

CITY OF NORTHVILLE
Planning Commission
May 17, 2016
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: Carol Maise
Dave Mielock (7:45 p.m.)
Matthew Mowers
Mark Russell
Anne Smith
Jeff Snyder
Jay Wendt

Absent: Steve Kirk (excused)
Christopher Miller (excused)

Also present: Jim Allen, Mayor Pro Tem
Patrick Sullivan, City Manager
Lori Ward, Downtown Development Authority Director
Don Wortman, Planning Consultant
1 resident

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

**Motion by Mowers, support Maise, to approve the agenda as published.
Motion carried unanimously.**

4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: May 3, 2016

Motion by Russell, support Mowers, to approve the May 3, 2016 minutes as published. Motion carried unanimously.

5. AUDIENCE COMMENTS: None.

6. REPORTS:

A. CITY ADMINISTRATION: None

B. CITY COUNCIL:

Mayor Pro Tem Allen noted that Northville Food Fest (formerly Rib Fest) would be June 24-26, 2016.

C. PLANNING COMMISSION:

Commissioner Mowers brought up 3 issues:

- Who if anyone was noticed regarding the Rib Fest? Commissioner Mowers recommended noticing a more generous radius than 300-feet for events in public spaces. The Rib Fest impacted

residential neighbors, especially the siren on the Monster Truck that last year was going until 11:00 p.m. every night. Had he known it was on the agenda, he would have attended the Council meeting where approval was given.

Mayor Pro Tem Allen explained that approval to use the public space was a regular item on the City Council agenda, and notice to residents within 300 feet was not required. There were many public events in Northville, including parades and downtown events, and noticing everyone within 300 feet for these events was not required, nor would it always be practical. Last year the Police Department received 3 noise complaints during the Rib Fest and these were remediated by the event sponsors. Additionally, City Manager Sullivan had just taken note of the siren complaint. City Council agendas were on the website. Also, the City Council meeting was videotaped and could be accessed that way.

Commissioner Mowers said that he would still like to have the Planning Commission consider some mechanism that would notify residents when public spaces were going to be utilized for special events. In this instance, Rib Fest occurred in an R-1B Zoning District, the City received compensation, the event brought in many people, and there should be some consideration for noticing residents.

- Commissioner Mowers said he was concerned about a lack of enforcement at 502 Grace Street where a construction dumpster had been moved out of the side yard and into the street, creating a traffic nuisance.
- Commissioner Mowers said that the Ordinance was silent regarding food trucks and the Planning Commission should address this generally. In the meantime, the microbrewery at 410 N. Center Street was running a food truck out of their parking lot, taking up parking spaces and operating a restaurant business where the owners had said they weren't going to have a kitchen or be operating a restaurant. The food truck was operating four nights a week as a take-out restaurant.

City Manager Sullivan said he would follow up regarding the food truck at the microbrewery.

D. OTHER COMMUNITY/GOVERNMENTAL LIAISONS: None.

7. DISCUSSION

SECONDARY STREET GUIDELINES

Referring to the Carlisle/Wortman memo of May 11, 2016, the draft document entitled *City of Northville Secondary Streets Design Standards May 11, 2016*, and utilizing overhead slides, Planning Consultant Wortman gave the background for this discussion item. Carlisle/Wortman had been working with the City of Northville Downtown Development Authority (DDA) Director Lori Ward on the development of Secondary Street Design Standards. It was anticipated that those standards would be adopted by the City of Northville DDA. The standards provided specifications for landscaping, lighting, street furnishings, sidewalks, etc. The purpose of tonight's discussion would be to receive comments on the draft document and forward those comments to the DDA for further review and/or adoption.

Planning Consultant Wortman said that Main Street had been covered by the Main Street streetscape and there would probably not be many changes in that area. With the development potential for Cady Street and other areas around the perimeter of downtown it was felt that the City should adopt streetscape design

standards that would apply to future development. It would be the developer's responsibility to put in streetscape improvements within the right-of-way, whether or not it was street trees, planters, trash receptacles, benches, etc.

References to the DDA Streetscape Design Standards were already in the Zoning Ordinance, specifically within the Central Business District Overlay District and the Cady Street Overlay District, even though there had never been an adopted DDA streetscape standard.

Planning Consultant Wortman explained that it was better for the DDA to adopt the Standards rather than have the Standards be part of the Zoning Ordinance, as manufacturing details and specifications were included and those details could more easily be modified if they were not part of the formal Ordinance.

DDA Director Ward added that this was a process that was recommended by Carlise/Wortman. After adoption, if there were ever any significant change in the document, the DDA would come to the Planning Commission for discussion before the modification occurred.

Planning Consultant Wortman said that even though the DDA Standards were referenced in the Zoning Ordinance, as already mentioned, they had been relying on the Department of Public Works Director to make sure any standards were implemented during the permit and construction process. A specific document adopted by the DDA would formalize the implementation of the Standards.

