



PLANNING COMMISSION

Thursday, August 20, 2015

1. Roll Call – 7:00 P.M. – City Community Room

2. Approval of Minutes – July 16, 2015 Regular meeting

3. New Business
 - a. Review and recommendation on the 2016-2021 Capital Improvements Plan
 - b. Review and comment on the City Council Action Plan
 - c. Amend meeting schedule for October
 - d. Discuss draft language for a new institutional campus zoning district

4. Updates
 - a. Downtown Greenway Corridor Plan
 - b. Downtown Accessibility Audit

5. Adjournment



City of Petoskey

PLANNING COMMISSION

July 16, 2015

A regular meeting of the City of Petoskey Planning Commission was held in the City Hall Community Room, Petoskey, Michigan, on Thursday, July 16, 2015. Roll was called at 7:00 P.M. and the following were:

Present: Gary Greenwell, Chairperson
Dana Andrews
Dean D. Burns
Emily Meyerson
Rick Neumann
Cynthia Linn Robson
Eric Yetter

Absent: James Holmes
Elizabeth Looze

Staff: Amy Tweeten, City Planner

Upon motion and support, the minutes of the June 11, 2015 regular meeting minutes were approved with Burns abstaining.

Public Hearing and Action on Amendments to Section 7.1 of the Sign Ordinance

Staff summarized the two proposed changes to projecting nameplates and home business signs. As there was no public present, the hearing was closed. A motion was then made by Commissioner Burns with support by Commissioner Andrews to recommend the changes to City Council. Motion carried 7-0.

Discussion of Multiple Family Districts Language

Staff clarified that the language she had been concerned with was under non-conforming uses, not non-conforming structures. Therefore, a multiple-family structure can continue even if it does not comply with the standards of the multiple family district in which it is in and would not lose its non-conforming status simply by becoming vacant. In reviewing other language in the multiple family districts, the consensus was that a new medical district should be created for hospital campuses and hospital-related medical uses. Staff had started language previously and will bring a draft forward. There may be other amendments to the multiple family districts as well and staff will compile different issues that may need addressing.

Staff expected that the Commission would receive the updated capital improvements plan at their August Meeting. Commissioners were asked about the economic development presentation by Dan Leonard, and they felt it was very informational and that the City should be more proactive on the 200 East Lake Street property. Suggestions were made that the City purchase the block with a MEDC loan and sell off pieces for development, and that an exploratory committee be formed to come up with alternatives to get the project going.

The Commission then reviewed and made comments on the streetscape designs developed for Emmet Street, noting the need for wider sidewalks at the four corners, parking, and extending the greenway beyond Emmet Street to Buckley Avenue as a better route for bicyclists.

The meeting adjourned at 8:25 P.M.

Minutes reviewed and approved by Emily Meyerson, Secretary

DRAFT



BOARD: Planning Commission

MEETING DATE: August 20, 2015 **DATE PREPARED:** August 10, 2015

AGENDA SUBJECT: 2016-2021 Capital Improvements Plan

RECOMMENDATION: Discussion / Action on the 2016-2021 Capital Improvements Plan

Pursuant to the Michigan Planning Enabling Act (PEA), Article IV, the Commission is being provided the 2016-2021 Capital Improvements Plan (CIP) for its review. The last few years the CIP was a five year capital planning document, but as the Planning Enabling Act requires, we have again gone back to a six-year document. The purpose of Planning Commission review is to ensure that the proposed projects are consistent with the goals, objectives and strategies of the City of Petoskey Master Plan.

Again this year there have been modifications in project dates due to anticipated funding availability and the desire to coordinate projects such as Emmet Street reconstruction with expansion of the Downtown Greenway Corridor from East Mitchell to Emmet Street. Major projects planned for the next six years include reconstruction of Emmet Street, Phase II and III of the Downtown Greenway Corridor, Wastewater Treatment Plant improvements; and Washington Park access improvements.

The 2016 capital budget projects include the first phase of implementation of the SAW grant (Storm Water, Asset Management and Wastewater program) through the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality, which will develop a storm water asset management and master plan. There will be no major street reconstruction, but pavement maintenance and utility spot repairs and replacements will occur. The refurbishment and painting of the water tower on US131 is also scheduled.

The City just received a DNR grant to engineer a pedestrian bridge that would connect the River Road Sports Complex and North Central Michigan College trail system. The bridge is included in the Parks and Recreation Master Plan and would allow the re-routing of the North Country Trail, which is an essential part of the new state-wide Iron Belle Trail.

