AGENDA NOTE

MEETING DATE:  August 13, 2018

PERSON PLACING ITEM ON AGENDA:  Recommendation from the Planning Commission
Proposed on 06/14/18

AGENDA TOPIC:  First Reading of Ordinance rezoning Parcel 21-19-126-002 (Thomasville) from RM-1 (Multiple Family Residential) to PD (Planned Development)

EXPLANATION OF TOPIC:

This is a housekeeping matter. Council previously addressed this issue on November 23, 2015 and approved the Preliminary (Stage I) Planned Development Site Plan for the Thomasville site condominium development with conditions. The Council also approved the rezoning of the property, 11.65± acres on the south side of Eleven Mile Road approximately a quarter mile west of Pontiac Trail (Tax ID 21-19-126-002) from RM-1 to PD (Planned Development), but no formal ordinance rezoning the Property was approved.

The previous PD rezoning and preliminary (stage I) PD site plan expired and the zoning reverted to RM-1 pursuant to ZO Section 102-391 due to no activity within 1 year and no extension. With respect to the current revised layout reducing the number units, the PC recommended rezoning and approval of the Preliminary site plan, both with conditions. This will be ready for Council consideration on 7/9/18 as to a first reading on the rezoning and preliminary site plan. The PD Agreement will be revised for steps 3 and 4 of the PD rezoning and shared with the developer.

MATERIALS ATTACHED AS SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

- Site Plan Material, including updated detail sheet
- Thomasville Summary Changes Letter
- Updated CIB Review Letter

POSSIBLE COURSES OF ACTION:  Approve/Deny/Table/Postpone

RECOMMENDATION:  Approve the First Reading of the Ordinance Rezoning Parcel 21-19-126-002 (Thomasville) from RM-1 (Multiple Family) to PD (Planned Development) subject to the listed conditions.

SUGGESTED MOTION:  Motion to Approve the First Reading
Date  August 1, 2018

Patrick Brozozowski  
Zoning Administrator  
335 S Warren  
South Lyon, MI 48178

RE:  Thomasville Site Condo  
      Site Plan Revisions

Dear Patrick,

Monument Engineering Group Associates, Inc. (MEGA) has made the following changes to the previously submitted preliminary site plan.

1. Moved sidewalk 2’ off back of curb.
2. Added 6’ vinyl fence along property line to the south and east to provide additional and immediate screening from Colonial Acres.
3. Removed staggered evergreens on south and east property lines. Replaced others in locations throughout the development. Replace others throughout the development with planting that meet the ordinance requirements.
4. Noted that all common area planting shall be done in late Fall or in the Spring.
5. 33’ access easement for future connection to the Colonial Acres development has been shown on the plans. The easement runs from 11 Mile along Lexington Drive to the south property line of the parcel.
6. The proposed buildings shown represent the largest possible footprint that will fit on the particular lot. The “Hampton” being the largest home being considered, is shown on most of the lots. However, a variety of homes may and will be chosen to be constructed based on market demand.

Additionally, we’ve addressed the following items per the planner’s review letter dated June 29, 2018.

1. The table on sheet C1.0 has been updated to better reflect the unit density.
2. Area and Bulk, the table on sheet C1.0 has been updated to better reflect the data being presented.
3. Noted
4. Lexington drive will be paved to the property line and an access easement (33’ wide) will be granted to the City should connection to the Colonial Acres development be established in the future.
5. Notes have been added to show the location of benches.
6. Added 6’ vinyl fence along property line to the south and east to provide additional and immediate screening from Colonial Acres.
   Removed staggered evergreens on south and east property lines. Replaced others in locations throughout the development. Replace others throughout the development with plantings that meet the ordinance requirements.
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7. Multiple building elevations have already been provided to the planner for review and comment.

Enclosed please find 15 copies of the revised plans.

Sincerely,
Monument Engineering Group Associates, Inc.

[Signature]

Allan W Pruss, PE, PS
President
August 6, 2018

City Council
City of South Lyon
335 S. Warren Street
South Lyon, MI 48178

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject:</th>
<th>REVISED Thomasville Site Condominium, Planned Development (PD) Rezoning &amp; Preliminary PD Site Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description of Application:</td>
<td>The applicant is requesting Planned Development (PD) rezoning and Preliminary PD Site Plan approval for the proposed development of a 50 unit single-family residential development on an 11.635 acre parcel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location:</td>
<td>South side of 11 mile, 1/4 mile west of Pontiac Trail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Applicant: | Lorenzo Cavaliere  
Cavaliere Company  
30078 Schoenherr Road, Suite 300  
Warren, MI. 48088 |
| Zoning: | RM-1, Multiple-Family Residential District |
| Plans Dated: | July 31, 2018 |

Dear City Council Members:

Pursuant to City Council’s July 9, 2018 request for the site plan to be “cleaned up and questions cleared up,” we have reviewed the above REVISED PD Rezoning and Preliminary PD Site Plan request to construct a 50 unit, detached single-family residential site condominium development fronting 11 Mile Road and abutting Colonial Acres. The site is triangular in shape and bordered by 11 Mile Road and single-family residential to the north; the railroad and condominium units to the south; and condominium units to the east. A pond is also located at the northwest corner of the site, next to the railroad track and 11 Mile Road. At one time, this property was approved for the construction of fifteen (15), 6-unit condominium buildings with outside parking, identical to those immediately east of the site. If developed under the original plan, a total of 90 units would be constructed.

In November 2015, the previous applicant, Tom Schrader, applied to the City for Planned Development (PD) Rezoning and Preliminary PD site plan approval for a 60 unit development.
The Planning Commission recommended and City Council gave preliminary approval of a 60 unit single family residential development.

This revised application for Planned Development Rezoning and Preliminary Planned Development Site Plan approval is a reduction in the number of units (from 60 units preliminarily approved in November 2015 to 50 units in August 2018), with an increase in the individual condominium lot sizes. As the November 2015 application did not receive Final Site Plan approval, this revised 50-unit application is considered “new” and not an amendment to the previous plan.

This proposed single-family, 50-unit development will use the same entryway location as shown on the original 2015 plan.

BACKGROUND

At the June 14, 2018 meeting, after holding a public hearing, the Planning Commission recommended approval of the PD Rezoning and Preliminary PD Site Plan to City Council, with conditions.

On July 9, 2018, City Council reviewed the PD rezoning and preliminary site plan. Due to inconsistencies in the site plan package and missing information, the Council tabled this application to allow the applicant to “clean up and clear up” the plan before any action is taken. The applicant subsequently met with CIB Planning and City Staff to review the inconsistent and missing information. A large majority of the items discussed during this meeting are addressed in this plan.

CURRENT ZONING REQUIREMENTS

The RM-1 District allows the development of single-family residential units as a permitted use, provided the dimensional requirements of the R-3 District are met. The R-3 District permits a maximum density of 3.7 units per acre (Section 102-457(n), Notes to schedule of regulations) with a minimum lot size of 8,750 square feet. Based upon the total acreage, this means that 44 units would be allowed by right under the R-3 District while a total of 50 units are proposed. To develop the site as shown, the applicant must utilize the PD, Planned Development Option.

The alternative to this proposal would be to construct apartments (not senior) as a use by right. Under the RM-1 regulations, up to 337 apartments could be constructed.
PD, PLANNED DEVELOPMENT REVIEW PROCESS

The proposed Planned Development (PD) Rezoning and corresponding Preliminary PD Plan approval provide general acceptance of the road layout, lot (unit) sizes, yard setbacks, distances between buildings, open space, preliminary landscaping, and housing designs. A public hearing was held by the Planning Commission, as required under the ordinance, for PD Rezoning and Preliminary PD Plan review, and a positive recommendation from the Planning Commission made. If the PD Rezoning, and corresponding Preliminary PD Plan, is approved by City Council, the applicant will return to the Planning Commission for Final PD Plan review and recommendation to City Council. All of the requirements for site plan submissions in Article IV of the zoning ordinance must be complied with at that time.

PD, PLANNED DEVELOPMENT REZONING REVIEW STANDARDS

Section 102-382 of the zoning ordinance lists the following standards that must be met for consideration of a Planned Development rezoning request:

(a) The uses proposed will have a beneficial effect, in terms of public health, safety, welfare or convenience or any combination thereof, on present and potential surrounding land uses. The uses proposed will encourage a more efficient use of public utilities and services and lessen the burden on circulation systems, surrounding properties, and the environment. This beneficial effect for the city (not the developer) shall be one which could not be achieved under any other single zoning classification.

Review Comment: The proposed use will create less density than the originally-approved attached single-family condominiums and be easier for purchasers to finance. It will provide moderately-priced new construction housing for the community, which is scarce in the City of South Lyon.

(b) The uses proposed shall be consistent with the master plan of future land use for the city.

Review Comment: The proposed future land use designation for the site is Suburban Residential, which includes “Planned developments that may contain a mix of suburban and traditional residential.” Additionally, the master plan has a goal to provide a diversity of housing for different populations. The moderate price point on the proposed development provides moderately-priced new single family housing not currently available in the City.

(c) The zoning is warranted by the design and amenities incorporated in the development proposal.

