

**Mt. Pleasant Planning Commission  
Minutes of Regular Meeting  
May 7, 2015**

**I.** Vice-Chair Hoenig called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

Present: Dailey, Driessnack, Friedrich, Hoenig, Horgan, Irwin, Kostrzewa, Ranzenberger

Absent: Cotter

Staff: Kain, Ridley, Murphy

**II. Approval of Agenda:**

Motion by Kostrzewa, support by Friedrich to approve agenda.

Motion approved.

**III. Approval of Minutes**

**A. April 9, 2015 Regular meeting**

Motion by Ranzenberger, support by Horgan to approve the minutes from the April 9, 2015 regular meeting as submitted.

Motion carried.

**B. April 9, 2015 Work session**

Motion by Ranzenberger, support by Horgan to approve the minutes from the April 9, 2015 Work Session as submitted.

Motion carried.

**IV. Zoning Board of Appeals Report for March:**

Commissioner Friedrich reported that the ZBA did not meet in April.

**V. Public Hearings:**

**A. SUP-15-07 - 2135 S. Mission**

Kain introduced Case SUP-15-07 noting that this was a request to permit a special regulated use in the C-3 zoning district. Kain reported that the site is located within the Kmart shopping plaza, sharing an aerial view of the site, along with photos of the area.

Kain reported that the zoning on the property is C-3, General Business, with a mixture of C-3 - General Business, OS-1 - Office Service; and M-2 - Multiple Family to the north; M-1 - Multiple Family to the east; R-3A - Apartments and Condominiums and B-4 - General Business (Charter Township of Union) to the south; and C-3 - General Business to the west. Future land use is designated as commercial and multiple residential (medium) and commercial and high-density residential in the township.

Kain noted that the proposed use is a health club, which is considered a Group "B" special regulated use under section 154.067 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Kain provided the Ordinance definition for a special regulated use; noting that there are two groups: Group A and Group B, with different requirements for each category. Kain reported that Group "B" regulated uses are restricted to no more than four within 1,000 feet of the site boundaries. Based on staff review, there is only one other special regulated use within 1,000 feet of the site.

Kain also reported that Group "B" uses are not allowed within 300 feet of a residentially zoned area, trailer park, K through 12 school, dedicated park, church or cemetery unless the applicant provides a petition signed by at least 51% of the parcel owners within 500 feet of the location. Kain noted that the applicant met that requirement, obtaining 19 out of 37 signatures.

Kain reported that along with meeting the relationship requirements, the applicant also needs to meet the criteria for a Special Use Permit, and referred to the applicant's responses to the criteria included in packets.

Kain concluded his report, recommending approval of the SUP with conditions noted in the staff report.

Commissioner Ranzenberger commented that although the SUP is required for this use under the current Ordinance, later in the meeting the Planning Commissioner will be considering making a recommendation for a text change to the Ordinance. Kain concurred this was correct; however noted that any recommendation by the Planning Commission for a text change would need to go the City Commission, who will also hold a public hearing and make the final determination. The applicant had already signed a lease as they were not aware of this requirement and is interested in pursuing approval under the current zoning ordinance.

Rob Cohon, Agree Realty, addressed the Board offering to answer any questions.

Commissioner Dailey asked about the other 49% of land owners who didn't sign the petition. Mr. Cohon stated they were unable to connect with many of them.

Commissioner Kostrzewa asked if the health club was moving into the city from a different location. Mr. Cohon stated they were not - they were new to the area. They have other locations but want to expand to Central Michigan.

Commissioner Dailey questioned whether sound would be an issue for the businesses next door. Mr. Cohon noted that the operator would address any sound proofing that may be needed.

Commissioner Driessnack asked if their other locations were within strip malls. Hoyt Frericks, representing Planet Fitness, noted that all of their locations are within strip malls with neighbors on both sides.

Commissioner Kostrzewa commented he didn't feel that noise would be an issue and questioned whether there would be a running track. Mr. Frericks stated there would not be room for a running track.

Vice-Chair Hoenig opened the public hearing. There being no one who wished to speak, the public hearing was closed.

