CITY OF SOUTHFIELD

PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING

COUNCIL CHAMBERS - SOUTHFIELD, MICHIGAN

Wednesday, September 30,2026 - 6:30 p.m.

Video Recording transcribed by

JANENE CLEARY, Michigan CSR No. 16359

COMMISSION MEMBERS AND STAFF PRESENT:

Robert Willis, Chair

Jeremy Griffis, Vice Chair

Anthony Martin, Commissioner

Ghana Adell Goodwin-Dye, Commissioner

Geralyn Stephens-Gunn, Commissioner

Cynthia Bernoudy, Secretary

Terry Croad, Director of Planning

Thomas Paison, Deputy City Planner

Planning Commission Meeting

Wednesday, September 30,2026

(At 6:30 p.m., meeting begins.)

CHAIR WILLIS: This is the call to order of the Southfield Planning Commission. Today is September 30th. The time is 6:30 p.m. We are in Council Chambers, 26000 Evergreen. And with that call order, we can start the meeting with the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

CHAIR WILLIS: Mr. Paison, may we have a roll call?

MR. PAISON: Yes, sir.

Commissioner Goodwin-Dye?

MS. GOODWIN-DYE: Present.

MR. PAISON: Commissioner Bernoudy?

MS. BERNOUDY: Present.

MR. PAISON: Chairman Willis?

CHAIR WILLIS: I'm here.

MR. PAISON: Vice Chairman Griffis?

MR. GRIFFIS: Here.

MR. PAISON: Commissioner Martin?

MR. MARTIN: Here.

MR. PAISON: Dr. Stephens-Gunn?

MS. STEPHENS-GUNN: Here.

MR. PAISON: You have a quorum.

Commissioner Gruber is excused.

CHAIR WILLIS: Thank you so much. Any announcements -- or, I'm sorry -- any motion for approval of the agenda?

MR. GRIFFIS: Motion to approve the agenda as written.

MS. BERNOUDY: Support.

CHAIR WILLIS: It's been moved by Commissioner Griffis; support by Commissioner Bernoudy.

All in favor?

FULL COMMISSION: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIS: That passes unanimously.

Mr. Paison, any announcements or communications?

MR. PAISON: None at this time, sir.

CHAIR WILLIS: Thank you.

We have a few people in the audience, and I'd like to just make a comment about public comment. We will have an opportunity for each person to speak to our commission; we'll have a three-minute opportunity. And our rules just ask that we have professional contact when we do that.

No abusive or threatening language. And we will then be able to hear your complaint. And this is also posted on the agenda. We will assume that you've had an opportunity to take a look at that.

With that, I'd like to start with PCZR26-0005.

MR. PAISON: Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

This is a conditional rezoning request for the property at 19900 West 9 Mile, the corner of Evergreen and 9 Mile, the former Specs Howard School location that is presently zoned OS, Office Service. They are looking to rezone with conditions to B-3, General Business, for a third -- .3 acres at the corner, and then the remainder of the site to RMM, Multiple-Family Medium Rise, to allow for renovation of the existing building into apartments.

Just looking here at the current zoning, you can see it's OS. The propose- -- the future land use of the site is Local Mixed Use, which either the OS or the Multiple-Family and Commercial would all be potentially appropriate under that land used designation.

Just looking at the existing site as it currently stands, the upper view is from 9 Mile, and then the lower view is from Evergreen on the side of the building.

This is the layout they're looking to do with the rezoning. So you got that .33 acres at the corner and then 3 acres for the remainder of the site for the Multi-Family Residential.

The conditional -- they are looking to do a conditional rezoning, and the uses they're going to exclude from the B-3 as part of the rezoning are gas stations, automobile and truck sales, automobile service and repair facilities, motor vehicle washing facilities, hotels and motels, drive-through

restaurants, outdoor sales and storage uses, adult use or sexually oriented businesses, marijuana facilities, and other similarly intensive uses would be inconsistent with the intended redevelopment of the property. So this is as proposed by the applicant in their application.

They would become part of a conditions -- they would become part of a conditional rezoning agreement should this be eventually approved by the City Council. After this body makes its recommendation, it moves on next month to that body.

They have provided a conceptual redevelopment plan just to give a sense of what their plans are for the property. As noted, they are going to take the two-story building and divide that up into apartments, you know, within those two stories. You have a -- and then a small commercial building at the corner, about 7,800 square feet, at that point.

And the petitioner is present. If you're willing to come forward.

CHAIR WILLIS: And if you may, could you give us your name and your business address.

MR. GILES: My name is Brian Giles. My address is 1212 Larrabee Lane, Northbrook, Illinois.

CHAIR WILLIS: Thank you.

MR. GILES: You're welcome.

CHAIR WILLIS: And would you like to add to what Mr. Paison has been able to share with us?

MR. GILES: Well, you know, as we had, you know, discussed three weeks ago, I don't have much to add. You know, we're moving for- -- you know, continuing with our redevelopment work, and this is critical for us to continue the process.

CHAIR WILLIS: Yeah. Okay. I don't --

MR. CROAD: Through the Chair. How many units -- well, just do an overview of number of units, one-bedroom, two-bedroom --

MR. GILES: Sure. Okay. I -- I can -- I can --

MR. CROAD: (Indiscernible) public hearing.

MR. GILES: Fair -- fair enough. Okay. For people that were not here last time.

Right now our plans call for 56 units, 28 per floor. There will be six one-bedrooms, eight three-bedrooms, and the balance will be two-bedrooms. So mostly two-bedrooms. You know, in terms of the overall development plan, as you can see on the Conceptual Site Plan, we have ample parking, essentially, two-to-one per unit, and we're intending to have some nice indoor and outdoor amenities for the development.

Outdoor we -- we're going to have a dog park as well as another -- you know, other outdoor spaces for the occupants, for the humans. And then inside we have a -- a community room, and there's going to be a little roof deck as well.

In terms of the corner outlot, you know, we don't know what -- what that's going to be but, you know, I love the

corner, and I -- I think it will be something that will be compatible and a -- a value add for the neighborhood.

CHAIR WILLIS: Thank you. Thank you.

MR. CROAD: If I could just remind the Planning Commission that we're only considering the rezoning, but it is a conditional rezoning. And I just wanted to give a brief overview so you're familiar with the types of residential and commercial that he's proposing, but we're not going to get into site plan details at this time. That'll come back later should he decide to move forward if -- if all the approvals are granted.

CHAIR WILLIS: Understood.

And with that, we will not -- with that, we have an opportunity for a public hearing. And so I'm going to ask that you have a seat.

And if there's anyone that wants to address this concern, they would have an opportunity to speak now. And if you could remember my admonition, that is a three-minute limit.

So is there anyone who wishes to speak to this point?

Thank you so much. If you can give us your name and your address.

MS. ALLEN: Hi. My name is Tonya Allen. My address is 23231 Mapleridge Drive.

CHAIR WILLIS: Okay.

MS. ALLEN: I am one of the executive board members

for our Washington Village Neighborhood Association, and, really, I -- I guess my concern here is in regards to the rezoning of it. I know it's going to be condos or apartments, which is not a problem. That's not an issue at all. But I think my main focus is, we would like to be included with updates maybe -- if it's not directly to the Neighborhood Association, maybe with the Planning Commission or the neighborhood committee people through the City. As long as we stand abreast of things.

We would like to also have an awareness of the property manager just so we can stay abreast of things, so in case anything does happen or who we need to contact. Because it seems like we have a disconnect with our neighborhood in regards to people that have rental properties and other things in the neighborhood. We have no way to really communicate with them and inform them of things that's occurring. So that was one concern.

And another concern, I know that the development is about to take place, or it hopefully will be taking place. We had a question in regards to, like, for the hiring, is there any way possible that we can put back into it a payer-forward opportunity to allow Southfield residents to be hired for even the businesses that's being -- you know, a percentage -- maybe a 1 percent of Southfield residents that can be a part of the -- the development or even a part of the establishment and

businesses that's going to be a part of that.

So those were -- like, I would say our main concerns was mainly staying connected with the property manager and also to considering Southfield residents to be a part of the business community as well. And that was it.

CHAIR WILLIS: Okay. Well, thank you so much. We have heard your comments.

MR. CROAD: Ma'am, did -- did the developer reach out to you? He was supposed to meet with the Neighborhood Association.

MS. ENYEDY: Yes.

MS. ALLEN: The president -- yes. I wasn't a part of it, but I am aware that they have.

MR. CROAD: Okay.

MS. ALLEN: And then after the last meeting, it was a few weeks back --

MR. CROAD: Okay.

MS. ALLEN: -- but we had congregated in the hallway.

MR. CROAD: And then after we take public hearing, we'll have the developer, Brian, can address some of your -- your concerns.

MS. ALLEN: Would that be today or another time?

MR. CROAD: Yeah. Tonight. Yep.

MS. ALLEN: Oh, I don't know if I want to stay all night, but okay.

MR. CROAD: No, it's -- it's just in a few minutes --
MS. ALLEN: Okay.
MR. CROAD: -- okay?
MS. ALLEN: Yeah. I mean, I'm coming from work. Okay.
MR. CROAD: Yeah. Yeah. So are we.
CHAIR WILLIS: Thank you.
Anyone else?
And good evening to you. Again, if you could give us your name and your home address.
MS. ENYEDY: Yes. My name is Linda Enyedy. My address is 23766 Mapleridge.
Yes, Brian reached out to me. I'm the president of our Neighborhood Association, Washington Village, and he -- prior to all us even hearing about this, he called me and explained everything that he had in mind, which I thought was very generous of him to do that.
And as Tonya said, we don't really have an objection to -- I think that's a good thing to put there. Our -- my concern is traffic cutting through our neighborhood because we have a horrible, horrible traffic situation in our neighborhood. And if these people are going to be coming and going through the neighborhood instead of using Evergreen Road or 9 Mile Road as their main access, then it's going to double the problem we have.

And as Tonya mentioned, too, if we could have, like, somehow to contact the property manager, because if he lives in Illinois, he's not going to be, you know, coming to look at anything that's wrong or the maintenance of it. Who's going to take care of bushes that are overgrown or grass or, you know, whatever, however they divide it or whatever they call it. That's something we need to address too.

Other than that, I think it's a good idea, and I wish he'd put a coffee shop in one of those little places and, you know, like, a little bakery or someplace you could stop and get ice cream or, you know, something that the whole neighborhood could avail themselves of because they're actually going to be part of our subdivision.

Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIS: Okay. Thank --

MS. BERNOUDY: Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIS: I -- I'm sorry. Could you give -- give me your name again.

MS. ENYEDY: Pardon me?

CHAIR WILLIS: Your name again.

MS. ENYEDY: Linda Enyedy.

CHAIR WILLIS: Thank you so much.

MS. ENYEDY: Uh-huh.

CHAIR WILLIS: Is there anyone else that would like to speak to this issue?

(No audible response.)

CHAIR WILLIS: Then, at that point, the opportunity closes.

MR. CROAD: Brian --

CHAIR WILLIS: So if you could join us again, and this would -- we can give our commissioners an opportunity to ask questions.

MR. CROAD: Could -- through the Chair.

Brian, would you mind addressing, you know, about property management, maintenance, and contact information first.

MR. GILES: Oh. Yeah. Yeah. Of course. In terms of the communication --

MR. CROAD: Brian.

MR. GILES: Fine. Well -- they asked the question, though.

MR. CROAD: I know, but --

MR. GILES: Yeah. In -- in terms of the communication, I'm more than willing to, you know, have regular communication with the Board and that the -- that -- you know, that whole community as -- as the -- our plans develop. Because there's going to be certainly another public hearing when we do the site plan approval, which is really when we get into the -- into -- into the gory details and whatnot. And I'll be happy to keep communication open, even, you know, flowing during construction, because they didn't mention it, maybe I shouldn't,

but, you know, that's when things get, you know, either exciting or -- or -- or otherwise, depending on your perspective.

In terms of property management, you know, I've been in multi-family development for 30 years, and, yes, my company, we will not be doing the management. That's not what I do. We did that, actually, back in -- back in the '80s with Berger Realty Group, who was, you know, in Southfield for many years at Comerica Tower, if you know -- if you know that group.

But we will certainly hire a professional company to handle the -- the management. And, you know, we want to make this a Class-A type property. So that means we got to have professionals. And in terms of that communication, I mean, certainly, you know, it'll be appropriate, you know, in -- in just running the -- running the property.

CHAIR WILLIS: Okay. Well, thank you. Then that gives the opportunity for Commissioners to ask you a few questions. I'm going to start with Commissioner Stephens-Gunn.

MS. STEPHENS-GUNN: Oh. Good evening. Thank you. Couple things. First of all, to my neighbors, I used to live next door to Ms. Allen, so I miss Washington Village.

But along those lines, Brian, I hope that you understand that communicating with the community about what you're doing and when -- how you're doing it and when you're doing it is very important. I currently live in Washington Heights, and we have a project that is undertaken by Contour

that has been in development for seven years.

MR. GILES: You're referring to the Northland --

MS. STEPHENS-GUNN: McKinley School --

MR. GILES: The Northland.

MS. STEPHENS-GUNN: The McKinley School project.

So making sure that they know what's going on, how the -- what your timelines are. Even when there's a delay, please communicate that. That's very, very important.

My question to you is, are you building to sell the -- the property to someone else to do the leasing? How's that -- and I -- I don't -- I'm sure -- I'm not sure if that's a legitimate question for this --

MR. CROAD: Yeah. I mean -- I mean --

MS. STEPHENS-GUNN: I'm just trying to understand what we're doing.

MR. CROAD: Yeah. I mean, it is a conditional rezoning, and it really -- it's just on the merits of the rezoning. But if he wants to answer it, that's his prerogative.

MR. GILES: No. That -- that -- that is not the plan. I mean, I will, you know, comp- -- complete this development, but, you know, you can't predict the future. And it better not take me seven years. So that's -- that's my answer to -- to the question.

MS. STEPHENS-GUNN: Okay. All right. All right. Thank you very much.

MR. GILES: You're welcome.

CHAIR WILLIS: Commissioner Martin?

MR. MARTIN: At this particular time, I have no questions.

MR. GILES: Thanks.

CHAIR WILLIS: Commissioner Griffs?

MR. GRIFFIS: I'm always in favor of adaptive reuse projects in the city. And this is an apartment-shaped building that used to be an office building, so it's a good proportion. That just happens to probably make it easier to make it an apartment building if you get zoned that way, so I think that's good.

But I also like the small commercial piece of the development. And I think it's important to mention we have this one-acre minimum rezoning requirement for each zoning district, but the other B-3 parcels are adjacent across the street, so it's not a spot zoning. It's a -- it's a -- it's a continuation of the zoning that's there.

But I think what's important that you do is, every month we're up here reviewing another gas station, and everyone says there's too many gas stations in this city. So you've said that you will not allow gas stations, which is important. And you're not allowing car washes; that's number two behind gas stations. Too many of them in too quick lately. And then drive-through restaurants, probably number three in terms of --

and then auto repairs.

So all of the things that could be bad on a relatively small acreage of commercial next to residents you said you're not going to allow them, and we're going to -- that's going to be with this conditional rezoning. So all those things make me in favor of this rezoning.

I think it's a -- you know, it's a great area to put a transition between the busier commercial stuff and the nicer residential area right next to it. So Multi-Family is a natural -- natural fit right there. So I think it's going to be a nice project.

CHAIR WILLIS: Thank you.

Commissioner Bernoudy?

MS. BERNOUDY: Thank you.

And thank you for this project that you're undertaking, but I have no further questions from the last time we met.

MR. GILES: You're welcome.

MS. BERNOUDY: Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIS: Commissioner Goodwin-Dye?

MS. GOODWIN-DYE: My question is, are they going to be condos, or are they going to be apartments?

MR. GILES: Apartments.

MS. GOODWIN-DYE: Apartments?

MR. GILES: Yeah.

MS. GOODWIN-DYE: Okay.

MR. GILES: Don't be, you know, fooled by my name.

MS. GOODWIN-DYE: Okay. Okay. And I am in agreement that we do need a coffee shop over there, okay? A nice little cozy coffee shop job for the neighborhood that I can drive over there when I'm taking my granddaughter to school and get a cup of coffee. Yeah.

MR. GILES: And people from the park can walk there, you know, and along the 9 Line.

MS. GOODWIN-DYE: Get their coffee --

MR. GILES: Okay. We got to get the -- you know, we got to get the right operator. We got to get the right operator, but --

CHAIR WILLIS: I have one -- I'm sorry. I don't mean to step on your --

MS. GOODWIN-DYE: Oh. No. That's -- I'm --

CHAIR WILLIS: Okay. I have one question. I believe it's in part of the list of excluded items. We discussed firearms?

MR. GILES: Yeah. That --

CHAIR WILLIS: And I don't know if I saw it on the list.

Did I overlook it, Mr. Paison?

MR. CROAD: Well, we could -- if he's willing to add that, that's fine. But because it's right across the street

from a daycare, it would not be permitted there.

CHAIR WILLIS: Okay. Okay. Okay.

MR. PAISON: Yeah. Firearms, that's -- we did discuss it when I looked at it. It would be excluded anyway because it's too close to residential and it's too close to a daycare.

MR. CROAD: Okay.

MR. PAISON: Like, it's -- it's excluded on multiple factors. It can't go here anyway.

MR. CROAD: However, if you're -- if you're comfortable adding it, it would just --

MR. PAISON: Firearms establishments?

MR. GILES: As I said last time, added.

MR. CROAD: Sure. All right.

MR. PAISON: I'll follow up on that.

CHAIR WILLIS: Commissioners, any further questions?

MS. GOODWIN-DYE: No.

CHAIR WILLIS: Mr. Paison?

MR. PAISON: All right.

MR. CROAD: Could I just make a couple of quick comments before he read the recommendation?

CHAIR WILLIS: Yes, sir.

MR. CROAD: I'm in favor of the coffee shop, bakery, and ice cream shop.

MR. GILES: By the way, I like -- I like the ice cream. Big fan.

MR. CROAD: And I'm glad that you brought up about the 9 Line. Because I think, again, it's hard to predict what kind of retail establishment you're going to get in there. But I think not only servicing the neighborhood, it's strategically located along -- we're just finishing up that stretch of -- of the 9 Line. It should be done in the next week or two.

And then we're continuing -- we just submitted a grant application that was due today for the bridge crossing. The city engineers bring forth the piece all the way to Greenfield. So we've got funding for another couple of miles. And we're -- we're cautiously optimistic about the grant application to cross the bridge. And we are building out this trail system.

So this is not just a planning exercise. We are implementing it. And I think over time, strategically, with the parks and -- and the neighborhood and everything else, this is going to be a -- a prime location.

MR. GILES: I appreciate that. That's what I see as well.

MR. CROAD: And I agree with Mr. Griffis. You know, adaptive reuse. We've had a couple of proposals for this building. It'd be nice to have it occupied. And I do like the out parcel development as a complement to the housing.

CHAIR WILLIS: Thank you.

MR. PAISON: All right.

CHAIR WILLIS: Now, Mr. Paison?

MR. PAISON: Yep. We have a -- a recommended resolution. We are make -- we are recommending that the Commission make a favorable recommendation to this Council of the conditional rezoning PCZR26-0005 to go from OS, Office Service, to a combination of B-3, General Business, and RMM, Multiple Family, based upon the following factors and the following conditions:

It is consistent with the Community Master Plan, Local Mixed Use designation for the parcel, which calls for a mixture of neighborhood, commercial, service, office with accessory multiple-family uses. So fairly standard.

Couple of conditions. Execution and recording of the Conditional Rezoning Agreement subject to review and approval by the City Attorney within six months of enactment of the rezoning.

And then the actual conditions on the use. Excluding gas stations, automobile truck sales, automobile service and repair facilities, motor vehicle washing facilities, hotels and motels, drive-through restaurants, outdoor sales and storage uses, adult use and sexually oriented businesses, marijuana facilities, we'll add here firearms establishments, and other similar intensive uses that would be inconsistent with the intended redevelopment of the property.

CHAIR WILLIS: Thank you.

Commissioners, you've heard the recommendation.

Everybody --

MS. GOODWIN-DYE: Through the Chair.

CHAIR WILLIS: I think we have a question --

MR. GRIFFIS: Oh. No. Go ahead. She can --

CHAIR WILLIS: Okay.

MS. GOODWIN-DYE: Through the Chair.

CHAIR WILLIS: Yes.

MS. GOODWIN-DYE: I move that we support the favorable recommendation for PCZR26-0005.

CHAIR WILLIS: Okay. Support?

MS. BERNOUDY: Support.

