Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, Ypsilanti Township will be conducting this public meeting virtually pursuant to the State of Michigan Open Meetings Act. To view and/or participate in the public meeting, please visit www.ytown.org.

To provide input or ask questions regarding business that will be considered at the meeting, please email planning@ytown.org or call 734-485-3943. If you need any assistance due to a disability, please contact the Planning Department at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting at planning@ytown.org or 734-485-3943.

1. CALL TO ORDER
2. ROLL CALL
3. APPROVAL OF THE TUESDAY, OCTOBER 27, 2020 REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
5. PUBLIC HEARINGS AND PLAN REVIEW
   A. 2544 EASTLAWN – PUBLIC HEARING FOR ARCHITECTURAL DEVIATION – TO CONSIDER THE REQUEST TO CONSTRUCT A NEW HOME AT 2544 EASTLAWN THAT IS A DEVIATION FROM THE EXISTING ARCHITECTURE FOR THE FAIRVIEW HEIGHTS NEIGHBORHOOD. PARCEL IDENTIFIED AS K-11-06-382-045
6. NEW BUSINESS
7. OLD BUSINESS
8. OPEN DISCUSSION FOR ISSUES NOT ON THE AGENDA
   A. CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED
   B. PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS
   C. MEMBERS OF THE AUDIENCE
9. TOWNSHIP BOARD REPRESENTATIVE REPORT
10. ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS REPRESENTATIVE REPORT
11. TOWNSHIP ATTORNEY REPORT
12. PLANNING DEPARTMENT REPORT
13. OTHER BUSINESS
14. ADJOURNMENT
Chair Sally Richie called the meeting to order at 6:30pm via Zoom due to COVID-19.

Commissioners Present: Chair Sally Richie and Commissioners Bill Sinkule, Laurence Krieg, Muddassar Tawakkul, Elizabeth El-Assadi, Stan Eldridge and Gloria Peterson.

Others in Attendance: Dennis McLain, Township Attorney; Jason Iacoangeli, Planning Director; Mike Radzik, OCS Director; Jonathan Currey, PEA Group; Wendy Ripper, PEA Group; Neil Mullins, R&L Carriers; Stan Richards, R&L Carriers; Keith Pruitt, R&L Carriers

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ROLL CALL

3. APPROVAL OF THE SEPTEMBER 8, 2020 REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

A motion was made by Commissioner Krieg supported by Commissioner Eldridge to approve the minutes of the September 8, 2020 Regular Meeting. The motion was carried unanimously.

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

A motion was made by Commissioner Eldridge supported by Commissioner El-Assadi to approve agenda. The motion was carried unanimously.

5. PUBLIC HEARINGS AND PLAN REVIEW

None

6. OLD BUSINESS

A. R&L CARRIERS

Jason Iacoangeli, Planning Director, said the R&L Carriers Freight Terminal project on Emerick Street which was before the Planning Commission last month, is an addition to an existing freight terminal. The property is currently already zoned I1; the applicant is looking to utilize some property that they own that is contiguous to their existing site, a portion of which is zoned I1 and another portion is zoned RM2. They are seeking a conditional rezoning to I1 in order to utilize it for some very specific industrial uses, one of which is the freight terminal use. The last time the Planning Commission met, this matter was tabled in order to get clarification on a number of issues that were sent to the Planning Department. Those issues were compiled and
given back to PEA, which is the design firm of engineers for R&L Carriers. PEA had put together a response letter to the Planning Commission addressing the issues that had been raised by the Commission and some of the neighbors. And they've also addressed that through a color rendering that does a pretty good job of illustrating the different types of screening and security, as well as the sound wall they’re proposing to install as a part of the sound study that was done for this project. Mr. Iacoangeli then offered to answer any questions the Commissioners might have.

Chair Richie said that she believes her concerns have now been addressed.

Commissioner Eldridge made a motion to take the proposal off of the table, supported by Commissioner Krieg.

Commissioner Eldridge expressed appreciation for the work done by the applicants, agreeing with Chair Ritchie that all his concerns had been satisfactorily addressed, and indicated his support for the project.

Chair Richie added her thanks to R&L and the Township for their work with the Commission. She wants to have R&L in the community as long as their facility is compatible with the residents. She then invited fellow Commissioners’ questions and comments.