Board Discussion:

Motion by Kostrzewa, support by Ranzenberger, to approve SUP-15-07 with the following condition:

1. The applicant shall comply with the requirements of the Divisions of Public Works (DPW) and Public Safety (DPS).

Motion approved.

**B. SUP-15-08 & SPR-15-12 - 714 S. Main - Rentwood Management.**

Kain introduced cases SUP-15-08 & SPR-15-12 submitted by Rentwood Management, proposing to convert a single family dwelling to a two-family dwelling in the R-3 zoning district. Kain shared a map of the area, noting that the property to the north, east and west is zoned R-3 and the property to the south is M-2. Future land use is Urban Residential/Main Street Overlay District to the north and east; Urban Residential to the west and Multiple Residential (Medium) to the south.

Kain pointed out that that property is addressed off Main, but has frontage on three streets: Main, Washington and High.

Kain noted that there are no major changes proposed to the exterior of the property as the dwelling already exists, as does the parking area. There will be some additional greenbelt and landscaping around the parking area.

Kain noted that two family dwellings are an allowed use in the Residential district with a Special Use Permit, and further noted that the site meets the conditions necessary for a two family dwelling. In addition to meeting the conditions, there is a list of criteria that needs to be met and referred to the applicant's responses to the criteria, and noted that staff concurs with the applicant's findings.

In regards to the site plan, Kain reported that the lot area exceeds the minimum lot size for a two family dwelling. In addition, the site meets all requirements except for the north setback, which is an existing condition.

Kain concluded his report with the recommendation for approval.

Commissioner Horgan asked if there would be any changes to the driveway. Kain responded that there would be no changes and no increase in impervious surface.

Commissioner Friedrich asked if staff knew how many other duplexes were located within 300 feet of the property.

Kain provided a list of the parcels (44) within the 300 feet, along with occupancy for each parcel. It was later noted that out of the 44 properties, 23 were rooming/boardings; 4 were duplexes or two-family dwellings, 7 were owner occupied single-family dwellings, 3 were single-family rentals, 2 were Registered Student Organizations and 5 were multi-family units (containing three or more dwelling units).

Kain reported that the property is currently licensed as a single-family dwelling with no more than two unrelated tenants permitted.

Commissioner Dailey questioned whether in the future, a change could be made to not allow duplexes in the R-3 zone. Kain responded that would be possibility if the Commission wished to pursue that.

Brandon LaBelle, Rentwood Management LLC, offered to answer questions.

Commissioner Ranzenberger asked who owns the property. Mr. LaBelle responded that the property is owned by Rentwood Management LLC.

Commissioner Kostrzewa asked if the property is controlled locally. Mr. LaBelle stated it was; he is the owner and operator. Mr. LaBelle also commented that the property was previously approved for a Special Use Permit for a duplex under the previous ownership; however, the previous owner did not act on it and the approval lapsed after a year.

Commissioner Ranzenberger asked how many renters were currently in the home. Mr. LaBelle responded there were two.

Vice-Chair Hoenig opened the public hearing.

Steven Berkshire, 602 S. Main Street, addressed the Board speaking in opposition of the request. Mr. Berkshire commented that if the property would remain a single family home, there is a chance it could be rented to a family or convert back to a single-family owner-occupied home. By converting to a duplex, he feels it guarantees it will remain a student rental with an increase in noise, etc. Mr. Berkshire urged the Planning Commission to reject the request and keep the property as a single family home.

Sam Raisanen, 507 S. University spoke against the proposal, commenting that he feels this is moving in the wrong direction. Mr. Raisanen stated that he is an academic and claims he is not against living near students; and further commented that going from 2 to 4 occupants doesn't greatly

concern him in regards to density; however having one less house that can become owner-occupied in a city that is over 70% rental units does concern him.

Ken Sanney, 415 E. Chippewa, also an academic, commented that he is against student rentals with large properties as they become magnets for parties. He also commented that duplexes lower property values of surrounding properties.

Ted Clayton, 302 E. High, commented that he is a faculty member and loves students, but nevertheless opposes the request noting that he feels this goes in the opposite direction of the City's Master Plan to encourage single-family owner-occupied units. He noted that once this is converted to a duplex, it is not going back.

