

CITY OF BIRMINGHAM
VIRTUAL REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING BOARD
WEDNESDAY, MAY 13, 2020

Held Remotely Via Zoom And Telephone Access

Minutes of the virtual regular meeting of the City of Birmingham Planning Board held on May 13, 2020. Chairman Scott Clein convened the meeting at 7:30 p.m.

A. Roll Call

Present: Chairman Scott Clein; Board Members Robin Boyle, Stuart Jeffares, Bert Koseck, Daniel Share, Janelle Whipple-Boyce, Bryan Williams; Alternate Board Members Jason Emerine, Nasseem Ramin

Absent: Student Representatives Rachel Hester, June Lee

Administration: Jana Ecker, Planning Director
Eric Brunk, IT Manager
Nicholas Dupuis, City Planner
Laura Eichenhorn, Transcriptionist

Master Planning Team: Annmarie Erickson, Van Dyke Horn
Matt Lambert, DPZ
Sarah Traxler, McKenna

05-45-20

B. Approval Of The Minutes Of The Virtual Regular Planning Board Meeting of April 22, 2020

Mr. Williams stated that while the Chairman acknowledged his presence at 7:59 p.m., he joined the meeting at 7:49 p.m.

Motion by Mr. Williams

Seconded by Mr. Koseck to approve the minutes of the Virtual Regular Planning Board Meeting of April 22, 2020 as amended.

Motion carried, 7-0.

ROLL CALL VOTE

Yeas: Williams, Koseck, Boyle, Jeffares, Share, Clein, Whipple-Boyce

Nays: None

05-46-20

C. Chairperson's Comments

Chairman Clein noted that people were likely dealing with challenges in every aspect of their lives as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic and concomitant Stay Home, Stay Safe guidelines. He stated that everyone experiencing these disruptions is doing so to promote the health and safety of their community. He took a moment to thank all medical personnel and first responders for their heroic efforts. He continued that all people still working in public-facing jobs in delivery, grocery, retail and along the supply chain also had his thanks for helping the community cope with current circumstances.

Turning his attention to the evening's meeting, Chairman Clein observed that the present Planning Board meeting was the second one occurring in a virtual space. He stated that the meeting was taking place under the guidance of the City administration and City Attorney to ensure compliance with Governor Whitmer's executive orders regarding virtual municipal meetings. He said it was his full intention to run the meeting in adherence with those orders, and to use the full capacities of technology to do so. Even so, he granted that there would likely still be some technical difficulties along the way. The Chair asked for the patience of all in attendance in light of the unusual circumstances, and laid out procedures for the evening's meeting.

Before Chairman Clein drew his statements to a close, he said there was one further matter he wanted to clarify for the public. Noting that there seemed to be some confusion regarding the charge of the Board, the Chair explained that:

- The Board solely exists to review proposed development projects within Birmingham, and does not solicit development projects for the City.
- Members of the public will see some projects come before the Board that they prefer, and some they do not prefer. Members of the public are always permitted to express their opinions to the Board regarding matters that come before the Board for review.
- Projects lawfully submitted and in compliance with City ordinance shall be approved by the Board, regardless of the potential personal preferences of any Board members. Doing otherwise would open the City to significant liability. The Board has no rights to prohibit a project that is lawful and complies with City ordinance.

With that clarification, the Chair concluded his statements. He asked Planning Director Ecker to review the evening's agenda.

05-47-20

D. Review Of The Agenda

There were no changes to the evening's agenda. Granted leave by the Chair, Planning Director Ecker took a moment to explain to the public how the 'raise hand' function works within the Zoom platform.

05-48-20

E. Unfinished Business

1. 35001 Woodward (Parking lots & Hunter House) – Revised Preliminary Site Plan & Community Impact Study Review to allow construction of a new 5 story mixed use building containing retail, office and residential uses.

Planning Director Ecker reviewed the item.

Mr. Williams said that “subject to deletion of the terms Hunter House and HH from the plan” should be added to the end of the proposed ninth condition.

