place. There has also been dialogue with the owners of the apartment complex about sharing some of their parking and along the rear property line there is currently fencing that is in need of repair and the owners have indicated they are willing to work with the property owner to upgrade and improve that fencing, create a pedestrian access, and they are seeking shared parking there as well.

They have also been talking with the adjacent property owner across on the north side, Village Commons, about the opportunity to share parking there as well. The City has been working very closely with the Downtown Development Authority, the City Administration Management, Economic Community Development, the owners of the two properties that are part of the PUD, also to the adjacent properties to the south, east, west and north, and looking to see what alternatives are available to put together to move forward with this PUD.

He responded to Chiara by saying that parking is a key issue here with the redevelopment of this site.

Chiara stated he would be concerned about people that are tenants in the building, making sure they have a place to park when they come, which has always been a problem behind Page's.

Petitioner Kemsley responded that he and his partner had just left a meeting with the Mother Mary's Toffee, and have offered to purchase their building and essentially tear it down and put a parking lot there. So that they are trying to do whatever they can to make this plan come to fruition.

Chiara inquired of Christiansen if it would be possible to put signage that designates that parking is for tenants only or something to that effect.

Christiansen stated there are a number of alternatives addressing the parking or whatever the issue of parking may be. He asked through the Chair if he could be allowed to ask the Petitioner to speak on the structure of the residential units, whether they are apartments for rent, for lease, are they condominiums for ownership, which will play into the equation.

Petitioner Kemsley responded that they are going to be available for lease, and that actually they had wanted to go higher and put in more units but that the parking situation limited their ability to do so.

Christiansen responded that one of the things that the City looks to try to do is look to see where the City can provide parking where possible but again there are public parking Areas that serve all of these uses. He stated that on Grand River there are uses on the north side that have a public parking field behind them but they also have residential units up on the second floor and there isn't any designation or exclusivity for parking. It's a matter of utilizing parking that is available. Part of the strategy the City has implemented is time limited parking so that parking doesn't become used for long durations by individuals, someone parking in a space for an all day situation. He indicated this is part of the dialogue and that certainly there has to be a strategy, it can't be where the City doesn't have the ability to provide parking alternatively in some way, whether it's on site, whether it's shared parking via reciprocal easement agreement, etc., whatever the tool is with adjacent properties or properties across the street or the ones adjacent south or east and that is all being worked on right now. It does limit somewhat what is able to be done. The reason the City is working with the Petitioner is the City is on a PUD and utilizing the PUD process is to provide flexibility in design, in layout, in infrastructure, in support services including parking and how that will all work. So again, exclusivity becomes a little bit of a challenge, designating parking becomes a little bit of a challenge, but all of these things need to be spelled out with a final PUD agreement.

Majoros asked through the Chair to Director Christiansen, that the box says 24 spaces required for the one property, 31 spaces required for the other, that adds up to 55 but below it says 59, so what number is the required number?

Christiansen stated he actually has the calculations on his desk and can go and get them and give him the numbers.

Majoros stated at a minimum there are 12 to 13 and Christiansen replied the parking standards are spelled out as one to three seats and that apartments require two.

Majoros stated the delta that Christiansen is talking about seems like a reasonable solution but that he has two other questions. One of them being making a left turn out of the Ace parking lot, whether that is easily accomplished.

Chiara responded that he frequently turns left out of Chicken King which is right down the road and doesn't have a problem.

Perrot stated that there are no cars usually parked out in front of the Ace parking lot.

Majoros stated that if across the street parking is a solution, should there be consideration of a crosswalk so that there are not just people darting across Grand River, and that public safety should be of utmost concern, if overflow parking should be across the street.

Christiansen responded to Majoros' questions by saying if there is access to the Great Lakes Ace site, if that works out, left hand turns will have to be looked at. He responded to the question asked about crossing Grand River, that likely that issue will be readdressed and brought back so that there is a crossing at School Street across to Great Lakes Ace to provide access north and south to this property.

