CITY OF SOUTHFIELD

PLANNING COMMISSION

Council Chambers - Southfield, Michigan Wednesday, October 23, 2024 - 6:30 p.m.

Video recording transcribed by Janice P. Yates, CER-9181.

COMMISSION MEMBERS AND STAFF PRESENT:

Jeremy Griffis, Chair

Cynthia Bernoudy, Commissioner

Dr. Geralyn Stephens-Gunn, Ede

Anthony Martin, Commissioner

Robert Willis, Vice Chair

Alex Bollin, City Planner

Terry Croad, Director of Planning

Thomas Paison, Deputy City Planner

1	Planning Commission Meeting
2	Wednesday, October 23, 2024
3	
4	Note: Due to technical difficulties, the start of the
5	meeting was not recorded. The missing segment
6	includes Agenda Items A through part of D: the
7	meeting opening, commission attendance, agenda
8	approval, and the staff introduction of item
9	PZRODD24-0002. This transcript represents only the
10	recorded portion of the meeting.
11	
12	(Recording begins.)
13	MR. CROAD: current, as well as the water
14	bill, but the Sakwa [phonetic], there were some
15	problems with the check, and I wanted to verify that
16	everything was resolved.
17	MR. MOELLER: I'll have to check with her
18	office, and I can let you know.
19	V. CHAIR WILLIS: Just a quick question.
20	CHAIR GRIFFIS: Go ahead, Commissioner Willis.
21	V. CHAIR WILLIS: It just crossed my mind.
22	We're engaging in a large project. Can you anticipate
23	the number of people you think reside in these
24	buildings once completed?
25	MR. MOELLER: Well, based on our count, we

1	have I think 1325 apartments.
2	V. CHAIR WILLIS: Okay.
3	MR. CROAD: Yeah, 1364.
4	MR. MOELLER: So, based on we have 1364
5	apartment units, and some of those are two bedrooms.
6	So, you know, I'd say maybe 25 percent of those would
7	be two bedrooms. So, add another, you know, 500 or so
8	to that. So, roughly just under 2000.
9	V. CHAIR WILLIS: Okay, okay. So, we're
10	looking at about 2000 residents to the city of
11	Southfield?
12	MR. MOELLER: Correct.
13	V. CHAIR WILLIS: Okay, thanks.
14	MR. CROAD: Yeah. I mean, I think our our
15	average household size, based on units, is in that 2.1
16	to 2.3 range. So, you just do the rough math, then,
17	it's going to be around
18	V. CHAIR WILLIS: That would make it about
19	26, 2700.
20	MR. CROAD: Anywhere from 2000 to 2500.
21	V. CHAIR WILLIS: Okay.
22	MR. PAISON: Yeah, I think that's fair
23	because (INAUDIBLE).
24	MR. CROAD: When fully built out.
25	MR. PAISON: Actually, it appraises around

that.

2.4

CHAIR GRIFFIS: And then, you know, then when the retail space is existing, people want to put their retail store in there. It's the development chicken and egg, constantly.

All right. Do we have a recommendation from the Planning Department?

MR. PAISON: Yes, we do, sir. We are recommending favorable consideration as noted. Just, you know, just noting that it is consistent with the comprehensive master plan, the DDA Subarea, and Northland Design Standards and Guidelines. That it's utilizing the Subarea Redevelopment Plan, ODD, underlying regional shopping center, and the design flexibility and scheduling flexibility is part of that.

The proposal will not have adverse effects on the adjoining zoning or land uses. And we do ask the condition that the petitioner continue to work with the Planning Department on refining the streetscape details to make sure we're on the same page, and those reflect what you see at the Costco Business Center going forward. We want some consistency on that perimeter, the developments to look like a whole.

So, we're pretty close on this. I think it's just a matter of kind of merging the LS and L-12

1 documents, 12 and 13 documents, with what the 2 petitioners additionally provided, and getting those -make sure those match up, because what's on LS-12 and 3 13 covers more than just like short wall segments; it actually covers entrance treatments. So, there's more to it than that. So, it can't actually replace those 6 It's going to be making clear where -- which sheets. details are substituted for which. 8 9 So, we're just going to -- we're just going to work with -- work that out before it ends up in 10 11 front of council, but we're close. I mean it's in the 12 same ballpark and in the same style. It's just we need 13 to make sure that they're fully consistent, so we --14 MR. CROAD: Yeah, if I could, Dale. So, like 15 the revised drawing that you submitted did not show the 16 lights, the solar-powered lights that were in Costco, and the limestone accents --17 18 MR. MOELLER: Yeah, it does. 19 MR. CROAD: -- are actually longer than that. 20 So either -- either the lights or the limestone accents 21 are missing. 22 MR. PAISON: Yeah, it indicates a light 23 fixture, but it doesn't -- there's no detail for it. 2.4 And then, I guess because it's missing the limestone 25 accents (INAUDIBLE) --

(Crosstalk.)

