

## PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING AGENDA REGULAR MEETING

Marianna Perakis, Chair, Lakshmi Malalahalli, Vice Chair Toby Buechner, Carlton Faison, Tyler Fox, Michael W. Hutson, Tom Krent, Dave Lambert and John J. Tagle

October 28, 2025 7:00 P.M. Council Chambers

- 1. ROLL CALL
- 2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- 3. <u>APPROVAL OF MINUTES</u> October 14, 2025
- 4. PUBLIC COMMENT For Items Not on the Agenda

### **ZONING ORDINANCE TEXT AMENDMENT**

 ZONING ORDINANCE TEXT AMENDMENT (File Number 258) – Neighborhood Node Revisions

#### **OTHER ITEMS**

- 6. PUBLIC COMMENT For Items on the Agenda
- 7. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENT
- 8. ADJOURN

Chair Perakis called the Regular meeting of the Troy City Planning Commission to order at 7:01 p.m. on October 14, 2025, in the Council Board Room of the Troy City Hall. Chair Perakis and Vice Chair Malalahalli presented opening remarks relative to the role of the Planning Commission and procedure for tonight's meeting.

### ROLL CALL

#### Present:

Toby Buechner
Carlton M. Faison
Tyler Fox
Tom Krent
David Lambert
Lakshmi Malalahalli
Marianna Perakis
John J. Tagle

#### Absent:

Michael W. Hutson

#### Also Present:

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

### 2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

### Resolution # PC-2025-10-058

Moved by: Fox Support by: Faison

**RESOLVED**, To approve the agenda as prepared.

Yes: All present (8)

Absent: Hutson

#### **MOTION CARRIED**

# 3. <u>APPROVAL OF MINUTES</u> – September 23, 2025

#### Resolution # PC-2025-10-059

Moved by: Buechner Support by: Krent

**RESOLVED**, To approve the minutes of September 23, 2025 Regular meeting as submitted.

Yes: All present (8)

Absent: Hutson

### **MOTION CARRIED**

4. <u>PUBLIC COMMENT</u> – For Items Not on the Agenda

There was no one present who wished to speak.

### SPECIAL USE APPROVAL

5. <u>PUBLIC HEARING - SPECIAL USE APPLICATION (SU JPLN2025-0018)</u> – Proposed Driveline Troy LLC Vehicle Sales, West side of Dequindre, North of Fourteen Mile (33475 Dequindre, PIN 88-20-36-476-073), Section 36, Currently Zoned IB (Integrated Industrial and Business) District

Mr. Carlisle reviewed the Special Use and Preliminary Site Plan application for the Driveline Troy LLC Vehicle Sales. He addressed the repurposing of an existing building, parking, reduction in impervious surface, significant landscape improvements and building façade improvements.

In summary, Mr. Carlisle expressed support for the overall project. He asked the Planning Commission to discuss with the applicant if any auto repair would be conducted on site, trash removal and building architectural features.

Mr. Carlisle asked the Planning Commission in its deliberations to consider if the application meets the Site Plan Review Design Standards (Section 8.06) and Special Use Approval Standards (Section 9.03). He said any approval of the application should be subject to the conditions identified in the Planning Consultant report dated October 9, 2025.

Present were Zaid Arabo of Zaid Design Build and applicant Romi Rsha. The gentlemen confirmed there would be no auto repair conducted on site and the majority, if any, prep work would be conducted off site.

Some comments during discussion related to the following:

- Stormwater management on site.
- Installation of pea gravel or grass in rear of site.
- Vehicular circulation.
- Layout of parking spaces in the front of the building.
- Traffic impact; less than restaurant use, parking of car haulers.
- Photometric plan; reduction of footcandles to meet Zoning Ordinance requirements.
- Improvements to building elevation.
- Trash removal, paperless business, dumpster not required on site.

- - Landscaping; applicant will provide calculation.
  - Sidewalk connection around building to the front door.
  - Installation of gutters to eliminate potential pooling of water on pavement.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED (continued from September 23, 2025 meeting)

There was no one present who wished to speak.

### PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

### Resolution # PC-2025-10-060

Moved by: Krent Seconded by: Fox

**RESOLVED**, That the proposed Driveline Troy LLC Vehicle Sales, West side of Dequindre, North of Fourteen Mile (33475 Dequindre), Section 36, Currently Zoned IB (Integrated Industrial and Business), meets the Special Use Standards as set forth in Section 9.03 and the Site Plan Standards set forth in Section 8.06, and be **granted** Special Use Approval and Preliminary Site Plan Approval, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Reduce footcandles along the southern and northern property lines to meet Zoning Ordinance requirements.
- 2. Provide landscape calculation.
- 3. Replace proposed pea stone in the rear with grass.
- 4. Add one way markings on the pavement and signage so that traffic goes in one direction
- 5. Add a sidewalk along the north side so that people from the rear of the property can get to the front door.

#### Discussion on the motion on the floor.

- Some Board members expressed support for the project.
- Layout and landscape screening of parking spaces in the front of the building.
- Consideration to paint the vinyl window frames a darker color (taupe) to match the building color scheme as presented in the rendering.

#### Vote on the motion on the floor.

Yes: All present (8)

Absent: Hutson

#### **MOTION CARRIED**

## **ZONING ORDINANCE TEXT AMENDMENT**

6. <u>ZONING ORDINANCE TEXT AMENDMENT (File Number 258)</u> – Neighborhood Node Revisions

Mr. Carlisle initiated discussion on the remaining two key points of focus on the Neighborhood Node zoning districts.

1) Setbacks and landscape buffer adjacent to one family residential.

Mr. Carlisle addressed proposed language on a graduated standard that varies by site type. Following a brief discussion among the Board members, the consensus was to incorporate the proposed language as presented in the Planning Consultant report dated October 9, 2025 in the Public Hearing draft of the Zoning Ordinance.

2) Primary entrance requirements particularly for residential projects.

Mr. Carlisle encouraged the Board members to focus on the overall vision and intent of the building entrance requirements for residential projects. The Board members agreed that there should be a distinction between building entrance requirements for non-residential and residential projects. After a lengthy discussion and varying views and approaches expressed, the consensus of the Board members was to task the administration to prepare draft language for further discussion.

# **OTHER ITEMS**

7. PUBLIC COMMENT – For items on the Agenda

There was no one present who wished to speak.

8. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENT

There were general Planning Commission comments.

9. ADJOURN

The Regular meeting of the Planning Commission adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Marianna J. Perakis, Chair
Wanama V. Foranio, Onan
Kathy L. Czarnecki, Recording Secretary

https://d.docs.live.net/2f7ed4fe5f664ea8/Documents/Kathy/COT Planning Commission Minutes/2025/2025 10 14 Draft.docx

DATE: October 21, 2025

TO: Planning Commission

FROM: R. Brent Savidant, Community Development Director

SUBJECT: ZONING ORDINANCE TEXT AMENDMENTS (File Number ZOTA 258) -

Neighborhood Node Revisions

The Planning Commission's Neighborhood Node Steering Committee met three times to discuss revisions to the Neighborhood Node provisions in the Zoning Ordinance. These revisions are required to implement recent amendments to the Master Plan.

On July 22, 2025 the Planning discussed draft text amendments proposed by the Steering Committee.

On August 12, 2025 the Planning Commission discussed proposed amendments to the Neighborhood Node Regulating Plan and Zoning District Map.

On October 14, 2025 the Planning Commission discussed two remaining issues: (1) Setbacks and landscape buffer adjacent to One Family Residential; and (2) Primary entrance requirements particularly for residential projects.

On October 28, 2025 the Planning Commission will discuss the issue of primary entrance requirements, particularly for residential projects.

#### Attachments:

- 1. Memo prepared by Carlisle/Wortman Associates
- 2. Public comment



117 NORTH FIRST STREET SUITE 70 ANN ARBOR, MI 48104 734.662.2200 734.662.1935 FAX

To: City of Troy Planning Commission

From: Benjamin Carlisle, AICP

Date: October 21, 2025

Re: Building Entrance Discussion

Based on the discussion and direction from the Planning Commission regarding building entrances in Neighborhood Node (NN) zoning, we offer the following language for consideration:

#### Section 5.06.E.1 Design Standards-Building Entrances

#### 1. Building Orientation and Entrance

Intent. The intent of these standards is to ensure that entrances within Neighborhood Nodes contribute to a pedestrian-oriented environment, enhance architectural character, and provide an appropriate transition between public and private space. Entrances shall be designed to promote safety, accessibility, and a sense of place consistent with the mixed-use character of the district.

