

Lauren Hood, MCD
Chairperson
Donovan Smith
Vice Chair/Secretary

Marcell R. Todd, Jr.
Director

City of Detroit
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
208 Coleman A. Young Municipal Center
Detroit, Michigan 48226
Phone: (313) 224-6225 Fax: (313) 224-4336 e-
mail: cpc@detroitmi.go

Brenda Goss Andrews
Kenneth R. Daniels
David Esparza, AIA, LEED
Ritchie Harrison
Gwen Lewis
Melanie Markowicz
Frederick E. Russell, Jr.

Meeting Minutes
April 21, 2022

I. Opening

- A. Call to Order – The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Hood at 6:25 p.m.
- B. Roll Call – Marcell Todd, Director, CPC called the roll. A quorum was present.

Attendees: Esparza, Harrison, Lewis, Markowicz, Russell, Smith and Hood.
Excused: Goss-Andrews and Daniels.

The Chair acknowledged Commissioner Melanie Markowicz, the new Commissioner for District 5.

- C. Amendments to and approval of agenda

Commissioner Russell motioned to approve the agenda; seconded by Vice-Chairperson Smith.

II. Meeting minutes December 2, 2021, and February 24, 2022

Due to time constraints that minutes the minutes were not approved.

III. Public Hearings, Discussions and Presentations

- A. **PUBLIC HEARING** – The request of New Path Villages to rezone 3926, 3932, 3938, 4100, 4106, 4110, 4118, 4122, 4134, 4140 Pennsylvania Avenue from an R2 (Two-Family Residential) zoning classification to an R5 (Medium Density Residential) zoning classification &
The request of Art Narthex LLC to rezone 4103 Cadillac Avenue from an R2 (Two-Family Residential) zoning classification to a SD1 (Special Development District, Small-Scale Mixed-Use) zoning classification

Chris Gulock and Eric Fazzini, CPC staff, provided a summary of report submitted April

13, 2022 regarding request of New Path Villages and Art Narthex LLC to rezone parcels generally located along Sylvester Avenue between Cadillac and Pennsylvania Avenues from a R2 (Two-Family Residential) zoning classification to a R5 (Medium Density Residential) zoning classification to allow for an emergency shelter consisting of ten tiny houses for men, women and couples. Each home would be approximately 250 square feet; there would be an adjacent stand-alone community restroom.

A vacant church and adjacent vacant two-story school, purchased by Art Narthex LLC would be renovated and rented out for religious services, event space, banquet facility and other possible uses. The school would include first and second floor rental spaces for artist workspaces, office space, classrooms, and nonprofit neighborhood activities.

The subject site is located within the St. Jean area of Neighborhood Cluster 4 of the Detroit Master Plan of Polices. The Future Land Use map for the area shows Low Density Residential for the subject area.

Commissioner Russell: The request is to change from R2 to R5 and from R2 to SD1. Why did staff feel that those were the appropriate zoning classifications?

Chris Gulock, CPC staff: R2 does not allow homeless shelters or emergency shelters. Emergency shelters are allowed in R5, medium density residential. Homeless shelters are conditional, and they will need to apply for conditional use approval. Emergency shelters are conditional in every zoning district.

Commissioner Markowicz: Clarity on the proposed surface parking lot; questioned number of parking spaces to service the emergency shelter community and the activity center.

Chris Gulock, CPC staff: The petitioners submitted two applications, one for the church and one for the tiny home site. They have not drawn up a plan with their architect on how many spaces needed to accommodate both facilities. I can provide information regarding number of spaces they might be able to get.

Commissioner Esparza: Are we expecting other city departments to weigh in with an opinion; Housing and Revitalization, Planning and Development; I believe you have already received some input from the BSEED.

Chris Gulock, CPC staff: The applicant did present the concept to BSEED and presented the Planning and Development Department (PDD). PDD made a few comments on the site plan; initially proposing duplexes back-to-back. If it is Detroit Land Bank land or city land, there is negotiations with the developer, to get a plan that is acceptable. The petitioner has reached out to Housing and Revitalization Department (HRD), Homeless Services Section and they are interested and supportive. They are willing to work with the petitioner to procure block grant funds.

Commissioner Esparza: Do you have the experience in this type of development?

Danielle Kaltz, Co-petitioner: Back in 2007, I started a small nonprofit, doing direct action outreach to folks who were living under the bridges in Detroit; we created supply field backpacks that have hats, gloves, scarves, hygiene packs, high caloric protein food, rain ponchos, etc. We are a 100% donation run program.

The last seven years, we have been working with Mariners Inn, they have been giving us their space outside of their facility on Cass Avenue. We have been doing something called free store, where we collect gently used clothing and hang everything out on Cass Avenue. We offer services to help people find what they need. We give haircuts; we offer hygiene kits as well. We have worked with other organizations in the city for the last what 14 years.

Commissioner Lewis: The petitioner talked about separate hygiene facilities, can you speak a little more on that and the code regarding tiny homes and separate hygiene facilities. What would those hygiene facilities look like?

Chris Gulock, CPC staff: At the back of the caretaker facility, the petitioner wants to build an addition, and there would be laundry facilities and attached shower stalls.

Mike Willenborg, Petitioner: The bathrooms will be separate rooms, there will be three of them one will be ADA specific, and the showers will also be all separate rooms. There will be three showers for the population of 10 tiny homes for the people to share. There will be no dormitory style showers or bathrooms. This will be a gated community; controlled access community; maned 24 hours a day.