2.4

MR. CROAD: The original one had hardwired lighting. We approved the solar panel, you know, solar lights. So, we just need -- we need those details kind of shored up to what was built out there. And as Mr. Paison said, that is the predominant wall element that will go around the perimeter. But at a couple of key entrance points, there's more elaborate features that are reflected in LS-13, which we just want to make sure we're clear moving forward what the requirements may be.

So, we did make some modifications in the field, and technology and construction techniques change, and we think it's more sustainable to have solar-powered lights than what was originally, the sconces that were proposed. So, that was a pretty straightforward modification that's reasonable. But we still have these original documents that we want to be true to, as far as the overall development.

CHAIR GRIFFIS: All good, thank you. With that being said, do we have a motion from the Planning Commission on PZRODD24-0002, the second amendment?

V. CHAIR WILLIS: Through the Chair, I move a federal -- for favorable consideration of PZRODD24-2000 [sic].

1	MR. MARTIN: Zero-zero-two.
2	V. CHAIR WILLIS: Zero-zero-two.
3	DR. STEPHENS-GUNN: Second.
4	CHAIR GRIFFIS: We have a favorable motion by
5	Commissioner Willis, second by Dr. Stephens-Gunn. All
6	in favor?
7	FULL COMMISSION: Aye.
8	CHAIR GRIFFIS: Any opposed?
9	(No response.)
10	CHAIR GRIFFIS: Okay, favorable
11	recommendation. Thank you. And please continue to
12	work out the details with the Planning Department, as
13	requested.
14	MR. CROAD: So Tom, they're going to come
15	back just for one meeting?
16	MR. PAISON: I believe so, the meeting on the
17	18th.
18	MR. CROAD: Eighteenth.
19	MR. PAISON: Yeah, because the study meeting
20	that was on 12th got canceled, and the one after it is
21	a study meeting. So, we'll just have one more meeting
22	with the council on the 18th.
23	So, we got to get these things nailed down
24	before the 18th. I'll reach out to you tomorrow.
25	MR. MOELLER: Okay, okay.

MR. PAISON: And we'll nail it down before 1 2 Terry goes out of town. 3 CHAIR GRIFFIS: All right, thank you. MR. MOELLER: Thank you. CHAIR GRIFFIS: Next item is a Zoning Text Amendment, PZTA24-0005. MR. PAISON: Thank you, Chair, Mr. Chairman. This is the parking lot drive aisle width amendment. 8 9 We discussed this a couple of times previously. We're 10 cleaning up some language that was unclear, and just providing some additional flexibility, but with some 11 12 additional discretion for the City Planner and the Fire 13 Marshal in order to be able to make sure sites are functional. 14 15 And so, we're not requiring more pavement 16 than we actually need, because that puts a burden on 17 the storm water system of the entire community. So, we 18 really don't want more pavement than we need -- than we 19 actually need to function. So, it's just a consideration when we look at these site standards 20 21 generally. 22 As I noted, it provides better clarity between Sections (3) and (10). It cleans up the drive 23 2.4 width table, making it a little simpler and easier to 25 follow; eliminates the metric items; then gives that

2.4

provisional authority to the Fire Marshal and the City Planner for maneuverability.

This is the table of (3). We cleaned this up and just simplifying this table, and clarifying that it's aisle width, as opposed to curb cut or entry width. So, this is your drive aisle width inside the parking lot between the parking spaces, depending on the angle of the parking and whether they are one way or two way.

And then, it has that footnote that they can be required to be wider if the City Planner or the -- or the Fire Marshal determines that's necessary for proper maneuverability, for loading or for fire, EMS emergency access.

And then (10), we just took out that second provision that was confusing people because it kind of overlaps with (3), and left the 24 foot as the curb cut entry, which is still the standard desired by the City Engineering Department.

So, it really just kind of cleans up that language and makes sure that we're not confusing people, our own staff, architects, engineers, builders, and being a little more flexible and updated with that.