CHAIR WILLIS: It's been moved by Commissioner Goodwin-Dye; supported by Commissioner Bernoudy.

All in favor?

FULL COMMISSION: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIS: Any opposed?

(No audible response.)

CHAIR WILLIS: That passed unanimously. And I thank you so much. And I think your next step would be with City Council.

MR. PAISON: Yep.

CHAIR WILLIS: Thank you.

MR. PAISON: Which that -- actually, your next meeting with City Council will be on Monday. So it's right away.

MR. MARTIN: He -- he didn't --

MR. PAISON: Yep. Harry (phonetic) will follow up with him. I'm also going to send him an email. I always send them an email reminder too.

CHAIR WILLIS: Well, I think we're ready, then, for the next agenda item PTZA26-0003.

MR. PAISON: All right. This is our Zoning Text Amendment PTZA26-0003 to address the accessory dwelling units issue in single-family property. It's been under discussion for, I think, the whole three years I've been here. I think that discussion even predates me being employed with the City.

It's been discussed at the joint Planning Commission/City Council meeting a couple of times, the annual meeting, so we're finally bringing forward this ordinance. And it did go to the Council Legislative Committee. They made some minor tweaks and then sent it on for the normal process. So it's coming to you, and then it'll go to Council next month.

So as we're looking at it, were just looking to provide -- to permit and provide regulations for the review process and citing any accessory dwelling units. As the Code currently stands, they're prohibited. Just flat out, you can only have one dwelling unit per lot; you can't do it.

Background: Just -- accessory dwelling units are historically common housing form that can help address housing shortages, affordability, and involving needs of an aging population. In addition, it can expand housing choices, support

residents seeking supplemental income, and accommodate multi-generational households, which is probably the bulk of our inquiries. I'd say 85, 90 percent of our inquiries about ADUs are about multigenerational households, which was really, really common pre-World War II. We get inquiries, one or two a month, on these, so we really do have, like, a -- a list of people who are interested, but it's taken a little while to kind of have these dialogues and get the ball going.

We did look at the Community Master Plan for goals and objectives that would be supportive of this amendment. One of those things we always do: We always check the amendments against the Master Plan. In this case, we've got several that are -- speak really -- quite directly expanding housing choice and diversity, increasing housing affordability, support aging in place, provide flexible living arrangements, promote efficient land use, preserve neighborhood character, encourage sustainable development, improve housing accessibility, and support workforce housing. I mean, these are all potentially relevant goals and objectives that we're addressing.

One of the things we got to do is adopt some definitions because we don't have them. So the first thing is just a general definition of accessory dwelling unit. And it really looks at it as being a self-contained, residential dwelling unit that is clearly secondary and supported to a principal single-family dwelling located on the same parcel.

The ADU must contain independent living facilities for one or more persons, including permanent provisions for sleeping, cooking, eating, and sanitation. And an ADU may be attached, detached, or contained within a principal dwelling.

So there's three different types of ADUs, and we have separate definitions for each one. ADUs include attached ADUs, detached ADUs, an interior use as defined herein. And then we get into these subdefinitions.

The attached accessory dwelling unit. That's really, you know, like, a rear addition to a house, a reversion of an attached garage. Those are your most typical versions of attached ADUs. So it's not within the house's original footprint, but it is attached to the home.

Your detached accessory dwelling units are like your tiny homes. They're detached. They'd be in the rear yard. It's its own structure with its own operating items.

And then you've got your interior ADUs, which comes down to either, like, basement apartments or, like, an attic apartment or even potentially a ground floor, if you had a big enough house and you wanted to split the ground floor in -- to create an apartment on the ground floor. So that could be a variety of items, but it is interior within the home's existing footprint.

All these would have to go through permitting and building code and have to meet all those requirements as well.

This is just the zoning part.

So one of the things we have to do is add accessory dwelling units to the permitted use list, subject to the standards in -- that we're going to create an Section 5.71, which is your accessory dwelling unit section within the Single-Family District. And this includes what -- the section that's going to have all the standards in it.

So we start out with eligible residential lots. An ADU can only be on a -- permitted on a parcel that either contains an existing or concurrently constructed principal single-family dwelling. It is an accessory dwelling unit, so there has to be a principal dwelling unit on the same property. It's limited to no more than one ADU, whether attached, detached, or interior, per parcel.

An ADU shall be permitted on any lot that meets the minimum lot size requirements in the ordinance. ADUs are not considered a dwelling unit for purposes of calculating required lot area per dwelling unit the provisions of section 5.193. So 5.193 is your schedule regulations. It has a minimum lot area just generally for the district, and then it has a lot size per dwelling unit calculation, which would get a little weird if we counted the accessory dwelling unit in terms of what that lot size would be, so we're excluding that consideration because it is accessory.

The review process will be administrative site plan.

So it'll come into the Planning Commission. We'll do an administrative site plan review just to make sure all of these requirements and the Zoning Ordinance are met and that it fits into the neighborhood in a reasonable way. This won't come to this body. It'll be done by the Planning Staff with final say by the city planner. A denial could be appealed, but it -- it would generally be at -- you know, per the standards.

So we'll be looking at both the specific dimensional standards you see in this section, but because it is subject to site plan review, it is also subject to review under all 18 site plan review standards. So it gives us some flexibility to try to make sure what's going in fits in the neighborhood it's going into in a reasonable way.

So getting into minimum ADU size -- the minimum ADU size will be the minimum habitable floor area required by the Building Code for a dwelling unit get a -- to get a certificate of occupancy. So you got to have the bathroom. You got to have the kitchen or kitchenette. You got to have the sleeping area. My understanding is it's between 200 and 300 square feet is the minimum size that would meet the Building Code as a dwelling unit.

Maximum ADU size: At this point, we're looking at 800 square feet or 35 percent of the floor area of the principal dwelling, whichever is less. Still allows a fairly sizeable -- if you figure a standard two-car garage is 400 square feet, 800

square foot is a pretty good size accessory dwelling unit. That would go on larger lots with larger homes.

We do have some examples. We originally had it at 50 percent and 1,000, but we thought that it was a little too high. Since our minimum size for a one-bedroom apartment is 800 square feet, it seemed like a reasonable place to start in the ordinance.

In no event shall the addition of an ADU exceed the total lot coverage limit within the Zoning District it's located. So, like, in residential districts, the maximum lot coverage for all structures is 30 percent. So if there's already a lot of structures on the property, they're eating up all the lot coverage, you can't put one of these in unless you get rid of something. Not very many lots have come up against that limit. Since we raised that from 25 to 30 percent two years ago, we haven't really had any more lot coverage waivers from the Zoning Board, so it seems to have met the need.

Attached ADUs: Looking at height, there's two -- the reason it's attached ADU, is it's attached to the house. It's subject to the height limits for the principal structure, but in no case can be taller than the principal structure. Detached ADU is limited like all accessory -- detached accessory dwell- -- accessory structures at 15 feet, which keeps it to one story.

And then you get into locations and the setbacks. You

got location. Attached ADUs have to be in the rear yard only. I provide this diagram just to remind people where the rear yard is, relatively. So you got the front yard, everything between the house and the street, the side yard are the two areas to either side of the building, and the rear yard is the whole thing past the back of the house.

Attached ADUs shall comply with the setback requirements applicable to the principal structure that are attached to the house. They have to meet the same setbacks as the house would have to meet. They're just considered part of the house for setbacks. So it could go on a side if they have side area to go on that would still meet the setback.

Could probably go on the rear. In many cases, it -- it's unlikely to go on the front because most homes are right up with the required setback. So it'd unlikely to go on the front of a structure. But theoretically, if the home is set back further than the accessory -- the required setback, it could, theoretically, be a front addition. You could do an "L," I guess.

Design standards: ADUs shall comply with all applicable building codes and shall be subject to all applicable inspections and approvals prior to receiving a certificate of occupancy. So really, the only design standards we're imposing are you -- you got to meet the building and occupancy codes, the construction codes.

Address requirements: All ADUs shall have a separate address, a designated -- designation approved by the City. This is to -- was a request of Public Safety so they would know when they're responding to the principal resident or responding to the accessory by address.

Utility requirements: Utility connections may be shared with the principal dwelling unit, unless separate service is required by the building official. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the applicant has to demonstrate there's adequate utility capacity to serve the ADU. So if they can get that by splitting off of the house's service, great; if they can't, they may have to run a separate service. All those connections have to be inspected by the City's building and engineering departments.

Minimum parking requirements: Now, for a standard single-family home, it's to be able to get two cars off the street, and that can be in a garage, it can be in a driveway, or it can be a combination driveway. We basically made that three vehicles if you had the ADU. But if you have a two-car garage with a driveway that goes to it, you can usually get three or four cars off the streets. I don't think this will be a substantial limiter on most properties.

Short term rentals: The use of an ADU as a short-term rental will be prohibited. When I was in front of Legislative Committee, we had this down as it would be regulated by the

normal rental registration, but Council wasn't willing to sup- -- there Legislative Committee wasn't willing to support this amendment unless the short-term rentals were prohibited in the ADUs. They said they could revisit the issue in the future if they felt it was necessary, but initially, they didn't want this to be the problem.

Just a couple of other things that relate to ADUs, because people look at the zoning and think, Is that all the rules? Like, no. There's the Michigan Building Code -- all those rules that affect these -- and the Fire Code. So there's a variety of other, like, safety codes in or- -- that affect these structures. We're trying to not add much more expense than these already add.

And then there's a few other zoning provisions that also affect the review. So we've got the site plan review requirements, since this is subject to site plan review. That gives us, like, 18, kind of, comprehensive general standards to use in our review beyond the specific ones we've discussed today.

Side yard: Accessory -- detached accessory dwelling unit will be subject to the same setbacks as a de- -- any detached accessory structure, like a garage. On a corner lot, they have to be 25 feet from the abutting street. So that -- the -- if you're on a corner, you'd be in the rear yard, but you'd have to be 20 feet off the -- off the sidewalk -- 26 feet

probably, because it's usually a foot for the property line. So you -- you wouldn't be -- you know, the -- the house is on the corner, but it's tucked in a bit.

The ADU in the back yard would also have to be in about 25 feet from the side street. It couldn't be out there, like, 3 feet from the sidewalk. Because at an interior lot, that side setback for accessory structures is 3 feet. So it would be tucked in a little more behind.

