ROSEVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING

CIVIC CENTER COUNCIL CHAMBERS
29777 GRATIOT AVENUE
ROSEVILLE, MI 48066
(586) 445-5440

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 2007

7:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

PRESENT:	Chairperson	Otto Wilhelm
	Vice-Chairperson	Geraldine White
	Commissioners:	Frank Maisano
		Kurmmell Knox
		Joseph Montgomery
		John Surhigh
		Nancy Sunderman-Elert
ABSENT:		Robert Neibel (excused)
		Robert Splane (excused)

OTHERS PRESENT:
Richard Steenland, City Clerk
Glenn Sexton, Director of Building and Inspection
Ben Tallerico, Planning Consultant
Jolynn Friedmann, Recording Secretary

Chairman Otto Wilhelm called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m. with the Pledge of Allegiance.

I. ROLL CALL (SEE FACE PAGE)

COMMISSIONER KURMMELL KNOX moved, COMMISSIONER GERALDINE WHITE seconded to excuse absent Commissioners Robert Neibel and Robert Splane.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Special Meeting of October 1, 2007.

COMMISSIONER JOSEPH MONTGOMERY moved, COMMISSIONER FRANK MAISANO seconded to approve minutes of the Special Meeting held October 1, 2007.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

2. Study Session of October 1, 2007.

COMMISSIONER KURMMELL KNOX moved, COMMISSIONER JOSEPH MONTGOMERY seconded to approve minutes of the Study Session held October 1, 2007.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

3. Regular Meeting of October 15, 2007.

COMMISSIONER GERALDINE WHITE moved, COMMISSIONER KURMMELL KNOX seconded to approve minutes of the Regular Meeting held October 15, 2007.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

III. CORRESPONDENCE

Vice-Chairperson Geraldine White received no correspondence.

IV. BILLS TO BE PAID

Vice-Chairperson Geraldine White presented a bill from Vilican Leman for professional planning consultant services for the month of October 2007 in the amount of $690.00.

Retainer	$600.00
Usable Square footage for 31070 Gratiot	$ 90.00
TOTAL	**$690.00**

V. PUBLIC TO BE HEARD – AGENDA ITEMS ONLY – NOT TO INCLUDE PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

The Commission agreed to hold this portion of the meeting under Old Business agenda item #1.

VI. PUBLIC HEARING

There was no Public Hearing.

VII. OLD BUSINESS

- **SITE PLAN REVIEW-**Macomb County Rotating Emergency Shelter Team (MCREST) Multi-Purpose Building, 20415 Erin (PP# 14-04-426-012)-West of Little Mack, north of 13

Mile Road; Dominic Abate, Wakely Associates, Inc. Petitioner. Jimetta Lewis of MCREST (Developers.)

Dominic Abate, Wakely Associates, Inc. /Architects, 30500 Van Dyke Avenue, Warren, MI 48093 appeared on behalf of this request.

Planning Consultant Ben Tallerico stated for the record that he is not for or against this request; his job is to review the plan to see if it meets the Zoning Ordinance requirements and then the plan proceeds with reviews and hearings.

Mr. Tallerico presented the following review:

The site plan package we received November 13, 2007, contained the following information:

- Two page letter dated November 08, 2007, with an attachment, from Jimetta J. Lewis to the City of Roseville Planning Commission with a November 09, 2007 City of Roseville Building Department stamp.

And the following sheets:

- Sheet A-1.0 Site Plan and First Level Floor Plan, dated November 06, 2007
- Sheet A-4.0 Landscape Plan and Site Lighting Plan, dated November 06, 2007

Our comments pertain to the information presented on the above referenced sheets of drawings.

CONSULTANT REVIEW

Vilican Leman and Associates has reviewed this request and provides the following information for consideration:

1.1 Existing Land Use:

The subject parcel has an existing 5,500 sq. ft one story facility. The existing land use is general commercial. Land Use to the west and north is Comparison Commercial. Land Use to the east is General Commercial and Quasi Public. To the south is I-94 access.