Christiansen went on to say he now has his calculations for parking and that total quick numbers that there are actually 187 seats total in the sushi, steakhouse and outdoor seating with three seats per space at 63 spaces for the restaurants together and the outdoor seating and the six residential units, two per is twelve, so there's a total of 75 spaces that are necessary and required right now and will be part of the PUD agreement.

Chairperson Crutcher asked with the potential of getting the other property would that also be part of the PUD?

Kemsley responded yes, if they do acquire the property, that they are diligently working to get more parking spots. He stated that they also can revisit the print and take away a couple of tables within the restaurant and outdoor seating and fluctuate the calculations for parking. He stated that as restaurant owners they really don't want to do that, but if that's what makes everything work, they are willing to do that. He stated he is willing to work with the City to come up with a solution for this issue.

Christiansen stated that his bottom line numbers are 75 required, 35 provided, and that is the deficiency right now and what needs to be looked at. There is the opportunity for shared parking which is a common theme in the downtown so they are looking for alternatives. He referenced the site plan with Mother Mary's Toffee providing another five spaces, but stated it is still a work in progress.

Waun stated what they haven't addressed is the issue of employee parking and where they are going to park.

Kemsley replied that he had addressed this issue with Christiansen to see if it was possible for the employees to park in the lot south of the Great Lakes Ace parking lot with either some type of walkway.

Christiansen put the aerial photograph on the screen depicting that there is a pedestrian walkway that goes from the Great Lakes Ace parking lot to the big parking field that is just south of T.J. Maxx but that that is all private so there has to be agreements in place in order to accommodate that.

Chiara confirmed that the parking spots per seat includes employees and Christiansen responded in the affirmative and stated it was an industry standard and in the Zoning Ordinance.

Chairperson Crutcher asked if the PUD approach was better than a variance request and Christiansen stated that the PUD allows for not only the flexibility in design and layout and creativity for combining parking and access and sharing parking, but the easement agreements and everything else, there is an ending agreement, a PUD agreement that is part of the overall project that spells out every aspect of the project including parking. So not only does it allow for the flexibility but it's specific as to how the project is established and how it functions.

Chairperson then asked if the PUD included only the two parcels and Christiansen responded that the Petitioner's interest is in the Grand Bakery Café, now Samurai Sushi and the Ginger's Café property that they've also acquired which is proposed to be Samurai Steakhouse.

Kmetzo asked the Petitioner if he has restaurants in other parts of Michigan and Petitioner Kemsley responded they currently have a restaurant in West Bloomfield at Haggerty north of 14 Mile Road which is a Samurai Steakhouse as well.

Kmetzo then asked why the Petitioner chose Farmington as their next location and Kemsley responded that they did look at the property which was the former Bellacino's location but that it was too small for what they wanted to do with it and he stated that downtown Farmington and the surrounding community is a little underdeveloped and that they are trying to help them redevelop this site.

Christiansen stated that the staff has had an opportunity to visit the restaurant in West Bloomfield and had lunch there and that it was awesome and that they are very excited

to bring this opportunity to the City and it has been a pleasure to work with the owners of the property to continue make this project come to fruition.

Chairperson Crutcher stated it sounds like it's a matter of how close to the required parking they are going to get and Christiansen responded that in most downtowns this is very typical where you don't have individual stand-alone sites that stand alone and provide all of that themselves. They have to share infrastructure. They have to share access. They have to share sewers and water and other infrastructure elements and it becomes part of a cohesive downtown environment.

Kmetzo expressed her concerns with the issue of parking and how it effects residents and customers in that area.

Christiansen responded that they have had this discussion as a Commission that development and redevelopment in our community and downtown has now moved down Grand River to the east, after Groves Street they knew they were going to get to this point and so they're now in this location dealing with this issue. And parking has been a topic of conversation for quite a long time and that they need to keep working on what is the most viable alternative and what they can make work.

