

**PUBLIC NOTICE**

**CITY OF BERKLEY, MICHIGAN  
REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION**

Tuesday, January 23, 2018  
7:30 PM - City Hall  
Information: (248) 658-3320

CALL TO ORDER  
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE  
ROLL CALL  
APPROVAL OF AGENDA  
APPROVAL OF MINUTES -- *Meetings of December 12, 2017, January 9, 2018*  
COMMUNICATIONS—*Michigan Association of Planning Trainings*  
CITIZEN COMMENTS  
ORDER OF BUSINESS

**1. 2018 WORK PLAN**

LIAISON REPORTS  
COMMISSIONER/STAFF COMMENTS  
ADJOURN

*Notice: Official Minutes of the City Planning Commission are stored and available for review at the office of the City Clerk.*

*The City of Berkley will provide necessary reasonable auxiliary aids and services, such as signers for the hearing impaired and audio tapes of printed materials being considered at the meeting, to individuals with disabilities at the meeting upon four working days notice to the city. Individuals with disabilities requiring auxiliary aids or services should contact the city by writing or calling City Clerk, ADA Contact, Berkley City Hall, 3338 Coolidge, Berkley, Michigan 48072, (248) 658-3300.*



## MEMORANDUM

January 19, 2018

TO: City of Berkley Planning Commission

FROM: Timothy McLean, Community Development Director

RE: Report for the Planning Commission Meeting, January 23, 2018

1. **2018 Work Plan:** This is a short but by no means exhaustive list of items for 2018.
  - **Master Plan Update:** Staff will work to develop an RFP for consultants to work with the City on the Master Plan Update. Once a consultant is selected, the Planning Commission will have a large role to play in the Master Plan Update.
  - **Redevelopment Ready Communities:** The Michigan Economic Development Corporation (MEDC) has the Redevelopment Ready Communities (RRC) program available to help communities attract new development. The program helps municipalities to develop best practices in order to have a streamlined process for new development.

The Planning Commission will have a very essential role in positioning the City of Berkley to earn RRC Certification. The first step is to go through the RRC's best practices training. Included in your packet is some information on the program as well as dates and locations for the training.

- **Public Participation Plan:** Based on feedback received from some of the Planning Commissioners, there is a need to develop a strategy for public engagement. A Public Participation Plan is a component of *RRC Best Practice #1: Community Plans & Public Outreach*. The goal of this plan is continuous public engagement above and beyond the dialogue that takes place during the Master Plan process and a typical public hearing.
- **Ordinance Review:** In order to ensure that the City of Berkley has up-to-date ordinances that meet the needs of its citizens, periodic ordinance review is necessary. It has been a past practice of mine to work with a sub-committee of Planning Commissioners to identify ordinances that are in need of updating, revision, or removal.

**A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BERKLEY CITY PLANNING COMMISSION WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 7:30 PM, DECEMBER 12, 2017 AT CITY HALL BY CHAIRPERSON BUCKLER.**

---

*The minutes from this meeting are in summary form capturing the actions taken on each agenda item. To view the meeting discussions in their entirety, this meeting is broadcasted on the city's government access channel, WBRK, every day at 9AM and 9PM. The video can also be seen, on-demand, on the city's YouTube channel: <https://www.youtube.com/user/cityofberkeley>.*

**PRESENT:**            Martin Smith                            Mark Richardson                    Dean Smith  
                          Tim Murad                                Michele Buckler                    Ann Shadle  
                          Kristen Kapelanski                    Joe Tangari

**ABSENT:**            David Barnett

**ALSO PRESENT:** Matthew Baumgarten, City Manager (Recording Secretary)

\*\*\*\*\*

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

It was recommended by Commissioner Murad that the second agenda item be relabeled as a "Discussion" in order to avoid any confusion with a "public hearing."

It was moved by Commissioner Murad to approve the agenda as amended and supported by Commissioner Shadle.

AYES:            Richardson, Murad, D. Smith, M. Smith, Shadle, Kapelanski, Tangari, and Buckler  
NAYS:            None  
Motion Carried.

\*\*\*\*\*

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Commissioners proposed corrections to the draft minutes.

It was moved by Commissioner Tangari to approve the minutes of October 24, 2017 with corrections and supported by Commissioner Kapelanski.

AYES:            Richardson, Murad, D. Smith, M. Smith, Shadle, Kapelanski, Tangari, and Buckler  
NAYS:            None  
Motion Carried.

\*\*\*\*\*

**COMMUNICATIONS**

Chairperson Buckler noted items for communication included in the packet.

\*\*\*\*\*

**CITIZEN COMMENTS**

Chuck Tyrell indicated he recently had a FOIA request for written procedures for ensuring Planning Commission conditions denied because those procedures were not in written form. Mr. Tyrell told the Planning Commission that they are not allowed to use conditions anymore.

\*\*\*\*\*

1. **SITE PLAN REVIEW: SP-12-17** Klajdi Ibi, 3170 Eleven Mile Road, North side of Eleven Mile Road, between Gardner and Griffith Avenues, Tax ID# 25-18-453-014 is requesting site plan approval for a building expansion.