As a result of the streetscape design planning that has occurred, staff has moved the reconstruction of Emmet Street from State Street to Washington Street to 2017 in order to coincide with the development of the Downtown Greenway Corridor from Emmet Street to East Mitchell Street. 2017 is also the year of major work at the waste water treatment plant.

Projects in 2018 are planned to be coordinated with the anticipated MDOT reconstruction of US 31 from East Mitchell Street to McDonald Drive, including the realignment of Lewis Street.

The projects proposed for the 2016-2021 CIP implement the following strategies stated in the 2014 update to the Master Plan:

- Develop the Greenway Corridor Plan improvements through Pennsylvania Park to include use of a passenger trolley and a multi-use trail;
- Install state-of-the-art drinking water and waste-water infrastructure;

- Continue to improve and expand the pedestrian amenities of the City;
- Continue to develop a multi-modal transportation system including improvements to roads, trails, sidewalks and rail infrastructure that will support and enhance economic development;
- Continue to upgrade community infrastructure such as utilities and streetscapes; and
- Implement the City Parks and Recreation Master Plan.

Staff recommends that the Commission review and accept the plan and forward it to City Council for approval.



BOARD: Planning Commission

MEETING DATE: August 20, 2015

DATE PREPARED: August 11, 2015

AGENDA SUBJECT: City Council 2015 Action Plan

RECOMMENDATION: Discussion / Comments

The enclosed action plan is a result of the goal setting sessions held between City Council and staff in late June. City Council has asked for comments from the Planning Commission and Downtown Management Board. Commissioner Neumann provided comments individually, but the City Manager is now asking for comments from the Commission as a body.

Please review the document for discussion.

**City of Petoskey
Action Plan**

Goal One Insure a Long-Term Sustainable City Budget

<u>Strategies</u>	<u>Responsibility</u>	<u>Notes</u>	<u>Estimated Timeline</u>
<u>Highest priority strategies</u>			
<p>1. Consider four specific new revenue sources to increase total revenues for the City</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seek voter approval to establish a public safety millage • Seek voter approval of a Headlee override to reset the millage rate • Impose a tax administration fee to cover the costs of levying the property tax • Impose a public safety cost recovery fee to reimburse the City for the extraordinary costs associated with responding to accidents 	<p>City Council City Manager Director of Finance</p>	<p>Direction will need to be given as to which of the sources warrant the kind of detailed analysis that would be necessary, especially with respect to the first two, where a ballot question is involved.</p>	<p>Decision by October 1, 2015</p>
<p>2. Develop and implement a comprehensive educational/informational campaign to explain to residents the need for additional revenues to insure sustainability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare an analysis that compares the revenue we are raising in 2015 with that which was raised 5, 10, and 15 years ago to demonstrate the need for a revenue increase • Prepare an analysis of budget reductions and service efficiency efforts over the past 6 or 7 years to indicate what has been done already to secure financial sustainability • Prepare a comparative analysis showing the services that we provide with current revenue and the service and revenue packages for comparable communities • Prepare an analysis of the impact on service levels of further budget reductions over the next 5 years 	<p>City Council City Manager Director of Finance</p>	<p>Consider whether we can effectively support the services that we currently provide. This would suggest the value of an analysis of current service levels and costs, and the impact of reducing services if resources continue to be limited. Such an analysis might be incorporated into the educational plans suggested in strategy two.</p>	<p>March 1, 2016</p>

Goal Two

Plan for New and Replacement Infrastructure to Accommodate the Future

<u>Strategies</u>	<u>Responsibility</u>	<u>Notes</u>	<u>Estimated Timeline</u>
<u>Highest priority strategies</u>			
1. Identify, perhaps by extending the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP), the long term infrastructure needs of city departments, indicating both new and replacement needs as well as long term infrastructure maintenance requirements	Director of Public Works Director of Finance Director of Parks and Recreation City Planner City Manager	Extending analysis further into the future may provide a clearer picture for City officials and residents of the City's infrastructure needs over the long term.	A routine process has been developed whereby the CIP is publicly presented to the Planning Commission for their review and approval, and detailed public presentations are done for City Council on a project by project basis. In recent years the CIP was altered to more explicitly tie proposed projects to projected revenues. Proposed projects list both an estimated cost, but also the funding source, with the total funding available being projected by the Director of Finance.
2. Consider specific revenue sources for infrastructure and capital expenditures; for example, a public safety millage to provide additional revenue for replacement of public safety equipment	City Manager Director of Finance	Discussion was whether such a millage would be short term (3-4 years) and designed only to cover equipment replacement; or as an alternative, establishing the equivalent of a sinking fund through a new continuing millage that would cover a broad range of infrastructure needs across City departments.	December, 2015
3. Aggressively pursue grants to support specific infrastructure needs, including Bureau of Indian Affairs funding for streets where appropriate	Director of Public Works Director of Finance Director of Parks and Recreation City Planner City Manager	A master list of past awarded grants along with deadline dates would assist Staff in maximizing grant dollars awarded to the City.	On-going
4. Explore reclassifying appropriate city streets to increase the level of state road funding	Director of Public Works City Manager	This has been done to some extent in the past and involves careful study of traffic data to make a case for MDOT consideration.	1-2 years