Cindy Verway, 420 S. Main, spoke against the request. Ms. Verway stated they knew they were purchasing a home in the middle of the student area; however, they also knew that the property was zoned residential. Ms. Verway commented that if duplexes are allowed in a residential district, they will eventually be all up and down the street.

Alexis Dailey, 601 S. University, spoke against allowing a duplex in an R-3 zone. Ms. Dailey also commented that out of the 44 properties listed, 17 of them are south of High Street in a different zoning district.

Allison Lents, 502 S. University, spoke against the request, commenting that just because duplexes are allowed in the district, doesn't mean the Planning Commission has to approve. Ms. Lents commented that in the 7 criteria listed, number 5 states that the applicant shall indicate how the special use will not have an adverse impact on the surrounding neighborhood within 300 feet in regards to traffic, noise, architectural compatibility, hours of operation, light, odors, etc. Ms. Lents commented that increasing the occupancy from 2 to 4 will increase noise, traffic, etc. and urged the commission to use that as a legal basis to deny the request. Ms. Lents also encouraged the Commission to look at a text change to no longer allow duplexes in the R-3 zoning district.

There being no one else who wished to speak, the Public Hearing was closed.

Vice-Chair Hoenig called Mr. LaBelle back to the dais.

Commissioner Kostrzewa asked how large the home was. Mr. LaBelle stated it was between 2,500 & 2,700 square feet, with 4 bedrooms and 2 1/2 baths. The home would be split into two similar sized units. Mr. LaBelle also commented that the area is currently about 90% students.

Commissioner Kostrzewa asked if there was anything that would preclude them from renting the units to a family, noting that it isn't likely that a small family would be interested in renting or purchasing this large of a home - it would need to be a large family.

Mr. LaBelle stated he would be happy to rent to a family; however, noted that the property next door (712 S. Main) is a rooming/boarded dwelling licensed for 6 occupants; the property at 708 S. Main is a single family rental; the property at 702 S. Main is a rooming/boarded dwelling licensed

for 7 and the property across from 712 is a multi-unit apartment. He commented that it is unlikely a family would be interested in renting this property.

Commissioner Horgan asked what measures the landlord takes to assure the property is not currently over occupied. Mr. LaBelle stated that there is a clause in the lease that strictly states that the unit can only be rented to no more than two unrelated and each tenant on the lease initials that. In addition, the maintenance personnel are trained to look for signs that the property may be over occupied whenever they are on site.

Commissioner Kostrzewa questioned whether the property was exclusively marketed to students and how a family would know the property was available. Mr. LaBelle stated that they advertise on their website; through Facebook, on Zillow and CM Life. Mr. LaBelle again commented that Main Street north of High is largely rooming/boarding dwellings and he doesn't see the owner occupied scenario going anywhere in this particular location.

Commissioner Horgan asked who the duplex would appeal to based on the types of finishes that the applicant would be installing. Mr. LaBelle stated that the location alone appeals to college students. He noted that the home is already nice and they will be putting up a couple of walls and adding a kitchen - a basic rental. Mr. LaBelle also commented that they have a strict lease when it comes to parties. They pay to have security and commented that good landlords have processes in place to address these issues.

#### Board Discussion:

Commissioner Ranzenberger commented that he appreciates the comments from the public; however, if the application meets the requirements he feels that it has to be granted. He noted that the lot is one of the few in the area that has enough land area and it meets the parking, screening and setback requirements. He also commented that based on the surrounding properties, it reflects the character of the neighborhood. Commissioner Ranzenberger added that although the area is zoned single-family, it is not a single-family neighborhood.

Commissioner Horgan questioned whether if granted, the applicant could possibly split the lot and put in another duplex. Kain responded that there would not be enough land area for two duplexes.

Kain reminded the Board that based on section 154.171 of the Zoning Ordinance, the SUP shall be granted if the proposed use conforms or can be altered to conform to all of the criteria. If it cannot conform, then the request should be denied. He commented that the keystone for the Board's decision is does it conform or can it be altered to conform.

