ROSEVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION
STUDY SESSION

MANAGER'S CONFERENCE ROOM
29777 GRATIOT AVENUE
ROSEVILLE, MI 48066
(586) 445-5440

MONDAY, DECEMBER 3, 2007
7 p.m.

ROLL CALL

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

OTHERS PRESENT: Ben Tallerico, Planning Consultant
Jolynn Friedmann, Recording Secretary

Chairperson Otto Wilhelm called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m.

I. ROLL CALL (See face page)

COMMISSIONER ROBERT SPLANE moved, COMMISSIONER ROBERT NEIBEL seconded to excuse absent Commissioner Frank Maisano.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Study Session of November 5, 2007.
2. Regular Meeting of November 19, 2007.

Minutes will be approved at the Regular Meeting on December 17, 2007.

III. CORRESPONDENCE

Vice-Chairperson Geraldine White received no correspondence.

IV. BILLS TO BE PAID

Bills will be paid at the Regular Meeting on December 17, 2007

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

No one from the public was present to be heard.

VI. PUBLIC HEARING

- **PROPOSED ORDINANCE CHANGE** – Add Adult Dependent Care as permitted use, subject to special conditions in B-3 District.

Planning Consultant Ben Tallerico reviewed the discussion held at the November 19, 2007 Regular Meeting at which the members discussed the topic of adding Adult Dependent Care to the Zoning Code, either through the Planning Commission determining a similar use or through an Ordinance change. Mr. Tallerico, City Manager Stephen Truman, and Director of Building and Inspection Glenn Sexton met with City Attorney Tim Tomlinson regarding this issue; Mr. Tomlinson advised Mr. Tallerico that the only way to add Adult Dependent Care to the Zoning Ordinance is through amending the Ordinance. The definition of Adult Dependent Care must be added to the Zoning Ordinance in the beginning and add this type of use to the B-3 District. Mr. Tallerico explained that this item will go before City Council and, if adopted, the Ordinance will contain a definition of Dependent Care Adult within the City of Roseville and in a B-3 District subject to special conditions.

Commissioner John Surhigh asked Chairperson Otto Wilhelm about Solid Ground and its classification. Mr. Tallerico stated that the current Zoning Ordinance was adopted two years ago and he was not involved with that project. Commissioner Joseph Montgomery stated that at the time Solid Ground was in review the Planning Commission did not review site plans; the Building Director at the time made the decision on similar use.

Chairperson Wilhelm stated that the Planning Commission has only reviewed site plans in the past year; previous to that the Building Department reviewed all plans.

Commissioner Kurmmell Knox commented that the MCREST facility applies only to men; whereas, Solid Ground applies to families and the Building Department made the decision on the site plan for Solid Ground.

Mr. Tallerico stated that at the last meeting he discussed determination of similar use or making a change in the ordinance. The Zoning Ordinance does not state that the Planning Commission has the authority to make a determination of similar use on special uses.

Commissioner Montgomery stated that under the previous Zoning Ordinance the building department had the authority to make a determination of similar use. The change in the Ordinance tightened the review process and allows the public to have input.

Chairperson Wilhelm explained that on December 17, 2007 the Public Hearing will be held on the proposed changes.

VII. OLD BUSINESS

- **SITE PLAN REVIEW-** Macomb County Rotating Emergency Shelter Team 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.)

Planning Consultant Ben Tallerico stated that he has not received a revised plan from the petitioners although he has spoken with the architect over the phone.

Brian Smilnak, Wakely Associates, Inc. Architects, 30500 Van Dyke Avenue, Warren, MI 48093 appeared with Jimetta Lewis of MCREST. Mr. Smilnak stated that he will submit the revised site plans for the Building Department and discussed the following issues he addressed in the site plan:

