

**CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF NORTHVILLE  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
February 27, 2018**

**DATE:** February 27, 2018  
**TIME:** 7:00 PM  
**PLACE:** Northville Township Hall  
44405 Six Mile Road

**APPROVED:** March 27, 2018

**CALL TO ORDER:** 7:00 PM

**ROLL CALL:**

**Present:** Richard Allen, Lisa Anderson, Tim Guerriero, Eric Lark, George McCarthy, Jane Watson, Tim Zawodny

**Excused:** None

**Staff:** Jennifer Frey, Township Planner

**Approval of Minutes:**

Planning Commission - January 30, 2018

**MOTION by Allen, support by McCarthy, to approve the January 30, 2018 Planning Commission minutes as published.**

Voice vote: Ayes: All  
Nays: None

**Motion approved unanimously.**

**Other Minutes:**

Zoning Board of Appeals – January 17, 2018  
Board of Trustees Regular – January 18, 2018

**MOTION by Allen, support by McCarthy, to receive and file the minutes from the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting of January 17, 2018, and the Board of Trustees regular meeting of January 18, 2018.**

Voice vote: Ayes: All  
Nays: None

**Motion approved unanimously.**

**Correspondence:** Township Planner Frey confirmed that no additional correspondence had been received.

**Brief Public Comments:** None.

**New Business  
Public Hearing**

- 1. JRZ18-0001            Adam and Tammie Harrison, Applicants**  
Property Owner: Harold W. Priestaf Trust  
Location: Fry Avenue; North of 5 Mile Road  
(Vacant Land – ID#77-051-99-0171-000)  
Request: Rezone from Local Business (B-1) to Single Family Residential (R-4)  
Action: Recommend to Board of Trustees

Referring to her review letter dated February 8, 2018, Township Planner Frey gave the background to this rezoning request. The 73'x120' parcel was located on the west side of Fry Road one parcel north of 5 Mile Road, and was currently zoned B-1. The applicants were requesting a rezone to R-4 in order to build a single-family home.

The parcel was the only one in the immediate area that was zoned B-1 that did not have frontage on 5 Mile Road. The parcel to the north was zoned R-4. The parcel to the south was zoned B-1 but was developed with a single family home. Allowing the parcel to be rezoned to R-4 to permit construction of a single-family home would be consistent with the development adjacent to the subject parcel.

Township Planner Frey concluded her remarks by explaining that in general, developing the property under R-4 zoning would have less impact than developing it as a B-1 property. Other properties accessed off Fry were single-family homes.

In response to a question from Chair Lark, Township Planner Frey said stated that the two parcels to the south had frontage on Five Mile. As already noted, the parcel on the corner was a single family home; that use was grandfathered. The parcel to the west was vacant.

Tammie and Adam Harrison, 14647 Garland Avenue, Plymouth MI were present on behalf of this request. Ms. Harrison said they wanted to construct a single-family home on the site in order to stay in the neighborhood.

Chair Lark asked if the applicants understood that both parcels to the south of them could be developed commercially. Commissioner Anderson added that a parking lot was across the street from the subject site, and that site was unlikely to change to residential.

Ms. Harrison acknowledged that they understood the situation.

Chair Lark opened the public hearing.

Township Planner Frey said that no correspondence had been received concerning this case.

Seeing that no one came forward to speak, Commissioner Allen offered the following motion:

**MOTION by Allen, support by McCarthy, to close the public hearing.**

Voice vote:           Ayes: All  
                              Nays: None

**Motion approved unanimously.**

Chair Lark felt that in this situation the rezoning criteria had been reasonably met and the rezoning would not have a negative impact. In fact, constructing a single-family home on the site would have less impact than a commercial development.

**MOTION by Allen, support by McCarthy, that the Planning Commission recommend to the Board of Trustees that Rezoning Request JRZ18-0001, petitioned by Adam and Tammie Harrison, to rezone land from B-1 Local Business District to R-4 Single Family Residential be approved.**

Roll Call Vote:        Ayes: Allen, Anderson, Guerriero, Lark, McCarthy, Watson, Zawodny  
                              Nays: None

**Motion approved unanimously.**

**Public Hearing**

**2. Ordinance Amendments Pertaining to Pet Day Care Facilities**

Referring to her memorandum letter dated February 15, 2018, and noting that the Commission had a packet of information from Dogtopia, 20440 Haggerty Road, Township Planner Frey gave the background to this agenda item.

At the January 30, 2018 meeting Dogtopia representatives presented a request for an ordinance amendment in order to allow them to have overnight boarding at their dog day care facility in a B-3 District. Based on the discussion that evening and the direction given to Township Planner Frey, proposed ordinance language was being presented this evening as follows:

Table of Uses

1. Changed Pet Day Care to Pet Care Facilities.
2. Added the Northville Road Mixed Use (NRMU) district to make it consistent with the table of uses by zoning district; pet day care and training facilities were already listed as a permitted use in the NRMU zoning district.
3. Added Pet Care Facilities with Overnight Boarding as a special land use in the B-1, B-3 and NRMU districts.

