ROSEVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION
STUDY SESSION

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

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 2007
7 p.m.

ROLL CALL

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

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

Vice-Chairperson Geraldine White called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

I. ROLL CALL (See face page)

COMMISSIONER NANCY SUNDERMAN-ELERT moved, COMMISSIONER KURMMELL KNOX seconded to excuse absent Chairperson Otto Wilhelm and Commissioners Frank Maisano, Robert Neibel and Robert Splane.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Special Meeting of October 1, 2007.
2. Study Session of October 1, 2007.
3. Regular Meeting of October 15, 2007.

Minutes will be approved at the Regular Meeting on November 19, 2007.

III. CORRESPONDENCE

Vice-Chairperson Geraldine White received no correspondence.

IV. BILLS TO BE PAID

Bills will be paid at the Regular Meeting on November 19, 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

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.)

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

Jimetta Lewis, Executive Director of MCREST, 20415 Erin, appeared with Mr. Smilnak.

Laurie Huff, Board President for MCREST, 20415 Erin, was present.

Planning Consultant Ben Tallerico reviewed the Site Plan and presented the following information to the Commission and the petitioners:

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. **Foster care group homes (small and large) are permitted in the RM-1 Multiple-Family Residential District. The use proposed does not appear to be allowed in the B-3 district.**

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 (west)	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.

Required	Provided
*	**27 spaces****

* Group Homes require one for each employee in the largest working shift, plus one for every five resident occupants. The applicant states there will be 24 male residents, which translates to five spaces. They also state the largest work shift will be fourteen (14), which brings the total to 19 spaces. We need to know the use/requirements for the existing community building to determine if the minimum ordinance requirements are met.

** The applicant states there are 26 spaces provided, though the plan indicates 27. In addition, they say there are five (5) new parallel parking spaces, though the plan only shows four (4).

Additional information is still needed to determine if the numerical off-street parking requirement for the site is met. It appears that there is insufficient parking for the following:

Kitchen Facilities for the new building
MCREST offices in the existing building
Emergency Shelter Team offices in the existing building
Drop-in Center for up to fifty (50) homeless and low-income persons
Drop-in Center Offices for County and non-profit agencies, (Department of Human Services, Social Security, CARE, VA benefits)
Safe Rooms for twenty-four (24) residents
Clinic with a Case Manager, nurse, nurse practitioner, therapist, and perhaps a Dentist

Additional Questions:

- The applicant states the staff will consist of fourteen employees in the largest working shift. Does this include services staffed by different County and non-profit agencies, such as the Department of Human Services, Social Security, CARE, VA benefits, and kitchen staff?
- Will these services be staffed at the same time?
- Will the twenty-four residents have cars?
- Where are the Board of Directors and staff located during normal business hours?
- Who will staff the training in the classroom? Is this a contracted service or an on-site employee?

.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

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 is to be adjacent to the new kitchen within the 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 loading/unloading area needs to be depicted on the site plan to ensure it meets ordinance requirements.

1.8 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 has 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 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.

1.9 Exterior lighting.

The applicant indicates exterior light fixtures on Sheet A-3.0, and that site lighting will be mounted on the building wall with 400W wall packs on Sheet A-1.0. 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 site lighting sheet (photometric schematic) needs to be provided.

1.10 Building Façade Design

The applicant proposes brick, split face CMU and brick veneer for the building, which meets the requirements of Section 2310.

1.11 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.

1.12 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. A detailed landscaping plan needs to be provided.

SUMMARY

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

- Foster Care Group Homes are not permitted in the B-3 district
- Additional information pertaining to parking requirements needs to be provided in order to determine if off-street parking requirements are met.
- The loading and unloading area needs to be depicted on the site plan.
- A photometric schematic needs to be provided, as well as all requirements of Section 2305.
- A detailed landscaping plan 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.

Ms. Lewis stated that this project is designated a safe haven and considered transitional housing by the Department of Housing and Urban Development; this is not a foster or group home.

Commissioner Kurmmell Knox commented that the Commission needs more information from the petitioner as to where they fall under the City's Zoning Code.

Ms. Lewis explained to the commission that the safe haven cannot have more than 25 people at a time; there are 23 bedrooms in the building with two rooms that contain double beds.

Mr. Tallerico stated that Zoning Codes do not address every use; therefore, it is up to the Commission to decide if this use is similar to Solid Ground and belongs in a B-3 district.

