

CITY OF NORTHVILLE
Planning Commission
November 17, 2015
Northville City Hall – Council Chambers

1. CALL TO ORDER:

Chair Wendt called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL:

Present: Steve Kirk
Carol Maise
Dave Mielock
Christopher Miller
Matthew Mowers
Anne Smith
Jeff Snyder
Jay Wendt

Absent: Mark Russell (excused)

Also present: Ken Roth, Mayor
Jim Allen, Mayor Pro Tem
Marilyn Price, Council Member
Patrick Sullivan, City Manager
James Gallogly, Public Works Director
Sally Elmiger, Planning Consultant

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

Chair Wendt asked to add *Cady Street Potential* as an additional discussion item.

MOTION by Snyder, support Mielock, to approve the agenda as amended to include the discussion item: *Cady Street Potential*. Motion carried unanimously.

4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: November 3, 2015

Motion by Kirk, support Smith, to approve the November 3, 2015 minutes as published. Motion carried unanimously.

5. AUDIENCE COMMENTS: None.

6. REPORTS:

A. CITY ADMINISTRATION:

City Manager Sullivan reported that two ordinance amendments had received a first reading at last night's Council meeting:

1. Arbors, Trellises, Pergolas
2. Garden Ornaments

The Garden Ornaments amendment had received some discussion related to the language that *Garden ornaments shall not be arranged to constitute a fence*. There were questions as to what defined a fence, and before the second reading staff would look at the definitions and make sure that the language in the amendment was consistent with other ordinance provisions.

B. CITY COUNCIL: None.

C. PLANNING COMMISSION: None.

D. OTHER COMMUNITY/GOVERNMENTAL LIAISONS: None

7. DISCUSSION

Foundry Flask – Assisted Living Use

Referring to the Carlise/Wortman memo dated November 3, 2015, Planning Consultant Elmiger gave the background for this agenda item. Carlise/Wortman had recently met with two individuals who wanted to investigate the possibility of an assisted living development on the Foundry Flask property. During the course of those discussions, they looked at the Master Plan and the Zoning Ordinance. It was not clear whether or not assisted living was a use that was desired for this property or a permitted use. Therefore, Carlise/Wortman had been asked to provide their opinion about that question.

The Master Plan for this parcel called for a preferred land use as a “Creative Mixed Use,” which included office, medical, research and development, or creative and industrial arts workspaces. First floor residential was not allowed; however upper level residential was permitted. This sub area did not mention senior-only housing as a preferred land use.

Regarding the Cady Street Overlay District in the Zoning Ordinance, all the Central Business District uses were allowed on this property. Residential – a very broad term – was one of those uses; the term was not qualified as a certain type of residential. There was already an assisted living facility in the Central Business District; this was a permitted use as far as the Zoning Ordinance was concerned.

Planning Consultant Elmiger concluded by saying that the Master Plan did not address whether or not assisted living was a desired use on this property. However, since the Central Business Uses were allowed on the parcel, the Zoning Ordinance would seem to allow an assisted living facility on the Foundry Flask parcel. The Master Plan would come into play if the applicant were to propose a Planned Unit Development, because being consistent with the Master Plan was a major standard of determining whether a proposed PUD was a good idea for the property.

Dan Thies and William Biermann, Partners, Stonecrest Senior Living, 230 S. Bemiston Avenue, Suite 800, St. Louis, MO 63105, were present on behalf of this application. Presenting together and utilizing overhead slides, they made the following points:

Stonecrest Senior Living was in partnership with two other entities: NorthPoint Development out of Kansas City and ISL (Integral Senior Living) from Carlsbad, California. ISL was the 20th largest provider of assisted living in the United States.

Typically a Stonecrest Senior Living facility would serve two different populations: (1) assisted living for seniors and (2) a memory care unit. The average age of their residents was 85. 75% of their residents were female. The average stay in their facilities was 2.5 years.

They felt that the Foundry Flask property provided a unique opportunity to offer an urban style assisted living product in the Detroit area. Locating at one of the main entrances to downtown Northville would provide a unique product, as most similar facilities were in a more suburban setting.

