

Chair Lambert called the Regular meeting of the Troy City Planning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. on September 13, 2022, in the Council Chamber of the Troy City Hall. Chair Lambert and Vice Chair Perakis presented opening remarks relative to the role of the Planning Commission and procedure of tonight’s meeting.

1. ROLL CALL

Present:

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

Absent:

- Carlton M. Faison

Also Present:

- R. Brent Savidant, Community Development Director
- Julie Quinlan Dufrane, Assistant City Attorney
- Kathy L. Czarnecki, Recording Secretary

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Resolution # PC-2022-09-049

- Moved by: Krent
- Support by: Buechner

RESOLVED, To approve the Agenda as prepared.

- Yes: All present (8)
- Absent: Faison

MOTION CARRIED

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – August 23, 2022

Resolution # PC-2022-09-050

- Moved by: Tagle
- Support by: Perakis

RESOLVED, To approve the minutes of the August 23, 2022 Regular meeting as submitted.

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

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 019 JPLN2022-0013)
 – Proposed Village of Troy PUD, South side of Long Lake, West of Rochester (Parcels 88-20-15-201-046 and 88-20-15-201-033), Section 15, Currently Zoned RT (One Family Attached Residential), R-1C (One Family Residential) and CB (Community Business) Districts

Mr. Tagle disclosed his firm is currently working with Robertson Brothers Homes on a project that has no association with the project before the Board this evening. He assured Board members that he can act upon the project in an unbiased way.

Board members agreed there is no reason for Mr. Tagle to recuse himself.

Mr. Savidant summarized the Planned Unit Development (PUD) review and approval process. He stated the applicant this evening is bundling together the Concept Development Plan and Preliminary Site Plan applications. Mr. Savidant addressed the location, natural features, wetlands and woodlands, zoning, access and circulation, proposed residential housing, parking and how the plan relates to the Master Plan.

Mr. Savidant reviewed items discussed at the January 11, 2022 Planning Commission meeting. He noted the applicant maintained the townhome concept contrary to the Board’s suggestion to consider alternative housing options. Mr. Savidant reviewed the proposed changes to the Site Plan since January 2022. He addressed dimensional deviations, benefits characterized by the applicant and the PUD Standards in Section 11.03 B of the Zoning Ordinance. Various elevations and housing types proposed by the applicant were displayed.

Mr. Savidant stated the City Traffic Engineer Consultant OHM recommends approval of the traffic impact study prepared by Fleis & Vanderbrink, dated June 22, 2022, with two exceptions as noted in the Planning Consultant report dated September 6, 2022. He announced Stephen Dearing of OHM is present in the audience should Board members have any questions.

In summary, Mr. Savidant said as part of the deliberation, the Planning Commission should consider:

- Does the applicant meet the intent and standards of a Planned Unit Development?
- Difference/distinction from attached townhomes and attached single-family homes.
- If alternatives to townhomes were considered?
- Are the proposed benefits commensurate with the relief requested?
- Materials and architectural details.
- Has the applicant sufficiently redesigned the site and provided a “villaging” concept as requested by the Planning Commission?

Mr. Savidant stated the role of the Planning Commission is to make a recommendation to City Council. He indicated another public hearing would be scheduled at the time City Council considers the application.

Tim Loughrin, Director of Land Acquisition for Robertson Brothers Homes, conducted a PowerPoint presentation. Some items addressed by Mr. Loughrin were:

- Village concept interconnecting various housing styles.
- Reduction in density; cut 40% townhomes.
- Increase of open space; 7 pocket parks, central park, pavilion.
- Parallel plan; what could be built under existing zoning.
- Elevations; design, square footage, building material, floor plans, price point.
- Sledding hill; quasi-public space located in southwest corner.
- Pedestrian pathway(s).
- Stormwater management; regional pond.
- Over 40% of site is active or passive recreational.
- Owner occupied homes.
- Surrounding zoning and area.
- PUD Standards.

Several members shared individual views on orientation of buildings, location of access drives, internal road design, public amenities and “village” concept. The applicant was encouraged to create something impactful that might attract one’s eyes within the project’s internal design such as a fountain or sculpture.

There was discussion, some comments related to:

- Quasi-public open space; liability, activity schedules.
- Orientation of homes, access drives, centrally located terminus drives.
- Screening on north and south sides; landscaping, berms, fencing.
- Stormwater management; regional pond.
- Parking; formula used to factor required number of spaces; consideration to landbank spaces if determined overparked.
- Building material; color scheme, cost, and maintenance of material.
- Board’s objection to vinyl siding.

- Potential to create additional pedestrian connections.
- Establishment of homeowners' associations.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

- Leonard Joseph, 4909 River Bank Court; addressed concerns with screening, asked about type of screening and additional tree line if trees are removed, asked if retention pond is connected to residents on River Bank Court and if streets are private.
- Susheel Vu, 4921 River Bank Court; addressed concerns with increase in traffic, left turn lane, noise and lights.
- Gary Osak, 4919 Davis Court; addressed concerns with density, increase in traffic, stormwater management, encouraged quality building materials and screening.
- Deepan Shrivastava, 4969 River Bank Court; addressed concerns with increase in traffic, no left turn, internal road design and wetlands.
- Sendhil Damodavan, 4933 River Bank Court; addressed project design and concerns with effect on property values.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

Chair Lambert stated one email communication was received from Harpreet Singh. The resident asked that a tree line for screening be maintained and addressed concerns with property values.

Questions posed during public hearing were addressed as follows:

- Applicant is receptive to address concerns with screening.
- Applicant acknowledged the streets are private.
- Applicant will work with EGLE (Environment, Great Lakes, & Energy) with respect to wetland regulations.
- Applicant addressed stormwater management; regional pond; no connection with residents on River Bank Court.
- Applicant addressed amenities that might be incorporated in pocket parks.

City Traffic Consultant Stephen Dearing of OHM addressed the proposed project's traffic impact as relates to access points, future reconfiguration of median and westbound left turn lane, crossover traffic, trip distribution analysis and planned future road improvements.

Ms. Malalahalli stated she would like to see the applicant take into consideration Planning Commission feedback and public comment expressed this evening and come back to the Board.

Resolution # PC-2022-09-051

Moved by: Malalahalli
Support by: Krent

RESOLVED, To postpone the Village of Troy PUD application to allow the developer an opportunity to take into consideration the direction given by the Board and public comment and to meet some of the PUD Standards cited in Section 11.03 B of the Zoning Ordinance that the Board feels have not been met.

Yes: All present (8)
Absent: Faison

MOTION CARRIED

Mr. Savidant clarified there would be no public hearing when the application comes back to the Planning Commission. He encouraged residents to view agendas posted on the City website to find out the meeting date the application would be considered again.

Ms. Dufrane asked the applicant to share with their attorney that revisions to the application might necessitate changes in the draft PUD agreement.

OTHER ITEMS

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

There was no one present in the audience who wished to speak.

Chair Lambert opened the floor to Planning Commission comment.


Mr. Savidant acknowledged Stephen Dearing and Sara Merrill of OHM for their assistance in traffic consultations and thanked Mr. Dearing for his explanation of complicated traffic matters in simplistic terms.

After a brief discussion, it was determined to schedule a few study session meetings in 2023 to discuss diverse topics.


7. **ADJOURN**

The Regular meeting of the Planning Commission adjourned at 9:29 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



David Lambert, Chair



Kathy L. Czarnecki, Recording Secretary

G:\Planning Commission Minutes\2022 PC Minutes\FINAL\2022 09 13 FINAL.docx