Chairperson Crutcher asked if there's a way if they can get the other parcel added and also looking at a way to reconfigure the Ace parking and do more than just do a pass-through but if they could reconfigure both of those lots they could increase the parking.

Christiansen responded that that requires cooperation between both parties and that Great Lakes Ace and there is a new owner of Groves Retail Center, and they've engaged the new owner several times and he has a willingness to work together and that is a continuing work in progress.

Chairperson Crutcher stated that the parking lot is a little problematic in how you navigate through it but if they could work with you to reconfigure it, it may be beneficial.

Petitioner Kemsley stated that they were actually sitting in the parking lot the other day and someone was trying to make the turn into the Ace parking lot and actually hit the car that was parked, she didn't have a big enough radius to do it. He said the second thing is, and he didn't know if it was a good time to ask but he was wondering about the Mexican restaurant and the parking behind that, was it public parking, and that he was kind of wondering where their actual parking was going in correlation to how they were seeking parking. He indicated they were willing to go above and beyond to acquire another piece of property to put parking there and was hoping the Commission takes that into consideration also.

Christiansen responded that what is unique about that situation is the former Dimitri's Restaurant was acquired and became Los Tres Amigos and the DDA bought the property, they leased the building to the restaurateur but they kept the parking and the parking became a public parking lot that still provided parking to Los Tres Amigos and then the restaurateur of Los Tres Amigos bought the building from the DDA. So, what is there now is a former completely private site that is owned private, the restaurant is, but the parking is public parking but if you look at the CBD regulations where you don't have parking on site but there is public parking adjacent to the parking fields, municipal lots, convenient parking, and on the street, that gets to be counted in. So that is that scenario with that property.

In this case here you don't have a public parking field adjacent. You do have public parking in the streets so that's going to offset and provide some public parking, if you will.

Another thing too, that happens here, if this works, the way the discussions are going and the plans are showing, is there's greater connectivity and access from property to property and that also bodes well because it connects downtown businesses together physically with shared parking and access and circulation.

Waun thanked the Petitioner for choosing Farmington and investing in our community.

Kemsley stated that he appreciated the open arms from Farmington and thanked the City and its Administration for working with him.

Chairperson Crutcher asked if any action was required from the Planning Commission and Christiansen responded that this is an optional pre-application conference prior to completion of the formal application and moving forward with the preliminary conceptual plan step in the PUD and the next step is conceptual plans and a Public Hearing.

Chairperson Crutcher thanked the Petitioner.

PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN AMENDMENT REVIEW FOR PROPOSED OUTLOT BUILDING AND EXISTING BUILDING FAÇADE AND SITE IMPROVEMENTS – WORLD WIDE CENTER, LLC 34701-34801 GRAND RIVER AVENUE

Chairperson Crutcher introduced this item and turned it over to staff.

Christiansen stated that this is a preliminary site plan amendment review for a proposed out lot building and existing building façade and site improvements for the World Wide Shopping Center which is located 34701-34801 Grand River Avenue.

There is a little bit of history with respect to this property and a project had been brought to the Planning Commission a few years ago that moved forward to site plan review and

was not realized. Currently the City has been working with the owner of the World Wide Shopping Center regarding a proposed out lot in the existing parking lot as well as façade remodeling to the existing building and site. The proposed out lot building addition as indicated in the plans that were attached with the staff report would be a 1,700 square foot one-story building with a drive-thru located on the east end of the existing parking lot. Additional site improvements include parking lot improvements, new site landscaping and lighting and new signage. The existing building site is located in the C-2 Community Commercial District and requires review and approval by the Planning Commission and the Zoning Board of Appeals in this case as it relates to site parking. No other changes to the existing site are proposed.