Overhead slides, along with a handout distributed this evening, showed two conceptual site plans: Scheme One and Scheme Two. Looking at the Master Plan and the Cady Street Overlay District, they thought there were some unique opportunities to develop the site creatively. This proposed development would include:

- A trail along the river on the southeast portion of the property.
- A Farmer's Market, which would provide interaction between the Stonecrest and Northville communities.
- Street level retail, including a café that would be utilized by Stonecrest and Northville residents.
- Perhaps an art studio or work out facility could be located on the first floor, fronting on Cady Street. Such spaces would be used by both communities (Stonecrest and Northville).
- Most of the residents that would live in this senior housing facility would come from the community, as they would want to stay here. It was important to place facilities in areas such as Northville so that the residents could remain engaged. The Farmers' Market and the first level retail, along with the walking trails along the river, would help facilitate this.
- The section labeled "Proposed Building" was a placeholder in the conceptual site plan.
- Cady Street would be realigned to make a better connection with Main Street.
- They would be flexible in terms of their architecture so that the finished product would belong to this space. The building would be urban-looking.
- The facility would be private pay, from \$4,500 to \$7,000 per month, with care fees raising that to about \$5,000 - \$8,000 per month.
- They were proposing an approximately 72,000 square foot 3-story building. There would be 85 units, 55 with assisted living and 30 with memory care, though that split was flexible. It could end up 65/20, or 50/50.

There was a smaller facility in Northville with about 20 beds. There was no other facility like this one nearby. The closest they had seen was the Sunrise facility in downtown Rochester Hills, which was also an urban development.

This would not be a skilled nursing facility; no medical care would be provided. A medical event would trigger a 9-1-1 call. Generally speaking their residents could engage in normal daily activities.

Tonight they wanted to introduce themselves, meet the Planning Commission, and see the City's reaction to this development. They believed this provided a unique opportunity to develop an entrance to downtown Northville with a first class assisted living facility that would have retail on the first floor.

Mr. Thies and Mr. Biermann concluded their presentation.

Chair Wendt asked Planning Consultant Elmiger to address the fact that part of this property was in the Historic District and part was not. Planning Consultant Elmiger said that she had talked with the State

Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), and they had confirmed that any area outside the Historic District would not be subject to Historic District Standards, and any part inside the Historic District would be subject to those standards. The conceptual plans presented tonight appeared to show the main building outside the Historic District. The Farmers Market and the retail building would be inside the Historic District.

Commissioner Snyder asked about parking as shown on the plan. Mr. Biermann said that typically they would only need 55 parking spaces for their use. This site plan showed additional parking for the Farmers' Market and for people who would be using the trail. The gray areas showed proposed parking.

In response to a question from Commissioner Kirk, Mr. Biermann said they were not counting on income from the retail stores to support their facility.

Commissioner Mielock asked if any consideration had been planned for the existing Foundry Flask building in terms of it being listed as a historic structure and with parts of it remaining. Mr. Biermann said that they had not actually been in the building. It was their understanding that the building was in disrepair and effectively useless. They would soon be in the building to see for themselves.

Commissioner Mowers referred to the Master Plan. Setting aside whether residential was included in a mixed-use development, the proposal did have a number of features that were listed in the Master Plan, including the development of the riverfront and an alternative site for the Farmers' Market. What was the process for going forward, especially in terms of looking at the "Proposed Building?" Did the Commission have to make a decision that applied to the entire parcel?

Planning Consultant Elmiger said this all depended on the applicant's full proposal to the Planning Commission. For instance, they could split off some of the property, or they could come back with a proposal that built a spec building in the location of "Proposed Building." If they came in with a PUD they would have to have a proposal for that corner. There were several different possibilities.

In response to a question from Chair Wendt, Mr. Thies said that after permits were pulled, it typically took from 9-12 months to construct a facility like this one.

Mayor Pro Tem Allen asked if the first floor would really constitute a non-residential use if it were used for the occupants of the building. The site plan as presented did not contemplate the historic nature of the Foundry Flask building, nor did it contemplate how the first floor was a non-residential use. Did no bedrooms on the first floor make it non-residential? A cafeteria used by facility residents was a use ancillary to a primary use. Was this really separate mixed use?