Review Comment: Given the unique characteristics of the site (unusual shape, a pond, proximity to a railroad, etc.) a Planned Development is more appropriate than a project
developed under RM-1, Multiple-Family Residential zoning regulations, or even the density requirements of the R-3, Single-Family Residential District.

\[\text{(d) Usable open space shall be provided, at least equal to the total of the minimum usable open space which would be required for each of the component uses of the development. The city may, if deemed appropriate, require for planned developments more or less open space than that required by this chapter.}\]

Review Comment: Given the challenging shape of the lot and unique characteristics of the site, the open space is provided between the units that back up to one another, thereby preventing the creation of through-lots. The pond at the northwest corner of the site is also being maintained as-is, the trees along 11 Mile Road will be preserved, and passive recreation trails throughout the development.

\[\text{(e) Off-street parking sufficient to meet the minimum required by section 102-476 shall be provided and the city may, if deemed appropriate by the City require for planned developments more or less parking than that required by this chapter.}\]

Review Comment: Each unit will have a garage and the amount of parking required under the proposed PD rezoning will be the same as that under the R-3 zoning designation.

\[\text{(f) Landscaping shall be provided so as to ensure that proposed uses will be adequately buffered from one another and from surrounding public and private property. The city may, if deemed appropriate, require for planned unit developments more or less landscaping than that required by this chapter.}\]

Review Comment: Landscape buffering and fencing is provided along the south and east property lines, abutting the existing condominium units. Any additional landscaping needed to buffer properties will be determined under Final PD Plan review.

\[\text{(g) Vehicular and pedestrian circulation, allowing safe, convenient, uncongested and well-defined circulation within and to the district shall be provided.}\]

Review Comment: Vehicular access to the property will be from 11 Mile Road and meets the above criteria, while potentially improving accessibility for the existing Colonial Acres project should an agreement for cross access between the two developments come to fruition at some point. Sidewalks are also provided within the project, to be reviewed as part of the Preliminary PD Plan review.

\[\text{(h) Natural and historical features of the district shall reasonably be protected and preserved.}\]

Review Comment: The pond and perimeter trees on the northern edge of the property will be preserved under this project.
PRELIMINARY PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW COMMENTS

Section 102-131(a) of the City of South Lyon Zoning Ordinance lists the submittal requirements for site plan review. Based on our review of the proposal, discussions with the applicant, and comments received from the Planning Commission during preliminary review of the project, we offer the following for your consideration:

1. **Overall Density.** Section 102-387(b)(1), *General design standards,* of the ordinance states that “The maximum permitted residential density for single-family dwelling in the RM-1 District shall not exceed the density allowed for the area currently zoned single-family as shown on the zoning district map.” The current zoning designation for the subject property is RM-1 but the ordinance states that “The standards of the schedule of regulations applicable to the R-3 one-family residential district shall apply as minimum standards when one-family detached dwellings are erected.” Footnote (n) for the R-3 District also states that “Single-family detached condominiums in condominium subdivisions shall meet all requirements and standards of the district in which such dwellings are to be constructed, including minimum floor area requirements, and excepting minimum lot size, which shall be so developed that the number of dwelling units per gross acre shall not exceed the following: (4) R-3, 3.7 dwelling units per gross acre.”

The applicant is requesting 50 units, to meet the benefit of providing moderately priced new housing, with an overall density of 4.3 dwelling units per gross acre. A waiver will have to be granted to allow an overall density of approximately 4.3 units per acre as it exceeds the minimum density allowed.

2. **Area and Bulk.** The proposed site was reviewed in accordance with Section 102-180, *Schedule of Regulations,* as described in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R-3 Requirements</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Provided</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area</td>
<td>8750 sq. ft. min.</td>
<td>Average of 5000 s.f.</td>
<td>The Planning Commission recommended approval of the waiver.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Width</td>
<td>70 ft. min.</td>
<td>50 ft. min.</td>
<td>The range of lot sizes should be provided. The total square footage of each lot should be noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Density</td>
<td>3.7 units/acre max.</td>
<td>Approximately 4.3 units/acre</td>
<td>The Planning Commission recommended approval of the waiver.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17195 Silver Parkway #309
Fenton, MI 48420
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### R-3 Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Provided</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum floor area</td>
<td>1,000 s.f.</td>
<td>43 units at 1,500 s.f.</td>
<td>In compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 units at 1,400 s.f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 units at 1,300 s.f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front yard setback (single-family)</td>
<td>25 ft.</td>
<td>25 ft.</td>
<td>In compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side yard setback</td>
<td>6/16 ft.</td>
<td>5/10 ft.</td>
<td>The Planning Commission recommended approval of the proposed side yard setbacks and the corresponding waiver.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear yard</td>
<td>35 ft.</td>
<td>30 ft.</td>
<td>The Planning Commission recommended approval of the waiver.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Height (single-family)</td>
<td>2 stories max.</td>
<td>1-2 stories, max. 25 ft. height</td>
<td>In compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-ft. max. building height</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Coverage (buildings)</td>
<td>25% maximum</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>In compliance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Six (6) lots throughout the proposed plan vary from the setbacks throughout the development:

- Lot 6  20’ side yard (instead of 25’)
- Lot 7  25’ rear yard (instead of 30’)
- Lot 8  25’ rear yard (instead of 30’)
- Lot 20 15’ rear yard (instead of 30’)
- Lot 21 15’ rear yard (instead of 30’)
- Lot 22 5’ rear yard (instead of 30’)

Preliminary approval of the plan (as presented) includes these variations and all proposed setbacks.

3. **Overall Layout.** The overall layout of the proposed development seems reasonable and matches that recommended for City Council approval at the June 14, 2018 Planning Commission meeting.

4. **Emergency Access.** The Police and Fire Departments requested the installation of a paved, gated emergency access drive to 11 Mile Road. This has been provided and details for construction and maintenance will be provided at the time of Final PD Plan review. They also indicated the need to have the main drive (Lexington Drive) connect with the drive for Colonial Acres to the north for improved emergency access. The property owners tried to work with Colonial Acres to obtain a cross access easement to allow the connection of Lexington Drive within Colonial Acres. At this time, Colonial Acres is not interested in pursuing this agreement. For the time being, the City requests that Lexington Drive be paved to the property line (should an agreement come to fruition) and that easement language be included as a condition of site plan approval.
5. **Park Area.** A pond exists at the southwest corner of the property, as well as open areas between the rears of units on Lexington Circle. A walking path is provided within the development. Park benches are proposed near the pond, however, this specific locations of the benches are not yet provided.

6. **Preliminary Landscape Plan.** The preliminary landscape plan provides both the required street trees and replacement trees. In addition, the planting size for almost all of the proposed trees exceeds ordinance requirements and is considered a benefit of the project.

While a buffer zone is not required between the two properties (Thomasville and Colonial Acres), due to the concerns of Colonial Acres' residents, the applicant is providing a six (6) foot privacy fence along the property line adjacent to Colonial Acres as well as narrow evergreen trees (five (5) feet minimum height). In a typical landscape buffering design, two (2) staggered rows of evergreen trees are planted within a 10 foot wide buffer strip. The applicant has not identified the buffer area, rather only the fence on the property line and the narrow trees (shown too close to the fence). A minimum 10 foot buffer area should be identified on the plan with precise planting locations, as adequate spacing is necessary for ensuring optimal growing conditions for the trees.

Fence details are not provided and must be submitted with Final Site Plan approval.

7. **Sidewalks.** The applicant is proposing five (5) foot sidewalks throughout the interior of the development. Originally proposed with no setback between the curb and the sidewalk, the Planning Commission has requested a minimum of two (2) feet of green space between back of curb and sidewalk edge. CIB Planning has recommended and continues to support a three (3) foot space.

The applicant proposes to irrigate the proposed green space between the curb and sidewalk to ensure the area remains lawn and not weeds.

It should be noted that Lots 27 and 28 do not have sidewalks due to the building envelope, required setbacks and limited available space. The applicant could consider placing larger homes on these lots, knowing that sidewalks can not be provided.

8. **Building Elevations.** The use of high-quality building elevations and materials is critical to the successful development of a small lot, single-family project such as this. The elevations submitted to the Planning Commission lacked in building variety and style, as well as architectural details. The applicant has submitted additional elevations for this submittal to City Council. The preliminary building elevations are attractive and have the potential to meet this standard, conditioned upon the proper variety of elevations.
and acceptable building materials/colors. The Planning Commission did express the need for architectural variety and should be considered under Final PD Site Plan review.

9. **Deck and Patios.** As presented, a number of lots are proposed to have houses with footprints that maximize the buildable area. As such, there is limited rear yard area to construct a deck or patio and remain within the setback requirements. *Section 120-108 Porches and Decks* permits “decks at or below the ground floor level to project into a required side or rear yard, not not exceed a depth of 25% of the depth of required yard.” The rear yard setback for this development is proposed as 30 feet. An additional 7.5 feet may be gained with this provision, however, the resulting deck size or patio still may not be large enough to make it useful. To avoid recurrent request for variances from the Zoning Board of Appeals, the applicant should be prepared to address this issue.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Based upon the above discussion, the Planning Commission recommends approval to City Council for the Planned Development (PD) Rezoning and Preliminary PD Site Plan for the Thomasville development, with:

a. a waiver to allow an average lot area of 5,000 s.f.;
b. a waiver to allow a minimum lot width of 50 ft.;
c. a waiver to allow an overall density of 4.3 units per acre;
d. a waiver to allow a setback of 10 feet between buildings;
e. a waiver for rear yard setbacks;
f. the installation of a 10 foot landscape buffering area with fencing and evergreen trees abutting Colonial Acres. Fencing should be installed at the beginning of the project/construction;
g. fencing specifications and details provided at final site plan review;
h. identify specific locations for park benches on final site plan;
i. inclusion of language for a future cross access agreement with Colonial Acres via Lexington Drive;
j. submission of revised building elevations and material samples to the Planning Commission during final site plan review; and
k. draft condominium documents to be submitted during final site plan approval.

If you have any further questions, please contact us at 810-335-3800.

Sincerely,

CIB PLANNING

17195 Skyler Parkway #609
Feaston, MI 48430

(810)335-3800

email: avantin@cibplanning.com
Kelly McIntyre
Senior Principal Planner
AGENDA NOTE

MEETING DATE:    July 9, 2018

PERSON PLACING ITEM ON AGENDA:    Recommendation from the Planning Commission Proposed on 06/14/18

AGENDA TOPIC:    First Reading of Ordinance rezoning Parcel 21-19-126-002 (Thomasville) from RM-1 (Multiple Family Residential) to PD (Planned Development)

EXPLANATION OF TOPIC:

This is a housekeeping matter. Council previously addressed this issue on November 23, 2015 and approved the Preliminary (Stage I) Planned Development Site Plan for the Thomasville site condominium development with conditions. The Council also approved the rezoning of the property, 11.65± acres on the south side of Eleven Mile Road approximately a quarter mile west of Pontiac Trail (Tax ID 21-19-126-002) from RM-1 to PD (Planned Development), but no formal ordinance rezoning the Property was approved.