The applicant, Klajdi Ibi, gave an overview of the project. He will expand the former Nip 'N' Tuck restaurant and rename it Golden Grille.

Commissioners then questioned the Mr. Ibi about the project and discussed the following topics:

- Size of the proposed expansion
- Installation of the awning
- The issues with cultured stone and winter maintenance
- The Engineering/Public Works review letter
- Location and size of dumpster & grease trap enclosure
- Handicap parking for sizing and location

The Commission invited to applicant to bring his architect to a future meetings to discuss the technical aspects of the site plan. Commissioners also suggested a vestibule for the building and the installation of bumper blocks to preserve the masonry wall along the parking areas. These were not made requirements of the site plan.

Chairperson Buckler opened the item up for public comment:

- Kurt Hite, Robina, noted a misprint on the plans that indicated a requirement for 33 parking spaces. It was confirmed that the site required 13 spaces.

**It was moved by Commissioner M. Smith and seconded by Commissioner Richardson to postpone SP-12-17 until the following items could be provided:**

- **Amend Site Plan to show enclosures for dumpster and grease trap**
- **Provide all items required by site plan review ordinance**
- **Indicate how the cultivated stone show in the plan is adhered to building**

**AYES:** Richardson, Murad, D. Smith, M. Smith, Shadle, Kapelanski, Tangari, and Buckler

**NAYS:** None

**Motion Carried.**

2. **DISCUSSION: PUD-01-17** Berkley-Coolidge, LLC, 2219 Coolidge Hwy, southwest corner of Coolidge and Oxford, Tax ID# 25-18-431-015, -016, -017 and a portion of -022, Lots 13-15 and 52-53 of the Denler Acres Subdivision is requesting Planned Unit Development approval for a mixed residential development.

Bennett Terebelo of Berkley-Coolidge, LLC noted the changes from their last presentation to this one those changes included updates to the following items:

- Landscaping and Public Plaza
- Lighting
- Aesthetics/Façade changes specific to EIFS and masonry
- Building/Site amenities

Chairperson Buckler opened the discussion up and allowed the audience to directly ask questions of the applicant:

- Jim Cox, Oxford, confirmed the removal of the existing school building and wanted a commitment from the developer that no large trucks would be using local streets during demolition and construction phases. He also questioned the provision of fire hydrants, water main, and appropriate firetruck turning radii throughout the proposal. Mr. Cox also asked about the storm sewer and its ability to “handle” the impact of this development during a large storm.
  - The applicant indicated he has been working with Public Works and Public Safety to make sure that the water, storm sewer, and the turning radii are all compliant with city and county standards.
- Mr. Cox also asked about on street parking and indicated that there are already too many cars on our local road system. Wanted to know how the project would prevent dangerous pedestrian/motorist interactions, especially in regards to children.
  - Applicant noted site aspects designed to keep intended to keep traffic directed toward Coolidge and away from local streets.
- Wendy Zabramski, noted the review from the Fire Marshall Pete Kelly who expressed concerns about turning radii and landscaping on the site.
- Kurt Hite, Robina, noted that the site plan is farther along than the previous site plan but is still too dense. He reiterated the fire safety concerns and added that the removal of the townhomes would reduce the need for a shared parking agreement with the church. Views into the parking lot could be improved with landscaping. He also noted that he was uncomfortable with the overall height as it was reminiscent of a six story building at its peak. Mr. Hite also called attention to the inclusion of fire pits even though they are not allowed by the City’s Code of Ordinances. He summarized his comments by noting that the removal of the townhouses would a step in the right direction.

The Chairperson requested that those speaking at the podium try to adhere to a three minute time limit so that everyone would have an opportunity to speak on this item.

- Patty Curtis, Kenmore, cited the master plan calls for “neighborhood retail” along the Coolidge Corridor and contrasted that with the purely residential project being proposed. She indicated that she would like to see a proposal that include a retail component on the ground floor. Ms. Curtis said the project is out of context and she considers the project irresponsible. She stated that she believed that townhomes are only included to offer a mix of housing types and shared concerns that they may not sell. She believes that the PUD is being pursued to sidestep zoning. She called the public plaza deceptive because of its size. Ms. Curtis also noted that the City has an opportunity to gain more benefits by entering into a contract through the PUD agreement. The City as the ability to draw hard lines as opposed to if/maybe statements on snow removal, pet waste, and how rainwater is addressed.
- Eric Wheeler, Oxford, noted his concerns with snow removal based upon the manner in which it is handled now. It is pushed up against his fence. His concern is that it will compromise his fence. He accused the applicant of “playing” the Planning Commission by adding a flag pole. He said there is smiley too much proposed for this site and traffic congestions issues are still a high concern. He summarized by saying this was a bad idea.
- Chuck Tyrell asked if a left turn was accounted for at Coolidge at Eleven Mile Road.
- Chris Riley shared his concern that back ups at Harvard will back up past the Oxford/Coolidge intersection. He shared that he feels the townhouses are ugly and should

be removed from the proposal. He also thinks the project is too big and will cause many problems with traffic and children in the street. He fears that a child could be hit by a car by someone from the apartments. He said local traffic all know about the kids but new residents may not know. He asked what recourse the City will have for these problem.

