

**Mt. Pleasant Planning Commission
Minutes of Regular Meeting
March 6, 2014**

I. Vice-Chairman Holtgreive called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Present: Cotter, Dailey, Hoenig, Holtgreive, Kostrzewa, Lents, Ranzenberger, Verleger

Absent: One vacancy.

Staff: Staff, Mrdeza, Murphy.

II. Approval of Agenda:

Staff asked that SUP-14-01/SPR-14-02 for 1015 Andre be added to the agenda under Unfinished Business.

Motion by Lents, support by Kostrzewa to approve agenda with staff's addition.

Motion approved.

III. Election of Officers

Vice-Chairman Holtgreive asked for nominations for Chair.

Motion by Kostrzewa, support by Dailey to nominate Holtgreive as Chair. There were no other nominations.

Motion carried.

Motion by Kostrzewa, support by Dailey to nominate Cotter as Vice-Chair. There were no other nominations.

Motion carried.

Motion by Kostrzewa, support by Cotter to appoint Lents as crossover member to the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Motion approved.

IV. Approval of Minutes:

A. February 6,2014 Regular Meeting

Motion by Lents, support by Cotter to approve minutes from February 6, 2014 regular meeting.

Motion approved.

B. February 6, 2014 Work Session

Motion by Dailey, support by Lents to approve minutes from February 6, 2014 Work Session.

Motion approved.

V. Zoning Board of Appeals Report for February.

Commissioner Lents reported that the Zoning Board of Appeals heard two cases at their February meeting. The first case was for a second phase of a redevelopment located at 916 E. Broomfield. There are two buildings on the property that went through redevelopment in 2004. The request was for the remaining building to be torn down and redeveloped with no increase in the occupancy. The redevelopment will increase aisle widths as required by the Fire Department, will result in a safer building and includes updates in the facades of both the new building and those that were completed in 2004. The request was approved.

The second case heard by the ZBA was for 215 Pine, where the applicant was requesting a variance on land area required for a duplex. The Board did not feel that the request met the criteria necessary for granting a variance and it was therefore denied.

VI. Public Hearings:

A. SUP-14-02 - 1007 S. Main - Joe Olivieri.

Staff introduced Case SUP-14-02, noting that the request was for a Special Use Permit to allow a Rooming Dwelling in the M-2 zoning district. Surrounding properties are rooming dwellings and Staff noted that the property was recently operating under a SUP for a Registered Student Organization. Staff reported that the RSO has recently lost its standing with CMU for a period of four years, and is therefore no longer recognized by the City as a Registered Student Organization. The applicant is requesting a SUP to re-designate the property as a rooming dwelling.

Staff reported that there are no proposed changes to the site other than removing the signage.

Staff provided some background of the property noting that this site underwent redevelopment in 2011. Prior to that time, there were numerous code violations. As part of the current SUP requirements, the applicant agreed to include stricter lease language to deal with the code violations, along with daily monitoring of the property. Since the redevelopment, staff reported there have been 29 code violations, mainly for trash; however, it was noted that swift action was taken to correct the situation.

Staff went through his recommendations for approving the request, concluding that the request is pretty straight-forward for a rooming dwelling. Staff did express one concern regarding the

removal of the letters, noting that although they have been removed from the exterior of the building, they are currently displayed through the upstairs window.

Joe Olivieri, owner and applicant, addressed the Board, offering to answer any questions regarding the request.

Commissioner Kostrzewa asked if the same tenants would be in the building. Mr. Olivieri stated the lease for the current tenants ends in August, at which time they will be moving out.

Commissioner Lents asked if this home was constructed in such a way that it could be converted into a duplex and if so, would the applicant consider that? Mr. Olivieri stated that he has a lease signed already for next year as a 12 unit rooming dwelling. He further noted that even if it was divided into a duplex there would be the same number of occupants on the property.

Mr. Olivieri spoke of the code violations, noting that although there will always be violations with these dwellings, what is important is that they are handled swiftly.

Chairman Holtgreive mentioned the letters in the windows. Mr. Olivieri stated that was done without his knowledge by the current tenants.