We -- it does require a public hearing. This is a zoning amendment, so.

CHAIR GRIFFIS: Okay. I'd like to open up
the public hearing at this time for PZTA24-0005.
(No response.)
CHAIR GRIFFIS: Seeing no public present,
I'll close the public hearing.
Any further discussion from the Planning
Commission, Dr. Stephens-Gunn?
DR. STEPHENS-GUNN: No.
CHAIR GRIFFIS: Commissioner Martin?
MR. MARTIN: No.
V. CHAIR WILLIS: No questions.
MS. BERNOUDY: No. I'm just glad that you
have taken out the metric system. Thank you.
CHAIR GRIFFIS: I've never once used the
metric numbers on that zoning ordinance or any other
zoning ordinance. So, I don't think that was
necessary.
MR. CROAD: So, just to reference the Fire
Marshal. So, when Northland was originally approved,
the templates for the fire trucks were put on to check
turning radius. Since then, we have a larger ladder
truck, and it's not the wheels' turning radius that's a
concern, it's that the ladder extends further out. So,
the real concern was any light poles or signs that were
obstructing in the turn. So, those modifications are

being made.

2.4

And so, by having this provision in there, we have standards, but in certain circumstances, because of the truck or changing things, the Fire Marshal or the Planner could can make amendments to the plan to accommodate.

So when, again, when this thing was originally laid out five years ago, four years ago, the templates of our existing fleet worked. But we have now since gotten a lot -- this is my understanding of what -- where some of the conflict was. Things are tight. There might be a car or two parking space that needs to be relocated again because of the turning radius. And it has to do with the overhang more than it has to do with the tire radius.

DR. STEPHENS-GUNN: Okay.

MR. PAISON: Another interesting factor on those larger fire trucks is more than one axle turns, so they can do some pretty interesting turns with those, because it's not just the front wheels that turn.

MR. MARTIN: It's also the back ones.

MR. PAISON: Yeah, the back ones turn, too.

And they can -- he said it, the main problem is that
ladder can't bend. It's straight. So, yeah, there's a

1	it's an interesting those trucks are, they're
2	all-wheel drive, and they have more than one axle that
3	turns. They're mechanically pretty complicated.
4	MR. MARTIN: The reason I brought up the
5	question was because usually, when if I go out and I'm
6	looking at the turning radius, I stay on the outside.
7	And I thought about it, that sometimes you're going to
8	have to be close to the inside. And turning close to
9	the inside, my car, and I'm riding in a, not a big SUV,
10	but an SUV, and it's going on the curb.
11	MR. PAISON: Yeah.
12	MR. MARTIN: So, that was why I came up with
13	the
14	MR. CROAD: Well, it was a good observation.
15	MR. MARTIN: Yeah.
16	MR. CROAD: And we've had to deal with it.
17	MR. MARTIN: Yeah.
18	MR. CROAD: But we do
19	MR. MARTIN: You dealt with it.
20	MR. CROAD: We do have like the engineers
21	check those things.
22	MR. MARTIN: Yeah.
23	MR. CROAD: And then, the Fire Marshal, it
24	was a new fire marshal. He brought it to our attention
25	that the truck is different, and they've had several

1	meetings to try to resolve that. And it just has to do
2	with some of the vertical elements might need to be
3	relocated.
4	MR. MARTIN: Yeah. You just said new fire
5	marshal?
6	MR. CROAD: Yeah.
7	MR. MARTIN: Did McAfee leave?
8	MR. BOLLIN: Same fire chief.
9	V. CHAIR WILLIS: Not the (INAUDIBLE)
10	(Crosstalk.)
11	MR. MARTIN: Sorry, sorry.
12	V. CHAIR WILLIS: Yeah.
13	MR. PAISON: We did get a new fire marshal,
14	though, relatively recently.
15	(Crosstalk.)
16	MR. MARTIN: Yeah.
17	DR. STEPHENS-GUNN: Yeah, we got a new fire
18	marshal, but not a new chief.
19	MR. MARTIN: (INAUDIBLE) yeah.
20	MR. CROAD: It's the Fire Marshal that checks
21	those things.
22	DR. STEPHENS-GUNN: Right.
23	MR. MARTIN: Yeah.
24	MR. CROAD: It used to be John Albo, who now
25	is working in the Building Department.

