

City Of Birmingham
Regular Meeting Of The Planning Board
August 27, 2025
City Commission Room
151 Martin Street, Birmingham, Michigan

Minutes of the regular meeting of the City of Birmingham Planning Board held on August 27, 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, Bert Koseck, Daniel Share, Janelle Whipple-Boyce; Alternate Board Member Duncan Currie; Student Representative Carter Anderson

Absent: Board Member Stuart Jeffares; Alternate Board Member Nasseem Ramin; Student Representative 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 August 13, 2025

To be reviewed at the September 10, 2025 meeting.

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

- 1. 211 Hamilton Row – N°28 – Request for Special Land Use Permit Review for New Food & Drink Establishment Engaging in Alcoholic Beverage Sales for On Premise Consumption**

CP Blizinski presented the item. Kevin Biddison, architect, Jordan Jonna with Palladium Birmingham LLC, and Randy Foumia of N°28 spoke on behalf of the project.

Staff and the applicant team answered informational questions from the Board.

Board members raised the following points during discussion:

- Some residents may have concerns about venues serving alcohol along Hamilton due to previous issues with Blue Martini. This proposal would be distinct from Blue Martini in terms of layout, business type, and location.
- It was important to note neither the building owner nor this applicant was ever affiliated with Blue Martini.
- The exterior proposal was well done. The bike rack could be relocated in order to allow the exterior proposal to be implemented. The greenery in front of the space should be retained.
- Exposed aggregate may not fit the definition of being ADA compliant. Individuals with visual challenges might have a difficult navigating the sidewalk given the proposed patio location. The two front two tops may need to be eliminated and the location of the outdoor dining shifted in order to keep the five-foot pedestrian walkway sufficiently clear.
- If a curtain is installed along the front facade, it should remain open at all times. It should not have the capacity to close.
- Alternatively, it might be more appropriate to disallow the installation of a curtain in order to avoid the curtain being closed.
- The aim is to encourage visual interplay between the interior and exterior of the space. This increases pedestrian activity along the street.
- Encouraging pedestrian activity along this stretch would likely also benefit the movie theater.
- There was some concern about the establishment being open between 12 a.m. and 2 a.m. Few establishments in Birmingham tend to be open during those hours, and different establishments open between those hours have resulted in some issues for the City.
- Given concerns about the establishment remaining open between 12 a.m. and 2 a.m., the SLUP might be used to limit the use of the space between these hours only to the presently proposed restaurant use.
- Because of the adjacent movie theater use, a number of people will likely be entering or exiting the theater at the same time. This applicant's outdoor dining should be laid out to avoid inadvertently encouraging these pedestrians along the curb or into the street. Allowing the sign, keeping the planters, and removing the aforementioned two two-tops would achieve this end.
- No issues seemed to be arising from the licensing plans at this time.
- The owner of the building has been a responsible building owner.
- The applicant's statement that people would be seated while dining and that this would be a restaurant-first experience minimized some potential concerns.
- The drawings did not indicate a host stand. It was unclear how diners would be seated within the establishment.
- This should not be a standing room only, bar-forward experience that lasts until 2 a.m. It might impact nearby residents negatively if it were.
- The Board ultimately seemed most comfortable with allowing eight chairs within the outdoor dining.
- If the bike rack is occupied by bikes, it should be determined whether that would impact the outdoor dining.
- The proposed sign was appropriate.
- The SLUP should be used to require table service at the outdoor dining area. This should be standardized throughout the City.

08-51-25

Motion by Share

Seconded by Boyle to adopt the findings of the Planning Department in the report dated August 22, 2025 related to the approval criteria outlined in Article 7, Section 7.36 of the zoning ordinance, with particular reference to subsections two and five, and we recommend the City Commission approve the Special Land Use Permit application for 211 Hamilton Row – N°28 – subject to the following conditions:

- 1. The applicant must comply with the requests of all City Departments.**
- 2. The applicant provide table service to the outdoor dining during all hours or operation.**
- 3. The applicant operate an establishment that is primarily a restaurant and not primarily a bar or tavern.**
- 4. That no curtain be installed at the front window as shown on the plans.**
- 5. That the City's investigation of the applicant's liquor license status confirms all representations and compliance with all statutory and regulatory requirements.**

Board members made the following comments on the motion:

- The piece of curtain in front of the door could remain in order to regulate temperature.**
- Only the curtain that is horizontal parallel to the property line, in front of the window, should be removed.**

Motion carried, 7-0.

VOICE VOTE

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

Nays: None

J. Site Plan & Design Reviews

- 1. 211 Hamilton Row – N°28 – Request for Final Site Plan and Design Review for New Food & Drink Establishment Engaging in Alcoholic Beverage Sales for On Premise Consumption**

Discussed during previous item.