Commissioner Mielock said that this unique project was not contemplated by the Master Plan. As he interpreted the Master Plan, the first floor should be fronting on Cady Street and be part of an active, vibrant walking path that connected with the downtown. The conceptual plan shown this evening appeared to turn its back on Cady Street. As a planning commissioner he felt he would need to evaluate whether or not this was the long-range vision as presented in the Master Plan. He did not see senior housing as a viable alternative for this area. He was looking for independently owned shops that were not part of an integrated operation. This plan did not seem to be heading in that direction.

Commissioner Kirk said that they wanted the river opened up and they didn't want buildings backing up right to the river. This proposal seemed to do this, opening up the river and also providing an entrance to the shops.

Commissioner Miller asked what would be on the first floor. Mr. Thies said the first floor retail would be on Cady Street, similar to what was on Main Street. They would be more than happy to have leased space there. Having the storefronts full was important to them. The assisted living court would show “back of house.”

Mr. Thies said they were looking to do a grand hotel entrance that would set the corner off. It would be a very urban entrance, providing a feel of a commercial building and providing the right look for the area. They were here tonight to listen to what the Commission had to say and then to figure out what changes they needed to make.

Commissioner Maise asked about the synergy in an urban environment with the population that would use this facility. Commissioner Smith said the facility already in the CSO District had a population that was not really active in the downtown area.

Commissioner Maise explained that while she appreciated the continued talk of an urban-like setting, the actual population being discussed was not one that was often out and about on their own. Also she was very concerned about the parking, especially as this related to the Farmers’ Market, etc.

Mr. Biermann pointed out that their staff worked hard to help the residents stay engaged in their community, including transportation to local stores, etc. Their experience was that if the right amenities were built, the facility residents would use them. Also the adult children of residents would use the surrounding stores, restaurants, etc. The Farmers’ Market would also provide opportunity for the residents to get out and participate in that activity. While the plans presented this evening were conceptual, they were confident they could provide a quality product that would be used by facility residents and Northville residents.

Commissioner Maise asked if Northville, in proportion to its population, was already providing enough senior housing. Planning Consultant Elmiger said she did not have the information to respond to this question. Brief discussion followed regarding the number of facilities close by. Commissioner Maise remained concerned about whether the facility residents would truly interact with the greater community.

Commissioner Mowers offered some counterpoints to the discussion so far, especially regarding Master Plan requirements. This was a unique product and could not truly be compared to Northville Senior Living, for instance. The recent Corner House project showed that empty nesters were hungry for more maintenance-free properties in the City. Tonight’s proposal represented another step in the progression for people who wanted to stay local. This project could provide a totally appropriate transition into the City’s downtown area, where businesses would probably want to locate. In terms of EMS use, this development was on the very edge of the City, so it would lessen EMS vehicles going through the downtown area. A Farmers’ Market and accessibility to the river did not currently exist; this project provided those things. The proposal also provided retail businesses along Cady Street. A population that was getting older was looking for this type of space; they did not want to leave their community to live elsewhere.

Mr. Thies emphasized that their residents were active and would be out in the community at large. There was a need for this type of facility.

Commissioner Maise said she understood there was a need for this type of facility generally. Her concern centered on the economic aspect of this development – that it would bring in people who were not users

of Northville restaurants, stores, etc. Another development might bring in another population that would spend their dollars in downtown Northville.

In response to a further question from Commissioner Maise, Mr. Thies said that memory care patients would range from 25-35% of the total residents. They would not be out in the community, but would live on a secured floor. However, their visiting families would definitely be visiting downtown Northville.

Commissioner Mowers mentioned that Holland MI appeared to have a similar facility located downtown and that appeared to be fully integrated into the retail/business community.

Commissioner Snyder said that he felt that the applicants could get to a point that might satisfy his concerns regarding the development. He asked about the configuration as shown regarding the straightening out of Cady Street. Mr. Biermann said they hadn't really figured that out yet. If the project went forward, they would have to work with the City in order to change Cady Street. They were trying to work with the Cady Street Overlay District generally. Conceptually they were talking about providing a Farmers' Market, with urban style assisted living, and with a nearby river trail. Commissioner Snyder said he didn't think there was enough room on the site to house the Farmers' Market, which often included 30-40 vendors and required significant parking. Mr. Thies said the space labeled "Proposed Building" might be used for the Farmers' Market – that truly was just a placeholder.