- Wendy Zabramski also asked what recourse the City will have for any problem caused by the project. She also noted that Village Green has poor reviews as a residential management company.
- Racheal Piacentini, Oxford, asked what recourse City would have for problems cause by project. Would residents have to sue the City?
- Kurt Hite, Robina, also asked about provisions for cleaning up pet waste. There are going to be a lot of people in this development and a high density of pets as well.
- Patty Curtis returned to the podium to discuss the pet waste as an issue which should not be minimized.
- Brandon Alger, lives in Meadowood Farms subdivision, he feels like good comments have been made so far and noted that the standards provided by ordinance are not being specifically addressed in the conversation thus far. He indicated that the townhomes are asymmetrical and visually stressful. He discussed stormwater standards provided by Oakland County. He characterized the standards as lax in contrast to Ann Arbor's standards.
- Jim Cannon, Harvard, stated that the townhomes should be removed in favor for green space or parking. Would like to see more height if the footprint could be downsized. He noted outstanding issues shared by his neighbors and asked specifically about how storm water standards are administered.
  - Eddie Zmich, representing the City's Engineering firm, discussed storm water management on the proposed development. He gave an overview of the Oakland County standards of being able to detain a "100 year storm event" which equates to 2 inches of rain in 2 hours and release it a .2 cubic feet per second (CFS) per acre which is an improvement over the existing condition. He also noted that there are best management practices (BMPs) that are being adopted by municipalities which would be useful on this site as well. Mr. Zmich again noted that he has not received any drawings which are required. He noted that 8 inch looped water main would be a requirement for the site, adequate fire hydrant coverage, and fire suppression lines reviewed by the Fire Marshall. The developer would be responsible for the installation of all infrastructure and then deeded to the City via a perpetual easement. Mr. Zmich then listed all the required permits required for a project such as this and the review process for each permit type.
  - Analise Pietras asked a question from the audience about the ultimate destination of a sewer water and confirmed that it all eventually flows into a single system.
  - Brandon Alger also asked a question from the audience clarifying the amount of rain per hour used to calculate a "100 year storm" and asked if a detention site can be designed to take off site storm flows.
- Lisa Kempner asked about the provision of sidewalks along "porkchop" traffic islands and along the Coolidge frontage.
- Barb Morris noted she shared the concerns of her neighbors and specifically stated her concerns with snow removal and the potential to lose parking spaces to snow piles.
- Karen Korber, Oxford, asked that the Planning Commission not minimize the concerns shared by those in attendance. Even if her immediate neighbors are not in attendance their concerns should be taken seriously.
- Analise Pietras, Franklin, shared concerns about the height of the building and felt it is too

tall and too close to Coolidge. She cited the Master Plan calls for complimentary developments to suburban design, indicated that the project is too dense adding 43 residents per acre, it would be better to remove a floor from the project. She felt that the street elevations and new curb cuts are a detriment to walkability which as also an emphasis of the Master Plan. She noted that this project needs to be guided by a planner which the City has not had since June.

**This being a discussion item, there was no required action from the Planning Commission.**

\*\*\*\*\*

**3. PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT:** PUD-01-17 Berkley-Coolidge. LLC, 2219 Coolidge Hwy, southwest corner of Coolidge and Oxford, Tax ID# 25-18-431-015, -016, -017 and a portion of -022, Lots 13-15 and 52-53 of the Denler Acres Subdivision is requesting Planned Unit Development approval for a mixed residential development.

Following the resident discussion the Planning Commissioners discussed the Planned Unit Development proposal.

- Commissioner D. Smith suggested that the City could join with the developer to upsize the storm water detention system to provide greater community development. He wanted to see the accommodations be made for current and future firetrucks. He expressed support for the townhouses as a transition to the single family residential homes along Oxford. He also feels as though the use compliments the intent of the Master Plan based upon his recollection as of the drafters of the 2007 document.
- Commissioner Tangari noted that the issues of snow and pet waste removal are valid and should be addressed in PUD agreement. He questioned the lighting of the in the pedestrian park as it was shown as dark on the photometric study. Tangari addressed concerns with the townhouse. He does not like the look of the continuous roof line as it makes the buildings appear too large for the street and he prefers a hip roof. He also asked for the number of shared spaces to be called out separate from the dedicated ones for both the church and the proposed development. He indicated that the size of the building was large but that concerned is mitigated slightly by the distance from the neighborhood.
- Commissioner Shadle noted that this is an evolving process and that the feedback offered is important. She specifically wanted to see the Fire Marshall's comments addressed.
- Commissioner Murad reiterated that balconies should be tied to brick and not EIFS. He discussed the Washtenaw County standards and asked that the City engineer provide that to the commission in the future. He also said he liked the wire grids on the first level that allows ivy to grow. He noted that he wanted to see the following items:
  - Elevations on the plans
  - Wants to see scale from Oxford
  - Shadow Study
  - 3D modeling on the townhouses showing 8 foot porches
  - Address snow removal and pet waste
- Commissioner Kapelanski noted that the site plan needs additional details and would also like to see 3D modeling of the townhouses. She would also like to see some of the storm water best practices included in the plans. She noted that there was too much EIFS on rear west elevation, and asked that it mirror the front east elevation in EIFS to masonry ratio.