1	MR. PAISON: Then, we had another gentleman
2	for a little, but now it's the Lateef Townsel is our
3	current Fire Marshal.
4	MR. CROAD: Lateef Townsel, yeah, so.
5	MR. MARTIN: Just.
6	MR. CROAD: Again
7	(Inaudible crosstalk.)
8	MR. CROAD: Just to refresh, right?
9	MR. MARTIN: Yeah.
10	MR. CROAD: So, when Planning gets these
11	projects, we have our internal expertise between
12	Planning, Zoning, and Landscape look at the plans. But
13	Engineering does a cursory review, Building does a
14	cursory view, Police does a cursory review, and Fire
15	Department. They all raise issues early on.
16	Then, when they come in for permitting, they
17	have to do more detailed plans with Building and
18	Engineering, and then fire suppression.
19	(Inaudible side conversation.)
20	MR. CROAD: So, we have multiple departments
21	looking at, even at the preliminary stages.
22	MR. MARTIN: Before he even gets this.
23	MR. CROAD: Before they even get to you or
24	further on.
25	(Inaudible side conversation.)

1	MR. CROAD: Not that things couldn't be
2	missed, but.
3	MR. MARTIN: Yeah.
4	(Inaudible side conversation.)
5	MR. CROAD: There's some there's a pair of
6	eyes looking at all of all of these different
7	things.
8	MR. PAISON: He seems a little too nervous
9	about this.
10	CHAIR GRIFFIS: All right. Anything else
11	from the commission?
12	MR. MARTIN: Thank you.
13	CHAIR GRIFFIS: Seeing none, Planning
14	recommendation, please?
15	MR. PAISON: Yeah, we do are recommending
16	favorable recommendation of this zoning amendment, to
17	modify the parking lot aisle with section of the
18	ordinance. Modify it'll modify and clarify the
19	ordinance requirements, and will provide promote
20	orderly development and provide for the whole safety
21	and welfare of the community.
22	CHAIR GRIFFIS: Thank you. I'm looking for a
23	motion.
24	DR. STEPHENS-GUNN: I'm go ahead.
25	MR. MARTIN: Recommend favorable

1 recommendation -- yeah, a favorable recommendation for PZ -- PTZA24-0005 [sic]. 2 MS. BERNOUDY: I'll second that. 3 CHAIR GRIFFIS: Okay. We've got a favorable recommendation by Commissioner Martin and a second by Commissioner Bernoudy. All in favor? FULL COMMISSION: Aye. CHAIR GRIFFIS: Any opposed? 8 9 (No response.) 10 CHAIR GRIFFIS: None. Thank you. 11 Next item is another Zoning Text Amendment, PZTA24-0006. 12 MR. PAISON: And this is the one related to 13 14 the primarily a drive-in, drive-through, and 24-hour 15 restaurants' site development standards in the RS and 16 B-3 districts. We have discussed this at study 17 meetings and the previous meeting, the longer study 18 meeting and regular study meeting. 19 And what we discovered was these uses are allowed as special land uses in six different 20 21 commercial zoning districts, but only in the RS and B-3 22 did these extra requirements pertain. And it appears 23 to be just the nature of how zoning ordinances evolve 2.4 that some issues, some potentially later created 25 districts ended up with these, and others did not.

2.4

We thought to make them, since they're all special land uses and all have to go through site plan review, and there are other Zoning Ordinance requirements that kind of cover the issues that these particular site development centers have, that we would just make them all consistent by deleting these extra standards and leaving it to the special land use site plan review and the standard Zoning Ordinance requirements for screening and site circulation and the other issues.

We do have noted that these requirements have created some problems where either council or the ZBA has had to waive them in at least four recent cases:

Culvers, Savvy Sliders, Panda Express, and the Onyx

ODD, which will be coming back to you.

So, we do look at these, we're just going to delete these extra standards from the B-3 and RS, leave them as special land uses as they appear in the B-1, B-2, and in the NS and RC districts. And then, rely on the other comprehensive site development regulations, combined with the comprehensive site plan review and special land use requirements to get this right.

It gives us a little more flexibility when trying to fit these things into the existing fabric of a built-out community like Southfield. You know, you

2.4

can have so many rules that you're actually hamstringing your own ability to reasonably develop a site.

And I think this body and the City Council have shown reasonable discretion in applying conditions or requirements where needed to make a site fit. And it's very hard when you're doing infill development to have a one-size-fits-all approach; you need a little more flexibility to make that happen. And since people -- put people through these public hearings anyway, and we go through this process, and we have those site plan review and special land use authorities, those are good tools for exercising that flexibility, as long as it's done in a reasonable and rational, justifiable fashion.