Vice-Chairperson Geraldine White stated that at the time Solid Ground was approved the Planning Commission was not responsible for site plan approval.

Ms. Lewis explained that Solid Ground is strictly transitional housing; the proposed building will have transitional housing on the second floor. Ms. Lewis explained that 20% of the homeless are using 80 % of the mainstream resources and the purpose of this building is to get the mentally ill men off of the streets and have resources located under one roof for those individuals.

Commissioner John Surhigh asked the petitioner if this building was going to be a safe haven or transitional house as the definitions are different.

Ms. Lewis explained that, according to HUD, a safe haven can be either permanent supportive housing or it may be transitional housing; MCREST has chosen transitional housing for the proposed building.

Ms. Huff explained that the individuals may stay at the safe haven for up to 24 months so that they may become medication compliant and stabilized. After the 24 months they may move into permanent supportive housing.

Mr. Tallerico told the petitioner that they must define the use of the proposed building and mentioned his concerns with parking.

Commissioner Joseph Montgomery commented about the number of individuals allowed in the building in reference to the parking. Ms. Lewis stated that Sam's Club offered extra parking spaces to MCREST.

Ms. Huff explained that MCREST's clientele generally do not own vehicles; most individuals use public transportation to get to the facility.

Commissioner Montgomery asked Ms. Huff what is the difference between the MCREST shelters that rotate around to different churches and this proposed building. Ms. Lewis explained that the individuals that will be housed at the proposed building may not necessarily be compatible for communal living and cannot be with large groups of people. The rotating shelter will continue around to the area churches.

Ms. Huff described that the current building is strictly administrative offices and does not house people; the new facility will lodge individuals overnight and the offices will be shared with different agencies that provide services to the MCREST guests.

Mr. Tallerico asked the petitioner to provide as much information as they can to the Building Department to justify the parking on this site; if the parking is not proven to be enough to satisfy the zoning requirements, a parking variance may be necessary from the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Chairperson White mentioned that she drove by the facility this evening and all of the parking looked to be completely occupied and a mini-bus was also in the lot. Ms. Lewis explained that a training program was meeting there this evening and they are held on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays; the bus belongs to MCREST.

Commissioner Kurmmell Knox asked Ms. Lewis what portion of the rotating shelter will be housed in the new facilities. The administrative offices for the rotating shelter will be located in the proposed building.

Ms. Huff explained that MCREST is the name of the non-profit operation designated a 501-C-3 organization and will operate the transitional housing.

Mr. Knox asked Ms. Lewis if the entrance to and from the facility will be restricted/secured. Ms. Lewis explained that MCREST cannot restrict the comings or goings of the residents; however, they may be evicted from the room if they do not occupy a bed in a two-week period.

Commissioner Montgomery recommended that the petitioner provide more information to the Commission to prove that this plan fits into a B-3 District.

Ms. Huff and Ms. Lewis asked what hotels/motels are zoned; Mr. Tallerico responded that hotels/motels fall into the B-3 Zoning area.

Ms. Lewis stated to the Commission that the residents will be charged rent to stay in the facility.

Mr. Tallerico explained that generally transitional housing is located within a residential district.

Commissioner Knox asked Ms. Lewis for clarification regarding the issue of rent for these rooms; Ms. Lewis explained that MCREST has to charge rent to teach the residents fiscal responsibility so they may move into permanent supportive housing.

Mr. Tallerico will get more information about Solid Ground from the Building Department.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

There was no New Business.

IX. REPORT OF PLANNING CONSULTANT

Planning Consultant Ben Tallerico updated the Commission about Public Act 61 which was passed by the legislature in Lansing.

X. PUBLIC TO BE HEARD

No one from the public was present to be heard.

XI. COMMISSION MEMBERS TO BE HEARD

Commissioner John Surhigh commented that he would like to see the City work with MCREST to get this project moving forward.

Commissioner Kurmmell Knox agreed with Mr. Surhigh's comments.

Commissioner Joseph Montgomery commented that the MCREST program is a good organization.

Commissioner Nancy Sunderman-Elert asked Mr. Surhigh for the HUD web address.

Vice-Chairperson Geraldine White may not be present at the Regular Meeting on November 19, 2007.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

COMMISSIONER KURMMELL KNOX moved, COMMISSIONER NANCY SUNDERMAN-ELERT seconded that the agenda having been acted upon, the meeting is hereby adjourned at 7:58 p.m.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Respectfully Submitted,
RAE A. OLDAUGH, City Clerk

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