Again, past history, as indicated at the April 14, 2014 Planning Commission Meeting, the Planning Commission approved the site plan for the World Wide Shopping Center, the approved site plan included exterior changes to the existing building façade and shopping center site, those approved exterior changes at that time included façade improvements, revised modified site landscaping, revised modified parking lot and building lighting and new site as well as building as well as tenant signage. The site plan was approved at that time with the following conditions: that the proponent submit a parking lot lighting plan, also to address a more detailed landscape plan and be provided back to the Planning Commission. The Petitioner then reappeared back on the Planning Commission Agenda on June 9, 2014 and at that meeting the Commission approved the amended site plan for World Wide Shopping Center including support materials. Minutes of those meetings were attached with the staff packets. However, the approved site plan that was approved back in 2014 was never completed and the approval for that site plan did expire.

As indicated, the Applicant has submitted a new site plan, this site plan is for a proposed one-story building addition in the parking lot as well as improvements again to the building.

Also with the staff report is an aerial photograph of the site and the Petitioner is in attendance to present his preliminary plans to the Commission this evening.

Christiansen stated the aerial shows the World Wide Shopping Center on Grand River Avenue. This an older strip type center, commercial property with a big parking field, in this case out on Grand River and it has the building that is pushed to the south end of the site with a very small loading area, alley type access along the rear, there's residential, the rear yards you see here, Whittaker Court, this is Whittaker Street to the east and then Whittaker Court with the single-family units that have rear yards and the rear property

lines that share a common boundary with the south side of the center. So, there's a variety of fences there, it's an older building, it's an older development, there's been a need for property maintenance and upgrades for a period of time, that was the reason that the

Petitioner came before the Commission with a proposed plan in 2014 and unfortunately it wasn't realized for a variety of reasons but is now back with not only those improvements again to a certain extent but the building addition as well. The application has been submitted. He put an existing condition survey on the screen and stated he would let the Petitioner go through this. He stated there will be a new roof put on the building and some other treatments and façade modifications, a complete change to the façade on the existing building. Currently it's a mansard type façade, kind of a cedar shake on a mansard roof configuration. The proposed building addition is a 1,700 square foot addition and a new monument sign off the entrance off of Grand River.

Christiansen then stated the Petitioner is here to present this to the Commission.

Chairperson Crutcher invited the Petitioner to the podium.

Scott Monchnik, the architect for the project, came to the podium and stated he is working with Joe Barbatt, the owner of the center, and is here as representative of the center.

He stated that Kevin was correct, they were before the Planning Commission many years back, to do the façade remodeling. Over the course of trying to get funding for that and work that out with tenants and everything else, that was never able to come together.

He stated this opportunity for an out lot will allow the owner to get his funding to do the entire project, he has convinced his financial institutions if you build it they will come, so if the approval for the out lot is forthcoming that he will be able to get additional tenants, a new tenant list, some of the older tenants will probably move out and new life can be instilled into the project.

He stated they intend to improve the site lighting, landscaping, parking lot improvements and the building. The building is old, the roof needs to be replaced which is a substantial cost, it's a very large center in terms of lineal feet. The addition of the out lot will draw additional customers to the area, to the project, and also allow the out lot itself to thrive and be a good addition to the neighborhood.

He stated that's pretty much where we're at, the façade was intended to be redeveloped and the redevelopment is very similar to what it was intended to be previously, it's gone

through a little bit of value engineering to allow it to be more affordable to the owner, without diminishing the esthetics to the public.

He said the number one objective is to get the site plan approved to allow them to move forward on the out lot which is as part of the lease, it is a super aggressive timeline to get it done. So, he is hoping that the Planning Commission agrees with them this evening and approves this project so they can facilitate the change for a long-needed project.

Chairperson Crutcher asked if there is a tenant for the out lot and Monchnik responded it is Tropical Smoothie Café.

Chairperson Crutcher opened the floor for questions from the Commissioners.

Waun asked if there was a reason they selected the east side of the lot versus the west side which is further away from the residential street?

Monchnik responded that the tenant on the west side of the property, their lease does not allow for an out lot.