1.2 Current Zoning:

The subject parcel is presently zoned B-3, General Business, as are surrounding parcels with the exception of the I-94 access to the south. **Elderly Housing, Dependent Care, is a special use in the B-3 district. Elderly, as defined by HUD, is persons 62 years of age or older. The proposed development is similar to the Elderly Housing, Dependent Care description as noted in Section 201, with exception to the age of the occupants. The proposed development states the occupants will be 18 and older, which would make this an Adult Housing, Dependent Care facility. Since the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Roseville does not define, nor list, Adult Housing, Dependent Care, we would recommend the Planning Commission make a determination of similar use for Adult Housing, Dependent Care. If approved, Adult Housing, Dependent Care that meets special conditions would be allowable in B-3 districts.**

Mr. Tallerico stated that he wants everyone to be clear that this isn't listed within the Zoning Ordinance and from a planning perspective and the most appropriate district for this type of use is in a B-3 District. If the Commission decides that Adult Housing and Dependent Care is

allowed in this district it doesn't mean this development is allowed in a B-3; the developer must meet the minimum requirements.

1.3 Future Land Use:

The City of Roseville's Master Plan for Future Land Use identifies the subject parcel as General Commercial, with center commercial to the north and west, and Quasi Public and General Commercial to the east.

1.4 Site Location:
The proposed building is located on the north side of Erin Road, west of Little Mack. The irregular shaped property has 203 feet more of less of frontage on Erin Road, and a depth of approximately 300.10 on the west side and 178.96 on the east side. The area exclusive of the right of way is approximately 0.86 acres.

1.5 Building Data:

.1 Building height. The proposed height of the building is within the maximum building height limitations of the B-3 General Business District, as noted below.

Permitted	Proposed
30 Feet	29.2 Feet

.1 Building stories. The proposed stories of the building are within the maximum building stories permitted in the B-3 General Business District, as noted below.

Permitted	Proposed
3 stories	2 stories

.2 Building set backs. Per Section 1800, the General Business District requires setbacks of a total of 30 feet on both sides, 10 feet from the rear, and on the west side, 68 feet from the centerline of the road.

The minimum applicable building setback requirements of the district are met, as outlined below.

Yard	Required	Provided
Front (south)	68 Feet	68 Feet
West side	10 Feet	10 Feet
East side	10 Feet	52 Feet
Rear	20 Feet	N/A Feet

1.6 Off-Street Parking:

.1 Numerical parking requirement.

Housing:	*Required*
Calculated as Group Home	5
Plus one for each employee in the largest working shift	*

Classroom/Training:	*Required*

Calculated as auditorium	15
Plus one for every two employees in the largest working shift	*

Drop in Center:	*Required*
Calculated as auditorium	34
Plus one for every two employees in the largest working shift	*

Largest working shift:	*Required*
Per applicants calculation	16

The applicant states on Fridays at 6:00 pm there will be an "ADA Program with 16 people total". Does this include the staff on site or just the participates. If just the participates, how many staff are expected?

* On sheet A-1.0, the applicant states there will be fourteen (14) employees in the new building and five (5) in the existing building. In addition, the attachment to the November 8, 2007 letter provided by the applicant shows at least sixteen employees at any one time.

Required	Provided
70 spaces	**28 spaces**

Even when using the least restrictive requirements, the parking fails to meet minimum standards (i.e., space, such as offices, conference rooms, kitchen, waiting areas, clinic, was not factored into the calculations for parking except to take a general number of workers in the largest shift, which the applicants shows as 16).

Mr. Tallerico does not dispute the parking information the petitioner provided; however that information must be presented to the Zoning Board of Appeals to help make the petitioner's case as to the required parking. The Planning Commission has no authority to override the Zoning Ordinance.

.2 Off-street parking space layout, standards. The parking layout proposed on the plan meets the requirements pertaining to maneuvering lane width, parking space width, and parking space length as indicated below:

Required (90 degree)	Provided
22 feet maneuvering lane width	24 feet
19 feet parking space length	19 feet
9 feet parking space width	9 feet

Required (Parallel)	Provided
12 feet maneuvering lane width	22 feet
23 feet parking space length	23 feet
8 feet parking space width	8 feet

It should also be noted on the plans that per Section 2002(5), adequate ingress and egress to the site must be provided per local, county and state guidelines. Corner Clearance standards must also be addressed by the applicant on the plan and met per Section 2307.

