

Chair Lambert called the Regular meeting of the Troy City Planning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. on August 9, 2022, in the Council Chamber of the Troy City Hall. Chair Lambert presented opening remarks relative to the role of the Planning Commission and procedure of tonight's meeting.

1. ROLL CALL

Present:

Toby Buechner
Carlton M. Faison
Michael W. Hutson
Tom Krent
David Lambert
Lakshmi Malalahalli
Marianna Perakis
Sadek Rahman
John J. Tagle

Also Present:

R. Brent Savidant, Community Development Director
Ben Carlisle, Carlisle Wortman Associates
Julie Quinlan Dufrane, Assistant City Attorney
Kathy L. Czarnecki, Recording Secretary

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Resolution # PC-2022-08-043

Moved by: Krent
Support by: Rahman

RESOLVED, To approve the Agenda as prepared.

Yes: All present (9)

MOTION CARRIED

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – July 26, 2022

Resolution # PC-2022-08-044

Moved by: Buechner
Support by: Faison

RESOLVED, To approve the minutes of the July 26, 2022 Regular meeting as submitted.

Yes: Buechner, Faison, Hutson, Krent, Lambert, Malalahalli, Rahman, Tagle
Abstain: Perakis

MOTION CARRIED

4. PUBLIC COMMENT – For Items Not on the Agenda

There was no one present who wished to speak.

PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT

5. PUBLIC HEARING – PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT (File Number PUD 2020-0018) – Proposed Concept Development Plan for Long Lake and Crooks Masterplan Development, Northwest Corner of Long Lake and Crooks, Section 8, Currently Zoned O (Office) Zoning District

Mr. Carlisle said the Planned Unit Development (PUD) application before the Board this evening is a formal submittal. He said the Planning Commission discussed two draft concept plans presented by the applicant at their January 12, 2021 and February 8, 2022 meetings.

Mr. Carlisle explained the three-step PUD application process and addressed the intent of a PUD application. He addressed highlights of the concept plan, proposed mix of uses, the changes since last reviewed, the four separate development areas proposed and associated amenities within those areas. Mr. Carlisle reviewed the applicant's proposed development parameters, relating to maximum square footage, minimum and maximum number of floors, minimum and maximum building height, and dimensional setbacks.

Mr. Carlisle said the applicant seeks flexibility to build any development area in any sequence, with one restriction that development area 4 (hotel/residential) and retail/restaurant pads can be built as part of any phase except they cannot be the first development built on site. He said the applicant seeks flexibility of all permitted and special uses in Office Mixed (OM), Office (O), or General Business (GB) zoning districts.

In summary, Mr. Carlisle asked the Board to consider public comments at the Public Hearing, and as part of their deliberation, to consider 1) the proposed development guidelines relating to building height and setbacks; 2) the proposed permitted and special uses; 3) if the PUD Standards in Section 11.03 of the Zoning Ordinance are met; and 4) if the proposed benefits are commensurate with the requested relief/development flexibility.

Mr. Savidant clarified a modification/correction to the development guidelines proposed by the applicant. Development area 1 (hotel/residential) should read 350,000 square feet, not 105,000 square feet.

Discussion among administration and Planning Commission:

- Flexibility in terms of what gets built, timing and location as proposed by applicant.
- Significance in determining appropriate uses and building heights.
- Gateway to North Troy and wayfinding signage.
- PUD Development Agreement.
 - Ms. Dufrane stated agreement is essentially standard agreement language except for unique aspects relating to development phases and development areas.
- Urban Residential (UR) zoning district; high density residential district in line with Master Plan.
- Preservation of State-regulated wetlands.
- Tree survey and mitigation; determined at each development phase, must meet site plan requirements.
- Green space/open space must be generally consistent with approved concept plan; what, where, size, whether for public use determined at each development phase and must meet site plan requirements.
- Housing types must be generally consistent with approved concept plan and must meet site plan requirements.

Anthony Antone of Kojoian introduced the project team present in the audience; Project Architect Chris Beck of Gensler, Attorney Tyler Tennent of Dawda Mann PLC, Environmental Engineer Leslie Accardo of PEA, and CEO of Hunter Pasteur Homes Randy Wertheimer.

Mr. Antone stated the residential component (development area 1) would be the first phase of development. He said the proposed uses for the overall project are residential, office and retail and are defined in the PUD Development Agreement. Mr. Antone said the development configuration is based on the market and potential clients. He noted configuration might change during the development process. Mr. Antone said the State-regulated wetlands (1.9 acres) will remain as is. He addressed proposed development areas, phases and amenities. He indicated adjacent businesses were notified of the proposed project.

Mr. Rahman asked if the center building could be moved to the street and the parking structure moved to an internal location. At the request of Mr. Rahman, an image was displayed on the wall monitor depicting a large green courtyard surrounded by building(s).

Mr. Antone stated moving the center building to the street would not be sensible from an architectural or marketing standpoint.

Mr. Wertheimer said placing residential the furthest point from a heavily trafficked and noisy street is essential for success. He noted the sequence of development phases would be residential, amenities, office, restaurant and hotel. Mr. Wertheimer said development area 3 would be flexible on what the market determines.

