

**City Of Birmingham**  
**Regular Meeting Of The Planning Board**  
**August 13, 2025**  
City Commission Room  
151 Martin Street, Birmingham, Michigan

Minutes of the regular meeting of the City of Birmingham Planning Board held on August 13, 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, Bert Koseck, Daniel Share, Janelle Whipple-Boyce; Alternate Board Members Duncan Currie (not voting), Nasseem Ramin (not voting)

**Absent:** Student Representatives Carter Anderson, Olivia Betanzos

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

**B. Approval Of The Minutes Of The Regular Planning Board Meeting of July 23, 2025**

**08-49-25**

**Motion by Williams**

**Seconded by Koseck to move approval of the minutes of the regular meeting of July 23, 2025 with the two corrections noted.**

**Motion carried, 7-0.**

VOICE VOTE

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

Nays: None

**C. Chair's Comments**

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

**D. Review Of The Agenda**

Since the interested parties were present, the Board chose to review the pre-application discussions prior to the study session.

**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**

### **K. Study Session**

#### **1. Zoning Ordinance Update – Request for Proposal Discussion**

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

Board members raised the following comments during discussion:

- A month should be a sufficient amount of time to reply. The due date should be Tuesday, September 30, 2025 for the benefit of the consultants.
- The Board was comfortable reviewing the proposal digitally. It may be necessary to increase the number of paper copies requested for the final.
- Staff did an excellent job on this item.
- A deadline for questions from potential consultants should be set. A week before the deadline would likely be appropriate.
- It would probably not be necessary to hold a pre-bid meeting. The questions should be shared with all interested parties.
- The 2040 Plan could be mentioned in the third paragraph of the introduction, at the end of the list in the second sentence.
- There were differing opinions about whether the word 'innovative' in the fourth paragraph reflected the City's intent in seeking an ordinance update.
- There were differing opinions about whether 'underserved communities' in 'Scope of Work' – 'Public Engagement and Stakeholder Involvement' was relevant to include. It was also suggested that 'robust' could be replaced with 'inclusive' to convey a similar meaning.
- 'Outreach to all segments of the community' was suggested as a possible replacement.
- In support of retaining 'underserved communities', it was noted that there are residents of Birmingham who are food insecure, face challenges related to age, who are unable to build savings, or who otherwise face systemically-based challenges. 'Underserved communities' served to emphasize that the zoning update should not be written only in the interests of residents of certain neighborhoods.
- While it may not need to be clarified for the RFP, the City does need to determine how the RFP process will be run and who will have authority over the final report. It would likely be most appropriate for the Board, staff, and consultant to prepare a revised and updated zoning ordinance to the Commission. It would likely be less appropriate to require the Board to regularly report proposed changes to the Commission throughout the process.
- In 'Diagnostic Report and Recommendations', it could include some kind of ultimate approval of a final report by the Planning Board. Then, in 'Drafting of Updated Zoning Ordinance', it could include integrating the recommendations from the final report.
- One term should be used to refer to the 2040 Plan throughout the RFP, for consistency.
- If there is a way to receive an update of the zoning map that would allow for easier differentiation between zoning categories, that would be helpful.
- In 'Drafting of Updated Zoning Ordinance', points two and three could be flipped.
- The RFP should make it clear that the consultant would be presenting to the Planning Board at multiple stages along the way. Indicating an estimated number of presentations while allowing the bidders some flexibility in their recommendations could be appropriate.
- It may not be necessary to require that the consultant team have architecture and landscape architecture.
- Staff could consider weighting the evaluation criteria.

- 'Content of Proposal' could be removed from the criteria. Instead, the RFP should state how incomplete submittals would be treated by the City.
- Finding some way to measure the quality of the submittal would be useful. This could entail asking for a work plan or a project approach.

## **L. Miscellaneous Business and Communications**

### **1. Pre-Application Discussions**

PD Dupuis presented the proposals.

#### **i. 35001 Woodward – The Maple**

Board consensus was that the request should be administratively approved.

Kevin Biddison, architect, was present on behalf of the proposal.

#### **ii. 2333 Cole**

Board consensus was that while the applicant must maximize compliance with the ordinances, this initial proposal demonstrated potential and it would be beneficial for this challenging site to be productively developed.

Thomas Lasky, owner, and Wyatt Gilbert, architect were present on behalf of the proposal.

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

The Board noted for the public that, at present, 479 S. Old Woodward had not submitted any revised proposals. Accordingly, at present, there was no date certain for a further review of 479 S. Old Woodward.

It was noted that public noticing would occur for any further review of plans for 479 S. Old Woodward.

It was requested that 479 S. Old Woodward only return to the Board once a full submittal, corroborating documentation, and any necessary reviews have been received and completed. There was a strong desire to avoid further postponement of the item on the basis of procedural matters.

**08-50-25**

### **Motion by Williams**

**Seconded by Whipple-Boyce to move that the regularly scheduled meetings for the months of September, October, November, and December be hybrid meetings of both site planning and study sessions.**

**Motion carried, 7-0.**

VOICE VOTE

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

Nays: None

**M. Planning Division Action Items**

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

**N. Adjournment**

No further business being evident, the meeting adjourned at 8:54 p.m.



Nick Dupuis, Planning Director



Laura Eichenhorn, City Transcriptionist