

2019-0246 Zoning Ordinance Amendments:

Auburn Road Corridor Zoning Amendments
Potential R-5 Zoning District

(Reference: Memos prepared by Kristen Kapelanski, dated May 31, 2019 and Giffels Webster, dated May 29 and May 30, 2019 and associated draft Ordinance language had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)

Present for the discussion were Jill Bahm, Eric Fazzini and Rod Arroyo, Giffels Webster, 1025 E. Maple, Birmingham, MI 48009.

R-5 District

Ms. Bahm said that they had put together two working drafts - the new R-5 district and the Brooklands District. They wanted to get as much done as they could up front to continue the momentum from the Master Plan. The drafts still needed refinement, and they were looking at having a Public Hearing as early as August if everything was satisfactory.

Ms. Bahm reviewed that R-5 did not make up a substantial part of the City. It took up relatively small areas, and some of it covered existing manufactured home areas. The uses proposed were generally consistent with those found in the other single-family residential districts, except that attached dwelling units would be permitted. Ms. Morita asked why alcoholic beverage sales were not permitted. Ms. Roediger said that it had been in all of the districts, because there were instances where it would be used for places of worship banquet halls, for weddings and for barn weddings. Some golf courses were in residential districts, and all of those uses would require larger parcels. Ms. Bahm asked if there were any uses missed.

Mr. Hooper mentioned the raising and keeping of animals and kennels. He stated that R-5 was small, so he asked why they want to entertain that. Ms. Bahm stated that they would not, but Mr. Hooper pointed out that it shown as permitted. Chairperson Brnabic noted that the raising and keeping of animals also included an average person having a maximum of three household pets of any one species, but she agreed that kennels were different. Ms. Bahm said that they would check it, because it should not have included kennels.

Mr. Hooper asked where the areas were proposed. Ms. Bahm explained that they were proposed for smaller and denser single-family areas, and would have four to six dwelling units per acre. They had included the existing manufactured housing communities, but they would not propose changing the zoning of those. There could be expansion areas around them that could be R-5.

Ms. Bahm advised that the minimum lot area would be 6,000 s.f., and maximum lot coverage would be 50%. That would make the residential areas more dense and compact with the goal of increasing walkability and affordability. They wanted to see if there was consensus for those, although they did not have to decide at the meeting.

Chairperson Brnabic asked about wireless telecommunication facilities. She realized that it was a conditional use in residential, but since the lot sizes would be smaller, she wondered about a tower 100 feet high. Ms. Bahm said that given the relatively small parts of the City that would be designated as R-5, it might be reasonable to not include them.

Chairperson Brnabic noted state licensed residential facilities, which were conditional uses for 7-12 residents. They just saw a case in an area that was not considered smaller and more dense, and the Commissioners had been concerned about parking. If someone applied who lived in an R-5 area, she felt that parking would be a problem. Mr. Arroyo felt that someone would have to have a larger lot, because it most likely could not be accomplished with a 6,000 s.f. lot. Conditional meant that it might be allowed, subject to conditions and meeting all ordinance requirements. Chairperson Brnabic asked if less than seven residents was permitted currently. Ms. Arroyo said that it had to be by State law. Chairperson Brnabic indicated that she would like to see wireless telecommunication facilities removed.

Mr. Gaber felt that they should think further about wireless telecommunication facilities. The industry was going to 5G, which had a different platform. It was not about 100-foot towers; it used smaller towers. As a result, more of them might need to be located around the area. He did not think that they should be precluded from R-5. He felt that the way to deal with it would be to look at the wireless ordinance and revise that accordingly. Chairperson Brnabic agreed that might make sense.

Ms. Bahm referred to lot area, and she noted that 6,000 s.f. would allow seven units per acre. She said that they were trying to improve affordability by considering allowing some smaller minimum floor areas. Efficiencies might have only 500 s.f., for example. They would not want to

see an entire development of 500 s.f. units, so it would be limited to 25% of the total. The rest could be one-bedroom at 600; two bedrooms at 900 s.f. and three bedrooms at 1,100 s.f. They would add 200 additional s.f. for every bedroom over that. They were trying to improve the options and affordability.