Mr. Koseck said that the words Hunter House and HH should be replaced with a more generic description of what will be located in those areas of the building.

Mr. Williams agreed.

Motion by Mr. Williams

Seconded by Mr. Boyle to amend the motion made on April 22, 2020, to approve the Preliminary Site Plan for 35001 and 35075 Woodward by affirming conditions 1 through 8 and adding condition 9 to the approved motion as follows:

9) Approved plans include the first floor plan on sheet A101, with the revision date 4-3-20, subject to replacement of the terms “Hunter House” and “HH” throughout the report and the plans with a more generic designation of the planned use of the space.

Motion carried, 7-0.

ROLL CALL VOTE

Yeas: Williams, Boyle, Koseck, Clein, Jeffares, Share, Whipple-Boyce

Nays: None

2. 219 Elm Street (vacant office building) - Request for Community Impact Study Review to allow construction of a new 5 story multiple family building.

City Planner Dupuis presented the item.

Mr. Williams shared concern about the lack of a dust, noise and debris plan given the planned five-story residential building across the street from 219 Elm which could be significantly impacted by this construction. Mr. Williams also noted that this development would increase stormwater runoff costs to every Birmingham resident if no stormwater mitigation initiatives are added. He stated that the City Commission would certainly want to see stormwater mitigation initiatives as part of this project.

City Planner Dupuis concurred with Mr. Williams. He explained that the development could potentially opt for a green roof as part of its LEED certification which would help with stormwater

mitigation. He said the developer could also pursue a number of other green infrastructure options for storm water mitigation including permeable pavement or making the proposed landscape feature in the rear of the building more functional. City Planner Dupuis said he included some of those options in his report on the Community Impact Study (CIS) in order to highlight some of the various options available to the developers for stormwater mitigation.

In reply to Chairman Clein, City Planner Dupuis confirmed that:

- Green infrastructure initiatives to mitigate stormwater runoff are not required by City ordinance or City engineering standards at this time.
- In light of the developer's request for two additional floors, some additional sustainability standards must be met beyond the usual requirements for a Birmingham development.
- By outlining the options for green infrastructure initiatives for stormwater mitigation, City Planner Dupuis is notifying the developer of one area through which they could satisfy some of the additional sustainability requirements for their development.

In reply to Mr. Koseck, City Planner Dupuis stated:

- In the Triangle District Overlay Standards, Article 3, independent senior living facilities are not a listed use. In reverting to the underlying zoning district of O2, independent senior living facilities are a permitted use with a special land use permit (SLUP).
- While not every building within the Triangle District Urban Design Plan (Triangle Plan) must be mixed use, building an exclusively residential building within the Triangle Plan area does not necessarily match the intent of the Triangle Plan.
- There are a number of standards the developer could meet in order to receive authorization to build an additional two floors. The CIS documents seemed to indicate that LEED Certification would be one of the standards the developer would like to meet.

In reply to Mr. Boyle, Planning Director Ecker stated:

- The City does require an updated CIS for the project. The applicant has been notified of various items such as a dust and debris plan, soil borings and a noise study that need to be updated within the submitted materials.
- The proposed building is a standalone building, entirely physically distinct from the neighboring All Seasons building. Residents of the proposed building would be able to utilize the amenities of the neighboring All Seasons building, and both buildings share an owner.

Mark Hyland, member of the applicant team, explained:

- The project will pursue LEED certification as one of the two ways they will qualify to add two extra floors to the building. Being so early in the development process the team has not yet determined how specifically they will meet the LEED certification requirements since there is such a broad range of ways to do so. They will be hiring an independent third-party company to review and approve their plans for achieving LEED certification later in the development process.
- The project team will submit all outstanding items pertaining to the CIS as soon as their contractors are able to complete the requisite studies. The team is waiting to submit the dust, noise, and debris mitigation plan until they know whether they will be granted the additional two floors, since the mitigation plan will shift based on the permitted height of the project.

- The building's units will be rentals.