The previous PD rezoning and preliminary (stage I) PD site plan expired and the zoning reverted to RM-1 pursuant to ZO Section 102-391 due to no activity within 1 year and no extension. With respect to the current revised layout reducing the number units, the PC recommended rezoning and approval of the Preliminary site plan, both with conditions. This will be ready for Council consideration on 7/9/18 as to a first reading on the rezoning and preliminary site plan. The PD Agreement will be revised for steps 3 and 4 of the PD rezoning and shared with the developer.

MATERIALS ATTACHED AS SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

- Site Plan Material, including updated detail sheet
- Updated CIB Review Letter
- Additional Elevation Samples for the project
- Draft Minutes of 06/14/18 Planning Commission Meeting
- Agenda packet excerpt from 06/14/2018 Planning Commission meeting

POSSIBLE COURSES OF ACTION:    Approve/Deny/Table/Postpone

RECOMMENDATION:    Approve the First Reading of the Ordinance Rezoning Parcel 21-19-126-002 (Thomasville) from RM-1 (Multiple Family) to PD (Planned Development) subject to the listed conditions.

SUGGESTED MOTION:    Motion to Approve the First Reading
CIB Planning

June 29, 2018

City Council
City of South Lyon
335 S. Warren Street
South Lyon, MI 48178

Subject: Thomasville Site Condominium, PD Rezoning & Preliminary PD Site Plan

Description of Application: The applicant is requesting Planned Development rezoning and Preliminary PD Site Plan approval for the proposed development of a 50 unit single-family residential development on an 11.635 acre parcel.

Site Location: South side of 11 mile, 1/4 mile west of Pontiac Trail

Applicant: Lorenzo Cavaliere
Cavaliere Company
30078 Schoenherr Road, Suite 300
Warren, MI. 48088

Zoning: RM-1, Multiple-Family Residential District

Plans Dated: 6-8-16

Dear City Council Members:

We have reviewed the above revised PD Rezoning and Preliminary PD Site Plan request to construct a 50 unit, detached single-family residential site condominium development fronting 11 Mile Road and abutting Colonial Acres. The site is triangular in shape and bordered by 11 Mile Road and single-family residential to the north; the railroad and condominium units to the south; and condominium units to the east. A pond is also located at the northwest corner of the site, next to the railroad track and 11 Mile Road. This property was originally approved for the construction of fifteen (15), 6-unit condominium buildings with outside parking, identical to those immediately east of the site. If developed under the original plan, a total of 90 units would be constructed.

In November 2015, the previous applicant, Tom Schroder, applied to the City for PD Rezoning and Preliminary PD site plan approval. The Planning Commission recommended and City Council gave preliminary approval of a 60 unit single family residential development.
This revised application for PD Rezoning and Preliminary PD Site Plan approval is a reduction in the number of units (from 60 to 50 units), with an increase in the individual condominium lot sizes. As the November 2015 application did not receive Final Site Plan approval, this 50 unit application is considered a "new" and not an amendment to the previous plan.

The proposed single-family development would use the same entryway location as shown on the original plan. The applicant has indicated that current lending requirements make the development and sale of attached condominium units impractical.

BACKGROUND

At the June 14, 2018 meeting, after holding a public hearing, the Planning Commission recommended approval of the PUD Rezoning and Preliminary PUD Site Plan to City Council, with conditions.

CURRENT ZONING REQUIREMENTS

The RM-1 District allows the development of single-family residential units as a permitted use, provided the dimensional requirements of the R-3 District are met. The R-3 District permits a maximum density of 3.7 units per acre (Section 102-407(m), Notes to schedule of regulations) with a minimum lot size of 8,750 square feet. Based upon the total acreage, this means that 44 units would be allowed by right under the R-3 District while a total of 50 units are proposed. To develop the site as shown, the applicant must utilize the PD, Planned Development Option.

PD, PLANNED DEVELOPMENT REVIEW PROCESS

The proposed PD, Planned Development Rezoning and corresponding Preliminary PD Plan approval would provide general acceptance of the road layout, lot (unit) sizes, open space, preliminary landscaping, and housing designs. A public hearing has been held, as required under the ordinance, for PD Rezoning and Preliminary PD Plan review, and a positive recommendation from the Planning Commission made. If the PD Rezoning, and corresponding Preliminary PD Plan, is approved by City Council, the applicant will return to the Planning Commission for Final PD Plan review and recommendation to City Council. All of the requirements for site plan submissions in Article IV of the zoning ordinance must be complied with at that time.
PD, PLANNED DEVELOPMENT REZONING REVIEW STANDARDS

Section 102-382 of the zoning ordinance lists the following standards that must be met for consideration of a Planned Development rezoning request:

(a) The uses proposed will have a beneficial effect, in terms of public health, safety, welfare or convenience or any combination thereof, on present and potential surrounding land uses. The uses proposed will encourage a more efficient use of public utilities and services and lessen the burden of circulation systems, surrounding properties, and the environment. This beneficial effect for the city (not the developer) shall be one which could not be achieved under any other single zoning classification.

Review Comment: The proposed use will create less density than the originally-approved attached single-family condominiums and be easier for purchasers to finance. It could also improve access for the existing Colonial Acres development and provide moderately-priced new construction housing for the community.

(b) The uses proposed shall be consistent with the master plan of future land use for the city.

Review Comment: The proposed future land use designation for the site is Suburban Residential, which includes “Planned developments that may contain a mix of suburban and traditional residential.”

(c) The zoning is warranted by the design and amenities incorporated in the development proposal.

Review Comment: Given the unique characteristics of the site (unusual shape, a pond, proximity to a railroad, etc.) a Planned Development is more appropriate than a project developed under RM-1, Multiple-Family Residential zoning regulations, or even the density requirements of the R-3, Single-Family Residential District.

(d) Usable open space shall be provided, at least equal to the total of the minimum usable open space which would be required for each of the component uses of the development. The city may, if deemed appropriate, require for planned developments more or less open space than that required by this chapter.

Review Comment: Given the challenging shape of the lot and unique characteristics of the site, the open space is provided between the units that back up to one another, thereby preventing the creation of through-lots. The pond at the northwest corner of the site is also being maintained as-is, the trees along 11 Mile Road will be preserved, and a small pocket park has been added just west of the pond.
(e) Off-street parking sufficient to meet the minimum required by section 102-476 shall be provided and the city may, if deemed appropriate by the city, require for planned developments more or less parking than that required by this chapter.

Review Comment: Each unit will have a garage and the amount of parking required under the proposed PD rezoning will be the same as that under the R-3 zoning designation.

(f) Landscaping shall be provided so as to ensure that proposed uses will be adequately buffered from one another and from surrounding public and private property. The city may, if deemed appropriate, require for planned unit developments more or less landscaping than that required by this chapter.

Review Comment: Landscape buffering is to be provided along the south and east property lines, abutting the existing condominium units. Any additional landscaping needed to buffer properties will be determined under Final PD Plan review.

(g) Vehicular and pedestrian circulation, allowing safe, convenient, uncongested and well-defined circulation within and to the district shall be provided.

Review Comment: Vehicular access to the property will be from 11 Mile Road and meets the above criteria, while improving accessibility for the existing Colonial Acres project. Sidewalks are also provided within the project, to be reviewed as part of the Preliminary PD Plan review.

(h) Natural and historical features of the district shall reasonably be protected and preserved.

Review Comment: The pond and perimeter trees on the northern edge of the property will be preserved under this project.

PRELIMINARY PD PLAN REVIEW COMMENTS

Section 102-131(a) of the City of South Lyon Zoning Ordinance lists the submittal requirements for site plan review. Based on our review of the proposal, discussions with the applicant, and comments received from the Planning Commission during Conceptual Review of the project, we offer the following for your consideration:

1. Overall Density. Section 102-387(b)(1), General design standards, of the ordinance states that “The maximum permitted residential density for single-family dwelling shall not exceed the density allowed for the area currently zoned single-family as shown on the zoning district map.” The current zoning designation for the subject property is RM-1 but the ordinance states that “The standards of the schedule of regulations applicable to the R-3 one-family residential district shall apply as minimum standards when one-family detached dwellings are erected.” Footnote (n) for the R-3 District also states that “Single-family detached condominiums in condominium subdivisions shall meet all requirements and standards of the district in which such dwellings are to be constructed, including minimum...
floor area requirements, and excepting minimum lot size, which shall be so developed that the number of dwelling units per gross acre shall not exceed the following: (4) R-3, 3.7 dwelling units per gross acre.” The applicant is requesting 62 units, to meet the benefit of providing moderately priced new housing, citing that the overall density will still be much lower than the previously approved 60 units and close to the 5.0 units per acre. A waiver will have to be granted to allow an overall density of approximately 5.2 units per acre.

2. Area and Bulk. The proposed site was reviewed in accordance with Section 102-459, Open space preservation option, as described in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Provided</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area</td>
<td>8750 sq. ft.</td>
<td>Average of 4200</td>
<td>The Planning Commission recommended approval of the waiver.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>minimum</td>
<td>s.f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Width</td>
<td>60 ft. minimum</td>
<td>50 ft. minimum</td>
<td>The Planning Commission recommended approval of the waiver.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Density</td>
<td>3.7 units/acre max.</td>
<td>Approximately 5.2 units/acre</td>
<td>The Planning Commission recommended approval of the waiver.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front yard setback</td>
<td>25 ft.</td>
<td>25 ft.</td>
<td>In compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(single-family)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side yard setback</td>
<td>6/10 ft.</td>
<td>5/10 ft.</td>
<td>The Planning Commission recommended approval of the proposed side yard setbacks and the corresponding waiver.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear yard</td>
<td>35 ft.</td>
<td>Varies, from 20 ft. to 40 ft.</td>
<td>The Planning Commission recommended approval of the waiver.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Height</td>
<td>2 stories max. 25-ft. max. building height</td>
<td>1-2 stories, max. 25 ft. height</td>
<td>In compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(single-family)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Coverage</td>
<td>25% maximum</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>In compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(buildings)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Overall Layout. The overall layout of the proposed development seems reasonable and matches that recommended for City Council approval at the June 14, 2018 Planning Commission meeting

4. Emergency Access. The Police and Fire Departments requested the installation of a paved, gated emergency access drive to 11 Mile Road. This has been provided and details for construction and maintenance will have to be provided at the time of Final PD Plan review. They also indicated the need to have the main drive (Lexington Drive) connect with the drive for Colonial Acres to the north for improved emergency access. The property owners tried to work with Colonial Acres to obtain a cross access easement to allow the connection of Lexington Drive within Colonial Acres. At this time, Colonial Acres is not interested in pursuing this agreement. For the time being, the City requests that Lexington Drive be paved to the property line (should an agreement come to
fruition) and that easement language be included as a condition of site plan approval.