Lot area: As noted, there's a couple of items here that affect this. Not less than 65 percent of all front and side yards have to be landscape on a sing- -- on the single-family residential. So that really kind of makes sure that they can't, like, cover the side yards or the front yard with parking, or otherwise create a completely no-landscape zone in the side yard or in the front yard. And then parking and motor vehicles should not be on any front or side yard landscape areas.

So we require these landscape areas, and you can't park on them. So it really is to kind of contain some of the potential concerns of, like, Oh, you'll add this ADU. There'll be two people. They'll have two cars. They'll turn the whole front yard into a parking lot. Well, this would be prohibited by these provisions.

Just some examples here: This is the R-1 District. Looking at a typical-sized lot; 80 feet wide. At the -- the

limit that they'd be able to do here is about 400 square feet. And it just shows it tucked back in the corner there with the minimum of 3-foot setbacks relative to the size of the house and the lot.

And then we have the R-2. This is a corner lot. The 707-foot is as big as it could be based on the size of the house, but it would have to be tucked in 25 feet from that side street. So it actually -- I know it's showing more than the 3 feet. It does say 25-foot yard setback, but in scale, it'd probably be a little further over.

Here's one in the R-3 District. Once again, we're looking at a possible size; you could do about 610 square feet in the backyard.

This is the R-4 District. These tend to be a little bit bigger lots. This one is a little pie-shaped, but it has such a large backyard that the 528 square foot ADU is kind of small by comparison to that backyard. Once again, this is a little smaller than the last one because the house is smaller. It's that 35 percent cap of the primary structure.

And then just some other -- this is RE, your rural residential estate homes. This is one on Farmbrook. It's not a very wide lot, but it's very, very deep. And it's -- it's showing a -- in this case, it's a 510-square-feet ADU because the home itself on the front is not particularly large.

And there's the large home lots. We have a few of

these. And this is on Norwood. It's about -- about an acre. Lot was a 144 feet. They could do up to an 800-square-foot ADU, and it's tucked back in that corner. It'd be about 11 percent of the total lot coverage with the ADU added.

So it does show that it is possible to put these on almost any Zoning District if you have the right size property and you haven't used up all your lot coverage, which not very many people actually have.

Just some information on further research -- we -- where we've drew reformation information from for this work. American Planning Association had a lot of information on ADUs. MSU Extension had a variety of resources. This Old House had, actually, like, a number of ADU episodes that were very interesting; you got a good look at them and what they were like. And then ARP has an ADU toolkit; their primary interest being this multigenerational living aspect.

So we do need to hold a public hearing, as this is a zoning amendment.

CHAIR WILLIS: Okay. Well, I thank you.

This would be our opportunity for a public hearing. If anyone in the public would like to address us on the accessory dwelling unit, would have the opportunity to do so now. If anyone would like to address this, they would have the opportunity to do so now.

Seeing none. That opportunity is closed. Thank you.

Commissioners, can we start with Commissioner Goodwin-Dye.

MS. GOODWIN-DYE: I -- I don't have any questions.

CHAIR WILLIS: Commissioner Bernoudy?

MS. BERNOUDY: My one question -- pardon me -- when you mentioned that those homes that are on the corner --

MR. PAISON: Yeah.

MS. BERNOUDY: -- will they be required to have a certain height of fencing or anything from the -- from the traffic or the public? That -- do you understand what I mean?

MR. PAISON: Well, we permit -- we allow the privacy fencing, but it's not a requirement of this ordinance, that they have to put it into doing ADU. But it seems like the sort of thing, if you were going to do an accessory dwelling unit and wanted to provide some privacy, it's something you would probably do as part of that project. And we do -- we do authorize it in the fence ordinance. It is not hard to get approved for a privacy fence, particularly on a corner because you don't need to have the agreement of your neighbor. Your neighbor is the city right-of-way.

MS. BERNOUDY: Right.

MR. PAISON: So you can -- you know, there -- there are some rules about -- it can't -- you know, obviously, it can't be in the front yard. And then where there's a driveway, there's some things you have to do to make sure you're not --

sure you're creating blind spots. But yeah, I -- I would think it'd be -- we didn't make it a requirement, but I would think it would be a likely occurrence. A lot of corner lots actually have privacy fences for that reason, even without an ADU.

MS. BERNOUDY: Yeah. I'm thinking of safety as well, you know?

MR. PAISON: Yeah. I mean, there's something to be said for safety for people being able to see into the yard. Because if there's someone lurking around the yard, someone driving by or a neighbor could then see them. One of the problems with privacy fence is if someone gets in your backyard, none of your neighbors can see them.

MS. BERNOUDY: Yeah.

MR. PAISON: That's -- you know, so say if you were away, and your neighbors were trying to keep an eye on your house, and you had a privacy fence, if somebody got over that fence, nobody -- none of your neighbors would be able to see what was going on back there. So it's -- privacy fences are -- from a security standpoint, they have pluses and minuses. From a privacy standpoint, they're great. From a security standpoint --

MS. BERNOUDY: Yeah. Thinking privacy. Thank you. That's all.

CHAIR WILLIS: Commissioner Griffis?

MR. GRIFFIS: Very favor -- in favor of accessory

dwelling units. I think we're still a little early in the rules and who's going to actually build one.

MR. PAISON: Yeah.

MR. GRIFFIS: Even though it's an old concept that was around 100 years ago.

MS. BERNOUDY: Yeah. Tiny houses.

MR. GRIFFIS: I get a lot of calls -- or not a lot. I get a few calls at my office about people wanting to design accessory dwelling units. Nobody's ever built one. We built a couple, actually, just on large estate properties, not on normal kind of suburban lots.

MR. PAISON: Right.

MR. GRIFFIS: They're -- they're usually cost prohibitive. And a cost prohibitive, I think, is going to keep the quality up if somebody actually does build one in the city, which is a good thing. So I'm -- I'm definitely in favor of getting some ordinance that allows them, so that somebody can -- somebody can start.

MR. PAISON: Yeah.

MR. GRIFFIS: I -- I think we're overreaching our -- our -- our powers as a zoning body when you tell someone how to run their business and how not to run their business. So a short-term rental versus a long-term rental is a business structure, and I don't think we should be talking about that in zoning ordinances. So I'd be in -- in favor of removing that

item from this ordinance, although I don't think that's an option. So in hopes of somebody building accessory dwelling units, we're going to go forward. In -- in reality of paying for accessory dwelling units --

MR. PAISON: Yeah.

MR. GRIFFIS: -- there's other ways to pay for them, and we shouldn't be telling people how to run a business, short-term or long-term or -- or otherwise. I -- I think it's going to be interesting. We've been talking about it for a long, long, long, long time, ten-plus years that I remember. I think we should get the rules out there and see what happens.

And I'm very glad that we -- and you're showing some perfect examples right now. There's a lot of these interesting modern kits, like the one on the top of this view, and these other prefab units out there. So I'm glad we removed the -- the talk about it had to match the neighborhood or had to match the building that's already there on site. I don't think we should match some of the less-than-great buildings around the city.

Again, if you're going to spend this much money on this small of square footage, make it look nice, please. So yeah, I -- I'm excited. It's -- it's going to be a slow build. And let's see what happens. Let's -- let's get a couple out here in the city. And I'm interested to see how they go.

MR. PAISON: Yeah. To that point, when I've checked with other communities that have allowed these, they didn't have

an avalanche of applications. They've had a few. And I would say with this small space, it's almost better -- more important that the -- the interior be installed -- designed well to function as a small living space.

It's -- you know, I think both of these look fine. I think it would come down to me -- for me or anyone, I was -- it would be how -- how good of a layout is it? Does it work as a small living space? Because that's -- where everything is located and how it works is a lot bigger of a deal when you're in a small space. So yeah, I would agree with that.

And I agree that if we get it on the books and there was a move, and it's, I guess, still out there, potentially, of the State preempting local government and allowing you ADUs, the more local governments who opt in doing it their way and allowing them with rules, the less impetus there is for the State to preempt us to force the issue and then force a one-size-fits-all solution on every community.

CHAIR WILLIS: Commissioner Martin?

MR. MARTIN: Can you go back to the diagrams you had with -- the examples you had with the -- the lot?

MR. PAISON: Which one?

MR. MARTIN: That's --

MR. PAISON: Which one you looking for?

MR. MARTIN: That's fine.

MR. PAISON: All right.

MR. MARTIN: So you're saying that the ADU can be up to 800 square feet or 35 percent of the residence --

MR. PAISON: The floor of the residence. Yeah.

MR. MARTIN: Yeah.

MR. PAISON: So if it was 1,000-square res- -- 1,000-foot -- say, if it was 1,000-square-foot residence, it could be 350 square feet.

MR. MARTIN: Okay. So -- and that's the max -- so the --

MR. PAISON: Yeah.

MR. MARTIN: The 800 feet --

MR. PAISON: The 800 was just, again, whichever is lower. Yeah.

MR. MARTIN: Okay.

MR. PAISON: Yeah.

MR. MARTIN: All right. That --

MR. PAISON: Because at that point, you -- you exceed 800 square feet, you're just building a house, not a -- not a tiny house, not a -- you're just building a "house" house. If you get to, like -- I grew up in houses in my neighborhood that were, you know, 900 to 1,100 square feet -- a story-and-a-half bungalows. They were everywhere. So, you know, you -- once you get to that point, you're really going -- like, 800 square foot is the size of a four-car garage.

MR. MARTIN: Yeah.

MR. PAISON: You're getting to be pretty sizable structure at that point for an accessory dwelling unit.

MR. MARTIN: The reason I came up with the question is because you noticed that you're showing 35, 30 percent --

MR. PAISON: Yeah.

MR. MARTIN: -- of the --

MR. PAISON: Yeah. And it was --

MR. MARTIN: -- primary building --

MR. PAISON: Yeah --

MR. MARTIN: Not the -- so --

MR. PAISON: Yeah.

MR. MARTIN: -- that -- that explain -- okay.

MR. PAISON: Yeah, that's -- so it's capped by whichever one is less.

MR. MARTIN: Yeah.

MR. PAISON: It's 800 square feet or 35 percent, whichever is less, so. And that was just to kind of try to keep things in scale at some level of reasonability. At least as we -- you know, and when I would discuss with the Legislative, they're like -- they like the idea of let's open the door so far as seems practical, but let -- let's not blow past that point and then have to try to pull it back.

MR. MARTIN: Okay. Can you --

MR. PAISON: And they -- they -- as they said, we can always open the door more later.

MR. MARTIN: Can you go up a slide I believe it is. Maybe in --

MR. PAISON: This one?