Mr. Koseck cautioned that LEED certification is not granted by the U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC) until a project is completed. He said this fact causes some difficulty since the right to build extra floors would be partially predicated on the assumption that LEED certification will be granted, when it is actually impossible to know whether the certification will be granted until the project concludes. Mr. Koseck said that basing the granting of extra floors partially on the assumption of achieving LEED certification is an issue with the City's ordinance. He noted that the right to build two extra floors is a significant benefit, and cautioned the project's team to go above and beyond the bare minimum LEED certification standards in order to ensure that their project is certified once concluded.

Planning Director Ecker acknowledged that while LEED certification is not granted until a project's conclusion, developers have access to LEED certification worksheets that indicate the likely points they will gain towards LEED certification for various types of environmentally responsible architecture practices and resource management strategies.

Motion by Mr. Boyle

Seconded by Mr. Williams to accept the Community Impact Study as provided by the applicant for the proposed development at 219 Elm St. – All Seasons – with the following conditions:

- 1. The applicant must submit an updated environmental/soil assessment prior to Final Site Plan;**
- 2. The applicant must submit details as to how they plan to mitigate dust, noise, and debris during construction prior to Final Site Plan;**
- 3. The applicant must submit a noise impact study to complete the community impact study prior to Final Site Plan;**
- 4. The applicant must contact the Department of the Interior or SHPO to make a determination on the historic eligibility of the property prior to Final Site Plan; and,**
- 5. The applicant must provide all details on the fire suppression system to the Fire Department for review prior to Final Site Plan.**

Motion carried, 7-0.

ROLL CALL VOTE

Yeas: Boyle, Williams, Clein, Jeffares, Koseck, Share, Whipple-Boyce

Nays: None

Samuel Beznos, member of the project team, and Mr. Hyland told the Board that typically fire suppression drawings are submitted prior to permitting. Mr. Beznos asked the Board if it could be a requirement to submit the fire suppression drawings prior to receiving a building permit, instead of being required to submit them prior to Final Site Plan.

Chairman Clein said that the fifth condition of the motion requires that the project team submit the necessary information directly to the Fire Department. He said that if the Fire Department

allows the project team to submit the fire suppression information before permitting that the requirement of the motion would be satisfied. He told the project team to work through the Fire Department and other relevant City Staff regarding those details.

3. 219 Elm Street (vacant office building) - Request for Preliminary Site Plan Review to allow construction of a new 5 story multiple family building.

City Planner Dupuis presented the item.

Planning Director Ecker said the Zoning Ordinance describes how the City calculates the amount a building project must contribute to Birmingham's parking facilities funds in order to qualify for extra building floors.

Mr. Share said he agreed with Mr. Koseck's earlier points about the significance of being granted two extra floors based on the assumption of future LEED certification. He said at this point in the process he expects to see a clear demonstration of how the building would qualify for the two extra floors. Mr. Share stated he would be very disturbed if every non-smoking building within a quarter-mile of a bus stop and within a mile of a train station met one of the requirements to qualify for an extra two floors. He said he was uncomfortable with the prospect of approving this preliminary site plan with little sense of how the project team would meet the requirements of the ordinance.

Mr. Williams asked Planning Director Ecker what recourse the City has if a building, granted two extra stories predicated on the assumption of LEED certification, does not ultimately receive LEED certification at the conclusion of the project.

Planning Director Ecker said that the City requires a letter from the project team stating that they will achieve some level of LEED certification, and requires the submission of a checklist to demonstrate the likely points gained towards LEED certification based on different aspects of construction. She said the City has not encountered a case where a building, granted two extra stories predicated on the assumption of LEED certification, has not received LEED certification once the project was completed.

Mr. Williams said that he agreed with Mr. Koseck's previous point that this is an issue with the City's ordinance, and that this ordinance should be reviewed by the City. He said that the developer and the Board should know the consequences if two of the five requirements are not met for gaining an extra two stories once the building has been constructed.

