

The Special/Study Meeting of the Troy City Planning Commission was called to order by Chairman James Reece at 7:32 P.M. on Tuesday August 25, 1992 in the Troy City Hall.

1. ROLL CALL

|          |        |                         |              |
|----------|--------|-------------------------|--------------|
| Present: | Reece  | Melaragni               | Absent: Lepp |
|          | Starr  | Kramer                  |              |
|          | Wright | Ethier (7:40 P.M.)      |              |
|          | Storrs | Chamberlain (7:40 P.M.) |              |

(The following resolution was presented near the end of the meeting)

Moved by Ethier

Supported by Wright

RESOLVED, that Planning Commissioner Lepp be excused as he is out of the City.

Yeas: All Present (8)

Absent: Lepp

MOTION CARRIED

2. MINUTES - Regular Meeting of August 11, 1992

Moved by Melaragni

Supported by Wright

RESOLVED, that the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of August 11, 1992 be approved as printed.

Yeas: All Present (6)

Absent: Lepp, Ethier, Chamberlain

MOTION CARRIED

STUDY ITEMS

3. BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS REPORT

Mr. Wright commented on some of the actions recently taken by the Board of Zoning Appeals, including their denial of a request by Veratex, at the southwest corner of Maple Road and Allen Drive, where a variance was requested in order to permit reduced parking bay sizes, and thus to increase the available parking at their site.

4. CURRENT DEVELOPMENT REPORT

Mr. Keisling noted that the City Council has now referred to the Planning Commission the request of Etkin Equities to consider a Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment which would permit a limited amount of research activity within office buildings. This request is in line with the proposed Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment which the Commission has been considering at recent meetings.

Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Ethier arrived.

5. PROPOSED ZONING ORDINANCE TEXT AMENDMENT - Reorganization of C-F District Text, Including Provisions for Elderly Care and Child Care Facilities

Mr. Keisling explained that a Public Hearing was held at the July 14 Regular Meeting in order to consider proposals to amend the text of the C-F District which would enable the establishment of care facilities for the elderly, as well as child care facilities, within such Districts. After reviewing the C-F District text, and the provisions proposed to be included, the Planning Department proposed a more extensive reorganization of the total C-F District text. Following discussion of these text proposals at the July 28 Study Meeting, action was further tabled in order to enable discussion at this Study Meeting, hopefully involving representatives of the Troy Futures Group. In order to accommodate this schedule, the Public Hearing originally scheduled for the

August 11 Regular Meeting, in order to consider the full series of proposed amendments to the C-F District, was adjourned until the September 8 Regular Meeting.

Mr. Keisling noted that, in line with the Commission's request, Ginny Norvell and Julie Butler of the Human Services Task Force related to the Troy Futures Group were present in order to provide input regarding the present and potential situation related to elderly care facilities. Mike Damone, one of the petitioners related to the proposed elderly care facility, was also present.

Ms. Norvell and Ms. Butler presented a series of statistics related to the rapid growth in elderly population throughout the country. It was their feeling that this trend would also affect Troy, and increase the need for housing and facilities for the elderly. It was noted that specific figures or projections relative to the City of Troy were not available. Ms. Norvell commented that the waiting list for senior citizen housing units in Troy is at least two years. The five ways of accommodating elderly residents were indicated as (1) within their home or a relative's home; (2) housing for the elderly; (3) congregate care facilities; (4) assisted living facilities; (5) nursing homes. The development now proposed by Mr. Damone would be an assisted living facility. Ms. Butler noted that such facilities are now in operation in Southfield and Sterling Heights. In addition to the types of facilities listed, she noted that there is also a need for Elder Day Care Centers, and for Respite Care Facilities, which provide a short-term alternative to living in a family member's home. It was further noted that 16% of the population over 65 years of age presently require assisted care of some level, while almost 40% of the population over 75 years of age require such care.

In the course of the Commission's discussion, they considered the alternative of providing for care facilities for the elderly under Special Use provisions within R-1 Districts. Mr. Storrs suggested that the transitional locational provisions which occur in the child care center text within R-1 Districts could also be included within the proposed C-F District text. He further raised a question as to whether it would be necessary to specifically prohibit the construction of apartment buildings or multiple-family residential dwellings within the proposed text. Those present appeared to generally support the overall text reorganization and amendment proposal. It was noted that the Public Hearing on this matter was adjourned until the September 8 Regular Meeting.

6. PROPOSED ZONING ORDINANCE TEXT AMENDMENT - Parking in Residential Yards

Mr. Keisling noted that Mr. Letzmann had advised that complaints are received from time to time regarding the parking of vehicles in residential front yards. Most of the complaints relate to the unsightliness of this activity, and the damage to the property which often results. The Law Department's concern is that the Zoning Ordinance does not presently properly cover this activity, and he has asked that the staff and potentially the Planning Commission review this matter.

Mr. Keisling noted that this request has provided an opportunity for the Planning Department and the Building Department to review the introductory portions of the Zoning Ordinance segment regarding Parking Requirements (Sections 40.20.00 through 40.20.05). Section 40.20.03, which has generally been interpreted as relating to residential parcels, has raised several questions over the years and is probably in need of review and updating.

In the course of the Commission's discussion of this matter with Mr. Letzmann and Mr. Keisling, it was noted that Section 40.20.03 basically provides that required off-street parking spaces cannot be located in the required front yard. This provision does not preclude the parking of additional cars in the front yard, as long as the required spaces are provided elsewhere, such as within a garage. Mr. Letzmann commented that the unlimited parking of vehicles within residential front yards can have a detrimental effect on the character and quality of a residential area. Mr. Reece suggested that consideration be given to a requirement which would provide for a minimum amount of landscaped area within residential front yards, rather than attempting to prescribe specifically where vehicles can be parked. It was noted that some residential subdivision lots, involving circular drives, etc., may have a difficult time meeting a minimum landscaped area requirement. It was decided that the Planning Department will further investigate such a text amendment proposal, and will return to the Commission with the results of their study.