

DEXTER VILLAGE PLANNING COMMISSION
Monday, May 6, 2013
Regular Meeting

The meeting was called to order at 7:32 p.m. by Vice Chair Bell at the Dexter Senior Center, 7720 Ann Arbor Street.

Present: Bell, Phillips, Schmid, Wilcox, Kimmel, Semifero

Absent: Kowalski, Stewart, Robinson

Approval of Minutes

-Moved Wilcox, support Phillips to approve the Regular Meeting minutes for April 1, 2013.

Voice vote: Unanimous Motion Carried

Approval of Agenda

-Moved Wilcox support Kimmel to approve the agenda as presented.

Voice vote: Unanimous Motion Carried

Public Hearings-none

Pre-Arranged Citizen Participation-none

Reports of Officers-

A. Chairman Report Kowalski-none

B. Planning Commissioners Reports

1. Ex-Officio Semifero-Working on the budget process. A meeting is scheduled for May 22, 2013, please attend it's an open meeting. Cityhood election tomorrow.

2. Commission Schmid briefly comments that the Art Committee met last week and decided on a new piece of art. It is a fish that will be place by the creek in Mill Creek Park.

C. Community Development Office Report-Allison Bishop

1. Project Update-LaFontaine Chevrolet-postponed punch list until weather improved, issues with landscaping-deadline of 6/1/13 given to fix and complete cleanup. Discussing status of temporary C of O with Washtenaw County. Sidewalk will be fixed by adding a slab to make it straight, waiting on AT & T to lower box.

2. Dexter Wellness Center final walkthrough on Wednesday, some lighting issues still to be resolved.

3. Sent out an email today about Training Wheels free workshop program. 5 Healthy Towns and Dexter Wellness Coalition considering bike lending program, we would purchase bikes and people could ride them throughout the town, considering implementation for next summer.

4. The election is tomorrow on Cityhood and the School Millage

5. 3rd Quarter Report is in packet-building/home construction picking up especially in Westridge

Citizens Wishing to Address the Commission-none

Old Business

A. Discussion of 2013 Ordinance Revisions-Signs, lighting and landscaping

DRAFT Goals and Objectives for revisions

Commission Comments:

This is to repair the Ordinance-directive to re-write them did not come from us.

There were some over-sights with LaFontaine lighting standards

Form a Sub-Committee, it should have 3 people including Allison. Subcommittee will be Commissioners Phillips, Schmid and possibly Sandy Hansen from the ZBA who is a landscape architect. Committee to review the Lighting, Landscaping and Sign Ordinance.

Tree Board has evaluated Landscaping Ordinance.

If we do them separate more people may want to participate.

Should have committee recommendation by September 2013

Council will want to know what time table we are working with

New Business

A. Recommendation to Village Council: Engineering Standards-Suspension of Street Lighting installation requirement (Section V.H.3-page 49)

Moved Bell, Support Phillips to recommend that the Village Council temporarily suspend Section V.H.3 Street Lights, of the Village of Dexter Engineering Standards as a review item at this point subject to the DDA and/or Village taking up the issue of the street lighting standard and acting without further delay to address implementation of the standard.

The Planning Commission discussion included, but was not limited to the following:

Engineering Standards were reviewed by Planning Commission in December 2011 and January and February 2012.

New standard valid or not (why was it included in the engineering standards)

DDA intent to install streetscape lighting in DDA and Baker Road Corridor

Planning Commission input a good thing

Installation of conduit only was considered; other options for partial compliance included developer escrow deposit for future use or deferral agreement for installation of lighting upon implementation

What is the plan – need an understanding of what? Location, separation, factors such as curb cuts, lot widths, commercial vs. residential, who and how is the project funded, etc.

Central Street – street lighting installation paid for by Village, how were locations determined, Central Street from Main to Fifth included in the DDA; Dexter Library and LaFontaine Chevrolet paid for installation by developer; Mugg/Bopps paid for own installation; UBT installation and Dexter Commerce Center light installation costs varied; downtown streetscape lighting paid for by voter approved special assessment district.

Joe Semifero comments - The fact that there is no plan is reiterated a few times here and should be collected. ("What is the plan – need an understanding of what? Location, separation, factors such as curb cuts, lot widths, commercial vs. residential, who and how is the project funded, etc.," "What are the criteria for rejection of developer proposed layout? Village needs to be able to respond with approval or denial of proposal and the basis for the decision; insufficient standard to meet the needs of the developer and the Village; we cannot explain the requirement.," "The developer does not have the direction necessary to implement the standard and we cannot tell him what we want without further corridor planning.," etc.)