Planning Director Ecker said the City would hold a bond and the project team would have to go back and make changes to the building in order to receive LEED certification. She said there are many different changes that could be made to a completed building in order to receive LEED certification.

Chairman Clein noted that this building will be subject to a SLUP that the City Commission has the right to condition as it sees fit.

Mr. Williams said he anticipates that the City Commission would have the same questions he, Mr. Share, and Mr. Koseck have raised.

Chairman Clein agreed.

Ms. Whipple-Boyce noted that contrary to the report, the proposed building would be another full story taller than the neighboring All Seasons building.

In reply to Ms. Whipple-Boyce, Planning Director Ecker stated that the two extra floors being proposed do not need to be stepped back from the alley like they would if they were adjacent to a street.

Ms. Whipple-Boyce said the alley in this case functions more like a street, and noted that the elevation being proposed is quite large. She said it was unfortunate that the two upper floors would not have to be stepped back in this case.

Mr. Jeffares concurred with Ms. Whipple-Boyce, saying that even the three stories of the neighboring building feel imposing from different locations along street level. He noted that Article 7, section 7.27 (2) of the Zoning Ordinance states "The location, size and height of the building, walls and fences shall be such that there will be no interference with adequate light, air and access to adjacent lands and buildings." Mr. Jeffares noted that the Board in the past has approved tall buildings near residential areas, but specified that this building is ~~must~~ **much** closer to residential areas than many of the Board's past approvals. He continued that while the building itself is not required to have mixed uses according to the Triangle Plan, permitting this building to be entirely residential means that a large portion of Maple, into Elm, would be occupied by solely residential buildings. He shared skepticism that such circumstances meet the intent of the Triangle Plan.

Chairman Clein said he was glad to see residential options being provided for seniors who want to downsize, remain in Birmingham, and live independently. The fact that if a resident parks in the rear of the building they would have to walk all the way around to the front to enter did give him pause given the likely average age of the residents. In concluding, Chairman Clein remarked that the project team seemed to possibly be trying to fit too much on too small of a lot, and that he was concerned it would not work.

Mr. Hyland responded to Board comments, noting:

- There would be a door accessible to the rear parking lot via the northern stairwell which would bring residents into the lobby by elevator.
- The planned building would be smaller than All Seasons in terms of square footage, even though it would be taller.
- The single-story office buildings adjacent to the planned building are in an area zoned for three-story attached single family. He said he anticipates that three-story townhouses will be built there in the near future. Given that, he said that stretch is likely to become at least three stories along that entire frontage.
- The project team is currently working on a building in West Bloomfield that is pursuing LEED certification. He said that project is giving them experience in the requirements for LEED certification.

- It is in his team's best interest to achieve LEED certification since it will be to their detriment they do not.

Mr. Koseck said it is a problem with City ordinance that residential units on the first floor of buildings can be built at the zero lot line. He said he could not imagine any residents who would be comfortable with the lack of privacy, and that he mostly sees the blinds closed on other first floor residential units at the existing All Seasons building. Mr. Koseck ventured it would have benefitted the project team more if they had put some of their public amenities around the periphery of the first floor, both in terms of resident preferences and in terms of activating the street. Listing Boston and New York as contrasting examples to Birmingham, Mr. Koseck noted that in those cities first floor residential is either set back, has porches, or has other ways of separating the residence from the immediate street.

Given that the plan proposes to have the residents of 219 Elm use the amenities of the neighboring All Seasons, Mr. Koseck said he did not see sufficient effort to provide ready access between the two buildings. Stating that he sees a lack of careful attention to details within the plan, Mr. Koseck noted for instance that there is a door on the north side of the building that is not required for egress, and that the trash room and fire pump rooms are along the south side of the first floor, which he stated is a fairly prominent elevation. He noted that Ms. Whipple-Boyce raised similar concerns about the view of the building that would be afforded the traffic that heads northbound on Elm Street.

Mr. Koseck concluded by saying he shared his other Board members' concerns about the proposed height, noting that even if the square footage of the proposed building is technically less than the All Seasons building, it will still likely appear substantially larger.

