CITY OF INKSTER
PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES

An Annual meeting of the Inkster Planning Commission was held on Monday, January 14, 2013 in the Inkster Council Chamber located at 26215 Trowbridge, Inkster, Michigan.

A quorum was reached. Vice Chairman Brown called the meeting to order at 6:10 p.m.

I. ROLL CALL

Present: Commissioners Thomas, Hendricks, Chastang, Vice Chairman Brown, and Commissioners Hampton and Davis
Absent: Secretary Garrett (excused), Chairman Wells, and Commissioner Manier
Others in Attendance: Mark D. Lloyd, Director of Community Development
Ed Al-Saati, Representative, 12-10(SCU) & 12-11(SP) & 12-08(SCU) & 12-09(SP)
John Bingham, Representative, 12-10(SCU) & 12-11(SP)
Ernest Allen, Jr., Representative, 12-10(SCU) & 12-11(SP)
Mark Hayes, Applicant, 12-10(SCU) & 12-11(SP)
Hasan Jaber (Sam), Representative, 12-08(SCU) & 12-09(SP)
Saidia Johnson, Planning Division Secretary

Public in attendance: Jean Fuller, Inkster Public Schools Board Member

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

MOVED by Chastang, Seconded by Hampton to adopt the agenda. **MOTION CARRIED unanimously.**

III. ADOPTION OF MINUTES OF OCTOBER 22, 2012

MOVED by Chastang, Seconded by Hendricks to adopt the Minutes of October 22, 2012 with any necessary corrections. **MOTION CARRIED unanimously**.

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. 12-10(SCU)/1615 Henry Ruff Road – Special Conditions Use Review
To allow a trade school in an R-1B District. The project site is located on the east side of Henry Ruff Road between Spring Arbor Drive and Parkwood Avenue. Mark A. Hayes is the applicant.

MOVED by Chastang, Seconded by Hendricks to open the public hearing. **MOTION CARRIED unanimously.**

Brown opened the floor to Mr. Lloyd. Mr. Lloyd gave report. Report highlights included: All State requirements for notification were met; site plan and special conditions use permits are required for a trade school in the R-1B District; the proposed project site is a vacant building that is approximately 5,000 square feet or approximately 12 acres; the existing structure is approximately 3,000 square feet with a first and second floor; and the site plan consists of both levels while the second level will be completed at a later date.

Mr. Lloyd discussed the proposed uses of the interior rooms.

Mr. Lloyd continued reporting on land usage issues. Report highlights included: Parking is adequate, hours or operation are reasonable; adjacent and nearby uses will not be impacted by the proposed operation; the Master Plan shows schools as a warranted use; all planning requirements have been met; the applicant also owns property located to the north and adjacent to the proposed school; and fire review is being conducted by an independent agency. In conclusion to his report, Mr. Lloyd indicated that the applicant was in attendance.

After there being no further report, Brown opened the floor to the public. Ms. Fuller indicated that the School Board members were not aware of this hearing and therefore has not had the opportunity to provide any comments. She requested the Commission to delay action until she discussed this issue with the School Board regarding the proposed trade school.

Ms. Fuller indicated that the previously operated school was chartered through the Inkster Public Schools and the State closed the school due to safety violations. In conclusion to her address, Ms. Fuller indicated and discussed drainage problems that existed on the site and that the site was a wetland.

The following discussions ensued to address Ms. Fuller’s request and concerns.

Reiteration was stated that the plans were submitted to the State for approval; occupancy of the building is not allowed unless all code requirements (including fire and building) have been met; the applicant has conducted due diligence to assure that they were financially able to complete the project in accordance with all code requirements; the Planning Commission cannot approve the project if it does not meet all code requirements; and all code requirements were met prior to the previous occupancy—it is believed that other events occurred that culminated into codes issues becoming non-compliant and at which time a decision was made to discontinue operation of the school.

