

Present: Chairperson Ostrowski; Vice-Chairperson Westerlund; Members: Borowski, Drummond, Grinnan, and Wilensky

Absent: Members Copeland, Ruprich, and Stempien

Also Present: Planning and Zoning Administrator, Saur

Chairperson Ostrowski called the regular Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. in the Village of Beverly Hills municipal building at 18500 W. Thirteen Mile Road.

AMENDMENTS TO AGENDA/APPROVE AGENDA

Motion by Westerlund, second by Grinnan, to approve the agenda.

Motion passed.

REVIEW AND CONSIDER APPROVAL OF REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF MEETING HELD AUGUST 23, 2017

Motion by Westerlund, second by Grinnan, to amend minutes of the regular Planning Commission meeting held August 23, 2017 as follows: correct the approval of the June 28, 2017 minutes to remove reference to Westerlund leaving early, and page 3 under “Temporary banner for NexTech; “...facing eastward on *temporarily installed*...”.

Motion passed.

Motion by Westerlund, second by Grinnan, to approve the minutes of the regular Planning Commission meeting held August 23, 2017 as amended.

Motion passed.

PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

Paula Roddy, E. Rutland St., submitted a letter to the Commission, and was in attendance to express her concern related to the allowance of second story additions within the Village. She is concerned second story additions will change the character of her neighborhood.

Lynne Ingberg, West Rutland, is concerned that adding second stories will change the character of the ranch style homes in her neighborhood.

Ostrowski explained that the Village has no ordinances prohibiting the construction of two-story homes or addition of a second story. There are zoning ordinances related to overall building height.

REVIEW AND CONSIDER APPLICATION FOR MODIFICATIONS TO A GROUND SIGN AT 31333 SOUTHFIELD RD. #200, NEXTECH HIGH SCHOOL

NexTech Charter High School is requesting to modify an existing ground sign at 31333 Southfield Road. They are replacing an existing sign panel, and are compliant with all Village requirements.

Motion by Westerlund, second by Wilensky, that the Village of Beverly Hills Planning Commission approve the application for modifications to a ground sign at 31333 Southfield Rd #200, NexTech High School.

Roll call vote:

Motion passed (6-0)

REVIEW AND CONSIDER RECOMMENDATION FOR SITE PLAN FOR RENOVATIONS TO 31015 SOUTHFIELD ROAD, BP GAS STATION

Saur explained the current project entails expansion of the convenience store into the unused car wash, enclosure of the covered area on the south side of the building, as well as façade improvements, a new waste receptacle/enclosure and brick finishes around the fuel canopy supports. Previous versions of the project included expansion of the fuel pumps, inclusion of a drive-through restaurant and exterior convenience items, which are no longer proposed. The Zoning Ordinance permits retail businesses in the B District, which is the focus of the proposed project. Given the removal of the project components noted above, the request requires only site plan review and approval and will not require special land use review and approval.

She highlighted items from the LSL review letter including: the applicant must provide the Village with material samples for consideration, any roof-mounted mechanical equipment must be fully screened, the new parking spaces proposed along the west side lot line currently house donation boxes which must be removed, the applicant must identify the type(s) of existing light fixtures to ensure they comply with current standards, exterior convenience items must be shown on the site plan, and the applicant may consider replacement of this sign in keeping with the intent of the Village's sign regulations and the plan to improve properties along the Southfield Road corridor.

Project Engineer Ziad El-Baba, PE explained the owner plans to keep the existing sign, but will replace landscaping with shrubs, greenery, and grass. The convenience store will expand into the space where the carwash was previously. New light fixtures are not included in the current plan. He further explained that it was the decision of the owner to reduce the scope of improvements to only renovate the existing building.

Several members expressed concern over the driveway and sidewalk visibility, the pavement on the west side of the building, overall condition of the surrounding sidewalks, and safe access to the building as well as the current condition of the parking lot, sidewalk, and curb cuts. El-Baba clarified the door to the store would be moved slightly north, they would retain the existing sidewalk in front of the store.

All members of the Commission expressed displeasure with the submitted drawings, citing inaccuracies, inconsistencies, and missing information.

Drummond asked about the existing vent pipes, canopy, and bollards protecting propane tanks on site. El-Baba explained that none of those are changing; they were removed from the site plan so that the site plan only shows changes being made.

Ostrowski noted the applicant needs an additional seven trees on the site plan and suggested the applicant reconsider the types of trees and shrubs being planted.

Commissioners expressed dissatisfaction with the quality and clarity of the site plan as submitted. The fire suppression system, dumpster enclosure, and the location of external sale items need to be clearly identified on the site plan.

El-Baba requested the site plan application be postponed to submit a revised site plan.