- Commissioner Richardson noted that the plan has come along way since initial site plan. He noted disappointment that the green roof has been removed from the plan because of the expense. He would have liked to see the figures on the green roof and how much was saved by its removal. He is supportive of the townhouses but would like to see some distinctiveness in their design. He also likes the public park but it seems too isolated and needs to be more inviting. He said he understands the need for the circular drive on Coolidge and sees the need for parking declining over the next several years and would like to see areas dedicated to parking returned to green space.
- Commissioner M. Smith restated the need for the applicant to provide preliminary civil engineering as part of the site plan requirements. The site plan should also address the fire truck turning radii and snow removal. He agreed that pet waste should be addressed by the applicant. He asked about transformers or generators on site and, if they are to be installed, then the possible locations should be indicated. He asked about alternative dumpster locations because of the proximity to the public plaza. He would also like to see a 3D rendering of the townhomes. He stated that he is satisfied with the EIFS to masonry ratio. He also wanted to see building dimensions and a confirmation of square footages for each apartment types. He is satisfied with the landscaping included in the plan.
- Chairperson Buckler indicated she was disappointed that the green roof was removed in latest plan. The 3D model should include the Harvard Commons and the townhouses should be altered to remove the continuous roof. She feels that the use does compliment the Master Plan which did not envision Coolidge as a continuous retail strip. She feels that storm water will adequately addressed by existing standards based upon the city engineer's comments. She is also satisfied with the parking provided and believes that reliance on vehicles over time will reduce the need for the spaces. She stated that overall she thinks this could be a good development.

Commissioners discussed the stripping on the shared parking lot to better accommodate the flow of traffic from the project parking areas to Harvard Road. The provision of parking was also discussed and how reductions in reliance on vehicles could be addressed. The inclusion of solar panels was also discussed for the roof and the covered parking areas.

Chair Buckler noted that the comments from this meeting would be summarized to the applicant and that the Public Hearing was the next step in this process. Commissioner discussed the holding the public hearing on January 9, 2018.

### **LIAISON REPORTS**

Tim Murad reported that the Chamber of Commerce has explore Berkley gift certificates are available for the holiday season.

Mark Richardson offered a report from the Environmental Advisory Board's recent efforts on their Sustainability Plan.

Joe Tangari reported that the Downtown Development Authority was working hard to develop a wayfinding signage strategy and design guidelines.

Dean Smith reported on the Zoning Board of Appeals heard and denied a case at their last meeting. He urged everyone to make sure permits are pulled when they are doing projects.

Marty Smith gave an overview of the recent City Council regular meeting and the meeting at the library to discuss the sewer system improvements at the home plumbing system.

\* \* \* \* \*

**STAFF/COMMISSIONER COMMENTS**

The commissioners all joined together to thank those who attended and made comments and to wish everyone a happy holiday season.

\* \* \* \* \*

**There being no further business, Chairperson Buckler called for a motion to adjourn the meeting. It was moved by Commissioner Murad and supported by Commissioner Richardson to adjourn the December 12, 2017 regular meeting of the Berkley Planning Commission.**

**AYES: Richardson, Buckler, Murad, Shadle, Dean Smith, Martin Smith, Barnett**

**NAYS: None**

**Motion Carried and the meeting adjourned at 11:21 PM.**

**A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BERKLEY CITY PLANNING COMMISSION WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 7:30 PM, JANUARY 9, 2018 AT CITY HALL BY CHAIRPERSON BUCKLER.**

*The minutes from this meeting are in summary form capturing the actions taken on each agenda item. To view the meeting discussions in their entirety, this meeting is broadcasted on the city's government access channel, WBRK, every day at 9AM and 9PM. The video can also be seen, on-demand, on the city's YouTube channel: <https://www.youtube.com/user/cityofberkley>.*

**PRESENT:**            Martin Smith                                 Mark Richardson                                 Lisa Kempner  
                               Tim Murad                                         Michele Buckler                                 Ann Shadle  
                               Kristen Kapelanski                                 David Barnett

**ABSENT:**             Joe Tangari

**ALSO PRESENT:** Matthew Baumgarten, City Manager (Recording Secretary)  
                               Tim McLean, Community Development Director  
                               John Staran, City Attorney

\*\*\*\*\*

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

It was moved by Commissioner Barnett to approve the agenda with one item added "Approval of 2018 Meeting Schedule" and supported by Commissioner Murad.

