

**PLANNING COMMISSION  
MEETING MINUTES  
SEPTEMBER 17, 2003**

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 7:32 p.m.

**II. ROLL CALL**

**Present:** F. Davis, G. Clark, F. Enneking, R. Johnson, J. Adams,  
N. Fosket, Mary-Margaret Brandt

**Absent:** Chris Knapp (excused)

**Staff:** N. Voght, City Planner  
N. Schuette, Secretary

**III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

R. Johnson moved to approve the minutes of August 20, 2003 with recommended changes – Page 7 - Remove items 6 and 7, Page 10 – correct name and street address of constituent, Page 13 change to September (Support: N. Fosket) and the minutes were approved unanimously.

**IV. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION**

None

**V. OLD BUSINESS**

1. Cross Street Area Master Plan Amendments

N. Voght, City Planner gave some background information on this issue to update commission members. He reviewed potential changes and the rationale for same, and stated that the next step would be to adopt the Master Plan Amendment changes and after implementation, initiate a area-wide re-zoning. He

recommended that the commission consider the possibility of a walking tour of the neighborhood to get a better understanding of some of the issues and give him more direction if needed. He referred to the number of comment cards that were returned by constituents adding that most of them supported what we are trying to do and some had some interesting suggestions.

Commissioner Davis had some concerns on what we are changing and who would be impacted. He agreed that a walking tour by the commission members would be a good opportunity to review the area on a more personal level.

Commissioner Clark asked if changes take place, does this change the tax revenue to the City. Also, it is his understanding that EMU is constructing more on-campus housing for students and wondered how this would impact the landlords. He is also in favor of walking the area looking at both daytime and night for commuter traffic impact. It was his opinion that more enforcement could eliminate the need for changes.

Commissioner Fosket and Commissioner Adams agreed that the lack of enforcement on parking with commuters has an effect.

Voght reminded the board that this is a land use issue and we are discussing density and the parking problems generated, and impacts to surrounding single-family neighborhoods. This body has no control over enforcement problems therefore, although an important issue, planning decisions and changes to the Master Plan should not be based on the level of City resources to conduct enforcement.

Commissioner Brandt asked Voght if he could estimate how long it would take to see noticeable changes if we were to go ahead with these changes and he responded that he would estimate about 20 years. She also stated that from her observation of the comment cards, the owner occupied properties seemed to be more in favor of this change than the landlords. Her other observation is that EMU has not been the best neighbor and although their business is important to us, it is after all a business as opposed to a neighbor.

Commissioner Davis added that EMU can do anything they want with regard to zoning or planning without any control. However, we have to recognize that this is a college town and we have to accommodate that situation. We do not want to zone out fraternities.

Commissioner Fosket asked Voght to explain non-conformities in the case of fire, which he did in detail.

Quite a bit of discussion was held on the problem with on-street parking and infringement of students in single-family neighborhoods. Voght explained that the Zoning Ordinance requires off-street parking requirements. It does not allow

public parking spaces located on-street to be counted towards off-street parking spaces required for private uses and private benefit. Conceptually, there is a distinction between public spaces that are on-street and private spaces that are off-street. The landlord can not burden the public with private gain, i.e. income from tenants that have insufficient room to park on-site. The idea of on-street parking is for guests, visitors and overflow. As an example, a property that has four apartments needing 8 spaces but yet they only have three, it is non-conforming because it does not provide parking needed for their private use. Although the issue of commuter parking has been raised as a root of problems in the Cross Street Area, this issue must be addressed separately, despite the fact that it may compound many problems in the study area. The Planning Commission must address land use, density, off-street parking and other planning issues apart from the on-street parking issue.

After further discussion on various points, it was agreed that a Special Meeting would be held on September 24<sup>th</sup> at 5:15 p.m. to walk the area in question (this meeting was later cancelled due to weather and rescheduled to October 14<sup>th</sup>. The board will gather at City Hall and proceed from there. Voght added that he will provide a map of the study area indicating non-conforming parcels before and after the changes.

## 2. South Depot Town Neighborhood Master Plan Amendments

Nathan Voght gave an update on how this initiative originated. Last fall, a group of neighbors in this area met to discuss issues they are facing in the neighborhood. They approached the Planning Commission stating that they would like to address some of these issues. There are a lot of mixed land uses in this neighborhood—large historic homes that are multi-family on N. River, smaller homes on N. Lincoln, Hearn's Concrete and Sobry's Towing and burned out homes on N. River but there are a lot of land use conflicts that have been identified. The people who live there want to make changes for the better.