- The parking is an issue due to the use of the proposed facility. Mr. Smilnak explained that the parking is calculated as if MCREST was not on site and the multiplier in the code is applied as an auditorium seating for the drop-in center on the main floor which will be used as a walk-in center. In terms of Parking and complying with the Ordinance the drop-in center is calculated using 1 (one) space for every 55 square feet. The auditorium seating definition is also being applied to the classroom/training room that measures 852 square feet, which will be used for training and teaching of the occupants, as opposed to a seminar setting where individuals will park vehicles on site. Mr. Smilnak explained that the second floor is looked upon as a group home requirement which is one (1) parking space for every five beds. (To comply with the Zoning Ordinance 70 spaces are required, for the terms and purposes of how the building is currently used 27 spaces which facilitate the largest staff at one time in the building plus the resident bed count.) Mr. Smilnak stated that as far as the use for the proposed building, he feels the plan complies with how the facility will be used, but currently the site plan does not comply with how the Zoning Ordinance is being applied to this parcel of land.
- Three spots have been eliminated to allow another exit which will facilitate the dumpster being emptied.
- The dumpster exterior has been changed to brick veneer to match the building.
- Two more parallel spaces were added.
- Mr. Smilnak explained that a variance is needed for parking and the loading and unloading area. Per the Ordinance, loading and unloading areas should be located behind the building and the proposed building does not have a rear area and the site cannot facilitate the required 10 feet x 80 feet. The site plan provides 10 feet x 42 feet and a variance will be required for the loading and unloading area.
- The clear vision triangle compliance has been identified on the plan.

- Mechanical equipment screening has been provided on the elevations of the building; all roof top equipment will be on the flat roof and screened.
- The lighting fixture on the outside of the building was changed and new photo-metrics have been prepared.
- The landscape/green area of the parcel is listed on the site plan.

Mr. Tallerico asked Mr. Smilnak if he received a copy of the letter from Building Director Glenn Sexton dated November 27; Mr. Smilnak said that he has received the letter. Mr. Tallerico reviewed the letter in regard to the requirements of Adult Dependent Housing. Mr. Smilnak stated that there are two requirements for elderly care that will have an impact and require a variance. Elderly Care requires a 40 feet setback from the property line to the side of the building; the existing setback is 10 feet. Mr. Smilnak asked Mr. Tallerico if the 150 foot landscape space per bed is over and above the landscaped space; the 150 foot landscape space is over and above the building coverage area. Mr. Smilnak feels this site plan is close to meeting this requirement.

Mr. Tallerico explained that if the Planning Commission recommends approval of this request to City Council and Council approves the request then this definition will be included in the code. This definition is not specifically for MCREST and does not mean approval or denial on this site plan; it strictly means that the definition will be included in the Zoning Ordinance if approved.

Jimetta Lewis explained that she received reports from the Board of MCREST that the Commission Members felt they were on the defensive at the November 19, 2007 meeting due to articles that were printed in the paper. Chairperson Otto Wilhelm stated that some members had concerns due to statements made regarding the fact that the Commission has not acted on this issue in a timely manner on this request. Ms. Lewis stated that no one from MCREST feels that the Commission has held up the process. Ms. Lewis asked Mr. Wilhelm if the Commission has any other issues for December 17, 2007; Mr. Wilhelm explained that on December 17, 2007 Public Hearing will be held and the Commission will decide whether to recommend approval of the amendment of the Zoning Ordinance to Council. Ms. Lewis asked Mr. Wilhelm how long this whole process will take. Mr. Tallerico stated that Ms. Lewis may contact the Building Department to check on the scheduling of the City Council meeting for this request and the schedule of the Zoning Board of appeals.

Commissioner Geraldine White asked Mr. Tallerico if the petitioner must reapply for site plan approval after the public hearing; he replied that the petitioner does not need to reapply to the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Joseph Montgomery asked Ms. Lewis if the residents in the proposed building have the capability of self preservation. Ms. Lewis explained that individuals who are paranoid schizophrenics are intelligent people who have a high level of self preservation and are aware of dangers. Ms. Lewis told the Commission a story about her brother who was paranoid schizophrenic. Mr. Montgomery explained that if self preservation was an issue it would change the guidelines for the building.

Ms. Lewis stated that Sam's Club is in contact with their headquarters so that MCREST will be able to get extra parking spaces from Sam's Club.

Mr. Knox asked Mr. Tallerico if in the future MCREST leaves the proposed facility if all of the variances stay in effect on this facility. Mr. Tallerico stated it will depend on the type of use of any future operation in this building.

Mr. Wilhelm explained to Ms. Lewis some concerns of residents and asked her if she will address the concerns regarding the residents that will be housed in the proposed building at the future public hearing.

Mr. Tallerico stressed to the Commission that the Public Hearing on December 17, 2007 is not for MCREST; the Public Hearing is strictly for an ordinance amendment.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

- **SITE PLAN REVIEW-**American House East I, 17255 Common (PP#14-08-152-031)- North Side of Common, East of Garfield. James T. Pappas, Fusco, Shafer & Pappas, Inc, Site Plan Designers, American House, Developer.

James Pappas and Pat Berry appeared on behalf of this request.