Article 25.2. – Use Specific Standards

1. Added NRMU district to 25.2.QQ.2
2. Added that outdoor facilities must be fully enclosed.
3. Added standards for overnight boarding.
4. The provision that overnight boarding shall not be located adjacent to a residential zoning district or use eliminated most parcels in the Township.

5. As a special land use, conditions could be approved to address noise concerns and visual impacts.

#### Article 44 – Definitions

1. Added a definition of Pet Care Facilities – will be reviewed when the rest of Article 44 is ready.

Commissioner Allen confirmed with Township Planner Frey that the enclosure mentioned in QQ.2. was meant to be a perimeter enclosure.

Commissioner Zawodny asked for clarification regarding the prohibition that overnight boarding facilities not be located adjacent to restaurants or food service establishments. Township Planner Frey said this referred to a multi-use situation, not when the facility was in a separate building. She would clarify that language.

Commissioner Zawodny noted that should a dog day care facility lease a portion of a multi-tenant building, a restaurant could not later come in immediately next door. Township Planner Frey agreed, saying this would be something the landlord would have to recognize.

In response to a comment from Chair Lark, Township Planner Frey said the term *adjacent* was defined in the ordinance.

In response to a question from Chair Lark, Township Planner Frey said she had included the B-1 and NRMU Districts as well as B-3 because those districts also allowed dog day care facilities.

Commissioner Guerriero asked how other communities handled distance from residentially zoned districts. Township Planner Frey said some communities required a certain distance from a residential property line. The language proposed this evening would be more restrictive (not located next to residential zoning or use).

Commissioner Anderson said she continued to think dog day cares generally should be a Special Land Use in the B-1 and B-3 districts. The nuisance factor of having 20 or so dogs in an outdoor run behind a building was allowed for dog day care facilities, even if they didn't have overnight boarding. She was opposed to having the use permitted by right in B-1 and B-3, and possibly the NRMU district. The Special Land Use was to protect the neighborhood against an outdoor use involving numerous dogs; this was relevant any time of the day. The boarding component would not have as severe a nuisance factor as the basic dog day care component. She acknowledged this is a situation pertaining to the current ordinance and in the future would like to revisit locational requirements for animal uses in general.

Chair Lark invited representatives of Dogtopia to speak.

Nick Mills, Dogtopia, 20501 Haggerty Road, said they had submitted documents regarding their evacuation plan, and that also answered questions that had been brought up in the last meeting. In Dogtopia's case, the primary use was dog day care, and most days and most weekends only a few dogs would stay overnight.

Commissioner Zawodny asked for the maximum response time to an emergency that occurred at night, when no employees were present. Mr. Mills said that was something they would have to work on as staff, depending on where people lived. In his case, he lived about 15 minutes away from the facility. The Fire Department would be the first responders.

In response to questions from Chair Lark, Mr. Mills explained that each dog/group of dogs was outside for about 10 minutes an hour. There were 2 playrooms, so each group would be out for a different 10-minute period. In total, dogs would be out for about 20 minutes out of each hour. They would be supervised. At night, no dogs were outside after 7:30-8:00 P.M. The dogs were never on a leash, as they had a supervised outdoor play/break area. An 8-foot solid vinyl fence screened the outdoor area. No dog play structures were close to the fence.

Commissioner McCarthy asked if the facility at 20501 Haggerty Road was under construction. Mr. Mills said it was not; they were waiting to see if they were allowed overnight boarding, which was a critical part of their business model. They did not want to move forward without a favorable decision from the Commission and the Board of Trustees.

Township Planner Frey said if the proposed changes were adopted for overnight boarding, the applicant would come back to the Commission for a Special Land Use approval.

In response to a question from Chair Lark, Mr. Mills said the majority of Dogtopia locations throughout the country were in retail locations. Township Planner Frey said of the locations in southeast Michigan, 2 were in commercial areas, and 1 was in an industrial/mixed use area.

Chair Lark opened the public hearing. Seeing that no one came forward to speak, Commissioner Allen made the following motion:

**MOTION by Allen, support by McCarthy to close the public hearing.**

Voice vote:           Ayes: All  
                              Nays: None

**Motion approved unanimously.**

Chair Lark brought the matter back to the Commission.