Ms. Morita asked how many units could be inside an acre and where everyone would park. She considered that if there were seven units with two cars for each unit that would be 14 cars. She wondered if 14 cars would fit on an acre. Mr. Arroyo said that the maximum would be four units on one 6,000 s.f. lot. Ms. Morita asked how many units there would be in an acre. She thought that it could be about 40 units, but Ms. Bahm said that it would be about 28. Ms. Morita said that would still be 56 if each unit had two cars. Ms. Bahm showed some slides for parking. Access would be from the rear. They were trying to place the emphasis on the front yard and the pedestrians and make main streets a place for social interaction. She showed a bungalow court with units that were centered around a common area. Each unit would have some parking associated with it in the rear. There would also be on-street parking.

Ms. Bahm showed slides of varied housing types with garages in the back, including duplex and quadplex units. With the quads, there could be about 23 units per acre, but they looked like single-family homes. Mr. Gaber asked if they could have attached garages. Mr. Arroyo agreed. Ms. Bahm talked about proposed reduced setbacks.

Mr. Gaber said that it looked as if those areas would appeal to developers to build homes for empty nesters. He thought that to do that, however, there would need to be one-story homes instead of two. He asked if there was anything in the ordinance to encourage single-story homes to fill that housing need. Ms. Bahm said that they would include renderings of one-stories. Mr. Arroyo said that what they typically saw with that type of unit was that there was a bonus half-story where an upstairs bedroom could be added for kids that had moved out or grandkids.

Ms. Bahm pointed out the defined building frontages. Those included a projecting porch, an integral porch, a stoop, which could be covered or uncovered and a court. They were trying to frame the streets and to encourage interaction with neighbors and to create a nice, walkable, dense environment. She felt that pictures were helpful, and they would incorporate more of them into the code. She asked if there were any further thoughts. She asked if the photos helped and if so, what they liked about them. Mr. Hooper said that he liked the variety, and he

commented that a picture was worth a thousand words.

Auburn Rd.

Ms. Bahm mentioned the open house where they were looking for input on uses, building heights, drive-throughs, building materials and setbacks. They got some good feedback, which she noted had been summarized in the packet. She outlined that the proposal was to replace the C-I Commercial Improvement district with the B Brooklands zoning district. She showed a chart about uses and asked about artist studios and galleries as well as small artisan manufacturing being added to the district. She also asked for feedback about maintaining the existing gas stations and auto repair services. They were listed, which could allow them to expand, but she did not think that was necessarily the vision for the corridor. If those uses were removed, however, the existing would become nonconforming.

Mr. Fazzini noted that there were substantial regulations currently by reference for the FB Overlay. Their approach was to start with a blank slate with a new, main street type of ordinance and pull in things they liked from the FB Overlay, rather than try to analyze everything that was in C-I and FB-2 together. With the auto related services, there were two sites zoned B-5, and they would not be affected, because they were not zoned C-I. They could decide later whether those two sites should be rezoned. Mr. Arroyo added that they could potentially strike gas stations and auto repair services as permitted uses, because it would not affect the district unless they wanted to see more of them in the district.

Mr. Hooper said that he would like to see the existing gas stations become nonconforming. They might eventually get redeveloped as something else. Ms. Roediger said that in talking with the businesses there, she knew that the Sunoco owner wanted to knock the building down and make it much larger with a 7-Eleven. If it was made nonconforming, they would not be able to do that. The Commissioners had to think about an existing business owner who wanted to invest, and if they would be able to do that or not. Mr. Hooper suggested that they could encourage the owner to invest in something that would be more profitable than a gas station.

Ms. Bahm said that they might want to consider the cost associated with the removal of all of the tanks and related cleanup to make it something completely different. Mr. Hooper pointed out that they were dealing with it currently at Auburn and Livernois. Ms. Bahm suggested that if they kept