Commissioner Lents asked for verification that the rooming dwelling would be different tenants. Mr. Olivieri indicated it would be 12 different individuals.

Chairman Holtgreive opened the Public Hearing. There being no one who wished to speak, the public hearing was closed.

Board Discussion:

Motion by Kostrzewa, support by Lents that the Planning Commission approve the request for SUP-14-02 from Olivieri Management, Inc. to allow a change of use to a rooming dwelling with a maximum occupancy of 12 at the property located at 1007 S. Main Street with the following conditions:

1. The applicant complies with the Department of Building Safety and the Fire Department requirements to obtain and retain a Rental license.
2. The applicant removes the sign labeling the suspended Delta Chi RSO from the building.
3. The applicant complies with all prior site plan review requirements.
4. The applicant appropriately addresses the code enforcement history of the site and adequately offers a plan to mitigate future issues at this site.
5. The applicant should conform to the requirements of the DPW and DPS as provided in separate comments.

Motion carried.

SUP-14-03 - 502 W. Broadway - Stephanie Prout.

Staff introduced Case SUP-14-03, noting that this is a request to add a cosmetology academy to the existing Waterworks Salon. The property is zoned C-2, with C-2 to the north, east and west, and OS-1 to the south.

Staff reported that the C-2 district allows business schools, colleges or private schools when located on the second floor or above; however, this requirement is modified in Section 154.066(D)(2)(e) which allows those uses on the ground level as a special use if they are located so they do not conflict with pedestrian walking patterns. Based on this language, the applicant is seeking a Special Use Permit to allow cosmetology school activities on the ground level.

Staff reported that the applicant is required by the State of Michigan Department of Licensing and Regulatory Affairs (LARA) to be licensed, further noting that LARA also requires a partition between a cosmetology school and other activities.

Staff reported there are no proposed changes to the existing site plan. Parking is available in the municipal lot across the street. At this time, the applicant has not proposed any new signage for the site. If new signage is proposed in the future, the applicant will be required to obtain a permit.

Staff noted that there are no changes proposed to the sidewalk; the project is not subject to Access Management Standards and there are no proposed changes to the site lighting.

Staff concluded his report noting his recommendations for approval and the requirements from the Department of Public Works and Public Safety.

Stephanie Prout addressed the Board, offering to answer questions.

Commissioner Lents asked how many students would be on site at any given time. Ms. Prout stated the number of students would be limited to 10.

Commissioner Kostrzewa asked how long it would take to get certified. Ms. Prout indicated it was a 40+ week program.

Commissioner Ranzenberger commented that he was aware that Ms. Prout had been lobbying to get the partition wall requirement changed and asked if there had been any changes. Ms. Prout stated there have been no changes and she will conform with the current requirements.

Chairman Holtgreive opened the Public Hearing. There being no one who wished to speak, the Public Hearing was closed.

Motion by Kostrzewa, support by Lents that the Planning Commission should approve the request for SUP-14-03 from Stephanie Prout for the property located at 502 West Broadway to allow the change of use from a salon personal service establishment to a use split between this function and cosmetology training/education, with the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall comply with all applicable requirements for State licensing of Cosmetology Schools and Cosmetology Instruction.
2. If required by LARA, at the time of seeking a building permit, submit specifications for the partitioning of the interior of the building as needed for LARA licensing requirements.
3. If any additional signs are to be proposed, those signs must be reviewed and approved by the City.
4. The applicant should conform to the requirements of the DPW and DPS as provided in separate comments.

Motion carried.

C. SUP-14-04 - 200 E. Broadway - Table74 LLC

Staff introduced case SUP-14-04, noting that the applicant is proposing the redevelopment of a 14,189 square foot property with approximately 39,761 square feet within the building: approximately 7,000 square feet of first floor office space; 5,000 square feet of restaurant use; and approximately 27,800 square feet of 2nd and 3rd floor residential units. Staff noted his review would also include SPR-14-05.

Staff noted there are no proposed changes to the footprint of the building, but will include some changes to the layout to include the removal of the building's current facade, refurbishing the historic brick veneer, development of an outdoor seating area, the addition of an entrance on the corner of the building and a change to the ingress/egress on the rear south side.