Planning Consultant Ben Tallerico presented the following review to the Commission:

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 currently has a building on it with vacant property to the rear. It appears that the applicant will be building the proposed structure behind the current building. Land Use to the north is Office and to the south is Single Family Residential with multiple family to the east and office to the west.

Mr. Tallerico asked Mr. Pappas if he wishes to apply for a land division; Mr. Pappas stated he prefers a land division. Mr. Tallerico stated that he has reviewed this project under one parcel so some minor changes will be required to the site plan.

1.2 Current Zoning:

The subject parcels are presently zoned RM-1, Multiple Family Residential, Low Rise. Surrounding zoning includes R-1, One Family Residential to the east and south and R-1, One Family Residential and I-1, Light Industrial to the west.

The RM-1 Multiple Family Residential Districts are designed to provide sites for multiple family dwelling structures and related uses which will generally serve as zones of transition between the nonresidential districts or major thoroughfares and lower density single family districts. The Multiple Family District is further provided to serve the limited needs for the apartment type of unit in an otherwise medium density, single family community.

Independent elderly housing is a use subject to special conditions per Section 602(6) as is dependent elderly housing per Section 602(7). Neither section allows height to exceed two (2) stories.

Any use subject to special conditions requires a public hearing per Section 2606.

1.3 Future Land Use:

The City of Roseville's Master Plan for Future Land Use identifies the subject parcel as Multiple Family Residential, with the surrounding property to the north and west designated for light industrial and to the south Single Family Residential.

1.4 Site Location:
The building is located on the north side of Common Road east of Garfield, with the proposed building to be behind the current one. The property has approximately 171 feet of frontage on the north side of Common Road and a depth of approximately 1,971

feet. The area exclusive of the right of way is approximately 13.99 acres inclusive of the existing Lot (A) at 7.69 acres and the proposed Lot (B) at 6.3 acres.

1.5 Building Data:

.1 Minimum Zoning Lot Size per Dwelling Unit. In RM-1, the total number of rooms of eighty (80) square feet or more (not including kitchen and sanitary facilities) shall not be more than the net area of the parcel (exclusive of any public rights-of-way), in square feet, divided by seven hundred twenty-five (725).

.2 Building height. The proposed height of the building is not within the maximum building height limitations of the RM-1 Multiple Family Residential District, as noted below:

Permitted	Proposed
25 Feet	30 ½ Feet

.3 Building setbacks. Per Section 1800, the Multiple Family Residential District requires setbacks as indicated below:

YARD	REQUIRED	PROVIDED
Front	25(e,r)	n/a
Side	20(e)	50
Side	40(e)	56
Rear	35(e)	60

Per Section 1801(e), the minimum distance between any two (2) buildings shall be regulated according to the length and height of such buildings and in no instance shall this distance be less than thirty (30) feet. Parking areas, maneuvering lanes and/or drives intended for ingress-egress to parking spaces which are adjacent to residential building walls containing windows or doorways on the ground floor level shall be located at least fifteen (15) feet from such walls.

Per Section 1801(r), exterior building wall materials shall be subject to the approval of the Building Department or Planning Commission and subject further to the standards set forth in Section 2310 of the Ordinance which states that all exterior building walls of all new buildings and any accessory buildings shall consist of the same uniform finish material as the front façade of the main or principal building. The applicant is responsible for providing a statement describing how the selected exterior building wall materials or combination of materials will enhance the building's appearance and be in harmony with the buildings on adjacent parcels. The applicant has shown brick and siding on the elevation drawings.

1.6 Off-Street Parking:

.1 Numerical parking requirement. Housing for the elderly requires two (2) parking spaces for every three (3) units plus one for each employee in the largest working shift. Should the units ever revert to general occupancy, the requirements for multiple family housing shall apply (The numerical off-street parking requirement for multiple family is two (2) for each dwelling unit plus one half (0.5) space for each additional bedroom over two (2) plus one (1) visitor parking space for every ten (10) parking spaces.)

The applicant has not provided information in regards to the number of employees in the largest working shift.

Required	Provided

74 spaces* **67 spaces**

* We request that the applicant show how the units are counted to equal 111 as it is not readily evident on the floor plans. In addition, as stated above, this figure is calculated without the addition of the employee spaces.

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

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

Mr. Tallerico commented that he is concerned with the parking that faces to the east due to light from the parking lot going into the multiple family building to the east of this property. Mr. Tallerico wants more landscaping added to this area on the plan.