Vice-Chair Hoeng referred to the criteria stating that the proposed use should not prevent the neighbors from enjoying their property - noting that is something to consider when deciding this case.

Commissioner Driessnack commented that the abutting neighbors appear to be largely rental properties. Kain responded that there are two abutting properties to the north - on the Washington

Street side there is a single-family property that is currently under contract for purchase by the applicant. Directly to the north is a rooming dwelling for 6 occupants.

Commissioner Ranzenberger stated that he has looked closely at this and in all other directions there are rentals with 80 rental licenses.

Commissioner Driessnack commented that much of the criteria refers to abutting neighbors, which is made up largely of rooming/boarding dwellings.

Commissioner Kostrzewa questioned whether there could be restrictions on the use of the property to not rent to students. Kain cautioned that the Federal Fair Housing Act prohibits discrimination by landlords in the renting of properties. He added that although he isn't sure if students fit into one of the groups, he would not recommend such a condition be placed that eliminates a certain group.

Commissioner Driessnack commented that the market will dictate what happens in that area. He also commented that it is only an assumption that two additional occupants will make the area bad and that we shouldn't assume that all students are bad. He also commented that the city needs to make improvements in Code Enforcement and hold people accountable for their behavior, whether or not they are students. He indicated he would be supporting the request as it is an allowed use in the area, it is consistent with the zoning and feels it meets the criteria. He further commented that a duplex is a better use of that site and with the busy street, he doesn't see it being desirable for a family.

Commissioner Friedrich commented that there are a lot of single family homes along High Street; some with small children and feels this would be a good family home.

Kain reminded the Board that they should only be considering the properties within 300' when looking at compatibility.

Commissioner Horgan commented that she is on the fence with this request, noting she is unsure of how she will vote.

Kain commented that if there are others that feel this way, it may be helpful to read through the criteria. Commissioner Horgan asked if that is what they need to base their decision on. Kain stated that it was, reiterating that based on ordinance, the request shall be granted if the proposed use conforms or can be altered to conform to all of the criteria. If it cannot conform, then the request should be denied.

Vice-Chair Hoenig read criteria 1 and Commissioner Ranzenberger noted that this is an allowed use for the area.

Vice-Chair Hoenig read criteria 2 and noted that there are several types of uses in the area, including duplexes.

Vice-Chair Hoenig read criteria 3 and noted this is the same as the previous criteria.

Vice-Chair Hoenig read criteria 4 and commented that we have had some people come in and speak; however, she indicated she wasn't sure if they were within the listed area. Kain commented that for this criteria, the ordinance recognizes abutting or adjacent properties which include a single-family home currently under contract by the applicant, 3 rooming dwellings and a duplex.

Vice-Chair Hoenig read criteria 5 and commented that the applicant has indicated that the occupancy of this property would be less than surrounding properties but will have two additional occupants at the subject property.

Vice-Chair Hoenig read criteria 6 and commented that the property will continue to be a residential property. Commissioner Dailey commented that he believes this is a judgment call. Commissioner Ranzenberger commented that this is already a student area and doesn't feel that increasing the occupancy by less than 1% will have any impact on the area.

Vice-Chair Hoenig read criteria 7 and stated that no impact was expected.

Motion by Kostrzewa, support by Ranzenberger to approve SUP-15-06. Request by Kostrzewa for a roll call vote.

Roll Call vote:

Yays: Driessnack, Kostrzewa, Ranzenberger: Nays: Dailey, Friedrich, Hoenig, Horgan, Iwrin.

Motion failed.

### **C. TC-15-01. Health Clubs in the C-3 General Business District.**

Kain provided some background, noting that Section 154.067 of the Zoning Ordinance specifies permitted uses and those subject to Special Use Permits. The Ordinance also identifies Special Regulated Uses as those "having serious objectionable operational characteristics, particularly when several of them are concentrated under certain circumstances thereby having a deleterious effect upon the adjacent areas." Kain noted that these special regulated uses are divided into two groups: Group A and Group B, with Health Clubs falling into Group B.

Kain asked the Commission to consider if health clubs are consistent with other uses permitted in the C-3 zoning district and to consider if an approval process for health clubs is necessary to protect the surrounding neighborhood.