**Motion by Allen, support by Zawodny, that the Planning Commission recommend to the Board of Trustees that the proposed language regarding ordinance amendments pertaining to Pet Day Care facilities be approved, with language added to reflect:**

- **The fencing mentioned in QQ.2. be perimeter fencing.**
- **That QQ.3. be clarified that the facilities shall not be located adjacent to a food establishment in a multi-tenant shared building situation.**

Commissioner Zawodny said that an evacuation plan should also be required as a requirement for a special land use, and should be added as item g) under QQ3. Commissioner Allen accepted as an amendment to the motion:

- **That QQ.3.g) be added to address the requirement for an evacuation plan.**

Commissioner Zawodny asked if this could be applied to all facilities, whether they were dog day care only, as well as overnight boarding. Township Planner Frey said this would depend on how the public hearing was noticed. If the notice was limited to the overnight component, another public hearing would be required.

Commissioner Anderson said that in B-1, dog facilities could have an outdoor component without special land use approval, yet the outdoor component was the part that needed control, as it could be the most disruptive. While she herself used a dog day care, she had always felt they were most appropriate in an industrial-type setting.

In response to questions from Chair Lark, Township Planner Frey explained that currently dog day care and canine facilities were permitted in B-1, B-3, NRMU, and CI or I zoning districts, with outdoor facilities allowed as long as they were located within a rear yard and screened from view.

In response to a comment from Commissioner Zawodny, Township Planner Frey said that changing the daycare component to a special land use would not affect Dogtopia's day care, as they had received approval and pulled permits for the day care part of their operation. Whether the motion could include language regarding changing the ordinance to apply special land use standards to all daycare components would depend on how the public hearing had been noticed.

Chair Lark called for a vote, noting that the original motion had been amended to add item g) to QQ.3 as noted above.

Roll Call Vote:       Ayes: Allen, Anderson, Guerriero, Lark, McCarthy, Watson, Zawodny  
                              Nays: None

**Motion approved unanimously.**

**Other Business:**

**1. Presentation by Adela Spulber, Transportation Systems Analyst for the Center for Automotive Research – Autonomous Transportation**

The Planning Commission heard a PowerPoint presentation by Adela Spulber of the Center for Automotive Research regarding *The Impacts of Connected and Automated Vehicles on Communities*. Bernard Swiecki, Director of the Automotive Communities Partnership, was also present.

Ms. Spulber gave the background and history of the non-profit Center for Automotive Research (CAR), which was located in Ann Arbor. Tonight's presentation was on the potential impacts automated vehicles would have on cities and regions. For example, as they developed and were integrated into road use, automated vehicles would reduce road crashes, saving over 1,000 lives a year.

Other widespread implications impacted commuting, travel, housing decisions, reduced parking needs, etc. Negative impacts could be felt on public transit, walking, biking, etc. Right now cities and municipalities were at a crossroads, and needed to think about what they wanted and how they envisioned their transportation needs decades from now. As almost all – if not all – car manufacturers and tech companies were developing self-driving cars, communities needed to prepare themselves and take advantage of opportunities the vehicles presented. Road capacity, curbside and on-site parking, bus stops, turn lanes, frontage and service roads would all be impacted.

Trustee Shadko said he had been responsible for scheduling this presentation. He was especially interested in how automated vehicles might impact the Five-Mile Corridor; the Township could proactively seek businesses that were focusing on this technology. Discussions with developers should include the future use and impact of automated vehicles within their developments.

Discussion included the following:

- The importance of preventing hacking.
- As a nonprofit, CAR provided research and education, and tried to present issues in a balanced way.
- CAR was reaching out to communities, to help them prepare for this new technology. The emphasis was on what could be done in the next 5, 10, 15 years.
- Southfield had included language in its Master Plan that encouraged development of infrastructure for automated vehicles.
- Ann Arbor, Dearborn, Novi and Canton are members of Automotive Communities Partnership (ACP).
- The ACP maintained relationships among automotive companies and communities who were working to prepare for automated vehicles. The cost of membership in CAR/ACP was \$5500 annually, which allowed multiple people to participate in meetings and webinars. ACP had about 80 members spread throughout the Midwest and Canada.

Mike Noita, Northville Township Economic Development Corporation, asked what kind of investment automated vehicular infrastructure would require, specifically including roadside units for communication with and among the vehicles. Ms. Spulber said she could provide current figures, though the costs would change as roadside units became widespread.

In response to a question from Commissioner Watson, Ms. Spulber said cities were already changing their parking designs based on ride sharing companies picking up and dropping off, rather than just parking.

Commissioner Guerriero said that while the technology was exciting, it remained to be seen how the necessary infrastructure change would be financed.

## **Department Reports**

### **Township Planner Frey**

- Pinnacle had been purchased by M/I Homes, Inc.
- The March meeting was scheduled to include another re-zoning request and possibly a couple site plan applications.

**Zoning Board of Appeals Liaison Lark**

- There would be 2 ZBA meetings in March.
- At the February ZBA meeting a variance was granted for a fence in a front yard for a family with a special needs child, with the condition that if the family moved, the fence would have to be removed.

**Extended Public Comments:** None.

**Adjournment:** 8:45 PM