Staff reported that the applicant is requesting a Special Use Permit for a Class I Restaurant along with commercial and multiple-family dwelling units. The applicant has applied for a Redevelopment Liquor License.

Staff reviewed the Ordinance requirements for Class I Restaurants, focusing on Section 154.066(D)(2), which requires:

- a. Culinary facilities shall at all times be maintained and provided for the preparation and cooking of food for consumption on the premises. *Staff reported that no action is needed by the applicant presently but he should take action to ensure culinary facilities are maintained as such.*

- b. The establishment shall offer a varied menu of food items consisting of not fewer than ten such food items cooked or prepared on the premises. *Staff noted that prior to opening, the applicant should provide a menu displaying a variety of not fewer than ten food items.*
- c. Not more than 50% of the gross floor area open to the general public shall be used for purposes other than seating for diners consisting of tables, chairs, booths and necessary aiseways. Public rest room facilities shall not be considered in this determination. *Staff noted that the applicant has provided a site plan showing that over 50% of the proposed development's gross floor area appears to be used for diners including tables, chairs, booths and necessary aiseways.*
- d. During any given 90-day period no more than 50% of the gross revenues of the establishment shall be derived from the sale of any alcoholic liquor as defined by the Michigan Liquor Control Act. Admission charges or cover charges which exceed 10% of the establishment's gross revenues shall be considered as derived from the sale of alcoholic liquors for purposes of determining the percentage of sales of alcoholic liquors. *Staff noted that no action is needed by the applicant presently but he should take action to ensure these figures are met.*

Staff reviewed the site plan requirements for the proposal, noting that the applicant meets the requirements for height, bulk, density and area. The applicant is proposing an outdoor seating area for up to 16 occupants, which will include the removal of some outdoor planters. The applicant will work with staff to assure they meet the requirements for right-of-way standards and to assure they meet the requirements of the Mt. Pleasant Downtown Sidewalk and Street Parking License Policy for Merchandise Displays, Food and Alcohol Service. In addition, staff noted that the applicant would need to work with the Department of Public Works to assure they meet the clear vision area requirements.

Staff noted that the proposal meets the requirements for parking, and noted that there were no requirements for walls, berms or greenbelts. At this time, staff reported that the applicant is proposing two new signs as part of the development, which meet Ordinance requirements. In addition, it was noted by staff that the proposed development must meet the standards for lighting which are specified in the Mt. Pleasant City Codes.

Staff reviewed the comments that were submitted by the Department of Public Works and the Department of Public Safety, noting that the applicant would need to meet these requirements to proceed with the project.

Staff concluded his report noting that the project is being recommended for approval with several conditions, which he reviewed.

Commissioner Kostrzewa asked about the location of a dumpster, noting that the amount of trash will increase significantly with this proposal.

Staff noted that there is currently a dumpster located in the alley next to the building.

Commissioner Ranzenberger asked if the proposed patio would be seasonal or year round. Staff responded that he believes it will be year round, but suggested the applicant answer that question.

Richard Swindlehurst, applicant, addressed the Board, noting that the patio would be year round. He indicated it would be the same level as the floor, noting that they need to keep the height at the minimum to qualify for the historical grant.

Commissioner Ranzenberger asked if the patio would be handicap accessible. Mr. Swindlehurst noted it would be, as previously stated, it would be the same level as the interior floor and the only way to access the patio would be from the building.

Mr. Swindlehurst noted this is their biggest endeavor to date and hopes it is the beginning of several buildings downtown being renovated. He indicated that they have hired an architect and also someone to handle the grants that they will be applying for. He plans to hire local people to do the work.

Commissioner Ranzenberger commented that he has heard some talk that the weight of the false facade was causing problems with the structural integrity of the building. Mr. Swindlehurst noted that they have hired a structural engineer to review the building and the facade is indeed causing a problem. The plan calls for the removal of the facade and the engineer has assured them this would work.

Commissioner Ranzenberger asked if they had any projections on the percentage of sales that would be from alcohol. Mr. Swindlehurst responded that they project more food than alcohol, noting that most of their other restaurants are around 85% food sales. The plan for this particular restaurant is for high end fine dining.