Village could request that developer proposed plan for installation of street lights to meet the standard; developer to provide proposed layout and rationale for proposed layout.

What are the criteria for rejection of developer proposed layout? Village needs to be able to respond with approval or denial of proposal and the basis for the decision; insufficient standard to meet the needs of the developer and the Village; we cannot explain the requirement.

Public utility problem, not a developer problem, no concept or plan for implementation

The developer does not have the direction necessary to implement the standard and we cannot tell him what we want without further corridor planning.

The standard was implemented after a majority of the development was complete. 140 feet of the 525 feet of frontage (26%) to be impacted with this phase of the project.

How do we keep things moving? Escrow, deferral (similar to DAPCO sidewalk deferral), developer proposal, OHM/DDA proposal, installation of conduit

Should developer have any investment at all in the public utility?

Without a plan there is not a way to make installation of poles consistent

Must have a concept; development of the concept should be led by the DDA, not the developer

Light poles are already there

Only portion of property that should be in play is in front of the subject building/unit (140 feet of the 525 feet or 26%)

Each lot is different, commercial or residential, DDA or not (west side of Baker Road residential and not in the DDA), lot widths vary, curb cuts vary, sidewalk location varies, light separation varies (Mugg and Bopps vs. up to Grand Street), Special Assessment District or not

A long separation between poles will likely be able to get more consistency.

The subject site plan review (Dexter Town Center Building 3) has brought the issue to light, but this item is not unique to only this development.

Remove requirement as a review item at this point, subject to further conceptual and design plan development.

Joe Semifero comments - the expectation is the requirement will be fulfilled at some point, but it should be delayed at this point until it is better defined. I believe Scott Bell's phrase was along the lines of, "Suspending the requirement does not mean the requirement should not be fulfilled, just that it should not be fulfilled now.

Ayes: Wilcox, Phillips, Bell, Semifero, Schmid

Nays: Kimmel

Motion Carried

- B. Recommendation to Village Council: Dexter Town Center-Building 3, Combined Site Plan-2740 Baker Road, ZBA Notice of Decision-Case #2013-03
Moved Schmid, support Bell, Based upon the information received from the applicant, reflected in minutes of this meeting, and in conformance with Section 21.04(E)3 of the Village of Dexter Zoning Ordinance, the Planning Commission finds the Dexter Town Center Building 3 combined site plan dated 4-21-13 meets the requirements to recommend the combined site plan.

In making this determination, the following additional conditions shall apply:

1. Applicable concerns noted in the planning consultant, engineering consultant and DAFD reviews included in the May 6, 2013 Planning Commission packet.

The discussion included, but was not limited to the following:

Staff gave a brief overview of the consultant review comments, the pre application meeting, the ZBA waiver and decision, and the site plan review committee meeting notes.

Staff referenced the additional parking lot lighting information provided by the applicant.

Street lighting installation requirement – The Planning Commission discussed the review comment from the Village Engineer referencing the requirement to install street lights along the frontage of the property. A suspension of the regulation was previously recommended, however at this time (prior to Council action) the Planning Commission does not have the authority to eliminate the requirement. The Planning Commission discussed some conformance with the standard, however only options for conformance. Options included installation of conduit across the subject parcel frontage (140 feet), deferral agreement, and performance escrow. The Commission agreed that any obligation should only be across the subject Building 3 property.

Building lighting was discussed and the applicant shared the updated façade plan as shown in the submitted site plan, but different from the color rendering included in the packet. The façade lighting is a combination of gooseneck fixtures like the Pharmacy Building and wall sconces. Fixtures seem appropriate to the façade.

Architectural comments – the initial submittal has pre cast stone on the elevator shaft – windows have now been added in the location and is preferred by the Planning Commission.

EIFS – The use of EIFS on the entry canopy was discussed. Staff reviewed the ordinance and confirmed that the use was permitted because it was less than 5% of the total and there is no height requirement on where EIFS is used.

Last building site of the 3 phase project, utility installation, parking, dumpsters, detention, and other site considerations primarily complete with first 2 phases.

Land banked parking to be constructed with Building 3.

Ayes: Schmid, Semifero, Bell, Kimmel, Phillips, Wilcox

Nays: none

Motion Carried

Proposed Business for Next Agenda

- A. Segment D1 B2B Revised Trail Plan Review
- B. FY13-14 Budget Update

Citizens Wishing To Address the Commission-none Adjournment

-Move Bell support Phillips to adjourn at 9:02 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Brenda Tuscano
Recording Secretary

Filing Approved 7-1-13