**AYES:**                 Richardson, Murad, Kempner, Smith, Shadle, Kapelanski, Kempner, and Buckler  
**NAYS:**                 None  
Motion Carried.

\*\*\*\*\*

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Approval of minutes from the December meeting will be on the agenda for the regularly scheduled meeting on January 23.

\*\*\*\*\*

**COMMUNICATIONS**

Chairperson Buckler noted items for communication included in the packet.

\*\*\*\*\*

**CITIZEN COMMENTS**

Charles Tyrell questioned the need for a Special Meeting of the Planning Commission. Mr. Tyrell asked for an official explanation for the Special Meeting.

Jim Cox asked if any action could be taken by the Planning Commission at a Special Meeting.

Kurt Hite expressed concerns about the size of the Special Meeting Agenda relative to time needed for resident comments during the Public Hearing.

\*\*\*\*\*

1. **SITE PLAN REVIEW: SP-12-17** Klajdi Ibi, 3170 Eleven Mile Road, North side of Eleven Mile Road, between Gardner and Griffith Avenues, Tax ID# 25-18-453-014 is requesting site plan approval for a building expansion.

The applicant, Klajdi Ibi, gave an overview of the project. He will expand the former Nip 'N' Tuck restaurant and rename it Golden Grille. Mr. Ibi's architect was present to answer questions from the Planning Commission.

Commissioners then questioned the Mr. Ibi about the project and discussed the following topics:

- The location of deliveries relative to available parking.
- The size of the barrier-free parking space.
- The grease enclosure.
- The location of nearest residence to the proposed dumpster.

**It was moved by Commissioner Smith and seconded by Commissioner Barnett to approve SP-12-17 with the following conditions:**

- **The applicant must double-check the size of the barrier-free parking space.**
- **Enlarging the size of the dumpster enclosure**

**AYES:** Richardson, Murad, Kempner, Smith, Shadle, Kapelanski, Barnett, and Buckler

**NAYS:** None

**Motion Carried.**

2. **DISCUSSION: PUD-01-17** Berkley-Coolidge, LLC, 2219 Coolidge Hwy, southwest corner of Coolidge and Oxford, Tax ID# 25-18-431-015, -016, -017 and a portion of -022, Lots 13-15 and 52-53 of the Denler Acres Subdivision is requesting Planned Unit Development approval for a mixed residential development.

Prior to opening the Public Hearing, Chairperson Buckler stated that public comments would be limited to four minutes per speaker and that time limits would be strictly enforced.

Commissioner Smith addressed citizen comments from the December meeting calling the proposed development a "six-story building/high-rise." Commissioner Smith also referenced a flyer posted on social media indicating the proposed development as such. A brief discussion with resident Kurt Hite (author of the flyer) and Commissioner Smith ensued regarding the definition of a "high-rise" building. Commissioner Smith asked that the flyer be removed from social media.

Chairperson Buckler opened the Public Hearing at 8:04PM.

- Kurt Hite, Robina, referenced the size of the Harvard Commons development and contrasted the size with the size of the proposed LaSalette project. Mr. Hite also referenced the traffic study that was done in July 2017. The validity of the study was questioned as school was not in session at the time and the traffic from school could not be measured.
- Barb Morris, Wiltshire, stated she was upset about the process. Ms. Morris communicated her belief that the developer has not submitted required information. Ms. Morris referenced

- the traffic study and expressed concern that no data concerning school traffic was gathered.
- Shirley Hanson thanked the Planning Commission for their service throughout this process. Ms. Hanson implored residents to consider the future. Ms. Hanson stated her desire to see the church continue to stay open. She also expressed her belief that there are not sufficient rental properties available in Berkley.
  - James Cox, Oxford, questioned community support for the proposed project. Mr. Cox believes the building should be classified as a “high-rise.” Mr. Cox feels there has been intimidation from the church and questioned the need for the penthouse.
  - Rob Robinette compared Berkley to changes in Garden City. Resident believes development is a good idea.
  - Eric Wheeler, Oxford, referenced the traffic study. Mr. Wheeler expressed his belief that school traffic is underestimated. Mr. Wheeler stated his hope that citizen comments matter to the Planning Commission.
  - Charles Tyrell, stated that the electronic version of the site plans does not show architect seals. Mr. Tyrell stated his belief that the developer should carry some personal liability and not be allowed to simply be an LLC. Mr. Tyrell expressed concerns about wastewater generated from the proposed development. He also referred to the PUD Criteria.
  - Patty Curtis referenced intimidation and ethics violations from Planning Commissioners. Ms. Curtis voiced her opposition to the development and stated she was “ashamed” of the parish. Ms. Curtis stated her belief that the site plans are “sloppy” and questioned whether or not the Planning Commission was in a position to take action on the proposed PUD. She also referenced the amount of City staff time being spent on review.
  - Paul Jordan welcomed new Commissioner Kempner. Mr. Jordan indicated he would like to see retail space on the first floor of the proposed development as well as more greenspace. Mr. Jordan expressed concerns about storm water.
  - Joshua Hunter referenced a letter he submitted to the Planning Commission. Mr. Hunter questioned the argument of viability regarding the size of the proposed development. Mr. Hunter questioned whether the standards for approval could be met. The absence of data on school traffic from the traffic study was referenced. Mr. Hunter stated his belief that the site plan lacks sufficient data for approval.
  - Chris Riley voiced concerns about parking, traffic, and noise. Mr. Riley stated that he believes the PUD requirements have not been met.
  - Wayne Wudyka voiced approval for the proposed development. Mr. Wudyka stated that he owns several properties in Berkley. Mr. Wudyka stated that he believes this type of proposed development is the future of the city. He also referenced benefits to the city relative to tax revenue.
  - Linda Gable-Smith, Elwood, indicated that she is very supportive of the proposed development. She expressed opposition to retail development being placed in the property. Ms. Gable-Smith voiced concern about the lack of rental property in Berkley and its effects on residents.
  - David King expressed his belief that Coolidge and Harvard are “congested.”
  - Analise Pietras, Franklin, shared concerns about the traffic study and the lack of loading space. Ms. Pietras expressed belief that the pedestrian path is incomplete. She also voiced concerns about affordability of the rental units.