Mr. Hyland responded to Mr. Koseck, stating that the project team has had no problem leasing other first floor residential units since it is a desirable area and the units are high quality. He continued that the trash and fire pump rooms are along the alley so as to minimize pedestrian and car exposure to the area, and noted that the trash room was put inside so that there would not be a dumpster in the alley.

Mr. Beznos said that the aim of the proposed building is to provide a much more independent living environment than All Seasons, and that connecting the two buildings would minimize the difference the project team hopes to convey. He explained that those living in the proposed building would be offered access to exclusive events held at All Seasons once or twice a month, and that while they would have access to other All Season amenities the goal is not to overemphasize the connection between the two developments.

In addressing Mr. Koseck's concern about the first floor residential, Mr. Beznos said that they will be designed to look like individual townhomes and will be more private than the current first floor residential in the neighboring All Seasons building. Access to the first floor residential can be either from the street or from the interior corridor. He said the project team anticipates those units will be very attractive as a rental option.

Mr. Williams stated that when the neighboring All Seasons building was built, the Planning Board at the time required that the height at the south end taper down to three stories so as not to be

too imposing next to the residential area. He said he was similarly uncomfortable with the proposed height of five stories for this building, especially since the five stories would also be adjacent to the residential area.

Mr. Jeffares agreed with Mr. Williams, stating that the existing three stories of the neighboring All Seasons already have a significant impact on the neighboring residential. He said that if a five story building is built at 219 Elm that the sun might disappear beyond the top of the building in the mid-afternoon for the neighboring residential homes.

Mr. Hyland stated the project team would be able to provide most of the LEED certification plans to the Board by Final Site Plan. In reply to a question from Mr. Jeffares, Mr. Hyland said the project team has not met with any of the residential neighbors to solicit feedback on the design.

Chairman Clein stated that the proposed building does not abut any single family residential, and that the homes Mr. Williams and Mr. Jeffares have expressed concern for are further to the east of the development.

Mr. Boyle said he suspected that the single family residential units to the east of the proposed building would not lose evening sunlight given their distance from 219 Elm. He observed that the proposed building would be surrounded immediately by other tall buildings and commercial buildings.

Ms. Whipple-Boyce stated that the Triangle Plan proposes to have taller buildings along Woodward with buildings diminishing in height more towards the center of the Triangle District and on the smaller streets. She said that putting this five story building adjacent to the neighboring three story building seems to disrupt the Triangle Plan's intent. She said that while she understood that if the building met the requirements to qualify for the two additional floors that the project team would be within their rights to build them, she said she was not sure that would necessarily be a positive outcome for the area.

Mr. Koseck said he would like to see the entrance receive greater emphasis in the plans. He said he was not suggesting in his earlier comments that 219 Elm and the neighboring All Seasons building should be linked, but just that there should be a more efficient and aesthetically pleasing way to move from one building to the other. Mr. Koseck said that the blank wall of the north elevation showed no care or design sensitivity, and said he would like to see that wall pushed back with windows added. He said he was not concerned that the proposed building would impact the nearby single family residential because he thought they were far enough away.

Xander Bogaerts, architect for the project, said he wanted to address Mr. Koseck's concern with the north elevation. He explained that the building is prohibited by ordinance to have any doors or openings on the north wall. He said the project team would look at the north elevation again because the comments are valid that more adornments are needed. Mr. Bogaerts said he would review the south elevation as well. He continued that his mother lives in a first floor residential unit on Maple and enjoys being able to watch the street from her window. He said that the first floor residential units being offered would attract that type of person.

Mr. Boyle and Mr. Jeffares suggested that the developer should take time to work with City staff and resolve some of the concerns they heard from the Board during the evening's conversation.

Motion by Mr. Boyle

Seconded by Mr. Jeffares to postpone discussion of the preliminary site plan review for 219 Elm until June 10, 2020.

Motion carried, 7-0.