Gronbach stated that on the proposed site plan they are showing removal of the existing trees which are pretty substantial but that there are no landscaping plans so that he expects the Petitioner will submit a complete landscape plan that meets the City's specifications.

Monchnik responded that the existing trees that are there are old and very full and makes it hard to see the center as you're passing down Grand River. So the idea is to take out the old trees, all of the islands up by the building, the landscape islands don't have trees in them now, but those will all have new trees put into them.

Gronbach stated that the islands along the driveway that are shown in the plan as remaining and existing, they are not showing changes, there are trees in those islands that may or not be okay, but the islands themselves are not in very good shape, there is asphalt curbing which a lot of it is busted up, there's a lot of weeds and stone and so on in these islands, so that he would think if you're going to leave the islands as proposed that you need to upgrade the islands to include concrete curbing, and it shows the existing asphalt paving will remain in the parking lot. He stated the parking lot is in pretty rough shape, it's been patched over many times and he stated if they are going to this extent, the parking lot needs to be redone and repaved.

Monchnik responded that the islands where it says they will remain means they are remaining in their shape and size but they do have to be addressed with landscaping,

curbing and then determine if it's going to be sod, or what's going to be on there. The parking lot is in need of repair and that's in the budget.

Gronbach stated that the Petitioner is going to need to submit a site plan that details these issues because he doesn't know how they could approve this site plan where it says existing, existing, existing, when you're agreeing it all needs to be replaced.

Monchnik stated they are preparing an upgrade, it won't necessarily be torn out and replaced, but it will be improved.

Gronbach stated that a lot of the asphalt curbs are in very poor condition and he doesn't see how they can leave those and the Petitioner responded he was speaking more of the parking repairs.

Gronbach also stated the sidewalk along the front of the building is very narrow and the site plan shows the existing sidewalk and he questioned if the sidewalk meets ADA requirements and certainly has no handicap access or ramps, it would seem to me if you're going to redesign this whole thing, it would be beneficial to widen the sidewalk along the store fronts which would be advantageous. The doors open directly onto the sidewalk, they come out and almost block the entire sidewalk as people are walking along there and it needs to be looked.

Monchnik stated they had not really intended to modify the sidewalk but in terms of making everything ADA compatible.

Gronbach stated it doesn't really show the width on the site plan but that is a very narrow sidewalk and he thinks it would be a very nice improvement if the sidewalk was widened out and had accessible handicapped ramps and appropriate placement of them.

Christiansen stated these are great questions and that is the reason they are having the preliminary review. He indicated one of the challenges they have in the City older centers were built under different standards at different times. When we're talking about a redevelopment of this center, it's more than just a fresh coat of paint. Now what's being proposed is a brand new building addition to an existing site which also allows an opportunity to look at enhancements and upgrades to the existing center. There is a lot of stuff that's nonconforming and one of them is the sidewalk and the lack of barrier free access. When this center was built there weren't barrier free requirements that were in place. So Mr. Crutcher alluded to the fact that if you change the sidewalk and he and Monchnik had this conversation and if it needed to be widened or bumped out from the front of the building, that goes into the travel lane that are in front of the units, which then affects the distance to those islands and might require reconfiguration of the parking lot.

That sometimes limits what an owner is willing to do, and they must together on these things. He stated they talked about the landscaping, needing a plan, if they're going to propose taking the trees out which would require the Planning Commission's approval,

what new landscaping will go in its place. There was a landscape plan with the 2014 approved plan, there were beds and flowers and other low profile type landscape plantings that were talked about and may need to be brought back.

Also, you'll note there's no dumpster enclosures here along the rear of the building where the dumpsters are at, it's a very narrow access. So there's a small wall that's about four feet high. He stated that Mochnick indicated they are willing to increase that wall back there and repurpose that wall. We've had residents come in and pull fence permits to create additional screening to themselves. But because of the way the shopping center was built and what isn't there that the residents want and that we can try and find a way to get those things. Short of the dumpster, there isn't a dumpster at the end of the building, we talked about some enclosure opportunities and they are still looking at that, don't know if we can facilitate it based upon where the building is at and its proximity to the rear lot line and to the west lot line, that's still a work in progress.