MR. MARTIN: You had -- I guess it was the first one or --

MR. PAISON: The first one? This one? It's R-1. And I -- I -- we have, like, five -- actually, we technically have six residential districts. It's RA, R-1, R-2, R-3, R-4 and RE.

MR. MARTIN: Was there one before this?

MR. PAISON: This is R-1. I don't think we have the RA in here. But the RA are the -- kind of the smaller standard city lots that you see.

MR. MARTIN: You had -- you the house -- oh. This one. This one.

MR. PAISON: That's Farmbrook. There's the large lot on Norwood.

MR. MARTIN: This -- that's fine right there. If that -- if that house was on the corner, the back portion where you could put the ADU is going to be -- you -- you have to have it 25 feet from the side --

MR. PAISON: Yeah. From a public right-of-way. So say if you had a -- for some reason, you had a lot that went through and you had --

MR. MARTIN: Okay.

MR. PAISON: Or it was a through lot and you had road

frontage on the front and the back -- which is rare in Southfield, but you do see it in some older cities -- you would have a frontage on both sides. Yeah.

MR. MARTIN: I have a -- there's a house on Concord that -- the side street Devonshire, and then the back of the house is 70 feet away from the -- from the sidewalk.

MR. PAISON: Yeah.

MR. MARTIN: If you go 25 feet, you've got the ADU in plain site and -- at the back of the house, but it's also -- from the front, it's in plain site. It's not behind the house. But it's back behind the setback.

MR. PAISON: Right. Yeah.

MR. MARTIN: So in -- in essence, in rare situations, you have a setback that you can make it, but it's still in plain view from the front and the side.

MR. PAISON: Yeah. And that's where a privacy fence or some landscape screening might be something that we would discuss as part of administrative site plan review with them. You know, we might say, Hey, 25 foot a setback is the minimum. Also, like, that's a case where maybe it would produce a better result, you go for a waiver to the Zoning Board because it'll produce a better result.

It's, like, we can put it here; it'll be screened in this location better and meet the intent of the ordinance. The problem is you got to write an ordinance for 95 percent of the

properties. For the 5 percent that need exceptions, that's what the Zoning Board is for.

MR. MARTIN: Moving on. What I was saying was that there -- there has to be exceptions, and you'll have to take those on an individual basis in those situations where we said it, but there has to be some modifications to it for --

MR. PAISON: Oh. Yeah.

MR. MARTIN: -- because of the lot sizes.

MR. PAISON: Yeah.

MR. MARTIN: That -- that was it. That's all.

MR. PAISON: Yeah. Technically, any dimensional waiver in the Zoning Ordinance is appealable to the Zoning Board. And you just have to prove a practical difficulty, or in some cases, that the result of following the ordinance exactly as written produces opposite of the intent of the ordinance. That is another grounds under which the Board might go, Yeah, we'll give you a waiver because it puts the ADU in a better location in terms of how it fits in. But that is -- you know, that's that case of -- like, that way, there's a hearing, there's a board, you need three out of the five to vote in favor.

It's -- you know, that -- there always is that appeal process. That's the safety valve on the Zoning Ordinance is the Zoning Board of Appeals because they always have the ability to go, Yeah, that's -- if applied strictly as written, it creates

either an undesirable result or a draconian result. So that relief really does assist in those cases. And there will be some. Every city of this size and this age is going to have some unusual properties where it just does either -- either it isn't going to fit at all, it just doesn't make sense on that property, or it needs to be in a different spot to make sense.

CHAIR WILLIS: Thank you.

Commissioner Stephens-Gunn?

MS. STEPHENS-GUNN: Okay. First of all, this -- this meeting is being recorded. Is that correct?

CHAIR WILLIS: It is.

MS. STEPHENS-GUNN: Okay. I'd like for the Board to be aware that I am not moving to the backyard. It's being recorded, so in case somebody hears it, make sure that this is noted: I am not moving to the backyard.

MS. BERNOUDY: I'll let your daughter know.

CHAIR WILLIS: Thank you. I have a couple of -- I -- I'm not sure if they're questions or concerns. But I am -- I can imagine plotting these properties -- after we start doing this, I can imagine the number of property disputes. We have them from time to time now even with established places, and you're going to add new dwellings to it. I can see the next door neighbor reacting.

We have a lot of tree disputes. And I can see the court just kind of getting into, again, a lot of new tree

resorts and -- and easements -- even easements to allow the structure to be built if you have to do it. I know most of them can probably go over the house, but I can see easement issues. And so I see somewhat of a burden, but on the court. I don't know if it makes sense to do -- issue guidelines to -- court to say this is -- but I can see those kinds of issues.

Other than that, I do think it serves an absolute purpose. I think I've had more questions about this kind of housing than virtually anything we've done, and I find that interesting. And I need to say I am absolutely, at this point, in support of it in spite of all of the things that I've presented.

So again, are -- are there any questions for any commissioners at this point?

(No audible response.)

CHAIR WILLIS: Then you've heard Mr. Paison. Are we ready to -- for a motion?

Yes, sir.

MR. GRIFFIS: I'd like to make a favorable recommendation on the Zoning Text Amendment PTZA26-0003.

CHAIR WILLIS: Do I have --

MR. MARTIN: Support.

CHAIR WILLIS: I think I heard commissioner Martin. So we heard motion by Commission Griffis; supported by Commissioner Martin.

All in favor?

FULL COMMISSION: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIS: Any opposed?

(No audible response.)

CHAIR WILLIS: That passes unanimously. Thank you so much, Mr. Paison.

And that takes us to the next item, which is -- I want to make sure I have that -- it's that PTZA26-0005 -- oh.

MR. PAISON: It'd be four.

MR. MARTIN: Four.

CHAIR WILLIS: Four. Okay. We're doing four.

MR. MARTIN: Uh-huh.

MR. PAISON: Yep. Yeah. As noted, this is a zoning text amendment. This is -- these next two zoning text amendments are more kind of fixes to the ordinance -- not major policy changes -- and updates.

In this case, we had an inquiry about a CDL training facility wanting to go in on 8 Mile in the Industrial District, which made us realize that vocational education wasn't allowed in the Industrial District for some reason. Which I don't know where else you would put CDL training, you know, truck driving training. The Industrial District is the correct spot.

So I started looking into that. And then I realized, after doing a little research and talking to Dr. Stephens-Gunn, who is a specialist in this area, that we were using old

terminology. Like "Vocational Education" is not the term currently used in law or practice. It is "Career and Technical Education." It is a little broader. It -- it -- it incorporates vocational education of the past, but is more.

So having gotten into that research and realized we just -- if we're going to touch this, let's touch it correctly and update it. So really, we're looking to update the terminology and then add it to some more zoning districts to allow additional areas where this training can occur.

As noted here, you know, there's a lot of -- these graphics kind of explaining career and technical education in more detail. But where it's currently allowed is vocational education is Office Service, ERO, Education Research Office, ERO-M, Education Research Office Limited, and RC, Regional Center.

As you noted, the sheet metal training facility recently was in an OS District. Would have -- but also would have been fine in an Industrial District, honestly. So that was the other thing that made us think, Okay. Well, we at least need to add this to these Industrial Districts. So we're looking at that.

We looked at the sustainable Southfield Master Plan and, once again, found goals and objectives that were helpful. Develop local talent and inclusive, diverse, and conference fashion; improve learning-to-job pipeline for people at all

levels of secondary and post-secondary education; cooperate with local educational institutions to coordinate training and skill requirements -- the needs of local employers. This is all good stuff that's in our master plan.

Identify economic needs of chronically unemployed and underemployed in the region and develop programming, including education and retraining, to meet those needs; develop and promote educational opportunities and resources that'll assist residents achieving a higher and healthier quality of life; provide opportunities for lifelong learning and increased collaboration and partnership with agencies to provide services to the city.

So doing our part of making it easier for a private provider of career and technical education to be able to operate within the city in appropriate locations seemed like kind of a no-brainer. Like, it doesn't really -- other than the staff time it takes to amend the ordinance, you know, we're just getting out of the way; we're getting out of our own way.

So the first thing we're doing is adding a definition for career and technical education. This is more or less right out of the federal law that created this term, the Perkins Act. And I put "as amended" because it's been amended every couple of years, but the definition hasn't really changed. So we are looking at organized educational activities that impart technical or occupational skills and academic content at the

secondary and post-secondary levels, lead to an industry-recognized credential, certificate, or an associate's degree, or further -- or further education. So really, it's -- that's right out of the law.

And now one of the things we did, we went ahead and added -- changed vocational education into career and technical education. And one of the things that the Legislative Committee asked us to do, because it wasn't included, was to add the term "universities." Because we do have a university here, and they don't like to be called a college; they like to be called a university. So we went ahead and just added that while we were in here making this amendment.

Once again, in the Regional Center, we did the same thing. I didn't have to change this in the ERO or the ERO-M because the ERO and the ERO-M include it because they include everything in the OS. So changing it in the OS changed it in those districts as well.

Now here we are adding it to the Light Industrial -- new use. And the -- in Light Industrial, the thing there is, everything has to be different from the general industrials. Everything has to be in a completely enclosed building.

And then in the I-1, we allow it, but we also allow including outdoor training area as approved as part of the site plan. So this would be your CDL and same as -- lineman training or any other outdoor training needs to happen as part of that

education effort. So we -- you know, that -- it's -- like I said, these ones are pretty straightforward. We're fixing -- we're getting a new definition, and we're fixing the Code and adding it to a couple of districts where it seems clearly appropriate. We do need to hold a public hearing on that because it is a zoning text amendment.

CHAIR WILLIS: Okay. Then questions -- well, let me start with --

MR. GRIFFIS: Yeah.

MR. PAISON: Call to the public.

CHAIR WILLIS: Sorry about that.

This is a public hearing. It would be an opportunity for anyone in the public to approach us with any concerns or any thoughts. You would have three minutes to do so. Does anyone interested in presenting on that issue?

MS. BURRELL: I had some questions. I do have a question about this, but I'm really here about the 005 questions? So can I ask you questions?

CHAIR WILLIS: Then we are going to do 005 --

MS. BURRELL: Later. But I can ask about this as well?

CHAIR WILLIS: Yep. Yep.

MS. BURRELL: Okay. This evening, I got a lot of information.

CHAIR WILLIS: Could you give your name and your --

MS. BURRELL: I'm sorry. Vanessa Burrell. My address is 27615 Aberdeen Street here in Southfield.