Per section 2002(23), dead-end off-street parking aisles are discouraged, especially in connection with business uses. Such aisles shall be no more than eight (8) spaces deep (the existing layout is twelve (12) spaces deep) on any side and may be used only when there is no reasonable alternative. If more than eight (8) spaces deep on any side, the layout shall provide a means for vehicles to turn around. This has not been addressed on the applicant's site plan.

Parking lot landscaping is also required in accordance with Article 22, Screening Devices and Landscaping. Per Section 2212, Aesthetic Landscape Areas, a minimum ten (10) foot wide landscaped lawn panel shall be provided between any public road right-of-way, existing or proposed, and any off-street parking space, service drive that parallels a road right-of-way line or other motor vehicle use areas, except loading and unloading areas at the rear of a building or when next to an alley right-of-way. This issue must be addressed by the applicant particularly in the area of parallel parking and to the rear of the site. Specific details may be found in Section 2212(2).

Development in a B-3 District also requires additional on-site landscaped areas equal to at least five percent (5%) of the total area of the site, less any land in public rights-of-way or equal to a ratio of ten (10) to one (1): ten (10) square feet of landscaping for each off-street parking space provided on-site, whichever results in the larger area. These areas need to be defined by the applicant on the site plan and shall be distributed throughout the site and may include tree islands within the parking lot, placed at parking row ends, except in the case of large parking lots which require these islands per every ten (10) to twelve (12) spaces. This item is further addressed in Section 2212(a) OR pedestrian walkways, plazas, planters and other decorative features if made part of the site's overall landscaping (further addressed in Section 2212(b)).

The applicant needs to address adequate ingress and egress, dead-end off-street parking aisles, parking lot landscaping, including the landscaped lawn panel and on-site landscaped areas per Ordinance requirements.

1.7 Loading and unloading:

Section 2003 requires loading and unloading if the applicant is in receipt or distribution of vehicles, materials or merchandise. Section 1801 (j) states off-street loading space shall be provided in the rear yard in the ratio of a least one (1) space per each establishment and shall be provided in addition to any required off-street parking area. The applicant states the loading area will be 10' x 42' and is adjacent to the new kitchen within the front/side yard and is expected to be utilized approximately once per week. They also state it is there for convenience to the kitchen staff receiving deliveries. The actual measurement depicted on the site plan is actually 10' x 34'. In addition, the loading area shall be provided in the rear year. The location has to be effectively screened from view from any public street per Section 2003 (6).

Therefore, the loading/unloading area, as depicted on the site plan, does not meet the following:

Dimensional requirements
Locational requirements
Screening requirements

Mr. Tallerico stated that the petitioner must make their case to the Zoning Board of Appeals as to why the loading and unloading is sufficient for this development. The Planning Commission cannot override the Zoning Ordinance.

1.8 Mechanical Equipment Screening

Per Section 2214, all exterior climate control equipment and any other exterior mechanical equipment shall be effectively screened from view. The applicant needs to provide information on the equipment and its location to determine if this Ordinance regulation applies.

The applicant needs to provide information on mechanical equipment screening.

1.9 Trash receptacle:

The trash receptacle is proposed in the interior rear side yard of the lot with a six-foot high, poured in place dumpster enclosure with a gate. The enclosure is required to match the building. (Applicant states it will match brick veneer.) There appears to be insufficient maneuvering room for the service vehicle to load and unload. (It would have to back all the way out, which is not a safely recommended route). A reinforced concrete pad should be provided in front of the gate. The pad extends outward 10 feet from the gate and is the width of the gate.

A site plan needs to state the exterior walls of the structure shall consist of the same masonry material used in the front façade. In addition, concrete masonry units are prohibited, and the gates need to consist of an opaque material. Consideration should also be given to an alternative location due to the safety challenges of a front loaded service vehicle backing out a distance of 110 feet, more or less.

Mr. Tallerico stated that the trash receptacle should be moved to the north east corner of the site to allow access and pointed out this section on the site plan for Mr. Abate.