Commissioner Lents asked about the apartment entries, questioning whether there would be a keyed system or if it would be an open hallway. Mr. Swindlehurst stated they would definitively be a locked entry system; however, they are not certain yet what type of system they will be using.

Commissioner Verleger asked if the apartments would be high end apartments. Mr. Swindlehurst stated that is the intent; however, noted that they need to meet MSHDA standards for the first rent cycle.

Commissioner Kostrzewa asked if the building would have an elevator. Mr. Swindlehurst noted that it would and further noted that the building would have a sprinkler system.

Commissioner Kostrzewa commented that with the increased intensity of the use, there will be a need for additional trash pickups. Mr. Swindlehurst noted that is a small detail in the scope of the project that they will work out.

Commissioner Lents noted that the building facade appears to have three store fronts and questioned whether they would be able to dress up the building. Mr. Swindlehurst noted it did have three store fronts and they won't really know what they look like until the false facade comes down; however, with historical grants, you are limited to what can be changed.

Chairman Holtgreive opened the public hearing. There being no one who wished to speak, the public hearing was closed.

Motion by Hoenig, support by Lents that the Planning Commission should approve the request for SUP-14-04 from Table 74, LLC for the property located at 200 E. Broadway to allow the construction of a 39,671 square foot (inclusive of the building envelope, which sits within the 14,189 square foot site) mixed use development including office uses, a dining establishment, and 16 multiple family dwelling units, with the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall comply with all site plan review requirements.
2. The applicant shall comply with the requirements of Section 154.066(D)(3) of the Zoning Ordinance and the performance standards listed in Section 154.003 related to Class I restaurants.
3. Use of the property as a Class I restaurant shall be subject to issuance of a liquor license and compliance with the requirements of the City Commission and the Michigan Liquor Control Commission.
4. Prior to opening, the applicant should provide a menu indicating a variety of not fewer than ten (10) food items served at the proposed Class I Restaurant as required by section 154.003 (*Class I Restaurants*).
5. The applicant shall comply with the attached *City of Mt. Pleasant downtown sidewalk and street parking license policy for merchandise displays, food and alcohol service policy*.
6. The applicant should submit a landscape plan as developed in conjunction with the requirements of the DPW to address tree removals in the proposed patio area.
7. Upon seeking a building permit, the applicant should ensure that the proposed location of fire hydrants and the fire department connection meets the requirements of the associated building use groups and their location indicated on the site plan document.
8. Upon seeking a building permit, the applicant should ensure that the proposed clear vision area, as it relates to the proposed outdoor patio, satisfies DPW requirements.
9. The applicant shall comply with the requirements of the Division of Public Works (DPW) and the Division of Public Safety (DPS).

Motion carried.

VIII: Public Comments:

Chairman Holtgreive opened the floor for public comments. There being no one who wished to speak, public comments was closed.

IX. Site Plan Reviews:

A. SPR-14-04 -805 S. Bradley - AT & T.

Staff introduced case SPR-14-05 noting that this was a request to add a 20' extension to an existing cell phone utility tower and to add an accessory equipment structure at the Chipp-a-Waters Park. Staff shared the proposed site plan along with an aerial view of the site, noting that the property is zoned R-1, with C-3 zoning to the north, R-1 to the east and south and Union Township to the west.

Staff provided an overview of the site plan approved in 2010 for the original cell tower and related facilities, located on land leased from the City of Mt. Pleasant. Staff also shared the proposed site plan with the proposed additions.

Staff noted that the Zoning Enabling Act allows for the construction and controlled expansion of cell towers and reviewed the requirements for the expansions, noting that the collocation shall not increase the overall height of the support structure by more than 20 feet or 10% of its original height, whichever is greater.

Staff reviewed the site plan noting that no off street parking is required, and the existing drive meets the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. In addition, staff reported that the existing cell tower site was obscured by a 10' high wooden slat fence and the fence will be expanded to obscure the new equipment shelter. Staff also noted that the applicant has proposed maintenance of the 24 evergreen trees adjacent to the site on the west, south and north sides.

