

City Of Birmingham
Regular Meeting Of The Planning Board
Wednesday, January 11, 2023
City Commission Room
151 Martin Street, Birmingham, Michigan

Minutes of the regular meeting of the City of Birmingham Planning Board held on January 11, 2023. Chair Clein convened the meeting at 7:30 p.m.

A. Roll Call

Present: Chair Scott Clein, Vice-Chair Bryan Williams; Board Members Stuart Jeffares, Bert Koseck, Daniel Share, Janelle Whipple-Boyce; Alternate Board Members Jason Emerine (not voting), Nasseem Ramin (voting)

Absent: Board Member Robin Boyle

Staff: Planning Director Dupuis; City Planner Blizinski, Senior Planner Cowan, City Transcriptionist Eichenhorn

DPZ: Matt Lambert

B. Approval Of The Minutes Of The Regular Planning Board Meeting of December 14, 2022

01-01-23

Motion by Mr. Williams

Seconded by Ms. Whipple-Boyce to approve the minutes of the Regular Planning Board meeting of December 14, 2022 as submitted.

Motion carried, 7-0

VOICE VOTE

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

Nays: None

C. Chair's Comments

Chair Clein welcomed everyone to the meeting and reviewed the meeting's procedures.

D. Review Of The Agenda

E. Unfinished Business/Courtesy Review

F. Rezoning Applications

G. Community Impact Studies

H. Special Land Use Permits and Site Plan & Design Reviews

I. Site Plan and Design Reviews

J. Study Session

1. The Birmingham Plan 2040 – Final Draft & Review of Notice Period Comments

PD Dupuis provided an overview of the item.

The Chair thanked Oakland County Staff for their review of the City's draft 2040 Master Plan. He then explained that the purpose of the evening's study session was to determine whether the draft was ready to be advanced to a public hearing for discussion and review.

Public Comment

Denise Rumsey, Mary Miner, Larry Bertollini, Mary Grobbel, David Bloom, Pam Willis, Kevin Kozlowski, Mary Jaye, Peter O'Keefe, Ted Singer, Alex Perkins, Kristi Karimpour, Kamran Karimpour, and Greg Waddell provided comment on the draft.

Public comments were as follows:

- Parcels at the corner of Eton and Lincoln should be single-family;
- The northeast corner of Kenning Park should not have a commercial use;
- Multi-family housing should be built in the Rail District;
- Birth rates are down nationally, so building more housing to increase school enrollment is an attempt to deal locally with a national issue;
- The area around Lincoln and Eton has good homes for older residents looking to downsize;
- Adams between Lincoln and Maple should be developed at a lesser intensity;
- The 'Future Land Use Plan' should be clarified to be more of a guide;
- There is a lot of traffic congestion on Lincoln and Eton, which could be increased if slight upzoning is allowed on the parcels at the corner of Eton and Lincoln;
- The differences in map colors are somewhat difficult to discern;
- There may be discrepancies between the maps on pages eight and nine and the map on page 50;
- Buffer, activity, and access seams, as well as fine-grained, and sleeves, should be defined;
- Zoning designations in the draft Plan should either be defined via hyperlink to the ordinance or defined in the appendix;
- Providing a pad for temporary stands or food truck access in some of the parks would be preferable to allowing brick-and-mortar commercial destinations in the parks;
- Improvement of the Woodward pedestrian crossings and the \$50,000 avoidance mentioned on page 77 were both positive proposals;
- The draft aims to both protect the tree canopy and to expand sidewalks, and there may be a conflict between those goals;
- Proposed upzoning on Madison was a positive aspect of the first draft of the Plan that should be restored in the final draft;
- Upzoning is a wonderful thing and would truly give Birmingham the ability to truly become a walkable City;
- Having enough density and mixed-use is essential for walkability;
- Upzoning will increase property values and attract younger families to the City;
- Often the concerns about upzoning are not about the increase in residences, but a potential increase in traffic. Increased walkability and bikeability, however, would reduce traffic congestion and allow for more effective traffic calming measures;

- The six parcels along Oakland between Woodward and Euclid are potentially historic resources and neighbors in the past have requested that area remain as it is presently zoned;
- Unsubsidized affordable housing is unlikely to be feasible in Birmingham because of the City's taxes, especially when there are nearby districts with lower taxes and comparable schools;
- The City should determine whether it wants to prioritize the preservation of historic homes or new developments. The City should also recognize that the preservation of historic homes somewhat limits the rights of the owner of a historic home;
- Multi-family at Eton and Lincoln could pose aesthetic or ambiance issues relative to the surrounding area; and,
- Quality-of-life should be a greater planning priority over increased commercialization and density.