So, as you see, we look at the RS section, we're just deleting the extra standards and just going to go with this as a special land use. And then in the B-3, we're doing the same thing. So, these will -- the language in these will now match what's in the other four districts.

And the purpose, once again, is to make consistent our requirements for the same use across the commercial districts for these uses. And it just, you know, it allows us to use our other tools to be able to address those issues as they come up.

1	And that's this is, it does require a
2	public hearing once again, because this is a zoning
3	text amendment, but.
4	CHAIR GRIFFIS: Okay.
5	MR. PAISON: That's what we got.
6	CHAIR GRIFFIS: I'd like to open up the
7	public hearing at this time for PZTA24-0006, Zoning
8	Text Amendment.
9	(No response.)
10	CHAIR GRIFFIS: Seeing no public present, the
11	public hearing is closed. Any further discussion from
12	the commission?
13	DR. STEPHENS-GUNN: No questions.
14	CHAIR GRIFFIS: Commissioner Martin?
15	MR. MARTIN: No questions.
16	V. CHAIR WILLIS: No questions.
17	MS. BERNOUDY: No questions.
18	CHAIR GRIFFIS: I agree. Planner Croad,
19	anything to add?
20	MR. CROAD: Nothing to add.
21	CHAIR GRIFFIS: Okay. I'm looking for a
22	motion [sic] from the Planning Department on this item.
23	MS. BERNOUDY: I'd like to make a motion to
24	approve
25	CHAIR GRIFFIS: Oh wait, sorry, a

1	recommendation. I said the wrong word.
2	MR. PAISON: Yeah, we are recommending
3	favorable recommendation once again. Just really in
4	the interest of making our ordinance more consistent
5	and a little more flexible, and providing, actually, I
6	think an enhanced promotion of orderly development and
7	health, safety, and welfare, by we have a
8	comprehensive process. We can use that process to make
9	these sites work better. We don't need these odd ball
10	requirements that don't match the other districts to
11	make that happen.
12	CHAIR GRIFFIS: Okay. Commissioner Bernoudy?
13	MS. BERNOUDY: Okay.
14	CHAIR GRIFFIS: Now we're looking for a
15	motion.
16	MS. BERNOUDY: Thank you. I'd like to make a
17	motion to approve PZTA24-0006, Zoning Text Amendment.
18	V. CHAIR WILLIS: Support.
19	CHAIR GRIFFIS: Okay. We've got a favorable
20	motion by Commissioner Bernoudy on PTZA24-0006 [sic],
21	supported by Commissioner Willis. All in favor?
22	FULL COMMISSION: Aye.
23	CHAIR GRIFFIS: Any opposed?
24	(No response.)
25	CHAIR GRIFFIS: All right, motion passes.

1	MR. PAISON: Come on now, there we go.
2	CHAIR GRIFFIS: Next, do we have the minutes
3	from September 11, September 18, and September 25,
4	2024?
5	MR. PAISON: Yep, these are would have
6	been provided to you in your packets. We are looking
7	for, if acceptable, approval of the minutes from
8	September, so we can post them, you know, online and
9	make them available to the public.
10	CHAIR GRIFFIS: Any further discussion on the
11	minutes from the commission?
12	DR. STEPHENS-GUNN: No.
13	CHAIR GRIFFIS: All right.
14	MR. MARTIN: No.
15	V. CHAIR WILLIS: None.
16	CHAIR GRIFFIS: Seeing none, do we have a
17	motion to approve the minutes?
18	DR. STEPHENS-GUNN: Mr. Martin?
19	MR. MARTIN: To the Chair, motion to approve
20	the minutes for September 11th, 18th what was the
21	other one?
22	DR. STEPHENS-GUNN: The 25th.
23	CHAIR GRIFFIS: The 25th.
24	MR. MARTIN: And the 25th, as provided.
25	DR. STEPHENS-GUNN: Second.