**Chairperson Buckler closed the Public Hearing at 8:58PM.**

\*\*\*\*\*

**3. PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT:** PUD-01-17 Berkley-Coolidge. LLC, 2219 Coolidge Hwy, southwest corner of Coolidge and Oxford, Tax ID# 25-18-431-015, -016, -017 and a portion of -022, Lots 13-15 and 52-53 of the Denler Acres Subdivision is requesting Planned Unit Development approval for a mixed residential development.

Following the Public Hearing the Planning Commissioners discussed the Planned Unit Development proposal.

- Chairperson Buckler stated that the site plan is incomplete. Ms. Buckler stated that there was not adequate time for the Planning Commission to review changes to the site plan. Due to technical elements being missing, Ms. Buckler stated her opinion that the only options available to the Planning Commission this evening are to either postpone action until outstanding items are submitted and reviewed, or to recommend denial of the PUD application to City Council.
- Commissioner Richardson clarified the required PUD standards of approval.
- Commissioner Barnett stated that there was not adequate time to review site plan changes and recommended postponement until outstanding items are submitted.
- Commissioner Richardson suggested that an administrative checklist be generated and submitted to the developer.
- Developer Bennett Terebelo and Architect Joe Novitsky gave a brief presentation of the site plans as well as revisions.
- Commissioner Kapelanski asked to see specs for the proposed fire apparatus to compare how it would fit into the proposed development.
- City Manager Baumgarten stated that the Department of Public Safety has narrowed it down to three possible models and would have specs available to the Planning Commission.
- Commissioner Smith stated he would like to see dimensions over the entire site plan.
- Chairperson Buckler asked the developer to submit the narrative required under Section 138-535(b) of the Zoning Ordinance.
- Commissioner Barnett voiced dislike for EIFS on the building façade. Mr. Barnett indicated a preference for various shades of brick. Concerns about the demolition of the school building and benefits to the community were also raised. A description of the interior of the building was also asked for.
- Commissioner Richardson indicated that elevations of the building were hard to read on 11x17 site plans. The total height of the building was asked for.
- Commissioner Shadle stated that electronic plans were easier for her to read. Commissioner Shadle also questioned windows being removed from the townhouse site plans.
- Architect Novitsky responded to questions about the townhouse windows.
- Chairperson Buckler recommended that the developer bring in someone to do quality control on the site plan.
- Commissioner Kempner questioned the square footage of the apartments. Commissioner Kempner also advised the developer to proofread site plans before submittal.
- Commissioner Murad referenced the long “expanse” of the townhouses.
- Developer Terebelo posed questions to the Planning Commission about increasing the vertical floorspace of the townhouses.
- Commissioner Smith suggested reducing the number of townhouses from eight to seven. Commissioner Smith posed the question of rooftop or individual HVAC units.

- Developer Terebelo stated that a decision on this was coming soon.
- Commissioner Smith mentioned the schedule of floor plans for each unit differed from the table analysis and that a floorplan for the penthouse was needed.
- Commissioner Murad referenced the size of the penthouse in Oxford Towers.
- Commissioner Kapelanski asked about an impact development strategy in the form of a rain garden for the property.
- Commissioner Richardson discussed the impact of the development on the surrounding neighborhood as well as the dimensions of the public plaza. Commissioner Richardson indicated a preference that the developer removes the proposed fourth floor of the building.
- Commissioner Kempner discussed the contextual relationship of the development to surrounding buildings. Commissioner Kempner questioned the balance of this development relative to density.
- Commissioner Barnett asked about elevator shafts and firewalls.
- Commissioner Shadle asked about the intent for loading/unloading on the property.
- Chairperson Buckler stated that the developer must meet ordinance Sec.138-680 **Required Information** to be included on a site plan. Chairperson Buckler also referenced simple elevations and a flow map.