Kain reported that he looked at other communities to see how this use was treated and noted that we stand alone in not allowing a health club by right. Kain noted that the proposal before the Commission is to recommend to the City Commission a Text Change to amend Section 154.067 of the Zoning Ordinance to include Health Clubs as a permitted use in the C-3 zoning district.

Dailey questioned how specific we should get in calling out what is allowed by right and what is a special regulated use. Kain responded that staff's opinion is that because the use is called out as a



Special Regulated Use it would be preferable in this case to explicitly list it as a principal use permitted in the district.

Vice-Chair Hoenig opened the public hearing. There being no one who wished to speak, the public hearing was closed.

Motion by Driessnack, support by Kostrzewa that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Commission approve Text Change 15.01.

Motion approved.

#### **D. TC-15-02 Dimensional Standards for Off-Street Parking.**

Kain provided information on section 154.121 of the Zoning Ordinance, which provides dimensional standards to ensure that off street parking provides for safe and efficient circulation and storage of vehicles. Kain shared the table from the ordinance, which defines lane width, parking space width and length and also includes other dimensions based on how many tiers of spaces are on the site.

Kain explained that the last two fields are redundant and reduce the area available for landscaping and buffering and/or create additional, unnecessary impervious surface.

Kain explained that there are regulations in place that ensure enough space is available to accommodate the parking and provided a diagram to illustrate why the last two columns are not necessary.

Kain asked that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Commission approve a text change to Section 154.121 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Vice-Chair Hoenig opened the public hearing. There being no one who wished to speak, the public hearing was closed.

Motion by Friedrich, support by Kostrzewa that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Commission approve Text Change 15-02.

Motion approved.

#### **E. TC-15-03 - Proposed Complete Streets Ordinance**

Kain introduced the proposed Complete Streets Ordinance, explaining that complete streets is a policy and design approach that requires streets to be planned, designed, operated and maintained to enable safe, convenient and comfortable travel and access for users of all ages and abilities, regardless of their mode of transportation.

Kain noted that the City recently adopted a new Master Plan, which includes a Transportation Plan that calls for the adoption of a Complete Streets ordinance. Kain explained that this will create a policy framework for the City.

Kain reported that in 2010 the State of Michigan passed Complete Streets legislation and that in response to that legislation 25 local government agencies have adopted Complete Streets ordinances.

Kain assured the Commission that adopting this Ordinance does not mean that "one size fits all." It will assure, however, that when the Division of Public Works looks at the capital plan it will use a complete street design approach for all projects. Kain noted the benefits of adopting a complete streets policy include:

- Increase user safety
- Increase modal options
- Increase connections between activity generators
- Improve mobility for the young, the elderly, and the disabled
- Improve system capacity
- Increase resilience and sustainability of the network

Kain noted that the proposed ordinance is consistent with the goals of the Master Plan and the requirements of Act 33 (Planning Enabling Act) and Act 51 (Michigan Transportation Fund).

Vice-Chair Hoenig opened the public hearing. There being no one who wished to speak, the public hearing was closed.

Motion by Kostrzewa, support by Dailey to recommend that the City Commission adopt the Complete Streets Ordinance.

Motion approved 7:1.

## **VI. Public Comments:**

Vice Chair Hoenig opened the public comments section of the meeting. There being no one who wished to speak, public comments was closed.

## **VII. Site Plan Reviews:**

### **A. SPR-15-12 - 714 S. Main.**

Kain noted that in light of the earlier denial of a special use permit for this site, it is recommended that this item be removed from the agenda.

### **B. SPR-15-08 - 1529 S. Mission.**

Kain introduced Case SPR-15-08, noting that the request is to amend a previously approved site plan to add an attached freezer to the exterior of the existing building.

Kain provided a copy of the site plan along with photos of the site. Kain reported that the property is zoned C-3, General Business, with C-3 zoning to the north, south and west; and M-1 to the east. Future land use is designated as Commercial.