1	CHAIR GRIFFIS: So, we've got a favorable
2	motion to approve the minutes by Commissioner Martin,
3	supported by Dr. Stephens-Gunn. All in favor?
4	FULL COMMISSION: Aye.
5	CHAIR GRIFFIS: Any opposed?
6	(No response.)
7	CHAIR GRIFFIS: No, okay.
8	MR. PAISON: All right.
9	CHAIR GRIFFIS: Now, we have a public comment
10	portion of the meeting. I'd like to open that up to
11	the public at this time. Any members of the public who
12	wish to come forward and address the commission, you'll
13	have three minutes to discuss each item.
14	MR. CROAD: Through the Chair, do you just
15	want to read the one name of the person that signed up?
16	CHAIR GRIFFIS: Yep. There is a Paul Kerber
17	[phonetic] signed in on the public comment sheet. No
18	longer seeing Paul here.
19	(No response.)
20	CHAIR GRIFFIS: All right. Seeing no public
21	present, we'll close the public comment section.
22	Council items update, do we have any updates?
23	MR. PAISON: We did want a we did have a
24	council study meeting on the 15th
25	MR. CROAD: Yeah, go ahead.

2.4

MR. PAISON: -- which I was present at. They discussed the backyard fowl and beekeeping amendment. Generally, it was favorably received. They did ask, after some deliberation and support from the animal control officer, that we look into creating a licensing or registration system similar to like pet licensing, so that the animal control officers, at least if they get called out to a place, they could check whether or not they have this registration and they would know whether or not they were potentially a legitimate operation.

And one of the things that was discussed is because of things like bird flu -- which the animal control officers, through their relationship with the State Department of Agriculture, they do monitor for like sick birds, because it can be wild birds or domestic birds -- that if we knew where they were, and say some bird flu was coming through, we'd at least know where these chicken coops are at, so they could be actively monitored if there were an avian flu that were moving through the community.

And then, with the beekeeping, I think was more of a just making sure people knew what the code requirements were, and we could use the registration opportunity as a place to kind of point people toward

2.4

educational resources about how to do this correctly and successfully. We do have some of that under -- we put some on our website, but we could also put that into the licensing or registration documentation.

So, we're working with the animal control officer and the City Attorney, because this would be a General Code Amendment to add the registration, like a dog license kind of would be, at this time. And we'll be bringing that back to council probably in December. We wouldn't be able to get it ready for November, but we think we can bring it back to them in December.

Hopefully at that point, the actual standards in the ordinance, other than requiring registration, they were -- they found acceptable. And they did, it was noted that you guys did a lot of work on that one, and looked over at General Code Ordinance in addition to the Zoning Ordinance, and provided some feedback on that. And there was some appreciation of the amount of effort that went in. Because we've been at this, really since the original time people approached the council, was last October. So, this has been under discussion actively for a year. So, we're getting there.

Retail alcohol sales came up again as a discussion. They, the Planning Department and Legal

2.4

Department, have been instructed to look into maybe putting some form of minimum spacing requirements between retail off-premise consumption and alcohol sales. We're going to put together some maps and inventories for council so they can see what those would look like.

We are a little concerned about creating a lot of legal nonconformities, where, you know, you might have two liquor stores or a liquor store and a CVS that are within 500 or 1000 feet of each other, and now all of a sudden, they've both become legal nonconforming because they're too close to the other one, even though it wasn't a problem in the past.

But I think there's -- there's some taste for looking into how we avoid over-concentration of that use. So, we're going to put some research together and go back to the council at a study meeting with our report, probably, I think we're thinking December or January. Because it's a lot of data we have to pull together and map, or Alex has got a lot of mapping to do I haven't told about yet, but it's coming his way.

Marijuana retail, they were looking at potentially further restricting the potential number of operations. Our spacing requirements are already pretty limiting, but the licensing order allows up to

1 five of the retail provisioning centers. We have two 2 that are open and a third that's been approved, Bloom -- Bloomery -- or Bloom Cannabis. 3 But they really kind of, there's some taste, though, it's not I think unanimous, hard to say, about 6 maybe limiting it just to three. At this point, though, like I think between Alex and I, we get probably calls looking for places to do retail 8 9 marijuana weekly, or bi -- you know, twice a month. And people, it's a pretty -- all those setbacks make it 10 11 really hard to find a usable spot. 12 I mean, the three that we've got are probably 13 the most -- you could reasonably do without like really 14 actively moving businesses around or even maybe 15 relocating residences. I don't know how they would do 16 it. That 500 foot from residential is hard to -- it's a tough one to beat in a community like Southfield, so. 17 18 MS. BERNOUDY: Can I ask a question? 19 CHAIR GRIFFIS: Yeah. 20 MS. BERNOUDY: Can you tell me if you have any update on the deer population or the control of the 21 deer population in Southfield? 22 23 MR. PAISON: I know they were discussing it. 2.4 I know deputy or Deputy City Administrator Michrina and the wilderness -- Wildlife Commission are still working 25