#### b. Non-residential Use

- i. Primary Entrance. The primary entrance for any building abutting a street shall be clearly identifiable, functional, and located on the front façade facing and directly accessible from the street.
- ii. Entrance Definition. Entrances shall be distinguishable and identifiable from other façade elements through the use of design features such as:
  - a) Recessed or projected doorways;
  - b) Stoops, porches, canopies, or overhangs;
  - c) Enhanced materials, lighting, or trim details.
- iii. Mixed-Use Buildings. For mixed-use buildings, separate and distinguishable entrances shall be provided for residential and nonresidential portions of the building.

#### c. Residential Use

 Primary Entrance. The primary entrance for any building abutting a street shall be clearly identifiable, functional, and located on the front façade facing and directly accessible from the street.

- a) The Planning Commission may waive the primary entrance requirement for a residential use if the Planning Commission finds that all the following have been met:
  - 1) The residential building type requires additional security or privacy measures that render a public right of way facing entrance infeasible.
  - 2) The development provides sidewalk connections from the primary building entrance to public walkways, parking areas, and adjacent uses.
  - 3) The development provides an internal pedestrian circulation system that ensures safe and convenient access throughout the site.
  - 4) The building facade that is adjacent to the street includes architectural and design elements that advance the neighborhood node zoning district intent of engaging the street, increasing pedestrian activity, and promoting high-quality design.
  - 5) Buildings are separated from the street by a landscaped greenbelt or other transitional feature that reinforces the pedestrian environment and provides visual interest.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

CARLISLE/WORTMAN ASSOC.,INC Benjamin R. Carlisle, AICP, LEED AP

President

From: Gerald Rauch
To: Planning
Cc: Marianna Perakis

Subject:Planning Commission Meeting SubmissionDate:Monday, October 13, 2025 3:13:30 PMAttachments:Node Ordinance Changes 3.pdf

**CAUTION:** This email did not originate from within the City of Troy. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Jackie,

Please submit the attached to the Planning Commissioners for the meeting tomorrow night.

Jerry Rauch 4187 Penrose dr. Troy, MI 48098 313-585-9808 jerryrauch@me.com

## **Gerald & Tracy Rauch**

4187 Penrose Dr. Troy, MI 48098

October 13, 2025

City of Troy Planning Commission 500 W. Big Beaver Rd. Troy, MI 48084

Re: Neighborhood Node Ordinance Changes

Dear Commissioners,

After watching the video of your August 12th meeting I would like to thank you for discussing my letter that was submitted for your consideration. Unfortunately, I think the point I was trying to get across in my letter didn't come through. Specifically, the desire for the ultimate use of the NW corner of Crooks and Wattles *as stated by the City Council and Planning Commission in the changes to the Master Plan* and how that fits with the Zoning Ordinance Changes being discussed.

In updating the 2016 Master Plan, City Council Members and Planning Commissioners actually walked this Neighborhood Nodes to fully understand the unique circumstances, and did so with each Node. As a result of that close up review and discussions, modification recommended by the Special Committee of Planning Commissioners and City Council members were approved by the Planning Commission and forwarded on by City Council for this location and read as follows for the NW corner of Wattles and Crooks:

"Any development or redevelopment of the northwest corner shall be of a scale and
massing to complement the existing low scale nature of the area. Low scale single family
and multiple family residential may be permissible if it models the scale and orientation of
the multiple family neighborhood at the northeast corner of node E." 1

The Applewood Development is the development at the NE corner of Node E, and has the same Site Type B, as the NW Corner of Wattles & Crooks. Applewood has 40 attached-residential homes built on 6.29 acres or about 6.4 units per acre including roadways.

Watching the video of your meeting, my take away from your discussion was summed up in *Mr. Carlisle's statement* that the development described the Applewood development "is something that would not be approved in the nodes". Which brings me to the point that if the Master Plan goal for the NW corner of the mode is something that would not be approved with the current Node zoning classification, why aren't you changing the category of development for this site to comply with the goal set forth in the Master Plan change? And, how in good faith can you not make the change when the Planning Commission, City Council and residents all

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Updated Master Plan 8/21/23 pg. 91 NN:F

Planning Commission 8/12/2025 Page 2 of 2

agreed that this is what should occur here and went so far as to put it in the Master Plan amendment?

Given the desire for this portion of the Node has been clearly set, I once again respectfully request the Planning Commission make the text changes for this portion of the node to show that the permitted multifamily use matches the Master Plan statement making it "permissible if it models the scale and orientation of the multiple family neighborhood at the northeast corner of node E.".

Respectfully Submitted,

Jerry Rauch

Dako