1.10 Exterior lighting.

The applicant indicates there will be ten (10) exterior building wall fixtures on sheet A-4.0. The lighting will be mounted on the building wall with 400W wall packs. In addition, the applicant states a maximum of 4.5-foot candles will be maintained as overall site lighting intensity. They also state all perimeter lighting will comply with Section 2305.

A complete site lighting sheet (photometric schematic) needs to be provided that shows the lumens from all ten (10) fixtures. In addition, wattage needs to be reduced from 462 to 400 to meet Ordinance requirements.

1.11 Building Façade Design

The applicant proposes brick, split face CMU and brick veneer for the building. The Zoning Ordinance requires that all exterior building walls of all new buildings shall consist of the same uniform finish material as the front façade of the main or principal building. Sheet A-1.0 states both will be brick.

1.12 Signs:

The applicant has not provided any sign information. If a sign is to be provided, it needs to comply with the requirement of the Roseville Sign Ordinance, Chapter 264 in the Roseville Code of Ordinances, as amended.

1.13 Landscaping:

The applicant proposed a new landscaped area in front of the proposed building, along the east side near the front of the proposed building, and between the two buildings. The following information needs to be provided:

- A statement of the planting season.
- The type of junipercus shrubs.
- A statement that all plant material shall meet current American Association of Nurserymen Standards.

SUMMARY

In conclusion, the following items need to be addressed as indicated in the specific sections above:

- The Plan Commission needs to make a Determination of Similar Use.
- The site plan as submitted does not meet the minimum parking requirements.
- The applicant needs to address adequate ingress and egress, dead-end off-street parking aisles, parking lot landscaping, including the landscaped lawn panel and on-site landscaped areas per Ordinance requirements.
- The loading and unloading area does not meet the minimum requirements as noted in 1.7.
- The applicant needs to provide information on mechanical equipment screening.
- A complete photometric schematic needs to be provided.
- Total wattage exceeds the ordinance requirements.
- We recommend the trash receptacle be move as noted in 1.8
- More information concerning landscaping needs to be provided.
- Additional Sign information will need to be provided that complies with the Roseville Sign Ordinance.
- The applicant needs to state what statute they are operating under and what provisions of the act they are providing.

Mr. Tallerico stated for the record that this development will not operate under any state statute or providing any provisions of any state act as previously stated by Brian Smilnak at the November 5, 2007 Study Session; the petitioners agreed with that statement.

Chairperson Otto Wilhelm explained that this evening is the first official discussion of the site plan review and a public hearing must also be held on the site plan review. The public hearing requires a 30 day notice which must be mailed to surrounding properties and published in the newspaper. Once the notification process has taken place, the public hearing will be held on December 17, 2007. Mr. Wilhelm stated that there are a few issues with the site plan that will have to go before the Zoning Board of Appeals for approval; the Planning Commission cannot override the Zoning Code of Ordinances. If the site plan is denied by the Planning Commission after the public hearing, the petitioner will have to go before the Zoning Board of Appeals in January. The site plan will be back before the Planning Commission for review after the ZBA makes a decision on the site plan.

Mr. Tallerico explained to the petitioners that if the minimum requirements are not met in the site plan, which the parking requirements are not met, the petitioner must go before the ZBA. The Commission must deny the site plan in order for the petitioner to gain access to the Zoning Board of Appeals. If the ZBA grants the variances, the site plan will come before the Planning Commission for approval or denial; the petitioner does not have access to the ZBA until the Planning Commission denies the site plan. Mr. Tallerico also explained that if no variances are required on the site plan, the petitioner will not have to go before the ZBA.

In the audience Commissioner Joan Flynn asked Ms. Huff when the grant will expire for this development; Ms. Huff replied that the grant will expire on February 12, 2008.

Mr. Wilhelm stated that if it is necessary, the Commission will hold a special meeting in January to accommodate this request.

Mr. Tallerico explained that he has hurried his reviews on this matter. Normally Mr. Tallerico has more time than receiving a plan on Thursday for a Monday review. The City and the Commission will do what they can to expedite the process for the petitioner; however, they cannot waive or eliminate Ordinance requirements for the petitioner. Mr. Tallerico feels the City has been expediting this matter for the petitioner.