The Chair replied to public questions about Lincoln and Eton, Oakland between Woodward and Euclid, and S. Old Woodward and George. Seeing no further public comment, the Chair returned discussion to the Board.

Board comments were as follows:

- MUTCDs, as referenced on page 29, should be defined in parentheses;
- Internal circulators, as referenced on page 40, should be described in one sentence in the third paragraph;
- The parking table on page 44 should be replaced with a less-blurry table;
- The City should discuss how to address some of the more editorialized or outdated sections of the draft, such as references to a community foundation, social districts, or Friends of the Rouge;
- The draft was ready to go to a public hearing;
- The master priority list may have been different than what the Board requested;
- The reference to the Bates Street extension and Lot 6 on page 20 of the draft should be made to align with the reference to the same area on page 69 of the draft;
- The amount of additional traffic that would be generated by the slight upzoning of the parcels at the corner of Eton and Lincoln would be miniscule, which must be acknowledged whether or not one was in favor of the upzoning of those properties more generally;
- Duplexes can be done beautifully, as demonstrated by some Wallace Frost homes in the City;
- There is value to having walkable commercial destinations in a neighborhood, and could be located near parks if not in them;
- The park near Roeper should possibly be marked green on the maps;
- The section on ADUs that references external stairs could be struck because the ordinance already has guidance on external stairs;
- The Haynes Square proposal is good;
- The draft is very good;
- There were some minor changes that needed to be made to the draft, but no major ones;
- Given some of the public comments regarding the parcels at the corner of Eton and Lincoln, and that upzoning the parcels would not significantly affect the City overall, it might be worth considering leaving those parcels as-is;

- The necessary minor changes could be recommended during the public hearing on the draft and forwarded to the Commission. If a major, conceptual issue were to arise at the public hearing, then moving the draft forward at that time should be re-evaluated;
- The 2040 Plan will function as a set of recommendations and a guide. No part of the Plan would be implemented without extensive future study and consideration of appropriateness. Consequently, there was little risk in allowing the draft to move forward with certain ideas that individual Board members might be on the fence about, since none of those ideas would be implemented directly from the Plan;
- There is value in retaining some of the proposals that did not presently have unanimous support because said proposals may become more relevant in the future;
- Some of the proposals could be rephrased from 'should be' to 'may be' to leave more room for future discretion; and,
- Master plans are required by the State to be reviewed every five years, and the City is presently on year four of writing the master plan. This master planning process has been superlatively thorough.

Mr. Lambert stated that the master priority list was reflected in the Summary Table.

PD Dupuis cautioned the Board that spending more time reviewing and changing the draft could lead to additional demands that other proposals in the draft be changed.

Mr. Emerine concurred with PD Dupuis.

After further discussion of when to set a public hearing, the Chair directed Board members to each make a list of any remaining items they believed should be discussed before setting a public hearing in order to give the public time to review the items.

The Board also asked Staff to create a one-page written explainer for the public regarding what a master plan does and what occurs after its adoption.

K. Miscellaneous Business and Communications

1. Pre-Application Discussions

i. Community House Bates Street Society Dinner Event Lighting

PD Dupuis presented the request.

Board consensus was not to allow the request.

2. Communications

3. Administrative Approval Correspondence

4. Draft Agenda

5. Action List - 2023

PD Dupuis asked the Board to consider Action List items.

6. Other Business

The Board commended PD Dupuis on the project update.

Mr. Williams thanked Planning Staff for their work in 2022, and said the Planning Department was performing at a very high level.

Other Board members concurred.

L. Planning Division Action Items

- a. Staff Report on Previous Requests**
- b. Additional Items from tonight's meeting**

M. Adjournment

No further business being evident, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 9:29 p.m.



Nick Dupuis,
Planning Director



Laura Eichenhorn,
City Transcriptionist