When I see the zonings and the -- when you have your planning meetings, it's hard to determine exactly what you guys are looking at because a lot of codes are quoted. So where do residents get a copy of the City's zoning and rules? Is there any place that we can see that online?

MR. CROAD: Yes.

Through the Chair.

If you go to the City's website under the Planning Department Homepage, the Zoning Ordinance, the Zoning Map, and all the Master Plans are available.

MR. PAISON: Yep.

MS. BURRELL: Because I know sometimes navigating the City's website, it can be difficult. But underneath the zoning --

MR. CROAD: If you -- if you get to the City's website under Departments and just hit Planning --

MS. BURRELL: Uh-huh.

MR. CROAD: The Planning Homepage on the left-hand column has all our ordinances and resources.

MS. BURRELL: Okay. That's all I really wanted to know about that.

MR. CROAD: Yeah.

MS. BURRELL: Thank you very much.

MR. CROAD: And you -- feel free to contact our office, too. We'll help you.

MS. BURRELL: Okay. That sounds good. Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIS: Thank you. Seeing no one else, public comment is closed.

I believe, then, we can go to fine.

MS. STEPHENS-GUNN: We're at -- whoa. Whoa.

MR. GRIFFIS: We're not going to talk more on this one.

CHAIR WILLIS: Where am I?

MR. GRIFFIS: Trying to leave.

CHAIR WILLIS: I think so.

MR. GRIFFIS: (Indiscernible.)

CHAIR WILLIS: So --

MS. STEPHENS-GUNN: Through the Chair.

CHAIR WILLIS: Yes. Thank you.

MS. STEPHENS-GUNN: I'd like to propose that we accept a -- a favorable recommendation for P -- PTZA26-0004, the Zoning Tax Amendment.

CHAIR WILLIS: Is there support.

MS. BERNOUDY: Support.

CHAIR WILLIS: Support by Commissioner Bernoudy --

MR. MARTIN: Through --

CHAIR WILLIS: Yes. And --

MR. MARTIN: Through the Chair.

CHAIR WILLIS: Yes.

MR. MARTIN: Can we have questions first?

MS. BERNOUDY: Sure.

MR. CROAD: Well, I think it's get the motion on, and then you can ask any questions.

CHAIR WILLIS: Well, we could do it either way, but I'm -- I'm -- I'm good. We can -- the question is out, then I think at this point --

MR. CROAD: Well, if --

CHAIR WILLIS: Let me take the motion --

MR. CROAD: Yeah. Just --

CHAIR WILLIS: Let me take the motion, and then we can ask the questions.

So it's been moved and seconded by Commissioner Bernoudy and (indiscernible) Commissioner Griffis?

MR. GRIFFIS: No, Dr. Stephens-Gunn's motion.

CHAIR WILLIS: Dr. Stephens-Gunn. Thank you.

MR. PAISON: Who was the support?

MR. GRIFFIS: Yeah, it was --

MS. BERNOUDY: Bernoudy.

CHAIR WILLIS: And at this point, then -- at this point, I'll open up the floor for questions. And I'll start with Commissioner Stephens-Gunn.

MS. STEPHENS-GUNN: I think it's an excellent idea.

MR. CROAD: Could I just clarify, who supported the

motion? Ms. Bernoudy. That's who I thought. Okay.

CHAIR WILLIS: You've got -- you've got to your questions. Okay.

MS. STEPHENS-GUNN: I think it's an excellent idea.

CHAIR WILLIS: Commissioner Martin?

MR. MARTIN: If -- if I remember correctly, someplace in here, it says everything has to be inside in --

MR. PAISON: In the Light Industrial District. In the General Industrial District, we're going to allow outdoor. The Light Industrial District already requires all activities to be indoors. That's just part of that district. It's the distinction between General Industrial and Light Industrial is whether or not things are going on -- not deliveries.

But, like, you can't be doing manufacturing; you can't store goods outside. That's -- the Light Industrial District -- if you look at our Limited Light Industrial Districts, they tend to be smaller scale buildings, more modern Light Industrial parks.

MR. MARTIN: What I'm saying is that -- I'll go back. Heavy equipment would not be something that has to be required indoors, correct? Because you're not going to --

MR. PAISON: Plated vehicles and trailers could be parked normally in the parking lot.

MR. MARTIN: Training.

MR. PAISON: Yeah. In this case --

MR. MARTIN: We're -- we're talking -- we're talking educational portion, right?

MR. PAISON: Yeah. If you're talking --

MR. MARTIN: So --

MR. PAISON: Yeah. Training -- if there are vehicles that are part of the training, those can be parked outside.

MR. MARTIN: Or used outside.

MR. PAISON: Or used outside.

MR. MARTIN: Not in --

MR. PAISON: Not in light -- not in Light Industrial.

MR. MARTIN: There's -- enclosed is what it says in here.

MR. CROAD: Right. But not Light Industrial. So if you want to train someone on a hi-lo -

MR. MARTIN: Okay.

MR. CROAD: -- it has to be inside in Light Industrial.

MR. PAISON: Yeah. Now, if you were doing CDL training, or if you were doing some kind of training that involved them to do road testing, they could go out on the road and drive in a plated vehicle. Anybody can do that. But yeah, we're -- we're not going to let somebody set up a CDL training course in an IL District. They got to be the I-1 District for that.

MR. MARTIN: Okay. All right.

MR. PAISON: Because it's semis. They're moving back and forth. They're backing them up and --

MR. MARTIN: Okay. That -- I'll just leave it. Okay.

MR. PAISON: So --

MR. MARTIN: Thank you. That's the clarification I -- yeah.

CHAIR WILLIS: Commissioner Griffis?

MR. GRIFFIS: This sounds like a commonsense --

MR. MARTIN: Yeah.

MR. GRIFFIS: -- evolution of the way things are going in this world that I'm totally in favor of.

CHAIR WILLIS: Commissioner Bernoudy?

MS. BERNOUDY: I have no questions.

CHAIR WILLIS: Commissioner Goodwin-Dye?

MS. GOODWIN-DYE: No questions.

CHAIR WILLIS: And I have no questions.

Then it has been moved and seconded. We have taken the questions. Are we ready for a vote?

MS. STEPHENS-GUNN: Yes.

CHAIR WILLIS: All in favor?

FULL COMMISSION: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIS: Any opposed?

(No audible response.)

CHAIR WILLIS: That is a unanimous vote.

MR. CROAD: I -- I -- just as a side note, I heard

today on the news that we have only about 50 percent of the skilled trade workers that we need every year in -- in -- in the United States. We -- we need to provide more facilities for training and encourage more of our youth to take on the skilled training.

MS. BERNOUDY: Absolutely.

CHAIR WILLIS: Which brings on the issue of the union that's open up shop on 12 Mile at Pierce. I -- the -- where are they in that process, if you know?

MR. CROAD: The union shop? I -- they're probably going through their building permits.

CHAIR WILLIS: Okay.

MR. PAISON: Yeah. They're working through their construction documents and getting their building permits with the Building Department. We also have to do a little bit of a admin site plan on their neighboring site because they're connecting the two parking lots at the back, and we just need to have that on both sites. But that's -- that's all working its way through the progress. It won't stop them from getting permits to build the new facility. It's just we need to wrap it up before we do CFOs.

CHAIR WILLIS: Okay.

MR. PAISON: But they're working on it. They've got a very good architect onboard, so it's not -- not been a problem to get them to be responsive.

CHAIR WILLIS: Okay. Thank you for that.

I think we are at PTZA26-0005.

MR. PAISON: Yep. Yeah. We're looking at here -- this is a -- basically, looking to kind of switch something in our ordinance that was put in place years ago that's kind of become a problem, probably when the city was being built out as opposed to the city being done being built out.

Right now, public parks and recreation areas and other public facilities like fire houses, which are located in single-family districts, require special land use. Many of them were built before that provision was in place. So anytime that they try to do an improvement to a public park or to a fire station, we end up having to go through the special land use process for existing use because of the change.

So we did look at that. You know, look at this kind of situation where we have a lot of these existing facilities that are in residential areas that we need -- we want to be able to do improvements on them, but they don't have the previous special as approval, so you can't do anything unless you do this thing even though it's already existing. So it creates a lot of extra process in the process, and kind of unnecessarily, because the City Council already, by charter, has absolute authority over what happens on city-owned properties. In addition, they control the budget, and they approve the Capital Improvement Program, and they approve all the contracts for the design work

and the construction.

They can stop a project at any point without having this additional oversight. And it is all -- and all that stuff has to be -- like, when they're doing improvements to parks or fire stations, it all has to be in the Capital Improvement Program. It all has to be in the budget. It all has to go through authorization to elect contracts, authorization to approve contracts. All that is already, like, highly overseen by the City Council.

So in an interest of kind of trying to shorten the amount of time it takes us to get a city project actually going and the amount of additional expense -- because when we do all these additional hearings, we'll -- the professionals that are working on these projects, the City has to pay them to come to meetings at the City and sit. And it -- it does cost a substantial amount of money to do it that way that could be going into the core project, the quality of the project and its design and not sitting in additional meetings beyond those are already necessary to approve them, so.

MR. CROAD: Well, and if I could just add to what Tom is saying. When -- I review all of our historical zoning ordinances and master plans. Now remember, we just adopted the third master plan in our 60-plus-year history. The last three have been done in the last decade and a half.

So we had 50 years with no adopted master plan, a very

rudimentary Zoning Ordinance in the sixties when we were the fastest growing community in Michigan. And I believe what happened in the seventies with the expansive growth, whoever the planners and elected officials at the time, just took a template from somewhere else and adopted it. And we've been kind of fixing it ever since. So I think some of this special land use requirements for parks and rec, as Thomas said, after the facilities were already here, was put in the ordinance, and it just becomes a burden each time they want to make improvements, or expand because they never received their special land use approvals prior to.

MR. PAISON: Yeah.

MR. CROAD: So we're trying to streamline the process.

MR. PAISON: Yeah. And once again, we always look -- once again, when we look at zoning text amendments, we look to the master plan to see if it's supported. And, you know, we're looking at promoting active living, making it safer to walk or bike to daily activities, like shopping, work, school, and recreation. So having the parks in the neighborhoods makes them more accessible to people by means other than cars.

Promote and provide for more public sports events and programs; promote public and semi-public exercise facilities; support land use pattern and land use designations that provide for housing opportunities at varying densities and at appropriate consistent land use. So this is mixing housing with

recreation and schools.