Commissioner Krieg said all of his concerns were addressed and expressed his appreciation to both R&L and PEA.

(Chair Richie noted that Muddassar Tawakkul had rejoined us and he’s back on the screen.)

Stan Eldridge asked Jonathan Currey (PEA Group design engineer) to explain what plywall is and what is its life span.

Mr. Currey said it’s basically a modular system of very heavy duty approximately 2 ½ inch thick treated wood material. The exhibit PEA sent gives a good idea of what the look is. Mr. Currey admitted that he did not have life span data specific to this manufacturer, but similar products list a life span of 20-25 years.

Commissioner Eldridge asked if the applicant was open to installing an 8-ft rather than a 6-ft cyclone fence on the northeast section between the larger pond and the apartment complex all the way down to Duncan St.

Mr. Currey said they had proposed a 6-ft fence with barbed wire on top, but that he would defer to R&L on that matter.
Commissioner Eldridge said that his concern is not necessarily about sound with that side of the project, but with young kids getting over a fence and into that pond. He thought the higher fence would be better, and if there’s a way to do a wood fence he would even prefer that. His concern is making it as difficult as possible to get over, especially for a young child.

Chair Richie asked if the fence on that side of the property is going to have the barbed wire on it.

Mr. Currey agreed that the perimeter fence would have the barbed wire. Any interior fencing around the pond won’t be barbed wire, but the full exterior barrier would be either barbed wire or sound wall as a security measure.

Chair Richie asked if the Planning Commission is being given a choice.

Mr. Currey asked if Mr. Richards or Mr. Mullins could weigh in on the height of the fence on the east side.

Mr. Richards (R&L) said he is not personally opposed to the request, but R&L has a security division that needs to be consulted.

Mr. Currey said that they would consider going to the 8-ft on the east side but can’t give a firm answer right now. Mr. Richards agreed.

Commissioner Eldridge indicated he was satisfied that R&L work with the Office of Community Standards to address his concern about making it as inaccessible for young people or anybody else trying to get over that barrier.

Chair Richie said that she agreed, because there are quite a lot of houses that back up to the property in question, and the apartments particularly have many young children.

Mr. Pruitt informed the Commission that he just got confirmation, R&L security division approves the 8-ft fence.

Commissioner Eldridge said that he had no further concerns, and thanked R&L as well as Mr. Iacoangeli, Township staff, and Attorney McLain.

Chair Ritchie invited a motion on Agenda Item 6A.

A motion was made by Commissioner Krieg supported by Commissioner El-Assadi to approve the request to rezone the 8.24 acre parcel from RM-2 (Multiple-Family
Residential) to I1 (Light Industrial) located at 1441 Russell Street, Parcel K-11-10-160-003. The motion was carried unanimously as follows:

Sinkule: Yes    Krieg: Yes    El-Assadi: Yes    Eldridge: Yes
Tawakkul: Yes   Richie: Yes   Peterson: Yes

Chair Ritchie invited a motion on Agenda Item 6B.

A motion was made by Commissioner Sinkule supported by Commissioner El-Assadi to approve the preliminary site plan for expansion of an existing Freight Terminal located at 43 Emerick Street, 960 Minion Street, and 1441 Russell Street, Parcels K-11-10-280-019, K-11-10-160-028, and K-11-10-160-003. The motion was carried unanimously as follows:

Sinkule: Yes    Krieg: Yes    El-Assadi: Yes    Eldridge: Yes
Tawakkul: Yes   Richie: Yes   Peterson: Yes

7. NEW BUSINESS
None

8. OPEN DISCUSSION FOR ISSUES NOT ON THE AGENDA
   A. CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED
      None
   B. PLANNING COMMISION MEMBERS
      None
   C. MEMBERS OF THE AUDIENCE
      None

9. TOWNSHIP BOARD REPRESENTATIVE REPORT
   None

10. ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS REPRESENTATIVE REPORT
    None