5. **Park Area.** A pond exists at the southwest corner of the property, as well as open areas between the rears of units on Lexington Circle. A walking path is provided within the development. A previously presented plan identified benches near the pond, however, this plan does not show any. These park improvements must be included on the site plan.

6. **Preliminary Landscape Plan.** The preliminary landscape plan provides both the required street trees and replacement trees. In addition, the planting size for almost all of the proposed trees exceeds ordinance requirements and is considered a benefit of the project. Since residents from the existing condominium units to the south and east expressed concern about buffering between developments, the landscape plan indicates the planting of evergreen trees (minimum 10’ height) along the property line.

7. **Building Elevations.** The use of high-quality building elevations and materials is critical to the successful development of a small lot, single-family project such as this. The elevations submitted to the Planning Commission lacked in building variety and style, as well as architectural details. The applicant has submitted additional elevations for this submittal to City Council. The preliminary building elevations are attractive and have the potential to meet this standard, conditioned upon the proper variety of elevations and acceptable building materials/colors. The Planning Commission did express the need for architectural variety and should be considered under Final PD Site Plan review.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Based upon the above discussion, the Planning Commission recommends approval to City Council for the PD, Planned Development rezoning and Preliminary PD Site Plan for the Thomasville development, with:

- a waiver to allow an average lot area of 4,200 s.f.;
- a waiver to allow a minimum lot width of 50 ft.;
- a waiver to allow an overall density of 5.2 units per acre;
- a waiver to allow a setback of 10 feet between buildings;
- a waiver for rear yard setbacks that in some cases drops 30 feet;
- the installation of landscape buffering abutting Colonial Acres to be installed at the beginning of the project/construction;
- inclusion of language for a future cross access agreement with Colonial Acres via Lexington Drive;
- submission of revised building elevations and material samples to the Planning Commission during final site plan review; and
- draft condominium documents to be submitted during final site plan approval.
If you have any further questions, please contact us at 810-335-3800.

Sincerely,

CIB PLANNING

Kelly McIntyre

[Signature]

Senior Principal Planner
City of South Lyon
Planning Commission
Regular Meeting Minutes
June 14, 2018

The meeting was called to order by Chairman, Scott Lanam at 7:15 p.m.

Roll Call: Scott Lanam, Chair
Keith Bradley, Vice Chair
Steve Mosier, Commissioner
Mike Joseph, Commissioner

Absent: Jason Rose, Commissioner, Excused
Wayne Chubb, Commissioner, Excused
Erin Kopkowski, Commissioner, Excused

Motion to excuse Commissioner Chubb, Rose and Kopkowski
Motion by Mosier, Second by Bradley

Voice vote: Ayes: unanimous
Nayes: None

Motion Approved

Also Present: Carmine Avantini, Planning Consultant
Kelly McIntyre, Planning Consultant
Judy Pieper, Deputy Clerk
Patrick Brzozowski, Zoning Administrator
Tim Wilhelm, City Attorney
Motion made to add New Business #1, set Public Hearing for July 12, 2018 for the ordinance Utility Poles and Wireless facilities in the right away - distributed by Attorney Wilhelm at the beginning of the meeting.

Motion by Bradley, Second by Joseph

Voice Vote: Ayes:   Unanimous
Nayes:   None

Motion Approved

Motion to approve the Agenda as amended
Motion by Mosler, Second by Bradley

Voice Vote: Ayes:   Unanimous
Nayes:   None

Motion Approved

Motion to approve Minutes as amended
Motion by Bradley, Second by Joseph

Voice Vote: Ayes:   Unanimous
Nayes:   None

Motion Approved

Public Comments – None

Public Hearings
1. Thomasville Site Condominium, PD Rezoning Preliminary Site Plan (#2018-003)
Allan Pruss, Monument Engineering Group and Associates, Inc., begins by explaining that the first time they went before the Board, sometime in early 2016, receiving a final site plan approval for the basically the same layout that is in front of the Board now. He further states that the only change is that the lots went from 40 foot wide lots to now 50 foot lots, the density went from 60 units down to 50 units. The road alignment has not changed. The intersection at Lexington and Thomasville has been tweaked to accommodate the 50 foot wide lots. He further states that they made a few other minor changes throughout the sub. They have been working with Patrick and Caroline. They are here to answer any questions.

Planning Consultant McIntyre states that this will be a two-step process and they are looking at taking care of this simultaneously. The rezoning and the preliminary PD Site Plan request to construct a 50 unit, detached single-family residential condominium site. McIntyre states the only major change is the increase in lot size. She also states that there are a number of items that will need a waiver on. The Lot Area, Lot Width, Residential Density, Front yard setback, Side yard setback, Rear yard, Building Height and Lot Coverage. McIntyre goes on to state that the Police and Fire Departments have requested the installation of a paved, gated emergency access drive to 11 Mile Road. The previous property owners tried to work with Colonial Acres to obtain across access easement to allow the connection of Lexington Drive within Colonial Acres. At this time, Colonial Acres is not interested in pursuing this agreement. The City requests that Lexington private paved to the property line and that easement language is included as a condition of site plan approval.

Planning Consultant Carmen Avantini, adds on the original plans, the sidewalks were back off of the curb by a foot or two. Now they are showing integrated with the curb.

Lorenzo Cavaliere, 30078 Schoenherr, Suite 300, Warren, Michigan Cavaliere states that in the old plan there was a 3 foot green belt between the back of the curb and the sidewalk, and you really can’t plant anything on the 3 feet. If we could go with a 2 foot green belt and a 5 foot public walk that would still give you the look and still give something that is quite practical.

Chair Lanam states that the elevations seem to be very similar and doesn’t see a difference when driving down the street.

Cavaliere states that it is done on a case by case basis, as they will not know which home is going to be sold on each lot.
Commissioner Joseph states that these are the epitome of “cookie cutter” houses. The designs are dated. They need to be more imaginative. Look at the materials that you are using. Take a drive around South Lyon. This is a 1980’s house. Chair Lanam states that the designs are mostly identical. Commissioner suggests flipping the garage from one side to the other. Cavaliere explains that the elevations will be changing. Commissioner adds that the homes have very little character. Avantini adds that this is a re-zoning, so the preliminary is done here, recommendation to Council, and then they would come back here for site-plan and then to Council again. Cavaliere adds that they can definitely add some additional options for elevations. Lanam adds that they should bring in samples of materials as part of the review process. The conversation continues regarding the target market for this development and the housing shortage in this state. Attorney Wilhelm states that he wants to raise some issues from looking back at the last time this was presented to Council. Avantini states that the only reason that that connection was sought by the Police and Fire Department was so that they can approve their emergency exit through Colonial Acres. It really provides no benefits to this development. The conversation continues regarding the 2nd reading that is included in the Council packet dated 11-14-2016.

Public Hearing opens at 7:56 p.m. Judy Keeling, Colonial Acres Board. Keeling states that she would like to re-iterate that they are not for this property coming on to Lexington Drive, it’s a private road and we maintain that road. She states that they have Heritage Road that goes through for Police and Fire. She again states that she wants it noted that the project itself is not the problem, the problem is if they come on to our road. Avantini adds that Colonial Acres may want to put up a sign on their property line. Public Hearing closes at 7:58 p.m.

Motion made to recommend to City Council approval for Plan Development and Rezoning the Preliminary PD Site Plan for Thomasville Development conditioned upon the approval of the following: a waiver to allow an average lot area of 4,200 s.f.; a waiver to allow a minimum lot width of 50ft.; a waiver to allow an
overall density of 5.2 units per acre; a waiver to allow a setback of 15 feet between buildings; the installation of landscape buffering abutting colonial acres to be installed at the beginning of the project/construction; inclusion of language for a future cross access agreement with Colonial Acres via Lexington Drive; Submission of revised building elevations and material samples to the Planning Commission during final site plan review; draft condominium documents to be submitted during final site plan approval; sidewalks back to 2ft green belt between the curb and the sidewalk; all recommendations from the 11-14-2016 City Council packet A – E; All part of the original plans must be included on the site plan.

Motion by Bradley, Second by Mosier

Voice Vote: Ayes: Unanimous
Nayes: None

Motion Approved

Cavaliere asked for a correction to 10 feet between buildings on prior Motion.

Motion to amend prior motion to allow waiver of setback to 10ft between buildings

Motion by Bradley, Second by Mosier

Voice Vote: Ayes: Unanimous
Nayes: None

Motion Approved

Motion to approve amended motion
Motion by Bradley, Second by Mosier

Voice Vote: Ayes: Unanimous
Nayes: None

Motion Approved

2. 825 W. Lake Street Conditional Rezoning (#2018-004)

Developer – Bob Langan, 128 N. Center Street, Northville, Michigan
One of the Principles of LV Holdings, LLC., which is the owner of this property. He
go on to state that his partner, Michael Valvona, and their Consulting Engineer, Cliff Seiber, from Seiber Keast and Associates is also in the room this evening. He
states that this property is at the corner of Lake Street and Dixboro and was in the
Township until about a year or so ago, when it was annexed in to the city. He goes
on to say that they have had a number of meetings with Consultants in the City to
go over what they thought would be a good use of this property. He states that
they have come up with a Multi-Family concept, 72 units in three buildings.
Consulting Engineer, Cliff Seiber, states that they have really made an effort to
make it not look cramped from Lake Street. He states that it is a looped traffic
system with a Boulevard entrance off of Lake Street and good circulation
throughout the site. Entering the site from the Boulevard gives you a more open
space with a Gazebo. The Storm Water Basin runs along Lake Street adding a
more open feel for the development. The Boulevard was added for a secondary
access (after speaking with the Fire Marshall) with a breakaway gate for
emergency use. Utilities, along with a looped water system, sanitary sewer and
storm water will be on site as well. The mix of the units will include 51 – 2
bedroom and 21 – 1 bedroom. The parking requirements are met, along with an
additional 20% guest parking.
Avantini refers the Board to the letter dated 6-7-2018, he states that this is an
additional rezoning request from R-1A (One Family Residential) to RM-3 (Multiple
Family Residential). He goes on to explain the process stating the applicant will
offer conditions. If those conditions are found acceptable in the Board’s
recommendation and also to City Council, the applicant would have to come back
for final site plan approval.