Lighting is a big one, too, and he thanked Commissioner Gronbach for taking a look at this site over time and also, too, he was involved when it came to the site plan in 2014, there was some temporary lighting that needs to be removed and needs to be redone.

The other item that he wanted to address is the 1,700 square foot building that is going in a location where there is existing parking, displacing or eliminating existing parking. If you look at the site plan, the existing building has 188 parking spaces required, there is 180 on the site. That is a current deficiency as it is but it's grandfathered in. With the removal of spaces and with the 1,700 square foot building, right now the building is about 42,000 square feet, with an addition of 1,700, it's going to need additional parking and it's going to end up being deficient probably by about 30 to 34 spaces.

Monchnik replied there's a net difference of 26 of what they are deficient now and what they will be deficient with the out lot.

Christiansen indicated the preliminary plan before the Commission tonight is to receive feedback but what has to happen here subsequent to the Planning Commission's preliminary review, if the Petitioner is moving forward, the Zoning Board of Appeals needs to consider a waiver for the deficiency of parking in order to accommodate the additional which needs to be done before coming back to the Planning Commission with a full formal site plan.

He stated the out lot building itself requires by ordinance a certain number of stacking spaces for the drive-thru and that it requires 10 and they have seven, so that will have to be modified as well by the ZBA.

Crutcher stated that if the out lot was put on the west end of the center, it would be more desirable and asked if it was possible to have the building further west.

The Petitioner replied that with the drives the way they are, even though the east side of the property is more parked right now, there is so much unused parking in that overall parking lot, that people will learn to modify where they park to go to the stores.

Crutcher stated he is more concerned with the traffic from Panera, there's a lot of traffic there and there will be an increase in noise activity on that corner.

The Petitioner replied Whitaker is a drive to go down to a residential neighborhood but there are no residential activities at that corner.

Crutcher stated that there will be with the new out building.

The Petitioner stated the drives and curb cuts are already there so there is activity, cars coming in and out of that area already, it's not like they are adding a new curb.

Crutcher asked if it possible to locate the building further west and minimize the reduction in the parking.

The Petitioner replied that they have looked at a number of locations all through the site and at the end of the day the out lot tenant was eager to be more on that corner and after showing him a number of derivations of where they could go and how they could circulate, they were eager to be on the east side.

Majoros stated that what helps is upon exiting you're pushed back to Grand River and you're most likely going to be exiting out on one of the Grand River outs rather than doubling back to Whitaker.

Christiansen stated that stacking and coming out of the stacking cue once you've gone through the drive-thru window, it puts you out to Grand River, that's the main entrance, or one of the three main entrances. On the east end of the site, too, the way you stack the maneuver on that building on a drive that you circulate next to, if you moved it over more to the middle of the site, you're in the maneuvering area for the main center of the site and all of a sudden you start to get involved and you're going to have to reconfigure all that parking because you're now in the maneuvering lane and how it all circulates,

pushing it to the east end you don't have that scenario, the stacking and the drive-thru can all be on its own end of the site.

The comment about the west end, that was the first thing we had dialogue with the Petitioner about and the owner of the center, utilizing the west end, and that was discussed early on but unfortunately based upon the current lease structure, they've indicated they are not able to do that with O'Reilly, the tenant on the end and what they have in their agreement.

Majoros questioned Christiansen in light of the 2014 approved site plan not coming to fruition, how the Planning Commission can ensure that all of the improvements will be accomplished and that once the out lot building is built, they won't complete the required upgrades and can a timeline be established for completion of everything.