Review the ordinance. Ordinances, codes, and regulations, and permitting process for excessive -- to eliminate and modify conflicting or excessive requirements and streamline the regulatory review process; offer unified, well-organized, walkable residential neighborhoods that provide a variety of housing options and recreation and social opportunities and community assets for a livable environment; provide an opportu- -- appropriate amount of mixed-use commercial, office, industrial, recreational uses -- convenience, safety, leisure -- resulting in aesthetic business areas; provide a high-quality, integrated community -- the various range of uses including recreation and housing; ensure all elements they built environment, including land use, transportation, housing, energy, infrastructure, work together to create a sustainable place.

So this is why you get places -- green places to live where it can have recreation. You know, it's really about the community being a little more integrated. And in this case, it's -- is the City logically built many of the facilities you find in residential districts where they need to be.

Parks are near the people. The fire station is near the part of the city in services, you know? It -- that's actually why those things are where they're at. The pump station for that sewer is there because that's where the water

needs to be pumped to make sure people's basements don't flood.

So in a lot of cases, it really is about the facility being where it needs to be, and it -- it is where it needs to be. It's just that we added this strange requirement later on to stuff that was already existing.

And I -- I agree with Planner Croad. Many communities, when they got to a point where they needed a new ordinance, would find somebody who had done one recently or had one done by a good consultant recently but didn't customize it to their community. They just ported it over. That was a very common situation when a lot of this went on.

So we are looking at the uses allowed in single-family -- changing that use list. We've got the typical uses. These are all ones that are already on the list: One-family dwellings, farms and buildings erected, moved on their accessory buildings. Family childcare homes properly licensed by the State of Michigan. That's up to six or seven children for a daycare home.

And then this is what we'd be moving: Publicly owned buildings and build -- buildings located on publicly owned land. This is stuff that's in the Special Land Use section, and we're just moving it up to the Permitted Use section. We're not even really changing any of the language.

So you do have general and professional office uses with -- within publicly owned buildings, maybe considered

ancillary uses, conditional upon these factors: This was really written primarily for the Burgh and the use of some of the Burgh buildings for other uses, but it does come up elsewhere.

And then B, Bed and Breakfast. This is one that was looked at also for the Burgh and some potentially other properties. So these were added. These were more recent additions, this A and B. The main category, the publicly owned buildings and buildings located on publicly owned land was there already.

And then we also have public parks and nature preserves getting moved up to the permitted use. Public recreational areas. Now, by "public," we mean government owned. This is city, county, state. It's not -- you know, these -- these are public facilities.

Public recreation areas, which are dom- -- predominantly open space -- and public indoor reck centers. Most people don't know, this campus is zoned Single-Family Residential -- everything on this campus. So the new aquatic center, because of this provision that we haven't updated, will need a special land use approval, even though there was already a pool there.

So the only thing on this campus we can find that had a special land use approval was the library. That's the only one that has it. Everything else here doesn't have a special land use approval. So to be modernized, it would probably have

to go -- unless we change the code -- would have to go through that process.

So we're taking these items out of this -- we're putting them in the permitted use. We're taking them out of the special use.

And then here what we're doing is, we're keeping the categories, but we're switching them to private parks and nature preserves and private recreation areas and private indoor recreation centers. Those would still be subject to special land use approval. It is only the public facilities that we're making permitted uses. The private facilities would still need to be reviewed for impact and appropriateness.

They don't have the levels of additional oversight that the public facilities already have from City Council, from budgeting and capital improvement. So special land use gives those facilities in a residential area that additional (indiscernible) to the public and additional potential oversight for impacts in a residential area.

They're already allowed as special land uses. We're keeping them as special land uses. So really, it really is the public facilities which are changing category in order to just kind of acknowledge that these are existing facilities and that in order to serve the public, we are going to need to modernize them. They all are going to need modernization at some point. And many of them have had modernization to some degree.

So that -- that really is -- the story behind that one is really just something weird happened in the ordinance back in the seventies, and we've finally just gotten to the point where we're needing to modernize a bunch of our facilities, and we've discovered that this thing that was put in the code in the seventies is kind of getting in the way of modernizing the public facilities in the city. It's creating an extra level -- level of regulation that's not really necessary.

CHAIR WILLIS: Okay. Well, thank --

MR. PAISON: I will say that these facilities would still be subject to site plan review, but, in most cases, that is an established permitted use. That site plan review would be administrative. Unless it were a totally new facility, then it would come to this body.

CHAIR WILLIS: Okay. Fair enough. With that, that opens up the floor for public hearing. If there's anyone who would like to address PTZA26-0005. And, again, if you could give your name and your address.

MS. BURRELL: Okay. Vanessa Burrell, 27615 Aberdeen Street.

And your presentation answered some of my questions. I was concerned about what other public facilities permitted use would be. And I wasn't sure what you were referring to in terms of other public facilities.

But still, there -- my understanding -- and I'm asking

you this just for clarification, there is some type of site over -- review and oversight that would happen before they would insert something in the community in terms of a public facility that was not there before? So the public would have an opportunity to at least address it with the Council.

MR. PAISON: Yeah. There's multiple levels of review that occur throughout the whole system.

MS. BURRELL: Uh-huh.

MR. PAISON: But if it were a totally new facility, it would be subject to site plan approval with this body, and mailings would go out, and there'd be something in the newspaper, in addition to Council discussing it at budget hearings. Council would discuss it at the Capital Improvement Program. It would come up in Council every time a contract was let -- related to the work. It would literally be over every step of that process from initial idea. Does it go into the budget? Does it go into the Capital Improvement Program? Council has to approve that.

MS. BURRELL: Okay.

MR. PAISON: So at every level, Council could go, Yeah, we don't think that's good there. Or they could direct staff -- say if it was a park facility or a fire department -- to reach out to that -- people in that area and hold some public meetings.

Like engineering, when -- every time there's an

engineering project, they automatically do this. They hold public outreach meetings for every road and sewer and water project. So there are other ways to do it that's not this body. Just calling it a special land use when it's an existing facility is --

MS. BURRELL: Yeah. I just wasn't sure what it was.

MR. PAISON: It's strange.

MR. CROAD: Yeah. So -- so, for example, our Department of Public Works has a yard. What's the name of the road?

MR. PAISON: Oh. On Clara Lane.

MR. CROAD: Clara Lane.

MR. PAISON: There off of Franklin.

MR. CROAD: Right. It's by the Road Commission of Oakland County.

MR. PAISON: Right against the freeway.

MR. CROAD: When they want to build a storage facility, we had to go through special land use because it never had special land use before. But that was an existing -- existing site.

MR. PAISON: Yeah. When the fire station got its training tower --

MS. BURRELL: Uh-huh.

MR. PAISON: -- that had to go through special land use approval, even though the fire station had been there

decades.

MR. CROAD: Yeah. But as Tom had indicated, if it was a brand new facility, it would -- it'd come to site plan, and then there would be multiple other approvals with the budgeting and contracting and so forth that would come to Council. And -- and you, as public, would be entitled to make comments on those.

MS. BURRELL: Okay. Because that's my concern. Sometimes when things come to people in our community, their attention, it's too late. It's already been approved. So I just wanted to make sure we would have an opportunity at least to know what was going on. And I'm sure if it's something acceptable to the community, there would be no pushback, but sometimes -- like the data centers was something people did not want.

MR. PAISON: Yeah.

MS. BURRELL: And some people do. So the dialogue, I feel, should happen with some of these things instead of just forcing it on the community.

MR. PAISON: Yeah.

MS. BURRELL: But thank you. That information was very helpful. The whole presentation is very good.

MR. CROAD: And the other thing I would -- when -- if you go onto the City's website under the Planning Department, we have projects online -- planning projects online. There's a map that shows the city and it has stars.

MS. BURRELL: Uh-huh.

MR. CROAD: And if you're interested in your particular neighborhood anywhere, you can click on that, and it'll show you the graphics and information on the projects that are being reviewed, have recently been reviewed, or proposed to be reviewed.

MS. BURRELL: Okay.

MR. CROAD: So there's a -- there's a lot of sources for you to be informed on what's happening. And again, you're always free to --

MS. BURRELL: I've never seen any of that when I check the site, but I will definitely look more carefully.

MR. CROAD: Yeah. And feel free to call our office. We can help you navigate that as well.

MR. PAISON: Yeah.

MS. BURRELL: Okay. I would appreciate that. Thank you, all, very much.

MS. BERNOUDY: Thank you for your comment.

MR. PAISON: And particularly with -- I would mention, too, that with parks and recreation facilities, it has to be in the Parks and Recreation Master Plan, which is a whole other process with the Parks and Rec Board. It would need to be in there before it gotten the Capital Improvement Program.

It has to be in the Capital Improvement Program before it gets in the budget. And each one of those, the Council

adopts the P&R Plan. They approve the Capital Improvement Program. They approve the budget.

So, like, Council is literally involved in every step of these projects, so if they think the public needs more input -- like, the parks people, when they propose a park improvement, they generally do outreach in that neighborhood. That's part of the design work.

MS. BURRELL: Okay.

MR. PAISON: So it -- it really is --

MR. CROAD: Their plans are adopted by the Planning Commission as well --

MR. PAISON: Yeah.

MR. CROAD: -- as part of our Master Plan, and those are all public hearings.

MR. PAISON: Yeah. So we -- we try to get that as much as we can, but people have busy lives, and they don't always -- you know, it's -- it's hard to keep up on everything. I know.

MS. BURRELL: It's true. That's true. Thank you very much.

MR. PAISON: Yep.

MS. BERNOUDY: Thank you. Appreciate your time.

MR. MARTIN: Thank you.

MS. STEPHENS-GUNN: Thank you for coming.

MS. BURRELL: Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIS: That would open up the opportunity for questions by Commissioners.

Commissioner -- let's start with -- Goodwin-Dye?

MS. GOODWIN-DYE: I don't have any questions.

CHAIR WILLIS: Commissioner Bernoudy?

MS. BERNOUDY: I have no questions, but I think this is really a wonderful thing for them to do this after all those years. I didn't realize it was that long ago, you know?

MR. PAISON: Yeah.

MS. BERNOUDY: So thank you for that.

CHAIR WILLIS: Commissioner Griffis?

MR. GRIFFIS: I think it's okay to pay design professionals to come to public meetings and design buildings, but these ordinance improvements make a lot of sense to simplify the process.

MS. BERNOUDY: Yep.

CHAIR WILLIS: Yep.