Avantini goes on to list the following Conditions:
1. Building Exterior – High quality building materials
2. High Quality Interior Fit and Finish
3. Outdoor Recreation – Walkway connection over to the trail that goes to McHattie Park
4. Carport Construction – With input from the Police Department, will be open design, be strategically placed and illuminated

Avantini goes on to talk about how they had 2 meetings to discuss different land uses. What would be a good transitional use? This particular use gives us more flexibility. He states that with the conditional re-zoning, they are locked in with this use.

Avantini goes on to state that they recommend the approval of the conditional re-zoning application for 825 West Lake Street, from R1-A, Single Family Residential to RM-3, Multiple Family Residential, in order to construct a low-rise apartment complex – based upon the following reasons:

1. Although the multiple family designation is not consistent with the site’s planned future use of industrial, residential properties are in close proximity to the subject parcel;
2. The proposed multiple-family residential provides an appropriate transition between the abutting industrial and single-family residential zoning districts.
3. It will be difficult to develop the property for any of the permitted and special land uses in the current R1-A zoning district;
4. The site’s physical and other environmental features are compatible with the proposed uses;
5. The proposed use is compatible with surrounding uses and zoning in terms of land suitability, impacts on the environment, traffic volumes, aesthetics, infrastructure, and addressing a community need;
6. The street system is capable of safely and efficiently accommodating the limited expected traffic volumes generated by the proposed use; and
7. The capacity of public utilities and services is sufficient to accommodate the proposed use without compromising the city’s health, safety and welfare.

The conversation continues regarding building a pathway and whether to build now or build it when the City feels it is appropriate, based on the paving of Dixboro. Chair Lanam states that Dixboro, between 8 and 9 Mile will be paved within the next year, but between 9 and 10 Mile there is no definite time. There are pretty major things in the way.
Lanam questions why they felt that the Dixboro entrance is not necessary. Seiber explains that this can be changed if the city would prefer. Commissioner Joseph states that he is not a fan of apartments, but these are an appealing design. He states that he would like these to be maintained and to have appropriate landscaping. Commissioner Bradley questions if 2 dumpsters will be enough. Langan states that they would be placing them and sizing them accordingly. Lanam states that they would like to see building and color samples.

**Public Hearing opens at 8:32 p.m.**
Gayle Neff, 834 W. Lake, South Lyon, Michigan
Neff states that she has lived at this corner for almost 33 years, and there have been numerous accidents at this location. She states that there is a slight curve to this road and her concern is the speed of the traffic as traffic is heading out of town. She questions if there will be any changes to Lake Street. She states that she is worried about losing her 100+ year old barn. She states that she is concerned regarding the electricity. She also states that it is a nice looking building, her main concern is the road and the traffic. She adds she would like to see a blinking light at this corner.
Commissioner Joseph states that if/when they pave Dixboro, they will have to put up a traffic light.
Matt Zajac, 132 Shannon Park Court, Charleston Park Sub-Division
Zajac states that he would prefer that South Lyon remain more of a community where the owners have a vested interest in the City. In his younger years, having an apartment was not a community; it was just somewhere you are staying. While it is proposed to be higher end, this is his point of view and he is assuming the same point of view from his community. If it does go forward, he states, he would like to see requirements from the city that landscaping be imparted to hide parking and/or carports. He states again, that he would like to see owned units vs leased or rented units.
Commissioner Bradley adds, that as far as landscaping is concerned, the Board is pretty tough on this.
Ken and Linda Redman, 24000 N. Dixboro, South Lyon, MI
Redman states that he borders the property that we are talking about. He just wanted to see what this was about; he really does not have any complaints as of yet. Just wants to see what is going on there.

**Public Hearing closes at 8:43 p.m.**
Langan states that the application that they submitted comes with a two page, written by me, narrative of the conditions which were the exterior quality (durability), the interior quality fit and finish, the outdoor recreation pathway that we discussed, and the carport construction that we keep public safety in mind and to minimize the overwhelming visual effect of a carport.
Langan states that he has submitted a landscape plan with the package. It has significant landscaping along Lake Street and significant landscaping with the Redman's.
Attorney Wilhelm states that he would like to briefly touch on the authorization for conditional rezoning — MCL125.3405

Motion to recommend to the Council approval of the conditional rezoning application for 825 W. Lake Street from R-1A, Single Family Residential to RM-3, Multiple Family Residential, with the following conditions:

1. The Exterior use of durable, exterior building materials including cultured stone accents, high quality composite siding, high efficiency and quality rated windows and attractive solid core exterior doors.
2. Interior Fit and Finish: Use of upgraded finishes including: stainless steel plumbing fixtures, granite countertops, marble and tile bathrooms, built in dishwasher, decorative trim, crown moldings, upgraded carpet, hardwood floors, and in-unit stackable washer and dryers.
3. Outdoor Recreation: the construction of a non-motorized pathway connecting the development to the Huron Valley Trail. The initial path will be temporary and constructed of wood chips or gravel. The owner/developer will deposit the civil engineer’s cost of construction estimate for the construction of an asphalt path to be complete after Dixboro Road is paved.
4. Carport Construction: Carports will use an open design, be strategically placed, and illuminated (consistent with the current crime prevention and personal safety standards), with a berm between the carports and Dixboro Road to soften the visual impact.
5. Final site plan approval including landscaping for the following reasons:
   1. Although the multiple family designation is not consistent with the site’s planned future use of Industrial, residential properties are in close proximity to the subject parcel;
2. The proposed multiple-family residential provides an appropriate transition between the abutting industrial and single-family residential zoning districts.

3. It will be difficult to develop the property for any of the permitted and special land uses in the current R1-A zoning district;

4. The site's physical and other environmental features are compatible with the proposed use;

5. The proposed use is compatible with surrounding uses and zoning in terms of land suitability, impacts on the environment, traffic volumes, aesthetics, infrastructure, and addressing a community need;

6. The street system is capable of safely and efficiently accommodating the limited expected traffic volumes generated by the proposed use;

7. The capacity of public utilities and services is sufficient to accommodate the proposed use without compromising the city's health, safety and welfare.

Motion by Bradley, Second by Master.

Voice Vote: Ayes: Unanimous
Nayes: None

Motion Approved.

New Business:

1. Consideration of Zoning Ordinance Amendments for Small Cell Wireless Communication Facilities Deployment Act (SB 637)

Attorney Wilhelm gives a bit of background information regarding this act. He states that we are just trying to be proactive and stay ahead of the game.

Motion to set a Public Hearing for 7-12-2018, to go over the ordinance for the wireless utility pole and other structures.
Motion by Mosier, Second by Joseph

Voice Vote: Ayes: Unanimous
Nayes: None

Motion Approved

Old Business:

Tabled Items:

Planning Consultant Report:
Avantini states that they are looking forward to meeting with you in two weeks to go through the Zoning Ordinance.

Staff Report: None

Adjournment:

Approval to Adjourn

Motion by Bradley, Second by Joseph
Voice Vote: Ayes: Unanimous
Nayes: None

Motion Approved – Meeting Adjourned – 9:05 p.m.

Scott Lanam, Chairman

Judy Pleper, Recording Secretary

Steve Mosier, Secretary
CITY OF SOUTH LYON  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
June 14, 2018  
7:00 P.M.

Call to Order  
Pledge of Allegiance  
Roll Call  
Approval of the Agenda for June 14, 2018  
Approval of the Minutes for May 10, 2018

Public Comment (Non-agenda items)

Public Hearings:  
1) Thomasville Site Condominium, PD Rezoning Preliminary Site Plan (#2018-003)  
2) 825 W. Lake Street Conditional Rezoning (#2018-004)

New Business:  
None

Old Business:  
None

Tabled Items:  
None

Planning Consultant Report

Staff Report

Adjournment
City of South Lyon
Planning Commission
Regular Meeting Minutes
May 10, 2018

The meeting was called to order by Chairman, Scott Lanam at 7:05 p.m.

Roll Call: Scott Lanam, Chair
Keith Bradley, Vice Chair
Steve Mosler, Commissioner
Mike Joseph, Commissioner
Erin Kopkowski, Commissioner, Excused

Absent: Jason Rose, Commissioner, Excused
Wayne Chubb, Commissioner, Excused

Motion to excuse Commissioner Chubb and Commissioner Rose
Motion by Bradley, Second by Kopkowski

Voice Vote: Ayes: Unanimous
Nayes: None

Motion Approved

Also Present: Carmine Avantini, Planning Consultant
Judy Plagem, Deputy Clerk
Patrick Brzozowski, Zoning Administrator
Tim Wilhelm, City Attorney (Arrived at 7:13)
Motion to approve Agenda as amended, correcting Minutes date to 2-8-2018
Motion by Mosler, Second by Bradley

Voice Vote:  Ayes: Unanimous
Nays: None

Motion Approved

Motion to approve Minutes as amended, correcting spelling of Steel
Motion by Mosler, Second by Bradley

Voice Vote:  Ayes: Unanimous
Nays: None

Motion Approved

Public Comments: None

Public Hearings: None

New Business: None

Old Business:
  1. Zoning Ordinance Review

Planning Consultant, Avantini, begins stating that the board has the latest draft of
the Zoning Ordinance. He advises that there was a Saturday meeting which
resulted in a few last minute changes. He states that there was a number of
special land uses in the ordinance and they are taking them and making them
conditional. They will maintain the same standards but they will eliminate the
Public Hearing. Avantini states that they are trying to make this easier for the
developers.

Avantini goes on to discuss materials and how they have changed from the past.
He wanted to give them there parameters of what materials should be so they
know what they have to work with. He states that because they are architects, he
would like Commissioner Kopkowski and Chubb to take a look at this.
Kopkowski states that the big concern would be how the new materials would stand up to the elements down the road, referencing the shingles from the past that were supposed to be better for the environment. She further states that she is in to new products, but there is always a risk. She adds that she would like to see something added regarding if the product fails what will the process be to clean up the situation.