Hendricks led discussion regarding occupancy of the second floor. Mr. Lloyd indicated that the applicant will have to prevent access to that area. Hendricks inquired if the Planning Commission had to approve site plan that contains future uses. Mr. Lloyd responded that the Planning Commission does not regulate floor plans—just the use of the building; the entire square footage of the building was used to calculate parking; this project will be in phases which we may require a bond to insure the completion of the project; and the second floor is already there.

Chastang commented that the building had previously collapsed due to poor engineering.

Davis led discussions regarding the partially built wall and time frame of the re-occupancy of the second floor. Mr. Allen indicated that demolition of the partially built wall would be the first improvement made to the property and the second floor will be occupied within six (6) to eight (8) months from the beginning of restructuring.

Brown led discussion regarding if enrollment would have an impact on the completion of the second floor. Mr. Allen responded that enrollment numbers would have no impact on the completion of the entire project. Mr. Lloyd responded that the first floor would be occupied then work will begin on the second floor.

Mr. Lloyd discussed his efforts with the project's representatives to assure that they knew the extensive scope of work needing to be completed.

Brown led discussions on if demolishing the partially built wall prior to issuance of an occupancy permit could be a condition of approval and would a temporary occupancy permit be issued for first floor. He also expressed concern that the Planner's report and the site plan did not reflect that the wall will be demolished. Mr. Lloyd responded that a different occupancy permit would be required for the second floor if it is not completed along with the first floor; and the revised plan will show that the partially built wall will be demolished.

Hampton led discussions regarding the extent of exterior improvements on the second floor (i.e. roof and electrical); closing off the second floor; and why there is recommendation that no additional landscape would be installed. Mr. Lloyd responded that the landscape will remain as it currently exists.

Hampton led discussions regarding the drainage problems and debris. Mr. Lloyd responded sewer and site engineering must be addressed and brought into compliance with codes; the project is to refurbish an existing building; the proposed is not to add any other structure to the existing building; a standard grading plan is required; the site is large and green with plenty of trees—there is no reason to add any additional landscape; the roof would probably be done; and there is no code regarding plugs especially since there will not be any occupancy on the second level at this point.

Chastang expressed concern regarding lack of drainage on the site. Mr. Lloyd responded that our site development standards must be met—the applicant has to resolve any issues of drainage.

Davis led discussions regarding occupancy of the first floor and when will the first students enter the building. Mr. Allen responded that students will occupy the first floor after its completion and there are students waiting for the opening of school; recruiting will be conducted after the first stage is completed; and the entire building will be occupied by 2014. Mr. Allen also indicated that the applicant's vision is to have a very aesthetically pleasing building where youth would be provided a safe environment while they are provided the opportunity to gain skills that would assist them with their livelihood. After there being no further discussions, comments, or reports, **Moved** by Chastang, Seconded by Hendricks to close the public hearing. **MOTION CARRIED unanimously**.

A.1 12-11/1615 Henry Ruff Road – Site Plan Review

To allow a trade school in an R-1B District. The project site is located on the east side of Henry Ruff Road between Spring Arbor Drive and Parkwood Avenue. Mark A. Hayes is the applicant.

Since there were no further discussions, comments, or reports, **Moved** by Hampton, Seconded by Chastang and Davis that recommendation of approval be made to City Council for Case #12-10(SCU)/Special Conditions Use to allow the operation of a trade school at property commonly identified as 1615 Henry Ruff Road subject to the following conditions:

- Approval of a site plan; and

that approval of the Case #12-11(SP)/Site Plan Use to allow a trade school to operate at 1615 Henry Ruff Road be granted subject to the following conditions:

- Submit a revised site plan noting that all drainage issues be approved by the City's Engineer
- That the site plan shows that the existing partially built wall will be demolished prior to issuance of the occupancy permit; and

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

B. 12-08(SCU)/26380 Michigan Avenue – Special Conditions Use Review

To allow a used auto dealership as an additional use with a minor automobile repair facility in a B-3 District. The project site is located on the north side of Michigan Avenue between Fairbairn Avenue and John Daly Road. A To Z Car Care is the applicant.