Motion by Drummond, second by Grinnan, to postpone discussion pending the submission of revised plans showing details as requested by the Commission.

Motion passed.

DISCUSSION ON UPDATES TO FENCE ORDINANCE

Saur presented a revised draft to the fence ordinance per the discussion at the August 23rd Planning Commission meeting. The language describing materials was modified; however the Commission may want to consider whether to include vinyl as an allowable material since that is a popular option in privacy fencing. As written, vinyl fencing would not be permitted. The definitions of front yard, side yard, and rear yard were updated for clarity. The option to utilize a wall as the base for fence was removed and walls are limited to a height of three feet. With the revised language in wall section, there is no permissible option for a property owner to install a fence atop a retaining wall. Finally, there is a reference to the existing section on construction fences in lieu of relocating that language. Commissioners posed questions regarding how height is measured if grade is variable. The Village has historically instructed fencing companies to follow the grade so the height of the fence is consistently within ordinance maximum.

Additionally, there was discussion regarding the zone districts that would be permitted to install six foot, solid fencing. Brian Borden, LSL Planning, reviewed the Village zoning map and provided images that show the impact of inclusion of the R-2B district. He noted the number of parcels per district as follows:

Zone District	Number of Parcels	Percent of Total
R-2A	829	39%
R-2B	1,134	54%
R-3	141	7%

As shown on the map and by the number of parcels, eliminating the R-2B district would be a significant reduction in the number of properties permitted to install privacy style fencing. The Commission may consider whether restricting the scope to only allow the R-2A and R-3 districts still results in an ordinance that provides relief to the property owners desiring such fencing.

The Commission discussed various types of vinyl fence and agreed that matte vinyl would be preferred and that maintenance of the fence would be essential.

Wilensky suggested that allowing fences will drastically change the visual character of the Village, and would like to see the ordinance limited to R-2A and R-3 only. Saur explained that R-2B already contains a significant number of existing non-compliant fences.

Westerlund asked that “grade” be defined in the ordinance. He noted A. 7. should read “Michigan Residential Code or Michigan Building Code” to ensure accuracy. Section A-3 reads “...shall not project beyond the perimeter of the private property...” and Westerlund expressed concern since there are a few property lines that extend into the roadway. There was also discussion on the fencing permitted at institutional playgrounds.

Upon discussion, the Commission agreed they would like to see an initial implementation of the ordinance start with only zone districts R-2A and R-3. They had concerns about inclusion of R-2B because the district extends west of Southfield Road and felt this version would allow the Village to ascertain the desire for privacy fencing by permits received in those limited areas.

Saur explained graphics would be included once the language was agreed upon. Following the approval of language, there would be a public hearing by the Planning Commission and recommendation to Council. Village Council would then hold a public hearing and two readings of the ordinance prior to adoption.

The Planning Commission is prepared to have a public hearing at their October 25th meeting provided R2-B is excluded, a clear definition of prevailing grade is included, and the allowance of matte vinyl.

UPDATE ON DRAFT REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP) LANGUAGE TO REQUEST PROPOSAL FOR MARKET ANALYSIS OF SOUTHFIELD CORRIDOR TOWN CENTER PLAN

Saur reported Village Administration has been working with Gibbs Planning Group (GPG) to draft language seeking consultant services for a pro-forma real estate development model to estimate the development costs, revenue, and potential return on investment for the land within the Southfield Overlay District for the implementation of the Village’s Town Center Plan.

The Village adopted the plan and overlay district in 2014, and to date has not seen development utilizing the new standards. The information being prepared will aid the Village, through assistance from GPG, to understand what aspects of the plan may be limiting potential development. Additionally, this information will assist the Village in possible modifications to the plan or district standards to help incentivize development. Upon selection, the consultant will perform the work within sixty (60) days after which Administration will present the findings to the Planning Commission and Village Council. Administration is seeking Council approval to solicit proposals for this work at the October 3, 2017 meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Roddy remarked that the meeting was informative and enjoyable.

LIAISON COMMENTS

None.

ADMINISTRATION COMMENTS

Saur reported Council passed the ordinance updating the penalties section of the zoning ordinance. Canine Couture has requested the sign request continue to be postponed. The December 2017 meeting has been scheduled for Wednesday, December 20th. Get Some Fitness has communicated with the Village that they are in the process of revising their projecting sign request.

COMMISSIONERS COMMENTS

Westerlund noted that the decision on Canine Couture was postponed due to lack of representation.

Drummond would like to see the tree ordinance passed.

Motion by Borowski, second by Westerlund, to adjourn the meeting at 9:50 p.m.

Motion passed.

George Ostrowski
Planning Commission Chairperson

Ellen E. Marshall
Village Clerk

Elizabeth M. Lyons
Recording Secretary