Chair Wendt asked about areas outside the DDA. Planning Consultant Wortman said the document would only formally apply to the areas within the DDA, though the Central business District Overlay District requirements referenced DDA standards, even though the area was outside the DDA.

Planning Consultant Wortman referred to the map in the Commissioners' packets, noting that the streets in blue – including Cady, Griswold, Dunlap, and others – were the areas most affected by the proposed Standards. With the anticipated developments along Cady Street, the timing was right for the adoption of these standards.

Plan view details included bump outs, sidewalk areas, benches, planters, etc. The Standards would apply to intersections and also inform the development of major streets in terms of how the details were developed, including street lamps, sidewalks, curbing, raised beds in planters around trees, etc. Details regarding tree grates included specification of the required manufacturer, along with some pricing details. The appendix included details regarding benches, tree grates, streetlights, benches, trash receptacles, planters, tables and chairs, fencing, bollards, drinking fountains, bike racks, and sidewalks.

A good example of the application of standards was the Corner house and what was required along their street frontage.

The last page of the document referred to furnishing frequency. Mayor Pro Tem Allen had completed a survey in terms of what had been used on Main Street; this information was included to demonstrate appropriate spacing.

Planning Consultant Wortman said the document was called *Design Standards* for a reason. It was important to get away from the terminology of "guidelines," as the Standards were requirements. However, a section on pages 2 and 3 did list some situations where modification might be appropriate because the strict application of the standards might be impractical. The Planning Commission or the

DPW Director had authority to waive the standards under certain situations: sight visibility at intersections, driveway clearance, sidewalk obstruction/walkway clearance, etc.

Again, the action tonight would be to forward comments to the DDA, and then it would be up to the DDA to take formal action to adopt the Standards.

Commissioner Maise asked how the decision would be made whether modifications to the Standards would be made by the Planning Commission or the DPW Director. Planning Consultant Wortman said that anything that would come before the Planning Commission would be decided by the Commission. Situations that might be decided by the DPW Director might include a light post that needed to be replaced and during replacement needed to be moved slightly, or a construction modification that would only be seen by the DPW Director.

Commissioner Maise wondered how the decision was made to use a tree grate vs. planting a tree in a raised bed. Planning Consultant Wortman said this would have to be addressed on a site-by-site basis. Eventually as new development occurred on Cady or Dunlap, for example, a pattern would be established.

Commissioner Russell pointed out that the comment in the introduction stating that *The streetscape was last upgrade in 1978-80* . . . needed to be clarified to show that this referred to secondary streetscapes. Cady Street was addressed in the mid-90's, when the pedestrian cut-through was developed.

Commissioner Russell said that the Steering Committee had often referenced the 8-block quadrangle/hub around Center and Main. Should all the components that were in the hub be included all the way down Main Street, including where East Main Street curved? By developing that streetscape along the spine/Main Street from The Garage down to the gateway to the City, it was important to develop the continuity of the streetscape down the entire spine, so that it started to gel for the entire city. Should the Main Street streetscape be made more primary?

Planning Consultant Wortman suggested that one decision to be made was whether the standards should be called *Secondary* or should they be applied DDA-wide?

Commissioner Russell said one way to view the design was to treat the four corners of the hub at Main and Center as primary. If that area was primary, why did secondary streets have similar design components? Where was the significance? If everything was treated the same why delineate between primary and secondary?

DDA Director Ward explained differences between the primary and secondary design streetscapes, including different pavements and spacing. She believed the lights and street furnishings should use the same components. The elements were the same but the patterns were different. However, perhaps these should not be called *Secondary* standards, as Main Street all the way down was going to see the same type of components utilized.

Commissioner Russell said that the raised circular beds, for instance, would likely not be as efficient as they were in the downtown area. Losing those on a secondary street was unlikely to make much difference architecturally, but keeping the raised circular beds limited to the downtown area gave more strength to the four corners of the hub. The significance of downtown would start to dilute if all the details bled into the secondary streets. From a planning standpoint, the main significance needed to stay built on Main and Center, the pulse of the City.

Mayor Pro Tem Allen thought that the furniture could spill over to the secondary streets, but with a different texture than at Main and Center. The planters would be circular, for instance. There would be a lack of brick, and the pavement would not be the same.

Commissioner Russell agreed that there was significance in having similar street furniture, thus creating a sense of continuity. Regarding trees, perhaps downtown could be the place for tree grates, and the secondary streets would use something else. Raising healthy urban trees was an evolving field. Tree grates, for instance, sometimes worked against tree health. Deep Root produced a planting system called Silva Cells. Structural soil had been developed by Cornell University. James Urban of Urban Tree Experts had many studies on urban trees. These systems and mediums could be expensive, but there was an opportunity here to do something to help the trees thrive.

DDA Director Ward commented that trees could also be placed in planting beds, which also presented an alternative to tree grates and raised planters.

City Manager Sullivan pointed out that on Dunlap mostly tree grates were used.