Christiansen stated when a site plan is reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission, it needs then to move forward to the next step which is detailed construction drawings and engineering. Those drawings need to reflect the desired site plan and all elements of it and any conditions that the Planning Commission has approved the site plan under, all of it needs to be carried forward. Permits that are issued for the approved site plan, the permits need to be implemented in their entirety and there are fees for the permits and there are financial guarantees that are put up, there's escrow monies that are then utilized to move forward with any development, any construction project. And all of the elements of the site plan as approved and the project under which the permits were issued under it for, need to be completed, and if not, the City has to take other steps and that's something we don't want to do and typically we don't have that situation, we have pretty good developers, builders, contractors that we would closely with them. Site plans that are approved by the Planning Commission in Farmington are good for a year of the date of approval, and if they're not consumed, utilized within that time, construction plans are not moved forward and permits not applied for and issued, then that site plan approval becomes null and void and that's what happened with this one in 2014. The guarantee that is held is through the permit process and through the financial guarantees that are provided and the obligation the owner of the property has, that's what is used.

If there is nothing done, if there is no site plan that moves forward, like any other property in the community, properties have the responsibility to follow the City's property maintenance codes meaning that they have to comply with the City's maintenance standards.

One of the challenges Farmington has is that it has an older building environment in a lot of areas and they work very hard to work with property owners to enhance, give new life, repurpose properties and this is one of them. We hope that it will move forward, whatever it takes to do that.

Crutcher asked if there is anything else that can be done and cited that O'Reilly's moved in and nothing else happened.

Christiansen responded that O'Reilly's had a portion of the property that was occupying an existing portion of the center and they came in to that portion and that area and repurposed what they were intending to do. The rest of the center wasn't tied to O'Reilly's and vice versa at that time. Certainly there are concerns with the center and through the site plan process, some upgrades proposed and that the Commission is looking for, these can be tied together. If you're talking about with the building addition to the site so it's new construction and the impact of that and the reduction of parking and the basis for supporting all of that and changes to the site, all of those items can be tied together comprehensively so that they are all done.

Crutcher stated he would like to see some type of assurance that all of these things will be addressed. He pointed out on the outbuilding itself, according to the plans, it looks like there's an outdoor walk-in cooler and the Petitioner replied that it looks like it's bumped out but it's part of the building, it's accessed from inside the building. Crutcher asked that the cooler be incorporated into the building and the Petitioner said that could be done.

Perrot stated that a lot of the Tropical Smoothie Café's have outdoor seating, and asked the Petitioner if there are any plans for outdoor seating.

The Petitioner stated that he did not anticipate having outdoor seating at this location.

Crutcher stated that due to the nature of the neighborhood in this area it would probably be a good idea to include that. There is already a deficiency in parking but it would make it more pedestrian friendly by incorporating outdoor seating.

Kmetzo asked Christiansen what the next step for this would be and Christiansen responded by saying the Petitioner will take the comments heard tonight and come back with a revised site plan that includes the elements discussed and then go to the Zoning Board of Appeals requesting a modification for parking and then come back before the Planning Commission for a formal site plan review.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Taylor Hixson, who lives in Farmington West Apartments, stated she was interested with what was going on with the former Grand Bakery and Cafe, that there were rumors that the whole site where the house is and where the barn is was going to be a parking lot,

and that she's happy to hear it is not just going to be a parking lot but at the same time she is concerned with too much access to the apartments itself. There are a lot of older people that live there and they go to bed early. She is a big proponent of downtown Farmington, has lived in Farmington her entire life, went to school there, and she is happy the community and all of the downtown is revitalizing because it was used to be very sleepy. She happy to hear of this coming in but she would like to see keeping separation between the residential and downtown businesses.

Petitioner Michael Helmsley, from Samurai Steakhouse, responded that between the Farmington West Apartments and the shopping center property there is a ratty looking fence and that they are working with the manager and the two owners to put up a retaining wall to keep people from hopping back and forth.

PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS

Christiansen provided information to the Commissioners on the Master Plan Update.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION by Chiara, supported by Waun, to adjourn the meeting.
Motion carried, all ayes.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:17 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Secretary