1	on that issue.
2	MS. BERNOUDY: I've been asked about it.
3	MR. PAISON: There's some discussion going
4	on, but they're trying to work out a coordinated plan
5	with our surrounding communities, because the deer
6	population doesn't observe municipal boundaries,
7	weirdly enough. So, they're trying to find out if we
8	can get our neighboring communities to agree to a plan.
9	MR. CROAD: It might be best if we invite
10	Mr. Michrina to come at a future study session
11	MR. PAISON: Yeah.
12	MR. CROAD: and give you an update, just
13	so we're not telling you third party, because he's
14	more
15	MS. BERNOUDY: That would be great.
16	MR. PAISON: Yeah. That was the last I
17	heard, though, is they were trying to see if they could
18	get some of the other neighboring communities on board
19	to do something in a coordinated fashion.
20	MS. BERNOUDY: Thank you.
21	CHAIR GRIFFIS: All right. Planner Croad,
22	anything?
23	MR. CROAD: Yeah, just wanted, besides all
24	the items that you acted on last month, Kroger Fuel
25	Station will be coming back Monday night to council.

1 MR. PAISON: Yeah. MR. CROAD: So, we'll see -- we'll see how 2 3 that goes forward. MR. PAISON: Yeah, they think, the Kroger Corporation yesterday did submit a two-page item 6 discussing their prior investments and their planned investments, and how they plan on addressing some of the issues at the store. It was pretty short, and 8 9 we'll see whether or not, hopefully an actual Kroger 10 representative comes up to speak on it. But we'll --11 we'll see what happens on Monday, I guess. 12 MR. CROAD: And the other thing is we got 13 some good news, and we're going to give Mr. Bollin the 14 opportunity to tell you about a grant that we 15 successfully got, that he took the lead on. 16 So, if you guys remember back in MR. BOLLIN: 17 May or June, we were asking for a letter of support for 18 a Safe Streets and Spaces grant from MDOT. Originally, 19 they had said that by August they would let people know 20 if they got the award. I guess there was overwhelming 21 applications and strong applications. 22 We received word on Monday that we received 23 it. We were awarded \$200,000 with zero match. 2.4 we're going to be working on that to put some more 25 bench and trashes throughout the city.

1	CHAIR GRIFFIS: Great.
2	
	V. CHAIR WILLIS: Oh, good.
3	DR. STEPHENS-GUNN: Good job.
4	MR. PAISON: Yeah, that's gonna move up our
5	program about two years.
6	DR. STEPHENS-GUNN: Yeah, good job.
7	MR. PAISON: It accelerates it up about two
8	whole years.
9	DR. STEPHENS-GUNN: Good job.
10	MR. PAISON: Which is pretty it's good
11	news.
12	DR. STEPHENS-GUNN: Good job.
13	CHAIR GRIFFIS: Nice work.
14	DR. STEPHENS-GUNN: Through the Chair?
15	CHAIR GRIFFIS: Yes.
16	DR. STEPHENS-GUNN: Planner Croad, regarding
17	the Northland project, the reason why I talked about
18	the community awareness, I get tons and tons of, what
19	are they doing? When is it coming? So, we have to
20	figure out a way to communicate with the citizenry,
21	especially those who are living around that area,
22	what's going on.
23	Because at this point, there's no direct
24	communication, and a website may not do it. So, if you
25	could put it in the mayor's bulletin or in some form of

2.4

regular communication about the status of that project. It's a massive, a massive, a big project, and everybody sees it, but nobody is really aware, the general public is not aware of what the status is, where they're going, you know. So, providing a little bit more information to the public about that major project, I think is going to be very, very beneficial.

MR. CROAD: I don't disagree, and the mayor is ombudsman. It's his role and responsibility. I can tell you that staff meets on a regular basis about the project, and there's been a lot of challenges with supply, labor, financing, logistics, and unknowns. It's not progressed as quickly as we'd like.

However, you know, there are things that we can talk about publicly and things that we can't. And our role is to keep you updated with things that we can. The mayor does his bulletin, and he's the -- he's the vehicle for communicating to the public on this project.

They're a private entity. They have their own rental retail department. We direct people who are interested in renting to the -- to their brokers and so forth. So, it's -- because it's a private job, we don't control a lot of things. So, we are asking the same questions, and we try to keep you as updated as we

can, within reason. And hopefully, you've noticed on, if you've been down Greenfield recently, the new signs, the new banners, and the landscaping. And that's a project we'll take ownership over.