Commissioner Snyder said that while there were some possibilities in the plan presented this evening, there were also questions. He reiterated that at this point he was not opposed to the project.

In response to a question from Commissioner Kirk, Mr. Thies said there would be no covered parking.

In response to a question from Commissioner Mielock, Mr. Thies said that tonight they were looking for a sense from the Commission as to whether or not they should continue to move forward.

The consensus of the Commission was that while there were hurdles to this project and there were significant questions, the project could at this point continue to move forward. Perhaps another working session like this might be appropriate, before significant money was spent on drawings, etc. Process for a proposed PUD was reviewed, as this would involve City Council approval, and would involve several public hearings.

Commissioner Snyder said that he would like to see an attempt made to save the front, historic, part of the Foundry Flask building. This represented an important part of the history of Northville. Mr. Biermann said they were aware of the importance of that building.

Seeing that there were no further comments, Chair Wendt closed this discussion item.

Building Height/Lot Coverage

BUILDING HEIGHT

Referring to the Carlisle/Wortman review letter of November 10, 2015 and the handout that included *Single-Family Building Height and Lot Coverage Standards Comparison of other Communities* along with proposed ordinance language revisions, Planning Consultant Elmiger gave the background for this discussion item.

Planning Consultant Elmiger explained that at the October 2015 Planning Commission meeting the Commission had continued its discussion on areas of the ordinance that impacted building height. In the November 10 memo Carlise/Wortman provided additional information regarding first floors and how they related to building on an existing site that was to be demolished. They also had provided additional information regarding basements as stories, walkout basements, a new definition for a story/mezzanine, new definitions for existing and finished grades, and also some lot coverage information. Regarding the proposed ordinance changes, the language new this evening was in blue, the previously proposed language changes were in red.

Commissioner Mielock confirmed with Planning Consultant Elmiger that the recommendations had been discussed with the Chief Building Inspector.

Commissioner Mowers said that he thought the proposed language appropriately tightened up the ordinance.

Commissioner Mielock noted that a clarification was needed at the bottom of page 5, Section 18.21 2: *first floor elevation height of contiguous residences, but not greater than (2 or 4?) feet above the existing grade, . . .*

Commissioner Kirk said that the more that was put into an article or amendment the more difficult it was to uphold and administer. The proposed changes seemed to tighten and clarify the language and make it easier to enforce.

Commissioner Maisie noted that the illustrations provided were for a flat grade. Could illustrations show some of the challenges when grades were not flat? Planning Consultant Elmiger said that illustrations could be provided that showed sloped grades and how the ordinance language interacted with that. The grade plane could be used to determine what was a basement, since using the grade plane allowed a determination of whether a basement was 50% below or above ground - a calculation that depended on the volume of a room. This as well as walkout basements could be illustrated.

In response to a question from Chair Wendt, Planning Consultant Elmiger said that Chief Building Inspector Strong had seen and approved the proposed changes.

In response to a question from Commissioner Kirk, Planning Consultant Elmiger said she would confirm with the Assessor that they did not use the zoning ordinance to define stories, floor space, etc., but had their own rules and definitions. The Assessor's valuations would also impact home appraisals. It was noted that Northville had a specific area that was hillier than practically anywhere else in the County.

City Manager Sullivan noted that the proposed modification of section 18.20 restricted the highest portion of the first floor from exceeding 36" from the average grade plane. That would restrict how far above the grade a building could be constructed.

Commissioner Snyder asked if grade plane could be tied to a sidewalk. Planning Consultant Elmiger said this could be done in a flat area, but it would not work for a sloping terrain.

Commissioner Miller said the Zoning Ordinance could not foresee the specifics of every single case. The goal was to regulate the majority of lots, with outliers going to the BZA for relief from the ordinances, when appropriate.

In response to a question from Commissioner Smith, Mayor Pro Tem Allen said there was no engineering requirement for driveway grades. Also, there was no prohibition regarding driveways in front of the house.