ROLL CALL VOTE

Yeas: Boyle, Jeffares, Koseck, Share, Whipple-Boyce, Williams, Clein

Nays: None

Motion by Mr. Williams

Seconded by Mr. Share to suspend the rules for June 10, 2020 to allow review of the preliminary site plan for 219 Elm.

Motion carried, 7-0.

ROLL CALL VOTE

Yeas: Williams, Share, Whipple-Boyce, Boyle, Clein, Jeffares, Koseck

Nays: None

Chairman Clein addressed the project team, stating that even though there was a lot of feedback the Board and Birmingham are very pleased to have the team's developments in the City. He asked them to take the Board's comments to heart and said the Board looked forward to meeting with the project team again soon.

05-49-20

F. Study Session Items

1. Debrief & Discussion on Draft Master Plan Review Process

Chairman Clein asked his fellow Board members to reflect on what they viewed as the successes or drawbacks of the first two meetings. He said he also wanted to clarify what the purpose is of this new round of public engagement, saying it could be to hear from the public in general, to seek certain feedback from the public, or to have the Board express its opinions on the draft master plan to the public.

Mr. Williams said that while the first meeting was relatively successful, the second meeting was less useful. He said the process is still lacking in that:

- It proposes to revise Birmingham neighborhood structures without having gained the feedback of those who currently participate in the neighborhood associations.
- The Planning Board has not had a meeting with the new City Commission to receive direction as to this draft master plan review. The Board and the Commission should have a substantive discussion regarding what the Board's focus should be before the public is

re-engaged. The master plan review process should be the only topic discussed at the Board and Commission's joint meeting in June 2020.

- No one can predict what the long-term impact of the Covid-19 pandemic will be on the City. Without a pause and an acknowledgement of the fact that the pandemic could yield significant changes, the plan could put forth recommendations that no longer have use or relevance in the new climate. For this reason, taking some time to try and figure out what the potential effects are and how those might impact the plan would be prudent.

Mr. Koseck noted his experience facilitating master plan projects for other groups, and said he felt sympathy for Birmingham's master planning team given the various pauses and the change at the Commission level they experienced. He said projects like these should have momentum and that trying to do it without it is undoubtedly challenging. Mr. Koseck continued that he was not sure that the guiding principles set forth in the draft master plan adequately represented the interests and goals of Birmingham residents. He said it would be beneficial if the Board and the Commission had a discussion to vet the guiding principles. He said that then conversations about the master plan proposals should be held in light of the guiding principles, and judged based on whether they adequately put those guiding principles into practice.

Ms. Whipple-Boyce said the largest difficulty she identified with the second meeting was the conflict between the Board's goal of keeping the discussion focused on the macro level and the public's desire to discuss the details of the draft. She said she anticipates that as the Board enters into more conversation about the neighborhoods, given people's passions regarding the topic, it will be even more difficult to keep the conversation at the macro level. She said it would be worthwhile to find strategies to navigate that challenge.

Planning Director Ecker stated that she has requested that the master plan be the only topic at the June 2020 joint Board-Commission meeting. She said one additional topic is being considered at this time. Planning Director Ecker said that one way of keeping the discussions running is to remind everyone that the master planning team is recording all of the comments in great detail, and that when a topic is reiterated by a member of the public the Board can assure them that the specific topic or issue has been heard, noted, and will be taken into account. In that way the Board can avoid getting mired in repeating their response to a subject that has already been addressed, or will be addressed in the second draft of the master plan.

Chairman Clein said that one of the most significant issues he perceived during the second meeting was that the Board did not seem to have a shared understanding of the intent of these meetings. He said his personal understanding of the goal of the draft master plan review meetings is solely to hear from the public, with no need for Board comment during the process. He asked his fellow Board members to opine on the purpose of these review meetings. He stated his belief that it is more correct to receive public feedback and to decide later how to integrate it, rather than having the Board tell the public the Board's opinions of the draft master plan.