11. TOWNSHIP ATTORNEY REPORT
    None

12. PLANNING DEPARTMENT REPORT
    Jason Iacoangeli said that staff continue to review the Chatfield Project final site plan; also he believes we’re getting close to having a tennis facility proposal on W. Michigan Ave. at the intersection of I-94 and US-12 come before the Commission. The only other item that we may see come to the Commission regards a provision in the ordinance that requires the Planning Department bring before the Planning Commission any architecture in a residential district that doesn’t fit in with the neighborhood. We think we may have a candidate for this. Someone is proposing a home with architecture
totally different than any of the other houses in its neighborhood, towards Washtenaw. The neighborhood was built in 60’s, so the architecture is quaint bi-level, or what some refer to as the Brady house. What’s being proposed is definitely not that, it’s very modern. So, if the applicants continue to move forward with their application for their new construction, the Commission may have to make a determination on whether or not that type of architecture will fit in the neighborhood.

Mr. Iacoangeli anticipates one more Planning Commission meeting before the end of 2020.

Commissioner Tawakkul asked for an update regarding the American Center for Mobility; in February they came to the Commission regarding turning a building into an event facility, but after that it’s been quiet.

Mr. Iacoangeli said that right now the event center is probably being put on hold due to the pandemic; it is his understanding that they are probably going to utilize that garage for research and development and for lease space, which was their original idea.

Director Radzik said that Mark Chaput, ACM Chief Operating Officer, contacted the Township a couple of weeks ago on this very issue. Apparently, Toyota has leased significant space at the facility recently and COVID took the wind out of their sail. They’ve been struggling, but Toyota is a new partner and is very interested in finishing the rest of that short-term garage space; and instead of converting it to event space, they want to build it out strictly as garage space. We’re hoping to see plans come through pretty quickly.

13. OTHER BUSINESS

A motion was made by Commissioner Krieg supported by Commissioner Sinkule to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 6:52pm.

Draft recommended for approval as edited.
Laurence J. Krieg, Secretary of the Planning Commission
To: Sally Richie, Chair, Ypsilanti Township Planning Commission
   Planning Commission Members

From: Jason Iacoangeli AICP, Planning Director

Re: 2544 Eastlawn Architectural Deviation

Date: November 17, 2020

Request and Review:

On October 2nd, 2020, the Building Department received a permit application for the construction of a new single family home for a vacant lot at 2544 Eastlawn. During the Zoning review for the new home it was made clear that the home which will be constructed out of Shipping Containers. This new home will be an architectural deviation from the other homes in the Fairview Heights neighborhood. Section 1801 Detached Single Family Dwelling Units allows the Zoning Administrator to have the Planning Commission determine if the structure being proposed is compatible with the neighborhood therefore protecting surrounding home values. The Planning Commission is also to hold a public hearing with residents within three (300’) feet receiving notification. The Planning Department provided in the notice to residents access to a link to the building elevations and floor plan for the proposed home. The notices were sent out more than fifteen (15) days in advance of the meeting. Below is Section 1801.j which outlines this requirement.

Section 1801.j The zoning administrator may request a review by the planning commission of any dwelling unit with respect to items d., e. and f., above. The planning commission shall review the proposed dwelling at a hearing where notice of such hearing shall be provided to all occupants of dwellings within 300 feet of the lot to contain the proposed dwelling. The zoning administrator or planning commission shall not seek to discourage architectural variation, but shall seek to promote the reasonable compatibility of the character of dwelling units, thereby protecting the economic welfare and property value of surrounding residential uses and the township at large. In reviewing any such proposed dwelling unit, the zoning administrator may require the applicant to furnish such plans, elevations and similar documentation as the zoning administrator deems necessary to permit a complete review and evaluation of the proposal. When comparing the proposed dwelling unit to similar types of dwelling areas, consideration shall be given to comparable types of homes within 300 feet. If the area within 300 feet does not contain any such homes, then the nearest 25 similar type dwellings shall be considered.
The criteria referenced in Section 1801.j with regard to the construction of the home as noted above are:

d. Dwelling units shall be provided with exterior finish materials similar to the dwelling units on adjacent properties or in the surrounding residential neighborhood. (*This item has been addressed in the rendering provided*)

e. Dwelling units shall have a roof with a minimum 4:12 pitch and minimum eight-inch eave, and with a drainage system that will collect and concentrate the discharge of storm water or snow away from the sides of the dwelling. The roof shall have wood shake, asphalt or other acceptable shingles, and meet the snow load standards for southern Michigan. (*This item needs to be addressed by the applicant as a part of the building permit process*)