City Manager Sullivan asked about the proposed language labeled Section 18.21.3: *The Building Official may require a certified copy of the grading plan to be submitted by a registered civil engineer or land surveyor.* In what cases would this not be required? Planning Consultant Elmiger said she would discuss this language with the Chief Building Inspector.

Planning Consultant Elmiger asked about the earlier question regarding (2 or 4?) feet above the existing grade for first floor elevation heights.

Commissioner Miller wondered if this specific language was necessary. The City wanted new projects compatible with established homes but that otherwise conformed to the existing provisions regarding first floor height relative to grade. It seemed unnecessary to add another dimension in this part of the ordinance. Other sections already had requirements regarding first floor elevation relative to grade.

City Manager Sullivan said that while the 4-foot requirement seemed reasonable, he understood Commissioner Miller's point that perhaps this dimensional requirement was not needed in this section. Planning Consultant Elmiger agreed, since earlier (Section 18.20) the ordinance limited the highest portion of the first floor grade to 36" from the average grade plane.

Chair Wendt asked the Commission's pleasure regarding this item. Commissioner Mowers did not think the proposed changes needed further Commission review before a Public Hearing. He felt that with the changes and requests noted this evening, the next meeting regarding this item could be a Hearing.

MOTION Mowers, support by Mielock, to schedule a public hearing for the 1st available Planning Commission meeting, for the proposed changes to the City of Northville Zoning Ordinance relating to Building Heights, subject to the edits that were requested in tonight's meeting.

Chair Wendt asked for a roll call vote.

Snyder	yes
Smith	yes
Miller	yes
Kirk	yes
Mielock	yes
Maise	yes
Mowers	yes
Wendt	yes

Therefore, the motion carried unanimously (Russell absent).

LOT COVERAGE

Referring to the Carlise/Wortman review letter dated November 10, 2015, Planning Consultant Elmiger gave the background for this discussion item. She explained she had done some preliminary research regarding what other communities similar to Northville included in their lot coverage calculations. She

called the Commission's attention to the chart: *Example Communities – Elements included in Lot Coverage Calculation*.

Northville's ordinance was clear about what was included and not included in lot coverage, except for porches. The 30% lot coverage was typical for smaller cities. Saline, Dexter and Milan only included buildings and accessory buildings, but the interpretation of accessory buildings for those cities was not yet known - this could include pools, decks, etc. The City of Plymouth had the caveat that for new home construction, if the garage was placed in the rear – attached or detached – then the property owner could put up to four feet of unenclosed covered front porch with a balustrade in the front yard setback, and this would not be included in lot coverage. This provision encouraged porches, walkability, etc.

Planning Consultant Elmiger continued that this background was provided in order to begin discussion. However, she reminded the Commission that there had been past conversation regarding how porches should be treated in terms of lot coverage.

Commissioner Mowers said he found it interesting that cantilevered projections were included in the lot coverage calculations for the City. He also found the Grand Rapids' requirement for a percentage of open/green space – discussed at a previous meeting – to be interesting, since this would reduce hardscape in residential neighborhoods. Also, he wanted to look at discouraging the construction of pseudo-driveways/parking lots/patios. These types of constructions sometimes resulted in hardscaping almost an entire residential lot.

In response to a question from City Manager Sullivan, Commissioner Mowers clarified that he was suggesting keeping the 30% lot coverage limitation for the items listed in Planning Consultant Elmiger's chart, but also adding another limitation for the amount of hardscape/non-permeable surface allowed.

Mayor Pro Tem Allen thought it was even more important to encourage detached garages in the rear. These encouraged rear yard use.

City Manager Sullivan said there were some conflicting provisions in the Ordinance regarding driveways. He asked Planning Consultant Elmiger to take a look at this and perhaps add a section on driveways. Also short driveways that ended up with cars parked across the sidewalk might be regulated, along with front yard parking spaces.

Seeing that there was no further comment, Chair Wendt closed the discussion on this item.

Cady Street Potential

Commissioner Mielock said he was working with the project to be discussed under this agenda item and asked to be recused.

