

City Of Birmingham
Regular Meeting Of The Planning Board
March 13, 2024
City Commission Room
151 Martin Street, Birmingham, Michigan

Minutes of the regular meeting of the City of Birmingham Planning Board held on March 13, 2024.
The meeting was convened at 7:30 p.m.

A. Roll Call

Present: Chair Scott Clein, Vice Chair Bryan Williams; Board Members Stuart Jeffares, Bert Koseck, Daniel Share (left 7:58 p.m.), Janelle Whipple-Boyce

Absent: Board Member Robin Boyle; Alternate Board Members Jason Emerine, Nasseem Ramin

Staff: Planning Director Dupuis; City Transcriptionist Eichenhorn

B. Approval Of The Minutes Of The Regular Planning Board Meeting of February 28, 2024

03-09-24

Motion by Mr. Williams

Seconded by Ms. Whipple-Boyce to approve the minutes of the Regular Planning Board meeting of February 28, 2024.

Motion carried, 6-0.

VOICE VOTE

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

Nays: None

C. Chair's Comments

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

D. Review Of The Agenda

E. Meeting Open to the Public for Items Not on the Printed Agenda

F. Unfinished Business/Courtesy Review

G. Rezoning Applications

H. Community Impact Study and Site Plan Review

I. Special Land Use Permits

J. Site Plan & Design Reviews

1. 370 E. Brown (Formerly 294 E. Brown) – Site Plan Extension Request

PD Dupuis summarized the request and answered informational questions from the Board. Alex Saroki, architect, was present on behalf of the request.

03-10-24

Motion by Mr. Williams

Seconded by Mr. Koseck that the Site Plan Extension Request for 370 E. Brown (Formerly 294 E. Brown) be extended until March 2025.

There was brief discussion about whether a full year's extension was necessary. It was noted that a year would offer sufficient time for the site plan review process to occur.

One Board member commented that, if a subsequent request for an extension were to occur a year from now, it might be received less favorably.

Motion carried, 6-0.

VOICE VOTE

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

Nays: None

K. Study Session

1. The Birmingham Plan 2040 – Prioritization of Key Actions

PD Dupuis presented the item and answered questions from the Board.

Board members made the following comments:

- A typographical error on page 10 of the agenda, in the fifth column from the left, should be amended.
- Staff should review the requests made of the Board by the Commission from the last joint meeting to ensure that the Board has fulfilled its responsibilities regarding this item thus far.
- The Board had fulfilled its responsibilities regarding the item thus far. The Commission asked the Board to recommend a process for implementing the 2040 Plan and to recommend, as part of that implementation process, duties for each board and committee, which the Board has done.
- Staff was commended for their work on the item.

L. Miscellaneous Business and Communications

1. Pre-Application Discussions

PD Dupuis presented the proposals.

i. 300 S. Old Woodward – RH

Board consensus was that the request should be administratively approved.

ii. 330 Hamilton Row

Chris Longe, architect, spoke on behalf of the proposal. There was Board consensus that a Community Impact Study (CIS) was not required by the ordinance in this particular case.

It was noted this finding would be formally indicated at the preliminary site plan review for the project.

2. Communications

i. Project Updates

ii. April Planning Board Meeting(s)

3. Administrative Approval Correspondence

4. Draft Agenda

5. Action List - 2024

PD Dupuis presented the list and answered questions from the Board.

Board members made the following comments:

- Whether 20,000 sq. ft. refers to the size of an addition or to an entire building should be clarified in the CIS ordinance.
- The CIS ordinance should be rewritten to include more modern and relevant requirements.
- 'Encourag[ing] renovations to expand existing houses rather than the construction of new houses' may or may not be the most appropriate method of preserving neighborhood character, depending on the context.
- Preserving neighborhood character and aging-in-place were distinct priorities for many members of the public who participated in the 2040 Plan drafting process.
- 'Encourage renovations to expand existing houses rather than the construction of new houses' was excerpted from the 2040 Plan. Some Board members noted concerns with the word 'encouraging' during the 2040 Plan drafting process. Further study regarding the topic will occur.
- The phrase regarding renovations could be rephrased as 'Analyzing the impact of the City encouraging renovations to existing homes.'

Staff indicated they would amend the action list to indicate that the 'Encourage renovations' item was an excerpt from the 2040 Plan and not a mandate for how the Board would approach the topic.

6. Other Business

i. Appointment to Ad Hoc Senior/Recreation Center Committee

03-11-24

Motion by Mr. Williams

Seconded by Mr. Jeffares for Dan Share to be the Planning Board appointment to the Ad Hoc Senior/Recreation Center Committee

Motion carried, 5-0.

VOICE VOTE

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

Nays: None

M. Planning Division Action Items

a. Staff Report on Previous Requests

b. Additional Items from tonight's meeting

Board members made the following comments:

- A review of the public development review process should be prioritized on the action list.
- Since that topic may be more of a matter of City administration or Commission policy, it would be helpful for the Commission to indicate at the upcoming joint meeting whether the Board should undertake a review of the public development review process.
- Instead of waiting for the joint meeting, if the Commission could provide guidance regarding this matter soon, the Board may be able to participate in the review process for the Senior/Recreation Center project. Largely the same process used to review private development could be used to review public development, and adapting the process from the one type of development to the other would be relatively straightforward. The Board could likely undertake this adaptation quickly enough that the amended process could be used for the Senior/Recreation Center project.
- It would be necessary to determine whether there are any legal reasons not to apply an adapted review process to public development.
- Courtesy reviews are frustrating because there is no set standard for public development and the Board does not see public development projects until late in the process.
- The Board would like information on the present public development review process and on whether the Board could review public development earlier in the process.
- It would likely be inappropriate for final site plan approval to be granted by the Board in the case of public development.
- It would be helpful to know how other communities review public development projects.

It was determined that Staff would seek preliminary guidance regarding the legalities of this topic from City administration, and would return with further information at the March 27, 2024 meeting.

N. Adjournment

No further business being evident, the meeting was adjourned at 8:38 p.m.

A blue ink signature of Nick Dupuis, consisting of a stylized 'N' and 'D' followed by a horizontal line.

Nick Dupuis, Planning Director

A blue ink signature of Laura Eichenhorn, featuring a cursive 'L' and 'E' followed by a horizontal line.

Laura Eichenhorn, City Transcriptionist