Commissioner Russell asked who paid for the ongoing maintenance of the trees, including water, drainage, and fertilizer. How were the trees maintained over time?

DDA Director Ward said the intent of the Standards was to create continuity with the Main Street area while also supporting Main Street's importance. If that hadn't come out as obvious then they needed to make some changes.

In response to a question from DDA Director Ward, Commissioner Russell said that perhaps some of the elm cultivars such as Princeton Elms could be added to the tree list. The tree list was strong – the most important thing was supporting the trees after they were planted.

DDA Director Ward noted that the Standards specified a minimum of 3" trees but there were other philosophies. Some communities, such as Ann Arbor, specified smaller trees. Commissioner Russell said that smaller was always better. However, if the Standards specified smaller trees, the entire tree ordinance might need to be modified. Mayor Pro Tem Allen said that currently the ordinance called for 2-1/2" new and replacement trees.

Rather than take up more meeting time, Commissioner Russell said he would be happy to meet with DDA Director Ward and Planning Consultant Wortman privately.

Commissioner Maise asked what the bump out requirements did for the non-motorized traffic in town – bicycles and pedestrians. Also, depending on how the streets were developed, there might be more of a need for parking and the bump outs were taking out parking.

DDA Director Ward said that where the bump outs were required there were either parallel parking places or bump outs. A cyclist would ride along the outside of both those uses. One of the things they struggled with on Cady Street was where the curb cuts would eventually be placed. They had tried to show the bump outs where they made sense, instead of being rigid about having them every 50 feet, etc. But they didn't know how big the eventual parcels would be.

Mayor Pro Tem Allen added that bump outs were only on one side of the street.

Commissioner Russell suggested that the figures regarding furnishing spacing on page 43 represented existing locations on Main and Center, not necessarily a standard for how things ought to be spaced throughout secondary streets.

Mayor Pro Tem Allen said that this chart was not intended to be a standard, but to show what existed. They would work on a clarifying explanation regarding the information on the chart and the intent of giving the information.

Planning Consultant Wortman said streetscape development hinged on the type of development – a 60-foot development was different than a 300-foot development. Commissioner Russell said it was important from a planning standpoint that the City maintain the continuity or connectivity of the City's spine. Regarding the area of the Cady Street deck, there needed to be a bump out on both sides of the street so that a crossing could be created there.

Seeing that discussion had ended, Planning Consultant Wortman summarized that tonight's comments would be forwarded to the DDA and Commissioner Russell could also meet with DDA Director Ward individually.

DRIVEWAYS

Referring to the Carlisle/Wortman letter dated May 12, 2016 entitled *Residential Driveways* and to the document entitled *Residential Driveways – Draft Zoning Text Amendments (May 12, 2016)* Planning Consultant Wortman led the discussion of this item. He noted that driveways were discussed at the May 3 Planning Commission meeting. Carlisle/Wortman had modified the proposed zoning text amendments based on that discussion, including:

- Modified the definitions of driveway and common driveway to exclude the length requirement and move that into the driveway standards in Section 18.18. Now driveway and common driveway were only defined by the number of properties they served.
- Parking in the front yard of a residential parcel had been amended to prohibit parking on the lawn or across a public sidewalk.
- The driveway standards in Section 18.18 were modified. There was now a requirement that driveways be paved, per Northville's Design Standards for Construction. Pavement in the required front yard was limited to 35%. Driveways were limited to an 18-foot width. Also, the current regulations regarding non-conformities would be followed, and a variance would need to be requested from the BZA for changes to non-conforming driveways.

Included in the Commissioners' packets was a companion chart *Paved/Open Space Comparison – Total Lot* showing an analysis of how maxing out the 35% pavement allowance and 30-35% lot coverage would affect R-1A and R-1B parcels of various widths. All lot sizes/configurations would still have approximately 60% of the lot left over (not covered by buildings or pavement in the required front yard). That is, they had applied the regulations to real life situations and they were convinced it would work.

Planning Consultant Wortman said that if the Commission were comfortable with the proposed changes, the next step would be to schedule a public hearing.

Commissioner Maise asked what roads were called in multiple-family developments. Did roads that were serving just two parcels need to be developed to the same standards?

Planning Consultant Wortman said the standards for private roads were given in the *Manual of Uniform Criteria and Design Standards*. A common driveway was defined differently than a private road.

MOTION by Russell, support Maise, to set for public hearing at the next available date a review of the residential driveway modifications to driveway standards in Section 26.02 and 18.18.

Chair Wendt asked for a roll call vote:

Mowers	yes
Maise	yes
Snyder	yes
Mielock	yes
Smith	yes
Russell	yes
Wendt	yes

Therefore the motion carried unanimously.

City Manager Sullivan complimented Planning Consultant Elmiger, who had received significant feedback regarding this issue at the last meeting.

8. ADJOURN

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

MOTION Russell, support Maise, to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting at 8:27 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,
Cheryl McGuire
Recording Secretary

Approved as submitted 6/21/2016