Staff reviewed the recommendations from the Parks and Recreation Commission as follows:

- 1) Applicant should follow the site plan as presented
- 2) If any existing plant life needs to be trimmed or moved to accommodate the project that it is done in consultation with the Park Staff prior to the work commencing.
- 3) New fence matches existing and that if there is any major variation in fence wood or stain color that it is made to match the existing as close as possible. The Parks and Recreation Commission understands that the fence may need to “weather” a bit to match the existing but if it does not in a reasonable amount of time then action must be taken by the applicant to correct.
- 4) If at all possible, the existing berm and surrounding plantings not be disturbed and if so they are replaced with same materials in consultation with the Park staff. (any replacement plantings must be of the type that deer do not like to eat)
- 5) All mowable turf that is disturbed must be replaced or reseeded to match existing grade.

- 6) If a safety strobe light is required on the top of the tower due to height requirements that it be red for night vs white as to not disturb the local area.

Staff also reviewed the comments submitted by the Department of Public Works and Department of Public Safety, noting the applicant would need to meet the requirements of these departments.

Staff concluded the report noting that the proposal is being recommended for approval and reviewed the suggested conditions.

Commissioner Dailey asked for clarification on what a "wavebridge" is. Staff noted that it is the system for holding the wires off the ground.

Wally Haley, Haley Law Firm, addressed the Board, as representative of the case. Mr. Haley noted that they agree with the recommendations for approval.

Commissioner Ranzenberger noted that the law says you can extend the height up to 20' above the existing height and questioned whether the applicant would return some time in the future requesting another 20'. Mr. Haley noted that the Zoning Enable Act indicates the height can be extended 20' above the *original* height, so that would not be an option.

Commissioner Ranzenberger asked if the increased height would pose any problems for air traffic and if there would be any lights/strobes.

Mr. Haley responded that the general rule is 200' or below does not present any hazards to air traffic; therefore no lights or strobes are proposed.

Board Discussion:

Motion by Lents, support by Cotter that the Planning Commission approve the request for SPR-14-04 for the property located at 805 S. Bradley Street, based on the site plan dated October 23, 2013, and as revised on 2/11/14, and prepared by Christopher Wzacny and Associates, Inc. for AT&T and Goodman Networks, with the following conditions:

1. Applicant to follow the site plan that was presented to the Parks and Recreation Commission on Tuesday, February 25, 2014:
 - If any existing plant life needs to be trimmed or moved to accommodate the project that it is done in consultation with the Park Staff prior to the work commencing.
 - New fence matches existing and that if there is any major variation in fence wood or stain color that it is made to match the existing as close as possible. The Parks and Recreation Commission understands that the fence may need to "weather" a bit to match the existing but if it does not in a reasonable amount of time then action must be taken by the applicant to correct.
 - If at all possible, the existing berm and surrounding plantings not be disturbed and if so they are replaced with same materials in consultation with the Park staff. (any replacement plantings must be of the type that deer do not like to eat)

- All mowable turf that is disturbed must be replaced or reseeded to match existing grade.
 - If a safety strobe light is required on the top of the tower due to height requirements that it be red for night vs white as to not disturb the local area.
2. Upon seeking a building permit for the proposed equipment shelter and monopole extension and platform, the applicant shall provide site plan drawings that clearly show the dimensions and the layout indicating the relationship between the proposed development and South Bradley Street.
 3. Upon seeking a building permit, the applicant shall work with the utility provider to ensure that proper electrical permits have been processed with the City. The applicant should also ensure that the proposed electrical plan satisfies all conditions of applicable electrical codes.
 4. Upon seeking a building permit, the applicant should seek structural inspection documentation and engineering structural calculations from a licensed engineer.
 5. The applicant should conform to the requirements of the DPW and DPS as provided in separate comments.
 6. The applicant should satisfy the six recommendations from the Parks and Recreation Commission.

Motion Carried.

B. SPR-14-05 - 200 E. Broadway - Swindlehurst Ventures LLC.

Staff noted that his staff report for this project was provided with SUP-14-04 and stated he had nothing further to present. The applicant also noted they had nothing new to add.