**It was moved by Commissioner Murad and seconded by Commissioner Barnett to postpone action on PUD-01-17.**

**AYES: Richardson, Murad, Kempner, Smith, Shadle, Kapelanski, Barnett, and Buckler**

**NAYS: None**

**LIAISON REPORTS**

No Reports to discuss. The Chamber of Commerce meets on January 10, 2018.

\*\*\*\*\*

**STAFF/COMMISSIONER COMMENTS**

Commissioner Smith commented on definition of high-rise building and indicated his willingness to discuss.

Commissioner Kapelanski asked that information on the High-rise district be included in the table of Deviations.

Commissioner Murad welcomed new Commissioner Kempner and Community Development Director McLean. He also asked about availability of funds in the budget for MSU Citizen Planner Courses.

Commissioner Shadle also welcomed new Commissioner Kempner and Community Development Director McLean. She also had positive comments for the DPW on repairing a broken water main.

Commissioner Kempner stated she was excited to be part of the Planning Commission and thanked the public for their comments.

\*\*\*\*\*

**With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:32 PM.**

## REDEVELOPMENT READY COMMUNITIES® (RRC)



Are you a community interested in attracting new investors, businesses and residents? Would you like to grow through a strategic community-driven approach to development?

The Redevelopment Ready Communities® (RRC) program is available to communities across the state. It's a voluntary, no-cost certification program designed to promote effective redevelopment strategies through a set of best practices.

The program measures and then certifies communities that integrate transparency, predictability and efficiency into their daily development practices. The RRC certification is a formal recognition that your community has a vision for the future—and the fundamental practices in place to get there.

### Why become redevelopment ready?

To be vibrant and competitive, Michigan communities must be ready for development. This involves planning for new investment and reinvestment, identifying assets and opportunities, and focusing limited resources. Certified Redevelopment Ready Communities® attract and retain businesses, offer superior customer service and have a streamlined development approval process making pertinent information available around-the clock for anyone to view.

#### Where to begin

The foundation of the program begins with [RRC Best Practices](#) (Note: interactive features work best in Internet Explorer). Developed by experts in the public and private sector, these best practices are the standard to achieve certification. They're also designed to create a predictable and straightforward experience for investors, businesses and residents working within a community. These best practices challenge communities to be flexible while seeking quality development that supports a sense of place. To learn more about RRC best practices, download the Best Practices document.

#### Eligibility

### Interested in becoming redevelopment ready?

The Redevelopment Ready Communities® (RRC) program is open to any community in Michigan—at no cost. Those who will benefit most are communities that either already have an area of concentrated development such as a traditional downtown or commercial corridor or are planning for such development.



Communities wishing to focus specifically on the revitalization of their downtown are encouraged to participate in the Michigan Main Street Program. Michigan Main Street exists to help communities develop main street districts that attract both residents and businesses, promote commercial investment and spur economic growth by helping to educate and organize local stakeholders and partner organizations. Communities can leverage the benefits generated through RRC certification by participating in the Main Street Program to support overall community prosperity. Learn more about [Michigan Main Street](#).

For more information about the RRC program and/or Michigan Main Street Program, please contact your [CA Team Specialist](#).

## Process

### How to become redevelopment ready

The Redevelopment Communities® (RRC) process consists of three steps: Engagement, Evaluation and Certification. Learn more about each step below. For more detailed, step-by-step process information, download our [RRC Process Document](#).



#### 1 - Engagement

Formal engagement consists of three steps:

##### LEARN

Attend Best Practices Trainings—A community must complete training on all 6 best practices. We offer in-person, 2-day trainings across the state: Day 1 includes practices 1/2/3 and Day 2 covers 4/5/6. To learn about upcoming trainings, visit our [RRC trainings](#) page or check out the left side bar.

##### ASSESS

Complete a Self-Evaluation—Using the information from best practices training, a community must complete a [self-evaluation](#). This is a tool used to assess how a community's current planning, zoning and development documents, policies and procedures measure up to RRC Best Practices. This must be done prior to receiving a formal evaluation by a RRC planner. Communities are not required or expected to have all of the best practices criteria met at the time of initial engagement.

##### APPROVE

Pass a Resolution of Intent—The community's governing body must pass a resolution of intent outlining the value the community sees in engaging in the process.

For guidance throughout this process, you will be assigned to a [Community Assistance Team \(CA Team\) Specialist](#). All completed documents should be provided directly to them.

#### 2 - Evaluation

After formal engagement, communities will be placed in the RRC pipeline. While awaiting formal evaluation, communities should begin to update the plans, policies and procedures identified in their self-evaluation that do not meet best practices criteria. The formal evaluation process is conducted by the RRC team through stakeholder interviews, meeting observations and data analysis.

#### 3 - Certification

To become a certified Redevelopment Ready Community, your community must demonstrate that all RRC Best Practices criteria are being met. The RRC certification is a formal recognition

that a community has a vision for the future and the fundamental practices in place to get there. Once certified, communities have access to additional technical assistance and opportunities to showcase their community to potential developers. A community is expected to be making progress toward certification on a regular basis in order to remain in good standing, but ultimately a community can work toward certification at its own pace.