MOTION by Maise, support Smith, to recuse Commissioner Mielock from Discussion Item Cady Street Potential. Motion carried unanimously.

Dave Mielock, David L. Mielock Associates Inc., 114 Rayson Street, Northville MI, gave the background to this discussion item. Developers Andrew Daily, 44785 Five Mile Road, Plymouth MI and Robert A. Ajlouny, 37619 Summers Street, Livonia MI, were also present.

Mr. Mielock said that they were presenting conceptual plans for a proposed development for Lot 170, on the south side of Cady Street, east of the hair salon that was on the corner of Cady and Center. He considered this a kind of test case for the new Cady Street Overlay Zoning District. They wanted to get some input from the Commission before moving forward.

They were looking at developing this property as a 5-story residential condominium project. They understood the requirements they would need to meet in order to obtain the bonus 5th floor.

They had met with City Manager Sullivan and Planning Consultant Elmiger, and needed to address allowable first floor parking with the Commission. This site was small and self-parking was required in the CSO District. This parcel was right next to the existing City surface lot.

Mr. Mielock showed renderings of the project, including a first floor elevation. They were planning six 2-bedroom condominiums, which would require 12 parking spaces. Additionally they would have about 1300 square feet of retail space fronting on Cady Street.

The intent was to provide secure parking for the condos in a first-floor parking lot. Entry into the secured 12-spot parking would be on the west side of the building. They were trying to keep the entrance to the parking off of Cady Street, and were trying to get an easement for access from the City owned parking lot.

The developers' intent was to get some presence of retail or office on the first floor in the walking area along Cady Street. They were also giving the City 12 feet to widen Cady Street in the hopes that the hair salon would do the same so that the Cady Street intersection would become aligned and create a safer intersection.

Mr. Mielock referred to massing studies of the front and side elevations. The grade dropped 5 – 5.5 feet from Cady Street down to the south end of the site. The 5th floor would be pulled in somewhat to reduce its massing impact along Cady Street.

Mr. Mielock said that the question for the Commission was: Did this proposed plan meet the intent of the Cady Street Overlay District and its supporting document?

The consensus of the Commission was that this proposed conceptual plan did meet the intent of the CSO District.

Discussion followed regarding details of the proposal, including the zero lot line along Cady Street, the need to obtain a 24-foot easement to the east, etc. This would be presented at future meetings.

Mr. Mielock pointed out that if parking on the first floor were not allowed, they could build a 2500 square foot maximum structure, and self-park with open parking in the back.

In response to a question from City Manager Sullivan, Planning Consultant Elmiger said the ordinance did not distinguish between underground and first floor parking.

City Manager Sullivan spoke to the characteristics of this lot, noting that this particular lot was so narrow that the developers would lose all the parking if they had to construct a ramp. However, the ordinance was not clear as to whether first floor parking was allowed or not. The proposed building did seem to meet the intent of the Master Plan. It was mixed use that presented itself as commercial use from the street, with

residential above. But for future planning, perhaps the ordinance should be clarified. What if, for instance, a similar building presented itself as all garage doors along Cady Street? That actually might be allowed under the current ordinance.

Mr. Mielock said that tonight they were identifying project-specific issues that needed clarification and feedback, but they were also identifying issues that impacted the zoning ordinance generally.

Commissioner Mowers was concerned that this project might be in essence “breaking it up” and having modular condos as opposed to streetfront. Streetfront was important during Master Plan and CSO discussions. The Commission needed to address whether they were going to create a standard or an exception.

City Manager Sullivan said that other cities might have standards for this type of infill. Bay City in particular had done a good job with this type of development. The City probably needed some language that said the front of buildings could not look like a parking garage.

Mr. Mielock said the proposed development would also set a precedent for widening Cady and installing parking in front of the buildings. They had met with Public Works Director Gallogly in order to provide what the City wanted there.

In response to a question from Commissioner Kirk, Mr. Mielock said they would talk about meeting the criteria for a 5th floor at a future site plan review.

Commissioner Mowers addressed the installation of an alley access, and the requirements in the CSO District for alley enhancement. The proposed plan provided blind parking so that drivers would not be able to see pedestrians as they exited. Mr. Mielock said that the access could provide a safe pedestrian passage to Cady, and ways to do this were discussed.