Ms. Perakis expressed dissatisfaction in what she views as no changes in the concept plan since last presented to the Board even though the Board offered specific suggestions. She said there is nothing unique about the proposed *Gateway to North Troy* development. Ms. Perakis recommended suggestions for the creation of a destination for residents to live, work and play: 1) phase 1 should be a pedestrian boulevard along with paths and natural features; 2) the parking structure with retail on the first floor should be the anchor building in the center of the PUD; 3) the pedestrian boulevard should run parallel to Long Lake with retail along Long Lake that fronts the pedestrian boulevard; 4) access to the pedestrian boulevard should be off Crooks and Corporate Drive. At the request of Ms. Perakis, images were displayed on the wall monitor that depicted existing parking structures located in Ann Arbor, East Lansing and Detroit. Ms. Perakis referenced page 192 of the Master Plan, “Strategy: Create a community gathering space” and addressed the application’s relationship to the PUD Standards.

Mr. Wertheimer stated details of the concept plan would come forth with each phase and at site plan submittal. He said the team’s focus is on the first step of approval of a concept plan and they look forward to providing specific details with individual site plan submittals. Mr. Wertheimer said the project team is asking for a consensus on the uses, building sizes and building heights at this time. He stated that 25% of the site is open green space. Mr. Wertheimer apologized if he is misinterpreting the PUD process and addressed the importance of landscape and architectural designs that would be presented at site plan review and approval.

Ms. Malalahalli said the concept plan appears industrial, like four rectangular Lego blocks with too much parking. She encouraged a concept plan that would *wow* the Board, to incorporate a promenade or plaza area, a connected pathway and a community stage to engage a public destination.

Mr. Tagle said it appears the development team has not *sold* the Planning Commission on its concept plan and encouraged the team to share a presentation inclusive of ideas, graphics and words that would get the Board excited about the project. He asked the applicant to address the product the team envisions for development area 1.

Mr. Wertheimer said the product would be a five to seven story luxury residential building similar to what one sees in Birmingham, West Bloomfield and Corktown. He identified some amenities as a rooftop pool, an expansive workout facility, a work-from-home office setting, state-of-the-art technology and concierge services.

Mr. Krent referenced a proposed development project at the former K-Mart Headquarters that *wowed* the Planning Commission with its pavilion style development.

Chair Lambert suggested a connected hub for public transportation.

Mr. Antone addressed the change in the configuration of office buildings since the pandemic. He said offices are becoming highly amenitized to bring employees back to what was the standard office building. Mr. Antone noted proposed parking is less than two acres of the overall project.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

- Laury Shah, 1448 Brentwood Drive, Troy; addressed personal visions of developing property; native grasses, lush vegetation, botanical garden, minimum height of buildings, noise buffer.
- Wei Cao, 6816 Vernmoor, Troy; shared concurrence with Planning Commission comments on the parking structure and amenities, encouraged a gathering destination and pedestrian boulevard.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

Chair Lambert announced the Planning Department received 10 to 15 email messages, copies of which were placed in front of Board members prior to tonight's meeting. Chair Lambert shared the messages expressed concerns with the destruction of green space and building heights.

Mr. Hutson said he would like to see the PUD Development Agreement be modified to include: 1) reduce the three buildings to a maximum height of eight (8) stories; 2) that no development phase should commence until the first development phase is complete; and 3) that the permitted and special uses are specifically identified. Mr. Hutson said he agrees with comments expressed by Ms. Perakis.

Ms. Dufrane stated the Planning Commission as a recommending body to City Council is responsible to forward either an affirmative or negative recommendation to City Council. In response to the Board's query if it is appropriate to postpone the item, she responded it would be reasonable to postpone the application one time should the Board desire.

Resolution # PC-2022-08-045

Moved by: Lambert
Support by: Buechner

RESOLVED, To postpone action on the PUD application to give the applicant an opportunity to consider input from the Commissioners on the overall concept plan and to give the Board a feel for what the entire project will look like.

Discussion on the motion on the floor.

Ms. Perakis addressed specific language she would like to incorporate in the Resolution as relates to parking structure location, pedestrian pathway, promenade/boulevard, relationship to Master Plan vision, uniqueness and creation of a destination point.

Mr. Antone and Mr. Wertheimer asked the Board to realistically consider the traffic impact and accessibility to the site as relates to the placement of the buildings.

Mr. Faison suggested design specifics should not be attached to the Resolution.

Mr. Hutson suggested to postpone the item with no specificity attached to the Resolution.

Ms. Dufrane said the attorney's office would collaborate with the applicant's attorney to tighten up the language on permitted and special uses.

Vote on the motion on the floor.

Yes: All present (9)

MOTION CARRIED

Ms. Perakis addressed existing traffic problems in the area and cautioned the applicant to not come back with an excuse that the traffic impact would prevent a pedestrian boulevard.

OTHER ITEMS

6. **PUBLIC COMMENT** – For Items on the Agenda

There was no one present who wished to speak.

7. **PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENT**


Mr. Carlisle addressed the Master Plan Update with respect to the release of census data in May 2023. He said during City staff discussion, it's been determined that the policy changes and amendments to the updated Master Plan would not be fundamentally impacted by updated census data, and it is recommended to continue with the process of finalizing the draft Master Plan and start the adoption process. Mr. Carlisle said the 2023 census data when released would be added as an addendum to the updated Master Plan.

After a brief discussion, Board members agreed to go forward with the Master Plan Update.

8. **ADJOURN**

The Regular meeting of the Planning Commission adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "David Lambert", written in a cursive style.

David Lambert, Chair

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Kathy L. Czarnecki", written in a cursive style.

Kathy L. Czarnecki, Recording Secretary

G:\Planning Commission Minutes\2022 PC Minutes\FINAL\2022 08 09 FINAL.docx