Motion by Ranzenberger, support by Lents, that the Planning Commission should approve the request for SPR-14-05 from Table 74, LLC for the property located at 200 E. Broadway to allow the construction of a 39,671 square foot mixed use development (inclusive of the building envelope) based on the site plan drawings provided by Kincaid Henry Building Group, inc.

Motion Carried.

X. Unfinished Business:

A. M-2 Amendment Project

Mrdeza addressed the Board, noting that Doug Piggott, from Rowe Professional Services has been working with the Planning Commission for the past several months to consider ways to codify the procedures that the Planning Commission and Zoning Board of Appeals have been

utilizing. He is present to summarize his findings and present the Board with three potential courses of action. Mrdeza noted that once the Planning Commission makes a decision, they will likely hold a Public Hearing on their recommendations. This will then go to the City Commission for their final consideration. Mrdeza also reported that the information has also been provided to the ZBA, and they were invited to attend the P.C. meeting tonight if they wished to offer any input or be a part of the discussion.

Doug Piggott, Rowe Professional Services, addressed the Board. Mr. Piggott shared a brief PowerPoint presentation to help summarize the issues for discussion. Mr. Piggott reviewed the process the City is currently using to review the requests for redevelopment of non-conforming properties, and noted that the City Commission has asked that we look into ways to codify the process. Mr. Piggott explained that currently these requests go to the ZBA first, but noted that these are not variance requests, but more of an administrative waiver. Variances have much more stringent restrictions and it is important to recognize the difference.

Mr. Piggott reviewed the information received from the open houses and interviews that were conducted.

- Process transparency/public input opportunities. Mr. Piggott noted that although at least two public hearings are held during the M-2 review process, there was some dissatisfaction expressed from the public sector that there is a lack of public awareness with these requests.
- Steps and participants in the process: Some developers thought that the two public hearings were too much.
- Geographic and use range: Although the study area was limited, there are currently no limitations to the area as a whole. There was some concern that it not be opened too wide, but others felt that this may be useful for commercial/industrial areas as well.
- Standards: Mixed results - some developers feel that the city is expecting more with each successive project. Most of the comments indicated that the subjective approach is good, that it allows the Boards to review each request on a case by case basis. The majority of the ZBA and PC members felt that having both boards involved is a good thing, and that we need to keep some flexibility.

Mr. Piggott reviewed the three options that he has drafted:

The "As Is" would keep both the ZBA and PC in the process, but would limit the use to RSOs and rooming dwelling houses in the M-2 District.

The "SUP" approach would remove the ZBA from the process and would include a set of minimum objective standards. This approach would also be limited to RSOs and Rooming/Boarding dwellings in the M-2 District.

The "Overlay Zone Approach" would involve the City Commission as they would need to approve the boundaries of the overlay zone. This approach would be limited to RSOs and rooming/boarded dwellings in the overlay district only, and would use established subjective criteria.

Mr. Piggott noted that none of the proposed options impact Section 154.004-5, which allows the broader discretion by the ZBA in approving changes to existing nonconforming uses.

Mr. Piggott shared a comparison of the approaches, along with the current process, noting which districts would be impacted; what criteria would be used; administrative roles; ZBA/PC and CC involvement.

Chairman Holtgreive asked for more explanation on how the Overlay district would work. Mr. Piggott stated that the boundaries would need to be determined by the Planning Commission and City Commission, and would be work similar to the Mission Street Overlay District, allowing the PC to grant waivers in exchange for better developments. He noted that his recommendation does not include the boundary.

Commissioner Dailey questioned what it is we are trying to fix - what is broken.

Chairman Holtgreive noted that there has been some concern that we have a mixture of owner occupied/single-family rentals/rooming dwellings/ RSO's etc. and that there was some desire to create a buffer zone and move the higher density uses closer to the middle of the M-2 districts.

Commissioner Dailey commented that it appears that codifying the process would create more hard-line regulations.

Commissioner Lents commented that there had been some concern expressed by members of the City Commission that we may be setting ourselves up for a lawsuit with the current process and they wanted to prevent any legal ramifications.

Commissioner Hoenig noted that the problem with not having it codified could look like the Board is discriminating.