08-52-25

Motion by Share

Seconded by Boyle to adopt the findings of the Planning Department in the report dated August 22, 2025 related to the approval criteria outlined in Article 7, Section 7.27 of the zoning ordinance to approve the Final Site Plan and Design Review for 211 Hamilton Row – N°28 – subject to the following conditions:

- 1. The applicant submit revised plans details a clear unobstructed five foot pedestrian path by removing the two two-top tables south of the property line.**
- 2. That the applicant remove the curtain parallel to the property line, but not the airlock curtain.**
- 3. The applicant maintain their Special Land Use Permit.**

- 4. The applicant must provide clear sign designs for signage to meet the zoning ordinance, although the Planning Board finds the proposed wall signage to be desirable.**
- 5. The applicant must comply with the requests of all City Departments.**

Public Comment

The Board answered a question from Mr. Biddison.

Board comment on the motion was as follows

- The applicant must provide five feet of clear space that does not include exposed aggregate in any portion of it, and does not include the bike rack within it.
- Without the submission of more detailed drawings, and discussion at the Board level, the tables should not extend beyond the property line.

Motion carried, 7-0.

VOICE VOTE

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

Nays: None

- 2. 2333 Cole Street – Request for Final Site Plan & Design Review for Major Renovations and Site Improvements at Existing Building – REQUEST TO POSTPONE**

CP Blizinski presented the request to postpone.

08-53-25

Motion by Share

Seconded by Boyle to postpone consideration of the final site plan and design review for 2333 Cole Street – Cole Street Station to October 22nd, 2025.

Motion carried, 7-0.

VOICE VOTE

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

Nays: None

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 points during discussion:

- This was well done.
- Under 'Evaluation Procedure and Criteria':
 - 'Qualifications and Experience of Firm and Team' should be the first criterion.
 - 'Individuals' could also be added to that criterion. This could be weighted 25%.

- 'Quality of Past Work/References' could be the second criterion. This could be weighted 25%.
- The third criterion should be a combination of 'Understanding of Project Goals and Approach' and 'Work Plan, Timeline, and Project Management'. This could be weighted 35%.
- 'Cost proposal' could be the fourth criterion. This could be weighted at 15%.
- The weights ultimately assigned do not have to align exactly with these recommendations. These recommendations are made to indicate the importance of these items.
- Alternatively, 'Community Engagement' should be a standalone criterion because of its importance. This should be weighted highly.
- A time limit on the references does not need to be added. It would be informative if an applicant submitted only older projects.
- Some national firms may submit a response to this.
- Under 'Deliverables':
 - A first section should be 'Interim Deliverables', and then 'Final Deliverables'.
 - 50% and 75% might be somewhat arbitrary.
 - It may be useful to draw from the 'Scope of Work' to devise the deliverables. Most of the numbered items could likely generate a deliverable.
- It would be worth considering whether the use of artificial intelligence should be referenced within the RFP.
- Under 'Scope of Work':
 - 'Residents, business owners, developers, institutions, and underserved communities' should possibly be narrowed by adding 'local'. 'Developer' should possibly be removed from the list. 'Property owner' could be an appropriate replacement.
 - 'Local' when referring to business would mean any business with a location in Birmingham.
 - A fourth bullet point could be added to 'Public Engagement and Stakeholder Involvement' to clarify the goal or the intent of the public engagement. It should capture the idea of giving voice to people outside the Planning Board, learning from their perspectives, and allowing their perspectives to inform the final draft.
- For the zoning code update list:
 - It would likely be simpler to create one list and to delete any redundancies. Any items not being addressed in this particular process should also be removed.
 - 'Create a new zoning district or modify the transition zone districts to enable infill development of small homes, townhomes, duplexes, and small multi-family buildings, limited to buffer and activity district seams', 'Adopt a policy requiring a minimum 6 foot clear path along the sidewalk throughout mixed-use districts,' and 'Encourage renovations to expand existing houses rather than the construction of new houses' should be included in the list.
 - 'Enable Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) in already compatible zones: MX, TZ1, TZ3, and R4 through R8' could also be included in the list. The second part of that item, 'Study ADUs for additional locations within the city and the regulations necessary to ensure compatibility.' would be a future task.
 - A number of the remaining items are listed for future study and could best be described as sub-area plans outside the scope of this current project.

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**

N. Adjournment

No further business being evident, the meeting adjourned at 9:21 p.m.



Nick Dupuis, Planning Director



Laura Eichenhorn, City Transcriptionist