Goal Three

Diversify and Strengthen the City’s Economic Base

<u>Strategies</u>	<u>Responsibility</u>	<u>Notes</u>	<u>Estimated Timeline</u>
<u>Highest priority strategies</u>			
1. Create an inventory of vacant and/or underutilized property for marketing purposes	City Manager City Planner	Marketing will be done by other area partners such as Northern Lakes Economic Alliance. There might be some external funding to support such an inventory, but it would be a required element of the Redevelopment Ready Certification process used by MEDC.	January, 2016
2. Develop a handbook that identifies City policies, processes, and costs for development or redevelopment in the City	City Planner City Manager	First three strategies are related to the process of securing state redevelopment ready certification. The process is labor intensive, but would put the City in a position to market itself through NLEA as “redevelopment ready.” Program URL: http://www.michiganbusiness.org/cm/files/fact-sheets/redevelopmentreadycommunitiesprogram.pdf	January, 2016

Goal Three**Diversify and Strengthen the City's Economic Base (Con't)**

<u>Strategies</u>	<u>Responsibility</u>	<u>Notes</u>	<u>Estimated Timeline</u>
3. Articulate a policy, even a general framework if necessary, governing the City's position on supporting development/redevelopment efforts through incentives of various kinds	Director of Finance City Planner City Manager	Policy could include incentives through tax abatements, types of grant funding City may support and other economic development programs.	March, 2016
4. Consider pursuing Redevelopment Ready Community Certification from the state MEDC	City Planner	Program will be instrumental in marketing vacant properties and is a requirement for many state grant programs.	June, 2016
5. Reexamine parking requirements for commercial uses outside the downtown area in the Zoning Ordinance	City Planner	The key is to recognize that even permitted uses in a commercial zone can change over time, and some uses have greater needs for onsite parking than others.	April, 2016

Goal Four**Identify and Address Downtown Development Issues**

<u>Strategies</u>	<u>Responsibility</u>	<u>Notes</u>	<u>Estimated Timeline</u>
<u>Highest priority strategies</u>			
1. Consider several specific strategies to increase parking or parking access in the downtown area	City Manager City Planner Director of Public Works DMB	Focus is to increase number of parking spots and also consider improving access to parking lots (i.e. use alleys or walkways from lots on the outer edge of downtown with clear marking to indicate access to downtown).	September, 2016
2. Examine and remove to the extent feasible obstacles to downtown residential uses	City Planner City Manager DMB	Alternative approach is to consider local transit or "park and ride" arrangements	September, 2016
3. Consider whether property code enforcement should be expanded in the downtown area	Public Safety Director	Encourage all downtown property owners to maintain their properties, given the importance to the City's economy of a vibrant downtown.	October, 2015



BOARD: Planning Commission

MEETING DATE: August 20, 2015

DATE PREPARED: August 12, 2015

AGENDA SUBJECT: October meeting date

RECOMMENDATION: Amend schedule

Staff had polled Commission members regarding the October meeting date as she will not be available for the regular meeting date of October 15. The consensus was to cancel the October 15 meeting and consider the October 8 meeting as a regular meeting.

Staff recommends that the Commission take action on this change.



BOARD: Planning Commission

MEETING DATE: August 20, 2015

DATE PREPARED: August 12, 2015

AGENDA SUBJECT: Creation of new institutional campus zoning district

RECOMMENDATION: Review/Direction

At its July meeting, the commission recommended that a new hospital and medical related use zoning district be explored. Staff had previously drafted language based on an institutional campus district language in the City of Grand Rapids Zoning Ordinance which is enclosed. Such a zoning district could be used for both the hospital and college instead of having these uses located in residential districts as they are currently.