Moved by Chastang, Seconded by Hendricks to open the public hearing. **MOTION CARRIED unanimously.**

Brown opened the floor to Mr. Lloyd. Mr. Lloyd gave report. Report highlights included: This project is for an addition of an auto sales with an existing oil change and car wash facility; the development standards have been met with the current code; the oil change was approved in 2002, the car wash was approved in 2004, and now the proposed is auto sales; the site has adequate space to include auto sales; and the building design was originally developed to the standards of the current code.

Mr. Lloyd recommended the following since there will be many uses on the same site:

That ten (10) display spaces be allowed instead of the proposed fourteen (14) spaces; that no vehicles parking along the Michigan Avenue frontage be allowed as proposed; that no perpendicular parking along Michigan Avenue be allowed as proposed; and allow display cars to be at least five (5) feet from the landscaped area.
After there being no further report, Brown opened the floor to the public. There was no public in attendance.

Davis stated for clarification that spaces 4, 5, 6, and 8, as shown on the site plan, will be eliminated and asked if the applicant parks cars there, could a ticket be issued. Mr. Lloyd responded that illegal parking is a code violation and the Planning Commission could also revoke the site plan approval.

Hendricks led discussion regarding having auto repair services at auto car sales and car wash facilities. Mr. Lloyd responded that zoning allowed different uses based on site design; in other cities, auto repair is allowed and is either located in an enclosed structure or a compound in the rear; auto repair in not allowed at the proposed site other than oil change; all used car sales require special conditions use; and the existing business is struggling and is looking for a way to supplement income.

Thomas reported that the oil change facility located at Glenwood Avenue and Inkster Road has cars for sale on its site. Discussion ensued regarding the violation.

Mr. Lloyd reported that adequacy of space on the proposed site, if auto sales was a reasonable request, and would auto sales impact other businesses along Michigan Avenue were considered.

After there being no further discussions, comments, or reports, **Moved** by Hampton, Seconded by Chastang to close the public hearing. **MOTION CARRIED unanimously**.

Moved by Hampton, Seconded by Chastang that recommendation of approval be made to City Council for Case #12-08(SCU)/ Special Conditions Use to allow used car sales as an additional use at property commonly identified as 26380 Michigan Avenue subject to the following conditions:

- Approval of a site plan; and

that approval of the Case #12-09(SP)/Site Plan Use to allow used car sales as an additional use at property commonly identified as 26380 Michigan Avenue subject to the following conditions:

- Submit a revised site plan showing the elimination of customer parking along the frontage of Michigan Avenue.
- Note on site plan that there will be a **maximum** of ten (10) display vehicles.

– No vehicles can park closer than five (5) feet from landscaped areas.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

Hampton inquired if recommendations have been submitted for review of future auto repair allowances. Mr. Lloyd responded no.

V. OLD BUSINESS

Brown led discussion regarding the resignation of Commissioner Manier. Ms. Johnson reported she verbally discussed the issue of lack of attendance with Manier and he responded he wanted to remain on the Commission. Mr. Lloyd volunteered to contact Manier regarding his resignation.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

A. Review and Adoption of the 2013 Annual Meeting Calendar

Moved by Chastang, Seconded by Hampton to adopt every second and fourth Monday of each month in the year 2013 as its meeting days, beginning at 6:00 p.m., and to be held in the Inkster Council Chamber. **MOTION CARRIED unanimously**

B. Review and Adoption of the 2012 Annual Project and Attendance Reports

Moved by Chastang, Seconded by Hampton to adopt the 2012 Annual Project and Attendance Reports. **MOTION CARRIED unanimously**.

VII. MISCELLANEOUS

There was no miscellaneous business.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT – 7:15 p.m.

Moved by Hendricks, Seconded by Chastang to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting held on January 14, 2013. **MOTION CARRIED unanimously**.

Respectfully submitted,

____
Sam Brown, Vice Chairman

____
Saidia Johnson, Planning Division Secretary

:sj