f. Dwelling units shall be oriented on the lot to be consistent with the configuration of dwelling units on adjacent properties and in the surrounding residential neighborhood. All dwelling units shall have width to depth and depth to width ratio that does not exceed three to one (3:1). All dwelling units shall have a minimum width dimension of 24 feet. (*This has been addressed in the provided plot plan and renderings*)
The architecture of the homes within a three hundred foot radius of 2544 Eastlawn were constructed in a wide range of dates from 1976 to 1990. Below are the pictures and locations of the homes adjacent homes that fall within the three hundred (300’) foot radius.

2577 Eastlawn located to the South across the street. Year Built: 1990
Assessed Value: $99,600.00

2582 Eastlawn located next door to the west. Year Built: 1980
Assessed Value: $92,700.00
2600 Eastlawn located next door to 2582 (above) to the west. Year Built: 1988
Assessed Value: $95,700.00

2622 and 2644 Eastlawn located to the west of 2600 (above). Year Built: 1987 and 1985 respectively
Assessed Values: $86,300.00 and $85,800.00
2534 Eastlawn located to the west of 2600 (above). Year Built: 1976
Assessed Value: $94,000.00

2525 Eastlawn located to the east on the south side of Eastlawn
Year Built: 1984,
Assessed Value $83,000.00
The homes built in the neighborhood range from one-story ranch style homes to the more common bi-level homes of the 1980’s. The materials used on the majority of the houses are vinyl siding, wood clapboard, and masonry material. Two story homes are common throughout the neighborhood. The average market value of the homes in the neighborhood within three (300’) hundred feet is approximately $220,000.00.

The land for the new home was purchased for a price of $30,000.00. The estimated value of the shipping container home construction including the structure (containers) and the electrical, mechanical and plumbing is valued at $45,000.00 according to the Building Permit Application submitted by the applicant.

The Planning Commission will need to make a determination based on the existing neighborhood architecture and that being proposed to make a determination if the new home will add value to the neighborhood or if it will detract from the surrounding home values. As this would be a first of its kind for Ypsilanti Township, no example from another neighborhood can be used as a case study example. The Planning has asked the Assessing Office to assist by providing any additional information they might feel is relevant. That information will be supplied to the Planning Commission as soon as its made available.

If you have any questions or concerns please feel free to contact my office.

Jason Iacoangeli

Jason Iacoangeli, AICP
Planning Director
Charter Township of Ypsilanti
Cc: Dave Bellers, Chief Building Official
     Mike Radzik, Director Community Standards
     Brian McCleery, Deputy Assessor
Take notice that a Public Hearing is being held pursuant to Section 1801 Detached Single Family Dwellings of the Ypsilanti Township Zoning Ordinance in order for the Ypsilanti Township Planning Commission to hear public comments related an architectural variation being proposed for a new single family home at:

2544 Eastlawn Avenue – K-11-06-382-045

The Building Elevations will be available for review on the Townships Website www.ytown.org on the Planning Commission page with a link to 2544 Eastlawn Avenue Elevations.

The Planning Commission invites the public to attend a public hearing on this matter to be held on TUESDAY, November 24, 2020 at approximately 6:30 P.M. to comment on or raise objections, if any, to this request.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, Ypsilanti Township will be conducting this public meeting virtually pursuant to the State of Michigan Open Meetings Act.

To view and/or participate in the public meeting, please go to www.ytown.org.

To provide input or ask questions regarding business that will be considered at the meeting, email planning@ytown.org or call 734-485-3943. If you need any assistance due to a disability please contact the Planning Department at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting at planning@ytown.org or 734-485-3943.
Beam Rests on the Concrete Pier Column
10" Concrete Sonotube Formed Pier
Secured with Galvanized Metal Strap
Sub-Floor Supported by Floor Joists

Concrete Pier is Reinforced with #3 Rebar, Forming a Steel Cage

Depth of Pier is 24" Below Existing Grade

24"x24"x12" Concrete Pad
Concrete Pad is Reinforced with #4 Rebar

#3 Ties Used if Length of Concrete Pier Exceeds 24"