Mr. Boyle said that the summary of the draft master plan presented to the public should be much broader than it has been. Mr. Boyle offered that the summary could lay out where Birmingham is today, where the City would like to see itself in the future, and what issues arise between those two conceptions. The Board should then solicit feedback from the public on how best to address those issues. Providing more examples, Mr. Boyle said the broad issues could be whether the City

has enough housing, what the public thinks about downtown, what the public thinks about mixed use, and whether the Triangle and Rail districts should be developed in the way the City is currently doing.

In reply to Chairman Clein, Mr. Boyle said the Board should listen to the public's input on these topics, and that the Board need not express its own opinion during these meetings.

In reply to Mr. Williams, Mr. Boyle said the list of issues to be discussed with the public should be set by the Board, City staff, and the Commission.

City Planner Dupuis asked if identifying the issues to be discussed would not be, in some ways, reverting to what the charrette discussions had already accomplished. He said he was asking the question for his edification as a new City Planner.

In reply to City Planner Dupuis, Mr. Boyle said the point was fair, but might still be one of the better ways of getting the public engaged.

Chairman Clein said the solution could be that the public is presented with the draft's recommendations in a broad way, and is asked to comment on those rather than on specific sections from the draft.

Mr. Jeffares voiced his agreement with Chairman Clein's proposed solution.

Mr. Koseck said it could be beneficial to the process to solicit feedback from the public during some of the Zoom meetings since people have more time and might be more willing to speak during a virtual meeting than in public. He said he also wondered whether the master planning team felt they were getting quality feedback from a broad enough swath of people, rather than the same people repeatedly.

Ms. Traxler said the master planning team is eager to begin revising the draft in order to address some of the common concerns they have been hearing. She said the presentations to the public can be shortened into executive summaries of the plan.

Mr. Lambert said he has been unsure whether the City would prefer that revisions happen immediately based on the feedback that has been provided so far, or whether the master planning team should gather all the feedback and begin its revisions once the feedback process is complete. Mr. Lambert noted that the master planning team has had opportunity over the course of the past year to get a broad range of feedback from the public, and that many of the recommendations in the draft reflect those conversations. Given that, he said the master planning team wants detailed feedback from the Board itself, since they are dealing with these kinds of planning issues within the City most regularly.

Chairman Clein stated that certain members of the City Commission do not believe that the Board has received nearly enough public feedback regarding the draft document. He stated he fully agrees with Mr. Williams' previous statement that the Board and the Commission need to meet in order to remedy the fact that the Board up to this point has received no direction from the current Commission in terms of how these reviews should be conducted. He said he would like

to hear the Commission's input and their opinions on the purpose of this first round of draft reviews. Chairman Clein suggested that the near future might be an appropriate time for the Board to meet with the master planning team in order for the Board to provide input on the parts of the draft that have been covered so far. He expressed hope that would allow the team to make those revisions throughout the draft so that when the public review returns the document will have incorporated and addressed some of the Board's concerns and comments.

Mr. Share said it was important to note that public engagement will always be complex, as there is no perfect way to streamline the process. He said he also thought it would be a loss if the Board did not have some time during these public review meetings to express their opinions about the draft. He suggested that the public could speak first for an hour or ninety minutes, and that then the Board could speak for an hour in reply. He said if these conversations can be kept as broad as possible, with some limitations on the length and frequency of comments allowed to each member of the public, then this process can occur relatively efficiently.

Mr. Williams concurred with Mr. Share. He said allowing the Board to express its comments during the meeting might necessitate that a few more meetings be scheduled, but that would be better than no one having a clear sense of the Board's opinions at the end of the draft review. He recommended that Board members determine during their June 2020 meeting a potential template for the rest of the draft review meetings. He said he liked Mr. Share's proposal of allowing the public to speak first for a period of time and then allowing the Board to express its views and respond. He said once the Board decides on a potential template it should be proposed to the Commission at the joint Board-Commission meeting in June 2020 for hopeful approval.

Chairman Clein said that would require the Board and the master planning team to be very concise in terms of what the public is being invited to comment on during the review sessions. He also repeated Mr. Williams' comment that the Board would have to solicit final approval from the Commission for any review session template the Board might propose.