Commissioner Martin?

MR. MARTIN: I agree. Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIS: Commissioner Stephens-Gunn?

MS. STEPHENS-GUNN: I agree. Thank you.

CHAIR WILLIS: Am I speaking to our normal commission?

Then the Chair would accept a motion.

MS. BERNOUDY: I'd like to make a recommendation --

CHAIR WILLIS: Commissioner Bernoudy?

MS. BERNOUDY: -- for PTZA26-0005, Zoning Text Amendment.

CHAIR WILLIS: Any support?

MS. STEPHENS-GUNN: Support.

CHAIR WILLIS: It's been motioned by Commissioner Bernoudy; supported by Commissioner Stephens-Gunn.

All in favor?

FULL COMMISSION: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIS: Any opposed?

(No audible response.)

CHAIR WILLIS: I think that addresses our agenda. We have a review of draft minutes.

Mr. Paison?

MR. PAISON: Yeah. We are looking at the August 5th and August 26th minutes, the study meeting and the draft transcription for the regular meeting. Those were provided to you in the digital packets. I think, the -- the study meeting one is in here, and I have it. If anyone needs it, I have -- I brought -- I make one hard copy, and bring it to the meeting, of the transcript because it's, like, 80 pages.

MR. MARTIN: Through the Chair.

CHAIR WILLIS: Yes.

MR. MARTIN: Motion to approve the Planning Commission Study Minutes --

CHAIR WILLIS: Any support?

MR. MARTIN: -- for August twenty -- August 5th and the Planning Commission Regular Meeting minutes for August 26th, 2026.

CHAIR WILLIS: Thank you. Any support of that motion?

MS. STEPHENS-GUNN: Support.

CHAIR WILLIS: Motion by our Commissioner Martin; support by Commissioner Stephens-Gunn.

All in favor?

FULL COMMISSION: Aye.

CHAIR WILLIS: Any opposed?

(No audible response.)

CHAIR WILLIS: At this opportunity, it's scheduled for public comment. The floor is open for comment from anyone in the audience.

Seeing no one in the audience at this time, that opportunity is closed.

Council item update?

MR. PAISON: Yeah. I got a couple of them. The Northland Towers' conditional rezoning was approved by Council last week. It'll be enacted in October, and then it'll be published and effective in November. It just -- the whole process, you know, at this point.

And the Costco Fuel Center special land use at the Northland Towers' site was also approved. And that -- that will -- you know, you'd already approved their site plan

contingent on the special land use and the rezoning being approved. So now we just have to wait for the rezoning to be done before they get going.

I know they -- they want to be breaking ground -- I think they said June or July next year.

MR. MARTIN: Oh. Wow.

MR. PAISON: Because the building has got to be demolished on the site before they can do that. But they want to be starting construction late spring, early summer. That's their plan. And knowing how Costco negotiates, they'll likely make that a condition of the purchase and put Contour under a tight, tight timeframe and -- with financial penalties as they did for the Business Center.

The -- we were allowed -- or authorized to approve for the annual DTE Tree Grant. We apply for this every year. It's 4,000. We put up -- you have to put up 4,000.

We usually put up 8- from the tree fund for our match. We've gotten it every year for, I don't know, like, 10 years, 12 years, 15 years, something like that. So we have a pretty good chance of getting that.

We usually pick a spot -- I think in this chance, we were looking at replanting along the new stretch of the 9 Line because we've got several places where trees had to come out. We always go after once it's done, and -- we -- we have some people who want their trees replaced that were taken out. So we

prioritize the people who want trees first, and then we'll work from there.

We had approval to accept a $200,000 grant from the Oakland County Access to Transit Program. They announced a late second round of funding in '26 for bus stop improvements because, like, nobody had applied for that money. So we jumped in and got authorized for another 200,000. We're providing a $40,000 match out of the metro funds, I guess. And so -- like, with that MDOT one we got last year, we're looking to do another 30 -- 30 to 40 bus stop improvements. We're starting to run out of the easy ones.

They just announced the '27 application for the Access to Transit Grant. We're going to be going for that, but we're trying to figure out, do we try to, like, go for, like, maybe some bus shelters in key locations? Do we look at filling sidewalk gaps? Any of those are potential things they would fund.

Interesting thing about that grant is there's no limit on construction grants. So if we want to build stuff, we can just ask for whatever we think we can manage.

MR. CROAD: Yeah. I think we've -- we've received three of these grants --

MR. PAISON: Yeah. We're on our third.

MR. CROAD: -- totaling about $800,00.

MR. PAISON: Yeah. So this is that mileage the county

pass for transit funding. We're getting a lot -- because we have a lot of transit here. We have a lot of riders here. And we have a lot of need here. And because we already have a program, we've been doing --

MR. CROAD: We've got proven track record.

MR. PAISON: Yeah. We've been doing really well on these. So we're just going to keep going for it. Because the other communities are finally starting to get mobilized about this bucket of money. But, like, we were in early, so we're just going to keep -- we're going to keep at it. But we will be -- we will be looking at doing one for '27. We're just trying to figure it out exactly.

We just got new ridership numbers for August from SMART, and it's interesting. There's about 45 bus stops out of our 290 that have -- like, the average -- if you take all 290, you get -- the average getting on and off every day is, like, eight and a half. But we have, like, 35 that are, like, 20.

And they have a couple of them that are, like, 80 and up a day. And so those are high ridership areas. So I -- you know, we're -- we're kind of -- I think one of the things we're going to look at is potential, like, where do we start putting in shelters maybe.

MR. CROAD: Yeah, so I don't -- I didn't see the specifics, but our ridership numbers up.

MR. PAISON: Oh. They're -- yeah, that --

MR. CROAD: Which --

MR. PAISON: They said regionally, the transit usage is up, like, 13 percent, but in Oakland County, it was, like, 300 percent.

MS. STEPHENS-GUNN: Gas is $5 a gallon.

MR. MARTIN: Yeah.

MR. CROAD: What's that?

MS. STEPHENS-GUNN: Gas is 5$ a gallon.

MR. CROAD: Yeah. No. I understand that, but I -- I -- it's in part to the fact that we've improved our bus stops and access to bus stops.

MR. PAISON: Yeah. And the Regional Transit Authority working with SMART has actually funded them to do more frequent bus runs down, like, really high volume areas like 9 Mile and Woodward. So there -- there's definitely more frequent, reliable bust service on the main routes. And I think that's moving people because of the costs. It's giving them an option that's more affordable.

MS. STEPHENS-GUNN: Well, through the Chair.

CHAIR WILLIS: Yes.

MS. STEPHENS-GUNN: As it relates to ridership, I travel around Southfield a lot, and one of the things I have noticed is that the bus stops, the people do relax at the bus stop.

MR. CROAD: Yeah. They do.

MS. STEPHENS-GUNN: They put their feet up, and they're reading books. And it totally looks different than it did before. One of the busiest bus stops is right here at Evergreen and 10 Mile --

MR. CROAD: Yeah.

MS. STEPHENS-GUNN: -- on both sides of the street.

MR. CROAD: Yeah.

MS. STEPHENS-GUNN: And you've added additional seeding.

MR. CROAD: Right.

MS. STEPHENS-GUNN: And every last one of them, somebody is -- you can just tell the difference. You can feel the difference.

MR. CROAD: Right.

MS. STEPHENS-GUNN: And the people that are -- are waiting for transportation, so.

MR. CROAD: Sure. I -- I -- I've often said -- 16 years ago when I started here, and I see people standing in the mud or behind the snowbank with no benches, no shelter, it -- it gives a negative impression on the community. But now that we have made this infrastructure improvement, not only at the bus stops, but we call respite stations. So today I'm driving down, and, just to your point, someone's sitting, taking a break on their phone. It wasn't a bus stop, but it was one of our respite stations --

MS. STEPHENS-GUNN: Yes.

MR. CROAD: -- our pedestrian respite stations.

MS. STEPHENS-GUNN: Yes.

MR. CROAD: And that just provides connectivity to the community, right? That you're a welcoming, friendly, supportive community. And we've made a lot of progress in the last ten-plus years.

MS. STEPHENS-GUNN: Yes. Very much so.

MR. CROAD: We're going to continue to do that.

MR. PAISON: Right. Absolutely. So that was good news.

CHAIR WILLIS: It is.

Then for our miscellaneous?

MR. PAISON: Yeah. Miscellaneous, we've got our October meetings. October 7th is a study meeting. October 14th is long-range study meeting, we are recommending for cancellation. We don't really have -- because for the other two meetings, I've got one land use case and three zoning amendments, just like this month. So we really don't need that third meeting on the 14th.

October 28th is the regular meeting. So we are looking for action on canceling the October 14th meeting if the commission is receptive.

MS. STEPHENS-GUNN: Through the Chair.

CHAIR WILLIS: Commissioner Stephens-Gunn.

MS. BERNOUDY: Second.

CHAIR WILLIS: Commissioner Bernoudy, second.

All in favor?

FULL COMMISSION: Aye.

MS. BERNOUDY: I would like to hear about your vacation.

MR. CROAD: Yeah. All right.

CHAIR WILLIS: Let me do one thing.

MR. CROAD: Yeah. Go ahead.

CHAIR WILLIS: And should we end the meeting?

MR. CROAD: Yeah. End the meeting.

CHAIR WILLIS: Okay. With that --

MR. MARTIN: Wait, wait, wait. Do we have any -- any other Council updates?

MR. PAISON: Nope. That was pretty much it for the -- other than Dr. Stephens-Gunn being reappointed.

MR. CROAD: What are you looking for, Mr. Martin? We got another meeting next Monday, so.

MS. STEPHENS-GUNN: Yeah. We're done.

MR. MARTIN: Yeah, it's gone. That's --

CHAIR WILLIS: Okay.

MR. MARTIN: Sorry.

CHAIR WILLIS: Then with that, I will use the opportunity -- no. Meeting is adjourned.

(Meeting adjourned.)

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER

I, JANENE CLEARY, do hereby certify that I was authorized to transcribe the foregoing recorded proceeding; and that the transcript is a true and accurate transcription, to the best of my ability, taken while listening to the provided recording.

I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not of Council or attorney for either or any of the parties to said proceedings, nor in any way interested in the events of this cause, and that I am not related to any of the parties thereto.

DATED this 14th day of OCTOBER, 2026



JANENE CLEARY, Michigan CSR No. 16359

Cynthia Bernoudy, Secretary

Date: 11-4-26