Kain directed the Board to refer to the site plan provided at the dais for an accurate depiction of the request. The proposed freezer includes a 9 x 13 cooler to be placed on the existing asphalt. Kain noted that the expansion does not negatively impact the rear setback. Kain further noted that there will be one parking space removed to accommodate the freezer; however, the site still exceeds the minimum required parking.

Kain reported that access to the freezer will be from the interior of the store. Kain concluded his report, recommending approval of the request.

Tracy Johnroe, applicant, addressed the Board, offering to answer questions.

Commissioner Friedrich asked if they actually needed the additional freezer space. Mr. Johnroe stated they did as their sales have increased.

Commissioner Ranzenberger asked if this would change any traffic patterns or deliveries. Mr. Johnroe stated it would not.

Motion by Ranzenberger, support by Friedrich to approve SPR-15-08 with the following condition:

1. The applicant shall comply with the requirements of the Divisions of Public Works (DPW) and Public Safety (DPS).

Motion approved.

### **C. SPR-15-09 - 120 S. University.**

Kain introduced Case SPR-15-09, noting this is a request to create a new entrance to an existing building and an enclosure for a dumpster for the Basin Building.

Kain noted that the location is at the NW corner of S. University and Michigan. The proposed entrance will be located at the NE corner of the building. Kain noted that the Board is not considering the use, just the proposed entrance.

Kain noted that the future land use is Central Business District.

Kain shared the proposed site plan, noting that there is only one requirement for height, bulk, density, and area in the C-2 district, which is that the height of the building cannot exceed 75'. Kain noted that the building is well within that limit.

Kain noted that staff recommends approval of the request with the condition that that applicant meets the requirements of the Divisions of Public Works and Public Safety.

Commissioner Friedrich asked about the distance from the proposed ramp to the sidewalk. Kain noted that the ramp falls within the private property.

Commissioner Ranzenberger asked if there was any site plan approval when the Class I use was approved.

Kain noted that some SUP's required site plan review and some do not.

Aimee Goudreau, applicant, addressed the Board, commenting that there was not a site plan review with the previous request as they were sharing an entrance. They have since decided to add a separate entrance.

Commissioner Dailey asked if that was left out of the first request intentionally or if it was forgotten. Ms. Goudreau stated it was based on a change in their business plan.

Motion by Driessnack, support by Dailey that the Planning Commission approve SPR-15-09 with the following condition:

1. The applicant shall comply with the requirements of the Divisions of Public Works (DPW) and Public Safety (DPS).

Motion approved.

#### **D. SPR15-11 2151 JBS Trail.**

Kain introduced SPR-15-11 noting this was a request to modify an existing loading dock for a Frito-Lay distribution center.

Kain shared the site plan and photos of the site. He noted that the proposal includes the addition of a loading dock with two overhead doors and additional paving and repaving of the existing paved area.

Kain noted the property is zoned I-1 Industrial, is surrounded by I-1 properties and the future land use is designated as Industrial.

Kain reported that the changes will occur at the northern part of the property and will include an additional dumpster enclosure.

Kain noted that the request meets the dimensional requirements of the zoning ordinance and is being recommended for approval.

Tim Woodbury, JBS Contracting, addressed the Board offering to answer questions.

Motion by Kostrzewa, support by Driessnack that the Planning Commission approve SPR-15-11 with the following condition:

1. The applicant shall comply with the requirements of the Divisions of Public Works (DPW) and Public Safety (DPS).

Motion approved.

#### **VIII. Unfinished Business:**

None

#### **IX. New Business:**

##### **A. Capital Improvement Plan:**

Kain explained that traditionally each year the Planning Commission is provided an opportunity to review the proposed Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) and provide feedback and a recommendation to the City Commission. Kain provided an overview noting that the CIP includes projects that are tentatively planned to take place in the next five years, which have a useful life of over 10 years and cost over \$5,000. Kain further noted that the CIP is meant to be consistent with the City's Master Plan.

Kain reviewed the projects for Parks, Downtown, Mission Street, Streets, Sidewalks & Lighting, Airport, Sewer, Water and Other.

Kain stated that the next step is for the Planning Commission to recommend that the City Commission approve the CIP. The City Commission will hold two work sessions prior to holding a public hearing on May 26th. The deadline to adopt the CIP is June 8, 2015. The CIP helps to shape the 2016 budget, which is due to the City Commission on September 14.