## **Upcoming Events**

**Jan25**

RRC Best Practices 1/2/3

Lansing (MML) 8:30a - 4:00p

RRC Best Practice training sessions are available to any interested stakeholder in an RRC engaged community or a community considering engagement in the RRC process. This training covers RRC best practices 1/2/3. The event is free and includes a light breakfast and lunch. Registration is required.

**Jan30**

RRC Best Practices 1/2/3

Kalamazoo (KVCC Groves Center) 8:30a - 4:00p

RRC Best Practice training sessions are available to any interested stakeholder in an RRC engaged community or a community considering engagement in the RRC process. This training covers RRC best practices 1/2/3. The event is free and includes a light breakfast and lunch. Registration is required.

**Feb6**

RRC Best Practices 1/2/3

Waterford (Oakland County Executive Building) 8:30a - 4:00p

RRC Best Practice training sessions are available to any interested stakeholder in an RRC engaged community or a community considering engagement in the RRC process. This training covers RRC best practices 1/2/3. The event is free and includes a light breakfast and lunch. Registration is required.

**Feb13**

RRC Best Practices 1/2/3

Clare (Pere Marquette Library) 8:30a - 4:00p

RRC Best Practice training sessions are available to any interested stakeholder in an RRC engaged community or a community considering engagement in the RRC process. This training covers RRC best practices 1/2/3. The event is free and includes a light breakfast and lunch. Registration is required.

**Mar8**

RRC Best Practices 4/5/6

Lansing (MML) 8:30a - 4:00p

RRC Best Practice training sessions are available to any interested stakeholder in an RRC engaged community or a community considering engagement in the RRC process. This training covers RRC best practices 4/5/6. The event is free and includes a light breakfast and lunch. Registration is required.



American Planning Association  
Michigan Chapter

Making Great Communities Happen

Print | Search:  Go

[Home](#) [About MAP](#) [Events & Education](#) [Officials](#) [Membership](#) [Resources](#) [Advocacy](#)



[Events & Education](#) > [Calendar of Events](#)

**January 18-19, 2018**

[Zoning Administrator Certificate Program](#)

Ramada Grayling Hotel & Conference Center, Grayling

**January 24, 2018**

[MAP Reads](#)

Join regular and new book group members bi-monthly as we read and discuss titillating titles and meet at different venues in the Detroit Metro Area.

Detroit

**January 25, 2018**

[MAP BBB](#)

Ypsilanti

**January 26, 2018**

[Energy Management & CIP Planning Workshop](#)

Grand Rapids

**February 2, 2018**

[Student Conference](#)

Eastern Michigan University

**February 6, 2018**

[Invasive Species Training](#)

East Lansing

**February 8, 2018**

[Transportation Bonanza 2018](#)

Lansing Center, Lansing

**February 13, 2018**

[Invasive Species Training](#)

Ionla

**February 15, 2018**

Capital Improvements Programs Workshop  
Newaygo, The Stream

**February 21, 2018**

Capital Improvements Programs Workshop  
Roscommon Village Hall

**February 27, 2018**

Site Plan Review Workshop  
Delta Twp Hall (Lansing area)

**Free Planning Webinars Scheduled:  
Planning Webcast Consortium**

MAP has again partnered with over 30 APA chapters, 15 divisions of APA, and one university to offer online professional development training at no cost to members. This partnership, called the Planning Webcast Consortium provides the opportunity to learn from national speakers and earn 1.5 AICP CM credits.

View [entire listing](#) of free webinars hosted by MAP and other APA chapters.

\*\*\*All webcasts will run from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m. Eastern. 1.5 CM credits are approved or pending for all webcasts. All webcasts will be recorded and will be available subsequently on the Planning Webcast Series' YouTube channel (search "planningwebcast"). Some recordings will be selected for CM Distance Education credits.

**March 1, 2018**  
Planning & Zoning Essentials Workshop  
Zoning Board of Appeals Workshop  
Frankenmuth, Bavarian Inn Lodge

**March 6, 2018**  
Capital Improvements Programs Workshop  
Owosso, Comstock Inn

**March 6, 2018**  
Planning and Zoning Essentials Workshop  
Sault Sainte Marie, SmartZone

**March 7, 2018**  
Planning & Zoning Essentials Workshop  
West Branch Quality Inn

**March 15, 2018**  
Planning & Zoning Essentials Workshop  
Risk Management Workshop  
Grand Rapids, Eberhard Center GVSU

**April 26, 2018**  
Spring Institute  
Lansing Center, Lansing

---

This page last updated on 1/18/2018.

Copyright © 2005 Michigan Association of Planning, A Chapter of the American Planning Association  
1919 West Stadium Blvd., Suite 4 | Ann Arbor, MI 48103 | (p) 734.913.2000 (f) 734.913.2061  
"Making Great Places Happen"

Powered by [Community Center](#)™ Software from [LIAA](#)