Mr. Jeffares noted the potential for the Zoom technology to allow many more ways of capturing public comment, and said he hopes the Board will find a way to take advantage of that benefit during this time.

In reply to Chairman Clein, Ms. Erickson said she believes the Board is headed in the right direction and commended them for their attention and care towards getting public comment. She agreed with Board members' previous comments that these presentations and subsequent feedback sessions need to be made both concise and more macro-oriented. She also noted that the Board should remember and remind the public that there will be a whole additional draft to review in the future as well. Agreeing that there are a number of issues that recur repeatedly during these discussions, Ms. Erickson said a list of those issues should be compiled so that Chairman Clein can assure the public that the issue has been previously raised and noted, and will be considered in the process of revising the draft. She said that would be one way the meetings can be kept efficiently moving.

2. Discussion on Use of Virtual Meetings

Chairman Clein said virtual meetings were proving far less efficient than meeting in person, and stated that the number of agenda items should be limited to approximately three items during this time.

In reply to Mr. Williams, Planning Director Ecker listed the four agenda items planned for the May 27, 2020 Board meeting.

Mr. Williams suggested that since the June 10, 2020 Board meeting has been made a hybrid meeting, one of the May 27, 2020 agenda items should be moved to the June 10, 2020 agenda. He said the first May 27, 2020 agenda item alone will consume a substantial amount of time that evening. He said he completely agreed with Chairman Clein that the meetings should be limited to three items. He continued that he was not sure how much the Board would accomplish during its June 10, 2020 master plan draft review session since that will still be prior to receiving direction from the Commission during the joint Board-Commission meeting on June 15, 2020.

Mr. Share agreed that fewer agenda items are better while the meetings are being held virtually. He expressed doubt that the Board would get through the rezoning application, CIS and preliminary site plan review for 469-479 S. Old Woodward during one meeting, and said that made it even less likely that the Board would be able to get to the fourth item scheduled for that evening as well.

Mr. Boyle said he agreed that the number of agenda items should be limited so that each item can receive the attention it merits.

Mr. Koseck said limiting the number of agenda items should depend on the complexity of the topics.

Planning Director Ecker told the Board that the notices for 770 S. Adams had gone out. She said if the Board consensus was to delay the final site plan review until June 10, 2020, she could notify the applicant and annotate the item on the agenda as being rescheduled to June 10, 2020. Then, during the May 27, 2020 meeting, the Board will vote to move the item to their June 10, 2020 meeting.

Motion by Mr. Williams

Seconded by Mr. Boyle to limit Planning Board virtual meeting agendas to no more than three substantive items for any particular meeting as long as the Board is exclusively meeting via Zoom and telephone technology.

Motion carried, 7-0.

ROLL CALL VOTE

Yeas: Williams, Boyle, Clein, Jeffares, Koseck, Share, Whipple-Boyce

Nays: None

05-50-20

G. Miscellaneous Business and Communications:

a. Communications

b. Administrative Approval Correspondence

c. Draft Agenda for the next Regular Planning Board Meeting (May 27, 2020)

- Rezoning application for 469-479 S. Old Woodward
- CIS Review for a five story building at 469-479 S. Old Woodward
- Preliminary Site Plan review for a five story building at 469-479 S. Old Woodward

d. Other Business

Mr. Share said it would be prudent for the City to consider using Zoom for Planning Board meetings beyond the expiration of the Governor's Order to do so. He said this would help maintain the health and safety of both Board members and members of the public who fall into the high-risk category for Covid-19.

Chairman Clein said Mr. Share's point was well-stated.

Planning Director Ecker acknowledged the validity of Mr. Share's comments, and said the City was considering some changes to future City meeting protocol.

05-51-20

H. Planning Division Action Items

a. Staff Report on Previous Requests

b. Additional Items from tonight's meeting

05-52-20

I. Adjournment

No further business being evident, the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 10:56 p.m.

Jana L. Ecker

Planning Director