Commissioner Lents commented that she feels it is important to continue having the requests reviewed by both Boards, noting that with each Board member having input, we are getting better developments. She further noted that although Mr. Piggott has done a really good job of researching and putting together the proposed options, she doesn't like any of them. She noted that she likes the process the way it is, however would like to see a buffer zone. She feels that by choosing one of the proposed options, we would just be piece-mealing the process.

Commissioner Kostrzewa, with the support of Commissioner Ranzenberger, asked that City Commissioner Kulick, who was in the audience, be allowed to speak.

Commissioner Kulick commented that he is hearing a lot of concerns regarding a buffer zone and noted that one option would be to create language in the Ordinance that would restrict redevelopments that abut a residential district to a certain number of tenants per unit, noting that as Commissioner Lents has expressed in the past, it isn't so much the number of tenants per parcel that concerns her, but the number of tenants allowed in one living unit. This would still

allow the density, but it would be broken down into smaller individual units. Currently the Ordinance does not allow an RSO to have a common lot line with residential districts and we could include language similar to that.

Commissioner Lents commented that she feels the Commission needs to look at the line and address that. She noted she isn't sure that they are ready to make that decision, commenting that it may be a joint effort between the PC and CC.

Chairman Holtgreive commented that we keep kicking this down the road and we need to look at the entire area and come up with boundaries that make sense. He further commented that it either needs to be left alone or we really need to fix the problem. Chairman Holtgreive commented that the draft Master Plan speaks of doing a study of the M-2 area, which would allow us to do this correctly.

Commissioner Lents stated she feels that the codification process needs to stop until after the study is completed.

Commissioner Kostrzewa commented that he likes Commissioner Kulick's suggestion, and questioned whether it would even be possible to reduce the M-2 area if that is what the study concluded.

Commissioner Lents noted that the desire isn't to reduce the area, and noted that the study may even indicate increasing the area if the jagged line is adjusted. She further noted that it may just mean a different style of development be allowed along the buffer zone, with multiple units, but with each unit having less occupancy (duplex/townhouse type developments).

Chairman Holtgreive agreed that the boundary issue needs to be resolved.

Commissioner Verleger asked if this is unique to Mt. Pleasant, questioning what processes other similar cities are using.

Mr. Piggott noted that the approach that Mt. Pleasant is currently using is somewhat unique to Mt. Pleasant.

Mrdeza provided some background of the M-2 codification process, noting that the City Commission asked the Planning Commission to look at a defined area within the M-2 district to see if there is a way of codifying the existing procedures. He further noted that the City has had their legal counsel look at the process and they have advised us that what we are doing is a legal process.

Chairman Holtgreive stated he would like to continue what we are doing and go with the "as is" process, noting that the proposed draft Master Plan gives us the opportunity to come back and deal with it.

Commissioner Lents expressed concern that once a codification is in place it may be hard to change.

Mr. Piggott clarified that the "as is" version may be deceiving as it does make changes - it actually codifies the process.

Commissioner Lents commented that the ZBA has gotten pretty stringent when looking at requests, noting that for a variance request they review all of the criteria and commented that the processes are quite different when it is a finding of fact.

Commissioner Ranzenberger stated he feels it is important to keep the ZBA in the process, noting that these types of requests are judgment calls. He also noted he feels it is appropriate for the PC to be involved and have both bodies look at the requests. Commissioner Ranzenberger commented that if we get too specific we will end up with "cookie cutter" projects, or projects that meet the requirements, but are ugly. He further stated that the process we have works really well and would not like to see it messed up.

Staff commented if not defining an overlay zone at the outset is a possible consideration. Mr. Piggott cautioned that adopting the overlay district but not zoning any property to that classification at that time might be viewed as creating a "floating zone". He noted that another alternative to the overlay zone approach would be to include within the standards of the "as-is" or "SUP" options a provision permitting the waivers within only a described portion of the M-2 district but cautioned that this might be viewed as violating the requirement that all properties in a zoning district be treated similarly. He suggested that we may wish to seek an opinion from the City's legal counsel if we use that approach.

Motion by Lents, support by Hoening, to postpone making a recommendation until the M-2 study noted in the draft Master Plan is implemented. Commissioner Lents asked that staff relay the reasons behind this motion to the City Commission.