1.7 Loading and unloading:

The loading and unloading area is proposed in the west side yard. Section 2003 (9) requires loading and unloading to be provided in the rear yard, except that in those instances where an interior side yard is located adjacent to an I-Industrial District, loading and unloading may be conducted in that interior side yard when located near the rear of the building. It appears that the orientation of the building may meet these requirements. However, loading spaces are required to be 10' x 80' in size and the applicant is proposing an area only 10' x 60'. The proposed space is provided toward the middle rear of the building. The maneuverability of large delivery trucks may prove challenging given the angle for entry and exit of the proposed loading area. The City may request aesthetic screening.

The proposed space does not meet the minimum dimensional requirements as indicated below:

Required	Proposed
10 x 80 feet	10 x 60 feet

The loading and unloading area does not meet the ordinance requirements pertaining to dimension and location will need to be determined to insure adequate access to parking spaces located within the area.

1.8 Trash receptacle:

The trash receptacle is proposed in the rear of the lot with a six-foot block to match the building. The placement of the receptacle will require the service vehicle to either back in, or most likely, back out. This may prove difficult considering the adjacent parking. A reinforced concrete pad should be provided in front of the gate. The pad should extend outward 10 feet from the gate and should be at least the width of the gate. A note stating the proposed trash enclosure will consist of the same material as the building has not been provided.

1.9 Exterior lighting.

Section 2305 addresses exterior site lighting. The applicant indicated wattage between 175 and 215 watts. This meets the ordinance requirements. In addition, no property shall exceed 4.5 foot candles of maximum overall site lighting. The plan as reviewed does not exceed 4.5 foot candles. Finally, pole heights cannot exceed 20 feet. The poles proposed are 15 feet in height for both of the two (2) designs.

1.10 Building Façade Design

The applicant proposes brick and horizontal siding for the building as well as decorative louvers, dormers and window pediments.

1.11 Signs:

The applicant has not proposed any signage on the site. Section 2307 addresses the corner clearance requirements. Per Section 2311, compliance with the Roseville Sign Ordinance, Chapter 264 in the Roseville Code of Ordinances, as amended, is anticipated upon submission of details.

1.12 Landscaping:

The applicant proposes a mixture of:

- 88 deciduous trees
- 108 evergreen trees
- 714 shrubs
- 302 perennials, groundcovers and vines

These are all appropriate materials. The applicant has provided a statement indicating that plant materials meet current American Association of Nurserymen standards as well as statements regarding irrigation.

SUMMARY

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

- Elderly housing (independent or dependant) is a use subject to special conditions per Section 602(6) and 602(7) and will therefore require a public hearing per Section 2606.
- The building height does not meet Ordinance requirements.
- Off-street parking is deficient.
- Information regarding staff levels and numbers of employees needs to be provided by the applicant.
- The applicant needs to show how the units are counted, as this is not indicated on the drawings.
- The loading and unloading space is underprovided.

  Mr. Tallerico discussed the driveway around the building and the trash pick up.

- The trash enclosure needs to have the same finish as the building and needs to be the appropriate height.
- Information regarding signage has not been received.

Mr. Pappas presented information to the Commission regarding the proposed development, reviewed the site plan and answered questions for the Commission. Mr. Pappas stated that the existing driveways are two ways around the building and access will be gained to the property from Common and Castle Street and continue

Mr. Pappas described the carports on the east side of the neighboring property and discussed the proposed landscaping and the materials that will be used on the proposed building.

IX. REPORT OF PLANNING CONSULTANT

Planning Consultant Ben Tallerico had nothing to report.

X. PUBLIC TO BE HEARD

No one from the public wished to be heard.

XI. COMMISSION MEMBERS TO BE HEARD

Chairperson Otto Wilhelm offered his condolences to Commissioner Robert Splane on the passing of his father and asked Commissioner Robert Neibel for an update on his son Stephan who was born premature. Mr. Neibel stated that his son will have to have surgery and is on a heart monitor.

Commissioner Neibel offered his condolences to Commissioner Splane and apologized for missing so many meetings.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

COMMISSIONER NANCY SUNDERMAN-ELERT moved, COMMISSIONER KURMMELL KNOX seconded that the agenda having been acted upon, the meeting is hereby adjourned at 8:02 p.m.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Respectfully Submitted,
RICHARD M. STEENLAND, City Clerk

PLEASE NOTE: A cassette tape of this meeting is on file with the Clerk's Office for further information.