Avantini adds that one of the great things about this ordinance in the site plan review section is that it requires you to maintain your site plan approvals. This is a section that Building Officials use in a lot of places to go after somebody.

Avantini goes on to discuss tree permits and how this section needs to be narrowed down.

Avantini goes on to explain that their intent (and Bob Dohohue will be helping with this) for the downtown area (B2 district) would be a planning and development.

Avantini states that what he is looking to do is begin the review process, whether we have the Planning Commission look at this again, or an around the table meeting with the Council members. The discussion continues regarding the review process. Attorney Wilhelm agrees that this is a good idea and this could eliminate the issues.

Avantini questions if the Planning Commission would prefer to have a workshop first. Vice Chair Bradley states that they could each take a look at it and focus on things that they see the most. Avantini adds that Kelly McIntyre has been sitting in on this for over 3 years and will be available for input.

The conversation continues regarding a date for the workshop. Avantini adds that he and McIntyre will both be able to attend this workshop. The Workshop date has been set for June 28th (as the regularly scheduled meeting).

**No Motion Necessary**

**Tabled Items: None**

**Planning Consultant Report:**

Avantini states that they have a lot of applications coming in, including the revisions for Thomasville and the conditioned rezoning for the corner of 10 Mile and Dixboro. Possible nice apartment complex. The conversation continues regarding Apartments, Condo's and single family dwellings.
Staff Report:

Discussion regarding 3 conflicts on ZBA for the Alexander's appeal, the Board will need to fill 1 vacancy and 2 alternatives. Discussion continues regarding filling in the Interim City Manager with the information on BP Gas Station.

Adjournment:

Approval to Adjourn

Motion by Bradley, Second by Mosier
Voice Vote:   Ayes:  Unanimous
Nays:  None

Motion Approved - Meeting Adjourned - 8:12 p.m.

Scott Lanam, Chairman

Judy Pieper, Recording Secretary

Steve Mosier, Secretary
TO: City of South Lyon
Planning Department
335 S Warren Street
South Lyon, MI 48178

DATE: 4-10-18
MEGA JOB NO.: 14-137

PROJECT NAME / DESCRIPTION:
Thomasville Site Condominium

CLIENT REFERENCE NO.

WE ARE SENDING YOU THE FOLLOWING:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Pages</th>
<th>Copies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-28-18</td>
<td>Site Plan</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site Plan Application</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review fee Check</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remarks:

Prepared by: __________________________  Copy to: __________________________

Shipping Cost: __________________________  Copy to: MEGA Billing Dept.
City of South Lyon
Site Plan Review Application Form

The Following, To Be Completed By Applicant Prior To Submittal Of Site Plan:

1. Developers Name: South Lyon 60 Unit Detached Condo, LLC
   Address: 30073 Schoenherr, Suite 300, Warren, MI 48088
   Phone Number: 586-563-1500

2. Legal Property Owner: South Lyon 60 Unit Detached Condo, LLC
   Address: 30073 Schoenherr, Suite 300, Warren, MI 48088
   Phone Number: 586-563-1500

   Name: Allan Pruss
   Address: 281 Veteran Drive, Fowlerville, MI 48836
   Phone Number: 617-223-3612
   Registration Number: 43168

4. Description of Proposed Development: X New Addition

5. If an appeal of the strict application of the standards of the Zoning Ordinance is to be taken, please so indicate below.

Appeal Requested

For City Use Only:

Initial Site Plan Review Fee paid (date)

Site Plan Application Number

Residential Site Plan

Non-Residential Site Plan
CITY OF SOUTH LYON
SITE PLAN REVIEW CHECK LIST FORM: PAGE 2

Prior to submittal of a site plan, the applicant shall review the following elements for inclusion, where applicable, on the site plan, and shall be in sufficient detail to meet the intent and purpose of the review process. The applicant will check the box in the left hand column marked 'Applicant' only and will mark all applicable elements. A check mark by the applicant for each element involved will indicate that the applicant made the proper notation on the site plan. If the applicant is satisfied that all such information required is properly noted on the site plan, the applicant will sign and date the checklist in the place provided and submit the signed Site Plan Review Application Form with the site plan to the Planning Commission Coordinator. The applicant will check only the column marked 'Applicant'.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Name of Development</th>
<th>Checked by Applicant</th>
<th>Checked by Review Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| 2. Name, address & phone number of          |
| a. Developer       | x                   |                          |
| b. Legal Owner     | x                   |                          |
| c. Designer/Firm   |                     |                          |
| d. Designer Registration No. and Seal       | x                   |                          |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Scale of Drawing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. If less than 3 acres- 1&quot; = 50'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. If more than 3 acres 1&quot; = 100'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Sheet size shall not exceed 24&quot; x 36&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Legend</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 4. Date   | x                   |                          |

| 5. North Point | x                   |                          |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Complete legal description of entire site i.e. Metes &amp; Bounds description if acreage, Parcel, lot #(s) and subdivision name. All Legal descriptions will include:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Gross # of acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Net usable acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Section Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 8 | Topographic elevations at 10-foot intervals on and off the site  
   a. Existing |   |   |
|   | b. Proposed |   |   |
| 9 | Existing drainage courses and existing lake or stream elevations |   |   |
| 10 | The location of all existing & proposed on-site utilities including their connection to off-site utilities  
   a. Water Supply  
   Existing |   |   |
|   | Proposed |   |   |
|   | b. Sanitary Sewer Supply  
   Existing |   |   |
|   | Proposed |   |   |
|   | c. Storm Sewer Supply  
   Existing |   |   |
|   | Proposed |   |   |
|   | d. Electric Supply (above & below ground)  
   Existing |   |   |
|   | Proposed |   |   |
|   | e. Telephone Supply (above & below ground)  
   Existing |   |   |
|   | Proposed |   |   |
|   | f. Gas Supply  
   Existing |   |   |
|   | Proposed |   |   |
|   | g. Other  
   Existing |   |   |
<p>|   | Proposed |   |   |
| 11 | Existing Zoning Classification of the parcel |   |   |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. Existing zoning classification of adjacent parcels</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Existing land use on adjacent parcels</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The location of all existing buildings &amp; structures within 100' of parcel</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The location of all building and structures on site</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. All building/structure heights</td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Location of all off-street parking spaces, including required handicapped spaces, vehicle maneuvering lanes, and service drives</td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Location of all loading/unloading facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Location of all driveways, drives, and turning lanes</td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Location of all driveway, driveways &amp; intersections across abutting streets from parcel</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Names, locations, right-of-way widths, center lines, and pavement widths of all bordering roads, streets, and easements</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Location of all sidewalks</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Critical site dimensions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Along property lines</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Between buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Between parking &amp; buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Between parking &amp; parcel lines</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Between principal &amp; accessory buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Parking space width/length (typical)</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Vehicle maneuvering lane/service drive widths</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Curb radius (entrances)</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Between buildings &amp; parcel lines</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Between buildings &amp; retention/detention ponds</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
24. Building layouts typical floor plans including:
   a. Principal entrances & service entrances
   b. The relationship between units within a building
   c. Exterior building wall & door drawings of all exposed walls

25. Building elevation drawings showing the type and color of exterior building wall facade materials to be covered by signs to be attached to the building

26. Location, size & type of signs to be utilized shall be provided for the site and building's on the site. In instances where signs are not determined due to unknown occupants at the time of site plan review, it shall be required that all signs receive the review and approval of the Planning Commission prior to occupancy of a structure.

27. The location and extent of any outdoor storage areas

28. The type, height & extent of any outdoor storage areas

29. The type & height of screening for trash Receptacles

30. The location, type & extent of any required screening devices.

31. A complete landscape plan identifying all landscape plantings by location, type and height. Where earth berm is used, their height and width shall be noted and a cross section of the berm included

32. The location & type of all outdoor lighting
Date: June 6, 2018

Patrick Brozozowski
Zoning Administrator
335 S Warren
South Lyon, MI 48178

RE: Thomasville Site Condo
Site Plan Revisions

Dear Patrick,

Monument Engineering Group Associates, Inc. (MEGA) Has made the following changes to the previously submitted site plan.

1. Moved sidewalk to back of curb to eliminate landscape strip between walk and road.
2. Min between buildings is 10' as previously approved.
3. Eliminated walking path between units 18-21 and the detention basin to allow these units to have greater depth.
4. Angled rear unit line between units 25 through 30 to allow additional depth in units 28 through 30
5. Rotated house on unit 7 to front on Thomasville Cir.
6. Reduced unit 17 to expand units 14 and 15 to accommodate a larger building footprint

Enclosed please find 15 copies of the revised plans.

Sincerely,

Monument Engineering Group Associates, Inc.

[Signature]

Allan W Pruss, PE, PS
President
Attached are the floor plans and elevations for the 11 Mile Thomasville detached condominium project for your use. Please call or email with any questions.

Thank you,

Vijay Shenoy
Cavaliere Companies
Legacy Construction Group LLC
30078 Schoenherr, Suite 300
Warren, MI 48088
Telephone: (586) 563-1500 Exl. 217
Fax: (586) 563-1200
vshenoy@cavalierecompanies.com

Email Disclaimer
CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The information contained in this transmission may contain privileged and confidential information, including patient information protected by federal and state privacy laws, including HIPAA Privacy Rule (45 C.F.R. Part 164). It is intended only for the use of the person[s] named above. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, dissemination, distribution, or duplication of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender at 586-563-1500 or by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message. Please do not reply via email, or reply at your own risk, with any information that is confidential as email transmission may not be secure.
Memo

To: Reviewing Staff
From: Patrick Brzozowski
Date: 4/26/2018
Re: Review of Revised Final Site Plan for Thomasville Site Condominiums

Revised site plans have been submitted by Monument Engineering Group for the final site plan review of the Thomasville Condominiums. The applicant is simply requesting to change the density for this development, whereas, they were previously approved to build sixty (60-qty) lots at forty (40') feet wide, and have now proposed a total of fifty (50-qty) lots at fifty (50') feet wide. The applicant commented to say that no other changes to landscaping, the approaches off 11mile, or any other changes are reflective in this plan submittal.