Mike Clover, 16279 12 Mile, asked whether this development is connected to Solid Ground on 11 Mile Road and mentioned the vacant K-Mart building on 13 Mile as a possible site for this development. Mr. Clover wished everyone a happy Thanksgiving.

Laurie Huff, Board President for MCREST, 53637 Atherton, New Baltimore, stated that the K-Mart building is too large for this type of project and she doesn't believe MCREST would have the funds necessary to renovate the K-Mart Building. Ms. Huff explained that this project is separate from Solid Ground which is a family transitional housing facility; the MCREST development will be specifically for severally and persistently mentally ill homeless men with 25 rooms. The downstairs area of the development will be a drop in center where services will come in for the homeless to access the services. The services that will be provided at the center include housing and work searches, health care and dentistry.

Ms. Huff asked Chairperson Otto Wilhelm if the Commission will automatically send this item to the ZBA after the public hearing or will they have to petition the ZBA; Mr. Wilhelm responded that the Commission would have to deny the plan for the petitioner to gain access to the ZBA and then MCREST will have speak with Glenn Sexton to have the item placed on the ZBA agenda if the petitioner wishes to appeal the decision of the Planning Commission.

Mr. Tallerico explained that this development will be an addition to the front of the existing building. The proposed building will be 18,000 square feet and two stories with a brick façade. The first floor will have offices, multi purpose rooms, a clinic, a kitchen, a drop in center and waiting area. The second floor will contain the safe rooms for the 24 male residents. The basement will contain the conference room, board room, laundry area, class room training facility. The safe rooms are 110 square feet and two rooms are 125 square feet for double occupancy. Ms. Huff stated twenty five individuals will be housed on this site.

Commissioner Joseph Montgomery asked Ms. Huff what the ability of the residents to respond to an emergency such as a fire alarm, because Ms. Huff had previously stated the residents are severally and persistently mentally ill. Ms. Huff explained that the residents will be able to exit the building on their own and the facility will be staffed 24 hours a day seven days a week. Ms. Huff also stated that the individuals that will stay in this facility are the type of people wandering around Macomb Mall at the present time. Mr. Montgomery stated he respects the work that MCREST is doing; however, there is a real safety question in relationship to the building code as well as the Commission's determination whether or not this development meets any use. If an individual is incapable of exiting a building, it changes how you look at the site plan both from a building and zoning standpoint.

Ms. Huff stated that this is an adult population that exists on the street now and the individuals are able to take care of themselves in many emergency situations; the individuals who would reside in this building are not children who would need assistance in exiting the building. Ms. Huff explained that security and staff on site 24 hours a day and stated that she is speaking of people with a mental illness who hopefully will be medication compliant as that is a part of what MCREST is working toward which makes people easier to work with. Ms. Huff also stated that regular fire drills any shelter facility drills must take place on a monthly basis.

Commissioner Kurmmell Knox questioned Ms. Huff in regard to the residents of the facility paying rent as was previously stated at the Study Session on November 5, 2007; Ms. Huff responded that if any resident has an income, whether they are on disability or working, it is part of HUD regulations that a certain percentage of their income they must pay rent so that eventually they learn to be totally self sufficient. Mr. Knox mentioned the residents being "medication compliant" and the fact that not all residents will take their medications. Ms. Huff stated that MCREST cannot force anyone with a mental illness to take their medication; however, they will have community mental health workers such as psychiatrists, case workers and a nurse to have the appropriate medication available for the individuals to take. Ms Huff explained that part of the reason people are wandering the street now is because they are not medication compliant. Mr. Knox also inquired as to security on this site not only for residents but for staff; cameras will be placed inside and outside and a professional security service will be on-site 24 hours a day.

Mr. Abate thanked Mr. Tallerico for his review and stated that he personally feels this is a worth while project and he is committed to this project. Mr. Abate explained that his biggest concern is losing the funding for this project, he will do everything he can to meet the deadlines. Mr. Abate Commented that Mr. Sexton and Mr. Tallerico have cooperated with his office to help with the site plan. Mr. Abate's goal is to remedy the parking issue and eliminate the need for a variance and Mr. Abate will make the case for the items that may need a variance and he asked for the City to expedite this matter in that regard.