Discussion took place on the proposed round-about in front of Larzalere Hall.

Nancy Ridley, City Manager, reported that CMU has a number of roundabouts in their master plan. They have identified the location in front of Larzalere Hall for the first one, and have proposed that the city and CMU both pay part of the cost. This item was put in the CIP to see if there was any interest from the Planning Commission and City Commission.

Commissioner Ranzenberger asked about the location for the Mission Connector. Ms. Ridley commented that there is no specific location at this time - we are looking at opportunities.

Discussion took place on the amount of funding needed to paint the water tower.

Commissioner Friedrich asked why a community pool is not considered a priority as there is a lot of interest. Ms. Ridley responded that the maintenance and ongoing operational costs have been a deterrent.

Motion by Horgan, support by Driessnack that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Commission approve the 2016-2020 Capital Improvement Plan.

Motion approved.

### **B. Discuss & Consider Text Change**

Kain introduced a proposed amendment to Section 154.068 (Mission Redevelopment Overlay Zone) of the Zoning Ordinance. Currently the language provides for residential on the second floor and above, and also the Planning Commission may authorize ground-floor residential if it could function as a transition use between commercial and single-family residential uses.

Kain explained that we currently have some interest from a developer for a Mission Redevelopment Overlay project which includes ground-floor residential to the rear of ground floor commercial and as a transitional use to the recently-adopted University District.

Kain explained that currently the Planning Commission only has authority to allow ground-floor residential as a transitional use to single-family residential. It is staff's opinion that the Planning Commission should consider amending the language to include consideration of ground-floor residential as a transition use to the M(Multiple Family), R (Residential), or U (University) district to provide developers and the Planning Commission more flexibility in the design of these preferred development projects.

Kain commented that if the Planning Commission feels this is worth pursuing, they should set a public hearing for the proposed text change.

Commissioner Kostrzewa asked if this would include first-floor facing the street. Kain noted that the interpretation would be that there would be commercial use in the front with residential in rear.

Commissioner Driessnack commented that this would allow the Planning Commission to be able to consider these requests and could help get a better project.

Motion by Dailey, support by Ranzenberger that the Planning Commission set a public hearing to consider an amendment to Section 154.068 (Mission Redevelopment Overlay Zone) at the Planning Commission meeting on Thursday, June 4, 2015 at 7:00 pm in the City Hall Commission Chambers.

Motion approved.

### **X. Other:**

**A. Community Improvement Awards:** Kain noted that the Community Improvement awards would be presented to the recipients at the May 11, 2015 City Commission meeting and asked if any of the Planning Commissioners would be interested in attending. Kain further noted that the prints were completed by a student from Mt. Pleasant High School and they have provided a second copy of each print to hang in City Hall. The recipients will get to take their prints home following the meeting.

## **B. Staff Report**

1. **June Meeting:** Kain reported that we currently have two site plans reviews on the agenda. The deadline for submittal is May 11, 2015.
2. **MiPlace Training:** Kain reported that he, Commissioner Horgan and Commissioner Friedrich recently attended a "Miplace" training session on place making hosted by MSU Extension.

Commissioner Horgan noted that she thinks the training would be really good for developers to attend.

Kain indicated there may be an opportunity to bring the training directly to the Planning Commission in the future.

3. **Work Session:** Kain reminded the Board that during the April 9 work session a tentative timeline was suggested for work on the proposal for the M-2 neighborhood. At that time it was suggested that an additional work session be held following the June 4 meeting to discuss the information gathered during the neighborhood walk and open house. Kain asked that the Commission take action to set a June work session.

Motion by Dailey, support by Ranzenberger to set a work session to be held on June 4, 2015 following the regular meeting.

Motion approved.

4. **Thank you.** Nancy Ridley thanked the Board for their service noting they have a tough job and they are appreciated.

## **XI. Adjournment:**

Motion by Kostrzewa, support by Dailey to adjourn.

Motion approved.

Meeting adjourned at 9:38 p.m.

bam