Please review the above referenced site plan and return your written comments by May 4, 2018. Please indicate in your comments if the plan complies with City Codes and Standards.

Thank you,

Patrick Brzozowski

Distribution List:

Carmine Avantini, CIB Planning
Mike Darga, Hubbell, Roth & Clark
Chief Collins, SLPD
Chief Kennedy, SLFD
Bob Martin, DPW/WWTP Superintendent
Dennis Smith, Chief Building Official
Patrick Brzozowski

From: Darga Mike <MDarga@hrcengr.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 07, 2018 1:59 PM
To: Patrick Brzozowski
Subject: RE: 14-137 Thomasville Revised Site Plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Patrick,
I don’t have a problem with any of these changes as long as you are OK with the sidewalk being on the back of curb.
Thanks,
Michael P. Darga, PE
Hubbell, Roth & Clark Inc
517-292-1485

From: Patrick Brzozowski <PBrzozowski@southlyenmi.org>
Sent: Thursday, June 7, 2018 10:09 AM
To: Darga Mike <MDarga@hrcengr.com>
Subject: FW: 14-137 Thomasville Revised Site Plan

Hi Mike,

The applicants from Thomasville Condominium project have made another minor change to the site plan. I have the new detail sheet attached, as well as a summary of said changes. If you could please indicate whether or not you have additional comments I would greatly appreciate it. Thank you.

Britney Shea [mailto:bsshea@monumentengineering.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 06, 2018 5:03 PM
To: Patrick Brzozowski
Cc: Al Pruss
Subject: 14-137 Thomasville Revised Site Plan

Patrick,

Attached is a PDF of the revised Thomasville Site Plan as well as a summary of changes. Please let me know if you need anything else.

Thanks
Patrick,

We have reviewed the proposed site plan change from 40 foot wide lots to 50 foot wide lots and do not have any major objections. The plans will still need to be submitted to this office for a final construction plan review prior to our recommendation for final approval and construction.

Thanks,

Michael P. Darga, PE
Hubbell, Roth & Clark Inc
517-292-1485
From: Mike Boven  
Sent: Wednesday, May 23, 2018 1:54 PM  
To: Patrick Brzozowski  
Subject: RE: Thomasville Site Condominiums

The only comment I have is to make sure the water system is looped to avoid dead ends, which it seems to show.

MICHAEL BOVEN  
Utilities and DPW Superintendent  
City of South Lyon  
23500 Dixboro Rd.  
South Lyon, MI 48178  
(248) 437-4006

From: Patrick Brzozowski  
Sent: Wednesday, May 23, 2018 1:51 PM  
To: Mike Boven <mboven@southlyonmi.org>  
Subject: Thomasville Site Condominiums

Hi Mike,

I don’t believe I received updated feedback from DPW regarding the Revised Site Plan for Thomasville Site Condominiums. Please let me know, thank you.

Sincerely,

Patrick Brzozowski  
Zoning Administrator  
335 S Warren  
South Lyon, MI 48178  
248-437-1735
Memorandum

To: Patrick Brzozowski, Zoning Administrator

From: Chief Lloyd T. Collins

Subject: Review of Final Site Plan for Thomasville

Date: April 27, 2018

I have reviewed the above-captioned site plan, which was forwarded to the Police Department for comment. I also conducted a visual inspection of the area in question.

Based upon my review, I have the following concerns with respect to the site plan submitted at this time. Exterior lighting for the condominiums, drives, and parking areas should comport with current crime prevention standards.
Patrick Brzozowski

From: Fire Chief  
Sent: Thursday, June 07, 2018 4:16 PM  
To: Patrick Brzozowski  
Subject: Re: Thomasville Site Condominiums

My new inspector Al Matthews spent most of the day reviewing the plans. I am not sure if he completes the review today. Rest assured this plan is a priority and will be finished soon. Tomorrow I will check his process and update you.

Robert Vogel, FO  
Fire Chief  
City of South Lyon Fire Department  
248-437-2616

On Jun 7, 2018, at 4:13 PM, Patrick Brzozowski <PBrzozowski@southlyonmi.org> wrote:

Good Afternoon,

Had your staff made any progress reviewing the Thomasville Site Plan? Please let me know at your earliest convenience. Also, they made a minor revision to the Site Plan, which I have attached and summarized the changes below:

1. Moved sidewalk to back of curb to eliminate landscape strip between walk and road.  
2. Min between buildings is 10' as previously approved.  
3. Eliminated walking path between units 18-21 and the detention basin to allow these units to have greater depth.  
4. Angled rear unit line between units 25 through 30 to allow additional depth in units 28 through 30  
5. Rotated house on unit 7 to front on Thomasville Cir.  
6. Reduced unit 17 to expand units 14 and 15 to accommodate a larger building footprint

Thank you.
From: Patrick Brzozowski
Sent: Wednesday, May 23, 2018 1:56 PM
To: Fire Chief <Firechief@southlyonmi.org>
Subject: RE: Thomasville Site Condominiums

Thank you very much Chief.

From: Fire Chief
Sent: Wednesday, May 23, 2018 1:55 PM
To: Patrick Brzozowski
Subject: RE: Thomasville Site Condominiums

Hello,

I have received the prints however I am in the process of hiring a new Fire Inspector. I will pass along the prints next week to him. Mr. Matthews is very experienced inspector/print reviewer and I believe we will have a quick as possible turn-around.

Sorry for the delay.

Robert Vogel, FO
Fire Chief
South Lyon Fire Department
T: 248-437-2616
C: 810-588-8238

From: Patrick Brzozowski
Sent: Wednesday, May 23, 2018 1:49 PM
To: Fire Chief <Firechief@southlyonmi.org>
Subject: Thomasville Site Condominiums

Good Afternoon,

I don’t believe I received updated feedback from SLFD regarding the Revised Site Plan for Thomasville Site Condominiums. Please let me know, thank you.

Sincerely,

Patrick Brzozowski
Zoning Administrator
335 S Warren
South Lyon, MI 48178
248-437-1735

<14-137_Site Plan_060618.pdf>
Patrick Brzozowski

From: Patrick Brzozowski
Sent: Thursday, May 03, 2018 10:00 AM
To: 'Dennis Smith'
Subject: RE: Thomasville Site Condos

No thank you Dennis, appreciate you letting me know.

From: Dennis Smith [mailto:dsmith@safebuilt.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 02, 2018 3:41 PM
To: Patrick Brzozowski
Subject: Thomasville Site Condos

Patrick:

I have reviewed the amended plans for Thomasville. I see no reason to add additional comments, however my comments from my July 2016 memo still apply.

Do you need anything further?

Dennis S. Smith C.B.O./C.F.I
Chief Building Official

City of Flushing
City of Montrose
City of Owosso
City of South Lyon
Office: 248.437.5255
City of Wixom
Office:248.624.0880
Cell: 248-568-7762

SAFEBuilt is a team of professionals that have been providing customized community development solutions to public agencies for over 30 years. So whether clients are looking for part-time or full-time for their Community Planning, Building or Code Enforcement Department, we have a program that fits their needs
CONSTRUCTION & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
MEMORANDUM

TO: Camille Avantini
FROM: Deans S. Smith, Building Official
DATE: July 7, 2016
SUBJECT: Thomasville Site Condominium Project

I have reviewed the above stated site plan and note the following: Conditional approval recommended.

BUILDING CODE:

1. All construction must comply with the appropriate construction codes in effect at the time of construction.
2. Ground surfaces in parking lot also must have slopes no greater than 1:48 in order to comply with Barrier Free Design rules.
3. Exterior lighting shall be provided to indicate compliance with exterior means of egress requirements.
4. Surface drainage shall be diverted to a storm sewer drainage system. Lots shall be graded to drain surface water away from foundation walls. The grade shall fall a minimum of 6 inches within the first 10 feet.
5. A preconstruction meeting is required prior to the start of the project.
June 7, 2018

Planning Commission
City of South Lyon
335 S. Warren Street
South Lyon, MI 48178

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject:</th>
<th>Thomasville Site Condominium, PD Rezoning Preliminary Site Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description of Application:</td>
<td>The applicant is requesting Planned Development rezoning and Preliminary PD Site Plan approval for the proposed development of a 50 unit single-family residential development on an 11.635 acre parcel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location:</td>
<td>South side of 11 mile, 1/4 mile west of Pontiac Trail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Applicant: | Lorenzo Cavaliere
30078 Schoenherr Road
Suite 300
Warren, MI 48088 |
| Zoning: | RM-1, Multiple-Family Residential District |
| Plans Dated: | March 19, 2018 |

Dear Commissioners:

We have reviewed the above revised Planned Development (PD) Rezoning and Preliminary PD Site Plan request to construct a 50 unit, detached single-family residential site condominium development fronting 11 Mile Road and abutting Colonial Acres. The site is triangular in shape and bordered by 11 Mile Road and single-family residential to the north; the railroad and condominium units to the south; and condominium units to the east. A pond is also located at the northwest corner of the site, next to the railroad track and 11 Mile Road.
This property was originally approved for the construction of fifteen (15), 6-unit condominium buildings with outside parking, identical to those immediately east of the site. If developed under the original plan, a total of 90 units would be constructed.

In November 2015, the previous applicant, Tom Schroder, applied to the City for PD Rezoning and Preliminary PD site plan approval. The Planning Commission recommended and City Council gave preliminary approval of a 60 unit single family residential development.

This revised application for PD Rezoning and Preliminary PD Site Plan approval is a reduction in the number of units (from 60 to 50 units), with an increase in the individual condominium lot sizes. As the November 2015 application did not receive Final Site Plan approval, this 50 unit application is considered a “new” and not an amendment to the previous plan.

CURRENT ZONING REQUIREMENTS

The RM-1 District allows the development of single-family residential units as a permitted use, provided the dimensional requirements of the R-3 District are met. The R-3 District permits a maximum density of 3.7 units per acre (Section 102-147n), Notes to schedule of regulations) with a minimum lot size of 8,750 square feet. Based upon the total acreage, this means that 44 units would be allowed by right under the R-3 District while a total of 50 units are proposed. To develop the site as shown, the applicant must utilize the PD, Planned Development Option.