MR. MARTIN: Yep.

CHAIR GRIFFIS:

2.4

MR. CROAD: I think the mayor -- the mayors of Oak Park and Southfield had a photo op yesterday out there, and more to come. We'll have a ribbon cutting probably in the spring when the plants are up.

And we have a lot of exciting projects. I'm attending SEMCOG's general assembly tomorrow, and I'm one of the featured speakers in the afternoon to talk about the Nine Mile Corridor, in partnership with Oakland County. So, it's another way for us to showcase all the good things that we're doing here.

MR. PAISON: Yeah, we have the schedule for November. We've got the study meeting is on November 6, the long-range study on November 13, and a regular on the 20th.

Cool.

Miscellaneous items?

We are -- the Planning Department is asking if the commission will consider canceling the long-range study on the 13th. We just -- we need to re -- I need to refocus for about a month on the sustainability plan, to get the part I need to draft

1 for that for Suzanne Hanna and our office done, so that 2 project can move forward. And we've got three zoning amendments still 3 in the pipeline. So, trying to get some more zoning amendments into the pipeline at this point doesn't 6 really make sense going into the holidays. So, what I want to do is, if we could cancel that long-range study, I'll sort of refocus my efforts 8 9 on getting the sustainability stuff done, and then switch back to the ADUs, the tiny homes, and get those 10 11 to you probably in January, like the actual draft ordinances to look at. 12 13 DR. STEPHENS-GUNN: Through the Chair, I recommend that we cancel the Planning Commission 14 15 long-range study meeting scheduled for November 13, 16 2024. 17 CHAIR GRIFFIS: I don't have any objection. 18 Any -- do we have to take an official? 19 MR. PAISON: Yeah, motion, yeah. 20 CHAIR GRIFFIS: Well, okay. 21 MR. PAISON: Because it's a change to the 22 calendar. 23 CHAIR GRIFFIS: Sorry, who supported? 2.4 Commissioner? 25 I did. MR. MARTIN:

1	CHAIR GRIFFIS: All right. So, we have a
2	motion to cancel the long-range study meeting,
3	November 13, by Dr. Stephens-Gunn, supported by
4	Commissioner Martin. All in favor?
5	FULL COMMISSION: Aye.
6	CHAIR GRIFFIS: All right, that's easy.
7	That's all I see. Anything else?
8	MR. PAISON: That is it.
9	CHAIR GRIFFIS: All right. Seeing none
10	MS. BERNOUDY: Did anyone see on the news
11	yesterday
12	DR. STEPHENS-GUNN: The veterans
13	MS. BERNOUDY: I guess they officially opened
14	the veterans'
15	MR. CROAD: Oh, I was going to mention that.
16	MS. BERNOUDY: Yeah.
17	MR. CROAD: Alex represented us. Tom and I
18	had a conflict.
19	MS. BERNOUDY: Yeah, I saw.
20	MR. CROAD: But the towers Tunnels to
21	Towers had an official groundbreaking yesterday.
22	MS. BERNOUDY: Yeah.
23	CHAIR GRIFFIS: I saw the sign facing
24	Northwestern.
25	MR. CROAD: Yeah.

1	CHAIR GRIFFIS: It looks nice.
2	MS. BERNOUDY: Yeah.
3	CHAIR GRIFFIS: It's a very long sign.
4	MS. BERNOUDY: Yeah, it was very nice.
5	MR. CROAD: And he said there was a good
6	barbecue there, too.
7	CHAIR GRIFFIS: Awesome. All right. Well,
8	meeting adjourned for the day.
9	MR. PAISON: Thank you.
10	(Meeting adjourned.)
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIPTION
2	STATE OF MICHIGAN)
3) SS
4	COUNTY OF KENT)
5	
6	I, JANICE P. YATES, hereby certify the
7	transcription of the foregoing proceedings. These
8	proceedings were recorded on video; said video was not
9	recorded by me nor under my supervision or control. I
10	certify that this is a full, true, complete, and correct
11	transcription of the video to the best of my ability.
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	C < / Add es
19	Janice Jables
20	
21	
22	JANICE P. YATES, CER-9181
23	Notary Public,
24	Kent County, Michigan
25	My Commission expires: December 2, 2029

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	$O \cdot O \cdot O$
7	(dudug Axamlu
8	Andrea Storch Gruber, Secretary
9	
10	
11	Date: 11/20/2024
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	