Joan Flynn, 13810 Treflaga, Warren, County Commissioner District 6, has been working with the Commissioners on this home for the last six years and explained that Macomb County will provide a lot of help to this project. Ms. Flynn explained that a dentist program, mental health board and Michigan Works will be in the proposed building to help Macomb County and stated that the only place in the County is the Salvation Army in Warren on Mound Road. She stated that the development will be open to women during the day; the men will stay so they may be rehabilitated. Women with children will welcome at the building. Ms. Flynn felt that it has taken so long for this project to proceed, she explained that HUD has strict rules and if this project doesn't get underway then MCREST will lose the grant and she appreciates the Commissions consideration on this matter.

Rick Lynn, 14984 Cranbrook Ct, Shelby Twp, appeared. Mr. Lynn is a newly-elected board member of MCREST, commented that Mr. Montgomery and Mr. Knox's questions were good questions. Mr. Lynn stated that it may be fortuitous that this development may fit into the aged housing category because all of these questions would have already been addressed in Roseville wherever those kind of facilities exist. Mr. Lynn stated that the architect can confirm that this project meets all of the qualifications of an elderly housing project, and stated while those questions are good questions, an aged person in a wheel chair would have the same challenges getting out of a building which is also staffed 24 hours a day with security cameras and fire alarms. Mr. Lynn stated that they are there to talk about specific facts and this is one fact that might relate to the future ZBA discussion and he thought it ought to be mentioned.

Commissioner Geraldine White asked Mr. Tallerico if this plan was routed through other City Departments such as the Fire Department. Director of Building and Inspection Glenn Sexton stated that preliminary site plan review was conducted by the Fire and Engineering Departments. There were concerns with the proposed building that delayed the review process from the time the plans were submitted and when the plan was placed before the Planning Commission. The concerns were corrected before the Planning Commission received the plan.

COMMISSIONER FRANK MAISANO moved, COMMISSIONER GERALDINE WHITE seconded to set the **SITE PLAN REVIEW-**Macomb County Rotating Emergency Shelter Team (MCREST) Multi-Purpose Building, 20415 Erin (PP# 14-04-426-012)-West of Little Mack, north of 13 Mile Road for a Public Hearing on December 17, 2007.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

There was no New Business.

IX. REPORT OF PLANNING CONSULTANT

Planning Consultant Ben Tallerico had nothing to report.

X. PUBLIC TO BE HEARD

City Clerk Richard Steenland introduced himself to the Commission and complimented them on how well their meetings are conducted.

XI. COMMISSION MEMBERS TO BE HEARD

Commissioner Nancy Sunderman-Elert wished everyone a nice Thanksgiving.

Commissioner John Surhigh commented that the Commission Members have been involved with MCREST through their respective churches and about the good work MCREST does. Mr. Surhigh stated that the Commission Members do not have a personal agenda, there job is to look at the plans and make sure the plans fit into the Zoning Ordinance.

Commissioner Joseph Montgomery congratulated newly-elected City Clerk Richard Steenland and wished everyone a happy Thanksgiving.

Commissioner Frank Maisano congratulated Mr. Steenland and wished everyone a happy Thanksgiving. Mr. Maisano thanked the individuals who were present to support the MCREST project.

Commissioner Kurmmell Knox congratulated Mr. Steenland, commented that he will travel to Delaware for Thanksgiving taking the warmth of Roseville with him and stated that a volunteer body such as the Planning Commission is often misunderstood and causes confusion if facts go unchecked. From Mr. Knox's perspective it is one of the failings of a community volunteer/servant system because they are mischaracterized as having personal agendas. Mr. Knox feels everyone should be careful before fingers are pointed at anyone who may impede the progress of any project because this will create dissention, dissention creates contempt and contempt breeds longer waits.

Commissioner Geraldine White congratulated Mr. Steenland and wished everyone a happy Thanksgiving.

Chairperson Otto Wilhelm wished everyone a happy Thanksgiving and congratulated Mr. Steenland.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

COMMISSIONER GERALDINE WHITE moved, COMMISSIONER NANCY SUNDERMAN-ELERT seconded that the agenda having been acted upon, the meeting is hereby adjourned at 7:45 p.m.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Respectfully submitted,
RICHARD M. STEENLAND, City Clerk