PD, PLANNED DEVELOPMENT REVIEW PROCESS

PD, Planned Development Rezoning and corresponding Preliminary PD Plan approval would provide general acceptance of the road layout, lot (unit) sizes, open space, preliminary landscaping, and housing designs. A public hearing is scheduled for June 14, 2018, as required under the ordinance, for PD Rezoning and Preliminary PD Plan review. The Planning Commission will then make recommendation to the City Council for action. If the PD Rezoning, and corresponding Preliminary PD Plan, is approved, the applicant will return to the Planning Commission for Final PD Plan review and recommendation to City Council. All of the requirements for site plan submissions in Article IV of the zoning ordinance must be complied with at that time.

PD, PLANNED DEVELOPMENT REZONING REVIEW STANDARDS
Section 102-382 of the zoning ordinance lists the following standards that must be met for consideration of a Planned Development rezoning request:

(a) The uses proposed will have a beneficial effect, in terms of public health, safety, welfare or convenience or any combination thereof, on present and potential surrounding land uses. The uses proposed will encourage a more efficient use of public utilities and services and lessen the burden on circulation systems, surrounding properties, and the environment. This beneficial effect for the city (not the developer) shall be one which could not be achieved under any other single zoning classification.

Review Comment: The proposed use will create less density than the originally-approved and the previously recommended attached single-family condominiums and be easier for purchasers to finance. It could also improve access for the existing Colonial Acres development and provide moderately-priced new construction housing for the community.

(b) The uses proposed shall be consistent with the master plan of future land use for the city.

Review Comment: The proposed future land use designation for the site is Suburban Residential, which includes “Planned developments that may contain a mix of suburban and traditional residential.”

(c) The zoning is warranted by the design and amenities incorporated in the development proposal.

Review Comment: Given the unique characteristics of the site (unusual shape, a pond, proximity to a railroad, etc.) a Planned Development is more appropriate than a project developed under RM-1, Multiple-Family Residential zoning regulations, or even the density requirements of the R-3, Single-Family Residential District.

(d) Usable open space shall be provided, at least equal to the total of the minimum usable open space which would be required for each of the component uses of the development. The city may, if deemed appropriate, require for planned developments more or less open space than that required by this chapter.

Review Comment: Given the challenging shape of the lot and unique characteristics of the site, the open space is provided between the units that back up to one another, thereby preventing the creation of through-lots. The pond at the northwest corner of the site is also being maintained as-is, the trees along 11 Mile Road will be preserved, and a small pocket park can be added just west of the pond.

(e) Off-street parking sufficient to meet the minimum required by section 102-476 shall be provided and the city may, if deemed appropriate by the city require for planned developments more or less parking than that required by this chapter.
Review Comment: Each unit will have a garage and the amount of parking required under the proposed PD rezoning will be the same as that under the R-3 zoning designation.

(f) Landscaping shall be provided so as to ensure that proposed uses will be adequately buffered from one another and from surrounding public and private property. The city may, if deemed appropriate, require for planned unit developments more or less landscaping than that required by this chapter.

Review Comment: Proposed landscape buffering is provided along the south and east property lines, abutting the existing condominium units. Any additional landscaping needed to buffer properties will be determined under Final PD Plan review.

(g) Vehicular and pedestrian circulation, allowing safe, convenient, uncongested and well-defined circulation within and to the district shall be provided.

Review Comment: Vehicular access to the property will be from 11 Mile Road and meets the above criteria, while improving accessibility for the existing Colonial Acres project. Sidewalks are also provided within the project, to be reviewed as part of the Preliminary PD Plan review.

(h) Natural and historical features of the district shall reasonably be protected and preserved.

Review Comment: The pond and perimeter trees on the northern edge of the property will be preserved under this project.

PRELIMINARY PD PLAN REVIEW COMMENTS

Section 102-131(a) of the City of South Lyon Zoning Ordinance lists the submittal requirements for site plan review. Based on our review of the proposal, discussions with the applicant, and comments received from the Planning Commission during previous reviews of the project, we offer the following for your consideration:

1. Overall Density. Section 102-387(b)(1), General design standards, of the ordinance states that "The maximum permitted residential density for single-family dwelling shall not exceed the density allowed for the area currently zoned single-family as shown on the zoning district map." The current zoning designation for the subject property is RM-1 but the ordinance states that "The standards of the schedule of regulations applicable to the R-3 one-family residential district shall apply as minimum standards when one-family detached dwellings are erected." Footnote (n) for the R-3 District also states that "Single-family detached condominiums in condominium subdivisions shall meet all requirements and standards of the district in which such dwellings are to be constructed, including minimum floor area requirements, and excepting minimum lot size, which shall be so developed that the number of dwelling units per gross acre shall not exceed the following: (4) R-3, 3.7 dwelling units per gross acre." The applicant is requesting 50 units, to meet the benefit of
providing moderately priced new housing, citing that the overall density will still be much lower than the previously recommended 60 units and close to the 5.0 units per acre. A waiver will have to be granted to allow an overall density of approximately 5.3 units per acre.

2. Area and Bulk. The proposed site was reviewed in accordance with Section 102-459, Open space preservation option, as described in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Provided</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area</td>
<td>8750 sq. ft. minimum</td>
<td>Average of 4200 s.f.</td>
<td>A waiver will be needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Width</td>
<td>60 ft. minimum</td>
<td>50 ft. minimum</td>
<td>A waiver will be needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Density</td>
<td>3.7 units/acre max.</td>
<td>Approximately 5.2 units/acre</td>
<td>A waiver will be needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front yard setback</td>
<td>25 ft.</td>
<td>25 ft.</td>
<td>In compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(single-family)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side yard setback</td>
<td>6/10 ft.</td>
<td>Varies from 15/30 to 20/40.</td>
<td>A waiver will be needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear yard</td>
<td>35 ft.</td>
<td>Varies from 30 feet to 50 feet</td>
<td>A waiver will be needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Height</td>
<td>2 stories max. 25-ft.</td>
<td>No elevations provided</td>
<td>Not in compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(single-family)</td>
<td>max. building height</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Coverage</td>
<td>25% maximum</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>In compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(buildings)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Overall Layout. The overall layout of the proposed development seems to allow for reasonable sized lots, ample open space, and straight-forward circulation.

4. Emergency Access. The Police and Fire Departments requested the installation of a paved, gated emergency access drive to 11 Mile Road. This has been provided and details for construction and maintenance will have to be provided at the time of Final PD Plan review. They also indicated the need to have the main drive (Lexington Drive) connect with the drive for Colonial Acres to the north for improved emergency access. The previous property owners tried to work with Colonial Acres to obtain a cross access easement to allow the connection of Lexington Drive within Colonial Acres. At this time, Colonial Acres is not interested in pursuing this agreement. For the time being, the City requests that Lexington Drive be paved to the property line (should an agreement come to fruition) and that easement language be included as a condition of site plan approval.

5. Park Area. A pond exists at the southwest corner of the property, as well as open areas between the rears of units on Lexington Circle. A walking path is provided within the development. The previous plan identified benches near the pond, however, this plan
does not show any. All park improvements from original plan must be included on the site plan. We would like to see the benches installed.

6. **Preliminary Landscape Plan.** The preliminary landscape plan provides both the required street trees and replacement trees. In addition, the planting size for almost all of the proposed trees exceeds ordinance requirements and is considered a benefit of the project. Since residents from the existing condominium units to the south and east expressed concern about buffering between developments, the landscape plan indicates the planting of evergreen trees (minimum 10' height) along the property line.

7. **Building Elevations.** The use of high-quality building elevations and materials is critical to the successful development of a small lot, single-family project such as this. The applicant has provided sketch elevations and floor plans for the proposed units. The variety in building/architectural details is limited and similar on each of the four (4) home floor plans. More variation is strongly encouraged to make each unit different. More detail—including material description and samples will be reviewed in detail during Final Site Plan Planned Development approval.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Based upon the above discussion, we recommend that the Planning Commission recommend approval to City Council for the Planned Development rezoning and Preliminary PD Site Plan for the Thomasville development, conditioned upon the approval following:

a) a waiver to allow an average lot area of 4,200 s.f.;
b) a waiver to allow a minimum lot width of 50 ft.;
c) a waiver to allow an overall density of 5.2 units per acre;
d) a waiver to allow a setback of 15 feet between buildings;
e) the installation of landscape buffering abutting colonial acres to be installed at the beginning of the project/construction;
f) inclusion of language for a future cross access agreement with Colonial Acres via Lexington Drive;
g) Submission of revised building elevations and material samples to the Planning Commission during final site plan review; and
h) Draft condominium documents to be submitted during final site plan approval.

If you have any further questions, please contact us at 810-335-3800.
Sincerely,

CIB PLANNING

Kelly McIntyre

Senior Principal Planner
CITY OF SOUTH LYON
PUBLIC HEARING

A Public Hearing will be held by and before the Planning Commission of the City of South Lyon at City Hall, 335 S. Warren, South Lyon, Michigan, on Thursday, June 14, 2018 at 7:00 p.m., or as soon thereafter as the agenda will permit, to consider Preliminary PD Site Plan approval.

The subject property located at the South East corner of 11 Mile Road and Dixboro Road, and the Parcel # is 21-19-126-002.

Comments can be expressed at the Public Hearing, or written comments can be directed to the attention of the Planning Department, City of South Lyon, 335 S. Warren, South Lyon, Michigan 48178, or by e-mail to pbrzozowski@southlyonmi.org no later than 3:00 p.m. one day prior to the date of the meeting. If you have questions you may contact the Planning Department by e-mail or by phone at (248) 437-1735.

The application on file can be viewed at the Planning Department, City of South Lyon, 335 S. Warren, South Lyon, Michigan 48178.

Notices and information for public hearings will also be posted on the City website at www.southlyonmi.org.

______________________________
Lisa Deaton
City Clerk

NOTICE: Persons with disabilities needing accommodations for effective participation in this meeting should contact the City Clerk by calling (248) 437-1735 at least two working days in advance of the meeting. An attempt will be made to make reasonable accommodations.
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