Voght previously presented an existing land use map and discussed some of the conflicts and zoning deficiencies. He held a workshop in February with 20-30 neighborhood residents and reviewed different land use scenarios. Those were submitted to the Planning Commission for consideration. A Special Meeting was held on March 26<sup>th</sup> at which time, the Planning Commission developed a map of the proposed land use amendments. In the interim, this was sent to Washtenaw County, Ypsilanti Township and Superior Township for their input. They had no objection to this particular plan which he reviewed again for board members.

Voght recommends setting the official public hearing for October for the Master Plan Amendments. Since there was no objection by the board, Commissioner Davis directed Voght to go ahead with the public hearing for October.

## 3. Supportive Housing Zoning Ordinance Amendments

Voght stated that last month we reviewed the initial language that was brought before the board for a text amendment for supportive housing. At that time, there were a few comments, one of which was that we should have definitions for all the uses for which we are requiring the separation and the one we did not have was for Emergency Shelter. He constructed a definition of homeless shelter that he thought was appropriate. This was modeled, in part, on the City of Detroit's definition but modified to fit the City of Ypsilanti.

Voght provided the updated proposed text as follows:

Supportive Housing means a facility that provides housing for twenty-four (24) hours per day and supportive services designed to assist residents with improving daily living skills, securing employment, rehabilitation, or obtaining permanent, independent housing. Supportive housing is not intended for short-term, emergency housing and care, but rather longer periods ranging from a few months to a few years. Supportive housing is distinguished from a hospital or other health care environment, and facilities regulated by the State of Michigan as State licensed residential facilities. This definition shall not include fraternities, sororities, dormitories, adult foster care facilities, group homes, nursing homes, substance abuse treatment facilities, emergency shelters, individuals utilizing tenant-based or homeownership-based voucher funding through the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, community correctional facilities, and housing for the rehabilitation of former occupants of correctional facilities.

Supportive Services are services provided to residents of supportive housing for the purpose of facilitating the independence of residents, and may be provided on the premises, or off-site. Some examples are case management, medical or psychological counseling and supervision, child care, transportation, and job training.

Add Supportive Housing as a special use in the R3, R4, and RC zoning districts, in each of the following sections:

Section 122-294:

(16) Supportive Housing, subject to the special provisions in section 122-811.

Section 122-314:

(18) Supportive Housing, subject to the special provisions in section 122-811.

Section 122-512:

(10) Supportive Housing, subject to the special provisions in section 122-811.

Add section 122-811 to Specific Standards for Certain Uses:

**Sec. 122-811. Supportive Housing.**

Supportive Housing where listed in residential districts shall be permitted after Special Use review and approval, and shall be subject to the conditions hereinafter imposed:

- (1) Supportive Housing shall be located at least 750 feet from all existing supportive housing, measured in a radius from the outermost boundaries of the lot or parcel on which the use is proposed, as well as all of the following uses:
  - a. State licensed residential facility, not including home-based facilities serving 6 or fewer individuals
  - b. Nursing homes
  - c. Substance Abuse Treatment Facility
  - d. Emergency Homeless Shelter
  - e. Drop-in center
  - f. Correctional institution
- (2) Site Plan Review in accordance with article IV shall be required.
- (3) A minimum lot area of 8,000 square feet shall be provided.
- (4) The maximum number of persons served per facility shall not exceed 8.
- (5) On-site services shall be for residents of the facility only.
- (6) All new construction or additions to existing buildings shall be compatible with the scale and character of the surroundings, and exterior building materials shall be harmonious with other buildings in the neighborhood.
- (7) Screening in accordance with 122-703 shall be provided along all boundaries between the proposed use and property either zoned or used for single-family and two-family purposes.

In addition to the above changes, the Planning Commission asked that he conduct an analysis of the proposed 750 ft. separation requirement to state licensed residential facilities. He attached a spatial analysis map which indicates potential areas within the City that may be available for new supportive housing.

After much discussion, F. Davis recommended that a public hearing be set for next month (October) and since this is an amendment to the ordinance, and if recommended for approval, would have to go before Council.

#### 4. Planning Commission By-Laws

Voght gave an update on the by-laws and recommended that we have election of officers next month.

R. Johnson moved to adopt the by-laws with recommended changes as discussed at the August meeting (Support: N. Fosket) and the motion carried unanimously.

## **VI. NEW BUSINESS**

Voght reviewed the proposed items on next month's agenda.

Commissioner Adams asked the status of Tyler Road project. Voght responded that it is his understanding Scott Klaason had lost his sub-tenant, however, he will follow up on this and report back next month.

## **VII. ADJOURNMENT**

Since there was no further business, G. Clark moved to adjourn the meeting (Support: J. Adams) and the motion carried unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 9:50 p.m.