

CITY OF NORTHVILLE  
Planning Commission  
July 15, 2014  
Northville City Hall – City Council Chambers

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

Acting Chair Mielock called the meeting to order at 7:31 p.m.

**2. ROLL CALL:**

Present: Steve Kirk  
Carol Maise  
Dave Mielock  
Matthew Mowers  
Anne Smith  
Jeff Snyder

Absent: Jay Wendt, excused  
Marc Russell, excused

Also present: Patrick Sullivan, City Manager  
Don Wortman, Planning Consultant  
Sally Elmiger, Planning Consultant

**3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

**Motion Mower, support by Smith,** to approve the May 20, 2014 minutes as submitted.  
**Motion carried unanimously.**

**Motion Snyder, support by Kirk,** to approve the June 17, 2014 minutes as submitted.  
**Motion carried unanimously.**

**4. AUDIENCE COMMENTS:** None

**5. REPORTS:**

**A. CITY ADMINISTRATION:** None

Commissioner Maise suggested the Wayfinding Committee make a courtesy report to the Planning Commission.

**B. CITY COUNCIL:** None

**C. PLANNING COMMISSION:** None

**D. OTHER COMMUNITY/GOVERNMENTAL LIAISONS:** None

**6. DISCUSSION**

## Master Plan

Note: Greg Presley, Presley Architecture, 412 W. Dunlap, Northville, MI was present for this discussion.

Planning Consultant Don Wortman led tonight's Master Plan work session. He explained that this was the first time the Planning Commission had seen the entire Master Plan document. After reviewing this document, the Commission's next step was to refer the Master Plan to the City Council for review and distribution for the 63-day period that was required under State Statute, to allow surrounding communities to also review the document. After this process the Planning Commission would hold a public hearing. During this entire time, changes could still be made to the document.

Mr. Wortman turned the discussion over to Planning Consultant Sally Elmiger, who outlined changes in the document since the last time the Commission had met. Highlights included:

- An explanation of an error made in the 2000 US Census that resulted in a 2010 correction that showed – on paper – a decrease of 124 housing units and 489 people. This decrease did not actually occur.
- Goals and policies were refined as requested by the Planning Commission. Some of these included:
  - a. Under *Downtown, Strategies*, references to future transit options and connections to areas within Southeast Michigan (item 5), and battery charging stations and possible car-sharing (item 6)
  - b. Under *Traffic and Roads, Strategies*, adding Center Street to the list of busy *major streets* (another addition). Discussion followed regarding the definition of *major*; a definition/description could perhaps be added on page 16. For clarity, it was suggested that item (8.), *Discourage development which significantly increases neighborhood traffic*, be placed after item (5.)
  - c. Under *Parks and Recreation, Strategies*, references to links between neighborhood parks and schools with non-motorized routes had been added (item 4).
  - d. Under *Future Land Use Plan, Corridor Commercial* (p. 49), large-format retail had been defined as 55,000 square feet or larger. The Land Use Map had also been revised based on previous Commissioner comments. A description had been included of the various sub-areas (p. 51ff).
  - e. Under *Residential and Neighborhood Preservation*, a phrase had been added (p. 61): “it is also recommended that *the principals of new urbanism or traditional neighborhood planning be considered, such as high-quality architecture, parking in the rear of buildings, and maintaining/enhancing pedestrian amenities.*”

Other discussion included:

- Including a section regarding what the City saw as desirable for the Main Street School should it be repurposed. The Joint Committee had visioned this as multi-family or senior housing use. It was noted that the location was actually no longer suitable for school use, due to lack of parking and access.
- Including a mention of preserving the historic nature of the Old Village School.
- Including a reference to the unique topographical features of the Cady Town/Cady Street Area (page 52).

Seeing that discussion on the Master Plan document had ended, Acting Chair Mielock brought the matter back to the Commission for possible action. After brief further discussion, the following motion was offered:

**MOTION Mowers, support by Maise**, that the Planning Commission forward the Master Plan document as amended this evening to the City Council for their review and distribution to surrounding communities in accordance with PA33. **Motion carried unanimously.**

Consultant Wortman affirmed that he would write a letter for City Council via City Manager Sullivan explaining this “intermediate statutory process.”

### **Cady Street Overlay**

Planning Consultant Wortman led the discussion regarding the drafting of a Cady Street Overlay (CSO) District, based on his Memorandum to the Planning Commission dated July 9, 2014. He spoke to the unique characteristics of this sub area, and noted that the Sub Area plan called for mixed-used development, form-based policies, attractive streetscapes and architecture, and pedestrian-friendly design.

Directing the Commission’s attention to illustrations in the Memorandum, Mr. Wortman pointed out that there was an issue regarding boundaries. Two options were:

- A southern boundary that followed existing property lines.
- A southern boundary that cut through property lines but more closely followed the “transitional mixed use” areas designated within the future land use plan.

Discussion included:

- Should Parcel 182 be included in this overlay district?
- Split zoning – two or more zoning districts on a single parcel – should generally be avoided, though there might be times when the benefits outweighed the disadvantages.
- Elevations were important in terms of boundary location.
- One possible resolution was to make the overlay district 126 feet deep – the depth of a City lot. However, there seemed to be a consensus to follow property lines in terms of the overlay district, taking it south to Beal Street. Still, greater height standards could be limited to the 126 foot depth already mentioned.
- Grid block planning could encourage new urbanism development.
- Straightening out Cady Street would provide a primary access to downtown.

Commissioner Snyder introduced discussion regarding incorporating the north side of Cady Street in this overlay district. It seemed strange to have an overlay district for only one side of a street. Landscaping, sidewalk setbacks, streetscapes in general should be unified on both sides of the street. Additionally, perhaps residential should be allowed on the first floor on the north side also.

The effect and location of the height standards permitted in the CSO District were also described and discussed.

Consultant Elmiger suggested looking at how the Central Business District Overlay District compared to the one discussed this evening.

Consultant Wortman summarized the discussion so far. The consensus of the Commission seemed to support having the CSO District follow property lines, with the permitted greater heights limited to the area 126 feet south of Cady Street. Further discussion needed to be held regarding the north side of Cady Street.

Since the Commissioners had not received the preliminary draft of the Cady Street Overlay District, it was decided to postpone further discussion of the CSO District until the August 5 meeting.

**8. ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no further discussion, Acting Chair Mielock asked for a motion to adjourn.

**Motion Maise, support by Snyder, to adjourn the meeting at 9:09 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.**

Respectfully submitted,  
Cheryl McGuire  
Recording Secretary

Approved as published Aug. 5, 2014