Issues to consider:

- Different district standards for the hospital property versus the Demmer/ Hiland House or college property (e.g., SDIC I and SDIC II)
- Building height – current hospital design tends toward towers
- Review process – Could be set up similar to a PUD, with Commission approval of master plan and staff approval of phased construction that is in compliance with master plan.

ARTICLE XXIX. SD-IC SPECIAL DISTRICT – INSTITUTIONAL CAMPUS

Sec. 2900. Intent.

1. Large, Campus-Like Settings. The Institutional Campus District is established to account for larger, campus-like settings including colleges, hospital campuses, senior living facilities and similar institutional arrangements.
2. Design Issues. These regulations guide the physical form of the development project in order to resolve concerns and address design issues that might occur with the mixture of different uses in the same project. These concerns and design issues may occur within a project or along its boundaries with surrounding residential neighborhoods or commercial areas.

Sec. 2901. Requirements.

1. Unified Control of Property. The proposed development shall be under single ownership or control to ensure there is a single entity with responsibility for completing the project.
2. Minimum Size. The site shall be a minimum of two (2) acres. The Planning Commission may approve submission of an application for a smaller site provided that the proposal substantially achieves the purpose and intent of the Special District and meets the other eligibility requirements.
3. Compatibility. The proposed plan and uses shall not adversely affect adjacent neighborhoods or other development in terms of traffic disruption or congestion or impediments to development or redevelopment of nearby properties.
4. Master Plan. The proposed area shall have a master plan and its use shall be consistent with the goals and objectives of the City Master Plan.

Sec. 2902. Principal uses permitted.

In a SD-IC District, no building or land shall be used and no building shall be erected except for one or more of the following specified uses unless otherwise provided in this Ordinance:

1. All residential uses permitted and as regulated in the RM-2 Multiple-Family District;
2. All educational uses, including residential and accessory facilities;
3. Child Care Center;
4. Community Center;
5. Hospital, Clinic, Medical Office, Urgent Care Center, Rehabilitation Center, Administrative Offices;
6. Park, Playground, Plaza, Square, Open Space, Trails and Walkways;
7. Religious Institution;
8. Social Service Facility; and
9. Accessory structures less than 2,000 gross square feet within the 250 foot perimeter area.

Sec. 2903. Principal uses permitted subject to special conditions

1. Commercial uses intended for the general public that may also serve the primary use (e.g. restaurant, pharmacy, other retail sales);
2. Accessory structures greater than 2,000 gross square feet;
3. Free-standing communication towers; and
4. Landing areas.

Sec. 2904. Site Layout and Building Placement Requirements

All development in the SD-IC District shall comply with the requirements in Table 2904 unless otherwise expressly stated, or unless a different requirement is contained in an applicable Overlay District.

**TABLE 2904 Site Layout and Building Placement:
Institutional Campus District**

Minimum Lot Area	2 acres, however, the Planning Commission may approve the submission of an application for a smaller site provided the proposal substantially achieves the Purpose and Intent of the District
Minimum Lot Width and Depth	250 Feet
Setbacks	Front, rear and side setbacks shall be a minimum of twenty five (25) feet from any property line for structures that are 3 stories or less in height. Every story above 3, is required an additional 10 foot setback.
Minimum Green Space	30% of Lot Area
Parking Areas	Parking requirements per Sections 1704 and 1705; No more than 70% of on-site parking may be provided in surface lots.

Sec. 2905. Building Elements

All development in the SD-IC shall comply with the requirements in Table 2905 unless otherwise expressly stated, or unless a different requirement is contained in an applicable overlay district.

TABLE 2905

Building Elements: Institutional Campus District

Height	No building shall exceed _____ feet or _____ stories, whichever is lower.
Streetscape Plan	Pedestrian features including adequate sidewalks, street trees, landscaping and amenities such as benches shall be review and approved.
Façade Variations	Where building walls for new main buildings are one hundred (100) feet or greater in length, design variations shall be applied to reduce the building mass. Variations may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Recesses and projections along the building façade of no less than 2 feet;• Enhanced ornamentation around building entranceways;• Landscaping; and/or• Variations in building height
Entrance	The primary entrance of a new main building shall be prominently located and clearly identified using changes in rooflines or other architectural features.

Sec. 2906. Review and Approval

1. Facilities Master Plan. The institution shall submit a facility master plan for review and approval by the Planning Commission. The area under development shall be identified.