Motion carried.

B. Master Plan.

Staff referred to the Master Plan draft that the Planning Commission received in their packets, and noted that it is anticipated that the City Commission will also be receiving a copy of the draft at their March 24, 2014 meeting. Staff noted that there is a required 63 day review period during which time the draft plan is shared with neighboring jurisdictions. Following the review period, the Planning Commission will hold a Public Hearing. Staff noted that during the review period, there will be chances to discuss changes. Following the public hearing the Master Plan document will be finalized and ready for adoption.

Staff noted that although monthly updates have been provided along the way, he wishes to be certain that the Planning Commission is comfortable with their knowledge of the proposed plan and are comfortable moving it forward to the City Commission.

Chairman Holtgreive indicated he has made some notations in the margins of his copy and will turn it over to staff following the meeting. He further indicated that he is comfortable moving forward with the draft plan.

Commissioner Ranzenberger indicated he too was comfortable moving forward.

Motion by Ranzenberger, support by Kostrzewa, to send the draft of the 2014 Master Plan to the City Commission and request they approve the draft for distribution and comments by the surrounding jurisdictions.

Motion carried.

C. 2014 Goals

Staff noted that at the previous meeting, the annual report was reviewed and the status of the 2013 Goals was reviewed. Staff noted that the completion of the Master Plan Update was the top priority for the Planning Commission and is nearing completion. The second 2013 Goal was to complete some Ordinance amendments/housekeeping issues. The Planning Commission was able to complete the Ordinance amendments. The "as time permits" goal was to complete the Mission Redevelopment Overlay north of High Street.

Staff commented that based on the M-2 discussions that have taken place over the past several months, it may be appropriate to include completing the study for the M-2 area, as referred to in the Implementation portion of the master plan, in the 2014 Goals, along with considering codification based on the M-2 study. Leaving the Mission Street Redevelopment for north of High Street as an "as time allows" goal was also offered for consideration.

Chairman Holtgreive asked staff to draft up a list of proposed 2014 Goals for the Board to consider at their next meeting.

Commissioner Lents asked about the status of hiring a new Planning Director, noting that without a full time Planner, we need to keep our goals reasonable.

Mrdeza provided an update on the search for a City Planner, noting that we currently do not have a candidate pool and our Human Resources department is looking at their recruitment process. He further noted that he is unable to provide a timeline.

Discussion took place on Complete Streets and the Non-Motorized Transportation Plan. Mrdeza commented that the city likely would not adopt the Non-Motorized Transportation Plan; however it has been included as a reference document and resource guide in the Master Plan draft and will be given consideration with each project as part of the review procedure.

Commissioner Lents suggested there are other communities that have Ordinance Language to address complete streets and noted the City could start with boiler plate language. Staff noted

that any ordinance language related to Complete Streets would need to be tailored to the specific needs of Mt. Pleasant. Commissioner Lents commented that if it is low-hanging fruit it is something we could do right away; whereas the M-2 process is going to be more involved. Staff noted that the draft Master Plan document has a section on Complete Streets that is specific to the City of Mt. Pleasant.

Mrdeza stated that this is being addressed through the Master Plan update. With the adoption of the Master Plan, we will be moving forward as a Complete Streets community.

Commissioner Lents asked that for future sidewalk waiver requests, that staff include the complete streets information in their report.

D. 1015 Andre. Staff provided a brief summary of the request that was before the Planning Commission last month. After determining that the request would require a variance, the Planning Commission postponed their decision. Since that time, staff reported that the applicant has decided to sell the property and is no longer pursuing the duplex at this site.

XI. New Business:

A. Joint Meeting

Staff reported that the City Commission has set the date for the Joint Meeting for March 24, 2014 at 6:00 p.m.

XII: Other Business:

A. Staff Report:

Staff noted that the April meeting will be held on the 2nd Thursday, April 10th, which means there is still a week until submittal deadline.

Mrdeza commented that there have been several conversations with developers of various projects, and we will likely have four new projects.

XIII: Adjournment

Motion by Kostrzewa, support by Lents to adjourn.

Motion approved.

Meeting adjourned 9:25 p.m.