

**City Of Birmingham**  
**Regular Meeting Of The Planning Board**  
**February 26, 2025**  
City Commission Room  
151 Martin Street, Birmingham, Michigan

Minutes of the regular meeting of the City of Birmingham Planning Board held on February 26, 2025. The meeting was convened at 7:30 p.m.

**A. Roll Call**

**Present:** Chair Scott Clein, Vice Chair Bryan Williams; Board Members Robin Boyle, Stuart Jeffares, Daniel Share, Janelle Whipple-Boyce; Alternate Board Member Nasseem Ramin; Student Representative Carter Anderson

**Absent:** Board Member Bert Koseck; Student Representative Olivia Betanzos

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

**B. Approval Of The Minutes Of The Regular Planning Board Meeting of February 12, 2025**

**02-09-25**

**Motion by Share**

**Seconded by Williams to move the minutes of February 12, 2025 as presented.**

**Motion carried, 7-0.**

**VOICE VOTE**

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

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**

**G. Rezoning Applications**

**H. Community Impact Study and Site Plan Review**

**I. Special Land Use Permits**

**J. Site Plan & Design Reviews**

- 1. 185 Oakland – Request for Final Site Plan & Design Review for New Whole-Building Generator at Rear of Property (Postponed from January 22, 2025) – REQUEST TO POSTPONE**

**02-10-25**

**Motion by Williams**

**Seconded by Whipple-Boyce to postpone consideration of the final site plan and design review for 185 Oakland – Belfor Property Restoration to April 23, 2025.**

**Motion carried, 7-0.**

**VOICE VOTE**

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

Nays: None

**K. Study Session**

**1. Triangle District Bonus Height Requirements Phase 2 – Study Session**

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

Board members made the following comments during discussion:

- Most of the recent development in the Triangle has been residential. A market study could help inform the City whether this is a pattern to be encouraged or altered.
- The Triangle has been considered an appropriate area for residential development in past discussions. It may also be the most appropriate area in which to encourage moderately-priced residential development.
- It would be helpful to know what incentives other communities have used to encourage moderately-priced development in areas like the Triangle, and whether those incentives have worked. It would be worth looking at Traverse City, for one example.
- Owners of single family residences sometimes express unease about potential multifamily development in their neighborhoods. The Triangle is an area in which multifamily development could occur along with commercial, while generating less unease for single family homeowners.
- Intensive commercial development seems less likely to occur in the Triangle at this juncture.
- A 2007 Triangle Plan<sup>1</sup> is too outdated to be informative in this circumstance.
- Increased residential development can encourage increased commercial development.
- The Triangle could also be a place to incentivize businesses that would make it more pleasant to live in the City, like bookstores.
- A market study would not be able to predict the likely future growth in the Triangle, and so it may not be a worthwhile endeavor.
- Demand for office space has declined. It would be helpful to have information on office vacancies in the downtown area and office vacancies in the Triangle.
- The BSD may be able to provide insight on how encouraging retail and commercial uses in the Triangle might impact the retail and commercial uses in the downtown.
- Sustainability is a public good that would benefit the community and could be addressed by a developer.
- Public parking, transit access, and transfer of development rights are less likely to be used by developers to gain bonus floors.

---

<sup>1</sup>As amended at the March 26, 2025 meeting.

- Moderately-priced housing can be defined by different criteria. Staff should return with options for both appropriate language – whether ‘affordable’, ‘attainable’, ‘moderate’, or otherwise – and definitions to define this goal.
- Offering some housing that would create sufficient affordability for ~~allow~~<sup>2</sup> employees of the City and school district to live within the City would be a public good.
- Commercial uses in the Triangle could include pharmacies, grocery stores, and other amenities that are conducive to living ~~the~~<sup>3</sup> in the neighborhood.
- One way of creating moderately-priced housing would be documents running with the land ~~a rental~~<sup>4</sup> indicating it as such for an agreed amount of time, even in the event of an ownership change for the building.
- Mixed use in the Triangle should be a priority, and likely should be a requirement. The retail and commercial use in the area should be open and available to the public.
- The Board seems to have consensus that moderately-priced housing in the Triangle should be encouraged. The Commission has more options to make meaningful change within the Triangle towards that end than the Board does.
- Adams Square and the area near Lincoln have commercial businesses that would be complementary to nearby residential.
- Opportunities to combine parcels in the Triangle for different uses also remain. Those opportunities may be more clear to ~~retail~~<sup>5</sup> developers than to Board members.
- Reducing required parking in the Triangle could help spur development in the area as well.
- Many developers would be unlikely to develop in the Triangle at this juncture without any parking.
- If mixed use is to be encouraged, appropriate types of retail or commercial uses should be studied, and the appropriate locations.
- A public amenity option may be useful to retain. Housing remains a higher priority.
- Other City ordinances already require urban design.
- While sustainability is a priority, many things that promote sustainability raise housing costs. Sustainability and the desire for lower housing costs must be balanced.
- Sustainability could be addressed on more of a City-wide scale, for example through the housing code.
- The Board could generate a broad list of both planning- and non-planning incentives that could drive residential development in the Triangle. Those incentives could then be presented to the Commission.
- The Board could invite developers in to discuss what promotes or prevents development within the Triangle, in order to help inform the process. The Board has asked other professionals for feedback in the past while revising ordinances to good effect.
- Options such as allowing for a wider range of materials or reducing the permitting and review process time could also help reduce costs.
- There are many circumstances outside of the Board’s, Commission’s, and City’s control that affect whether development occurs as well. The Board can only control those incentives within its purview, and recommend some possible others to the Commission.

---

<sup>2</sup>As amended at the March 26, 2025 meeting.

<sup>3</sup>As amended at the March 26, 2025 meeting.

<sup>4</sup>As amended at the March 26, 2025 meeting.

<sup>5</sup>As amended at the March 26, 2025 meeting.

**L. Miscellaneous Business and Communications**

- 1. Pre-Application Discussions**
- 2. Communications**
- 3. Administrative Approval Correspondence**
- 4. Draft Agenda**
- 5. Action List**
- 6. Other Business**

**M. Planning Division Action Items**

- 1. Staff Report on Previous Requests**
- 2. Additional Items from tonight's meeting**

The Board asked staff to look into the location of a generator at a new home on Canterbury.

**N. Adjournment**

No further business being evident, the meeting was adjourned at 8:42 p.m.



Nick Dupuis, Planning Director



Laura Eichenhorn, City Transcriptionist