In response to a question from Commissioner Mowers, Chair Wendt said that the applicants were seeking the Commission’s reactions to the conceptual project, including the first floor parking. The consensus of the Commission was for the applicants to bring back a more refined proposal.

In light of the previous discussion, Commissioner Mowers asked that sample ordinance restrictions regarding infill massing and including garage placement along Cady Street be brought back to the Commission.

Mr. Mielock said there was another step that would play into this proposal, in that they would need to approach City Council for an access easement along the west side of the building and the possibility for obtaining a land swap for some additional property to the east.

Mr. Mielock said that based on what they had heard tonight they would continue to proceed to the next step.

City Manager Sullivan asked if a formal opinion were needed from Planning Consultant Elmiger regarding the parking as proposed for this project, in terms of how it related to the Cady Street Overlay District.

Commissioner Mielock said that Planning Consultant Elmiger had provided them with an interpretation via email. Ms. Elmiger noted that the plan had been changed since she had given that interpretation and in her opinion they were now more consistent with the Zoning Ordinance.

In response to a comment from Commissioner Mielock, Planning Consultant Elmiger said that an applicant could ask for parking credits in the CSO District, though these were not desirable. That request would go to City Council.

Seeing that there was no further comment, Chair Wendt closed this discussion item.

Commissioner Mielock rejoined the Commission at 9:25 p.m.

R-2 Second Density Residential District

Referring to the Carlisle/Wortman memo dated November 10, 2015, Planning Consultant Elmiger gave the background for this discussion item. She explained that the Planning Commission had asked them to do an analysis of the R-2 Second Density Residential District on North Center Street. This had been part of the Master Plan discussions as many of the properties in this area had been renovated from older buildings into new single-family residential buildings. They were asked to take a look at this area and come up with an analysis and some possible recommendations. They had reviewed the existing land uses, the Master Plan, and what a change in zoning from R-2 to R-1 B would do as far as what a property owner could do with their parcel, and then came up with a possible way forward, should the Commission desire.

Planning Consultant Elmiger said there was a small house on Rayson whose parking lot connected to a multi-family building off of Hutton. This created a natural boundary line between potential single-family residential and multi family residential (Section C on the schematic on page 6). The properties just north of that, going up the west side of Grace Street, were now single-family (Section A). North of Lake Street, the properties both east and west on North Center included some single family homes, some older multi-family homes, and a new multi-family home, with 2 garages. That area (Section B) did not lend itself to making modifications because there were no clustered areas that might make sense to change. Therefore they suggested that those parcels should be left alone. The parcels along Grace (Section A) possibly might be changed to R-1B and the four parcels on the east end of Rayson and Hutton might also possibly be changed to R-1B (east portion of Section C). Those rezonings would be consistent with the Master Plan, which called for all single family residential in that area.

Commissioner Mielock asked why all the properties on the south side of Rayson could not be changed to R-1B and thus would provide greater consistency. Planning Consultant Elmiger said that while more research might be needed, it appeared that the adjoining R-3 property to the south depended on parking on the R-2 multi-family parcel, as shown on the schematic on page 6.

Commissioner Mowers said the same people who owned the R-3 property to the south owned the multi-family property on Rayson. Long ago the driveway was passed through from one property to the next, one way in and one way out. All the parking (on both properties) was available for the use of the R-3 property.

Planning Consultant Elmiger said that she was concerned whether or not this had at one time received site plan approval or was grandfathered in as a nonconforming use.

After discussion, it was agreed to move forward on rezoning Areas A and all of C per the schematic on page 6 of the memo. The multi-family home would remain multi-family under a rezoning, as it would be grandfathered in. But for the sake of consistency, the entire area C should be rezoned.

MOTION by Mowers, support by Smith, to set for public hearing at the earliest possible date the rezoning of areas A and C on page 6 of the November 10, 2015 Carlise/Wortman memorandum. Motion carried unanimously.

8. ADJOURNMENT:

See that there was no further discussion, Chair Wendt adjourned the meeting at 9:37 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Cheryl McGuire
Recording Secretary

Approved as amended 12-15-15