Public Comments

Neighborhood President in District 3, State Fair: We are very interested in watching this project and have a lot of support for it, as we deal with a lot of displaced people in our neighborhood and have a lot of extra space so we're in big support of this project we're looking forward to seeing how it goes and working with the people that are involved today; they have been great people they have great people for reaching out. We are here to put our support behind this project and hope that it moves forward think very much for the time.

Tonya Watts: District 5, President Islandview Community Association
Trying to find out more about these little homeless, little boxes you want build out here in our area for the homeless. I think it is a little suicidal box; to put human beings in these types of atmospheres. They are really depressed, and you are going to make them more depressed; whoever is coming up with this plan to put homeless people in. It is an insult to me; I was trying to read the rest of the article about people must work to stay in these little 10 box homes, I did not get the rest of the presentation. I would like to know a little bit more about the homeless coming into our neighborhood they could have mental issues or disability issues.

Natasha Baranik: The neighborhood is extremely low density I really welcome neighbors and people I would very much like to see more people there which. Done some work with the homeless. As far as I understand there is very little love in their hearts for emergency shelters. They are not comfortable with it. They just do not feel safe there it's very, transitional they don't they can't settle down, I do think that this is worth exploring; for their benefit for homeless residents of Detroit and I really look forward to this project. I do believe that the petitioners have their hearts and minds, et set straight forward and they are going to be able to fulfill this in a in a good way, that is good for the Community and for the residents both the new residents and old.

Amy Senese: Lives in that neighborhood; part of my own block club and another group called Charlevoix Village Association. I have also done some homeless organizing with folks in the Cass Community Shelters and Detroit Eviction Offense.

Rhonda Adams: Okay, I wanted to find if any cultural emphasis been taking place here for displaced families, you do not have any option there for families. How is this going to allow for or empower the community as a whole? Detroiters are having to be displaced with their families is there is no option there available for them to.

Chris Gulock: Staff will continue to research the request and the responses from the public and we plan to bring it back at your next meeting if it is ready.

There was no action taken at this time; this item will be brought back with answers to Commission concerns.

- B. PUBLIC HEARING** – The request of R. Philip Lockwood on behalf of XYZ 2002 RPF LLC and the City Planning Commission to amend Article XVII, Section 50-17-6, District Map No. 5 of the 2019 Detroit City Code, Chapter 50, Zoning, to show an SD1 (Special Development, Small-Scale, Mixed-Use) zoning classification where R2 (Two-Family Residential), R3 (Low Density Residential), and B4 (General Business) zoning classifications are currently shown for twenty-two parcels generally bounded by West Hancock Street to the north, Avery Street to the east, Lysander Street to the south, and Rosa Parks Boulevard to the west.

Jamie Murphy, CPC staff, provided a summary of report submitted April 18, 2022 regarding request of R. Philip Lockwood on behalf of XYZ 20-20 RPF LLC and the City Planning Commission to rezone twenty-two (22) parcels bounded by W. Hancock, Avery, Lysander and Rosa Parks Boulevard to show a SD1 (Special Development, Small-Scale, Mixed-Use) zoning classification where R2 (Two-Family Residential), R3 (Low Density Residential) and B4 (General Business) zoning classifications currently exist.

The developer proposes to build a mixed-use development consisting of

approximately fifty-nine residential units and 7,500 square feet of commercial space, 20% of the rental units will be marketed at 50% AMI. The SD1 district allows narrower setbacks and more walkable layouts. CPC is including additional parcels which will provide consist zoning in this area.

The subject site is located within the Jeffries Area of Neighborhood Cluster 4 of the Detroit Master Plan of Polices. The Future Land Use map for this area is RL- Low Density Residential for the subject property.

Timarie Szwed, CPC Staff, provided a summary relative to the Average Medium Income (AMI) per the Commission's request during a presentation on April 7, 2022. Several questions were asked about whether, AMI is the best way to calculate affordable housing in Detroit. A report produced by the Legislative Policy Division (LPD) was summarized, offering some insights on AMI.

The area median income is the median or average household income based on household size and specific regions, defined by the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). That is what is used as a benchmark to determine housing affordability. It is calculated using the median family incomes for those designated geographic locations, then adjusted for family size, as well as areas with unusually high or low family income. Detroit falls into the Detroit - Warren- Livonia AMI area, and that means that the city's AMI is calculated using Wayne, Oakland, Macomb, Lapeer, and St Clair Counties' median household incomes. Affordable housing are housing costs that are 30% of a household's income.

The AMI for a two-person household is \$62,800, that is for the entire region. Detroit's median income is around \$32,000, and Detroit's median gross rent rate exceeds our median household income amount or exceeds 30% of that. A low-income household is at 80% of the AMI (\$50,240) or less annually, very low income is \$31,400 or less than 50% AMI. The extremely low income is at \$18,840 or less and that is 30% of AMI.

Other cities have found creative ways to increase the available number of affordable units. Ann Arbor residents approved an Affordable Housing Milage in November 2022. It will generate approximately \$6 million or more, per year for 20 years to subsidize and create 1,500 affordable housing units for households making 60% or less AMI. Charlotte, North Carolina provided long term leases and city owned parcels at only \$1,000 per year. The developer had to set aside 50% of units as affordable for 20 years. Los Angeles gave incentives for developments using their transit-oriented communities' program which encourages development of affordable housing near busing transit stations.

Looking at whether Detroit can create its own local AMI; Detroit could, but it would have little impact. The only projects that could use utilize it are those receiving only city funding. There would be no option for layering funding and none of the federal funds could be used on those developments. The LPD report indicated that Detroit could create financial and planning incentives,

such as zoning variances and fee reductions, like Los Angeles.

Public Comments

Joshua Berkow: I am a homeowner on Fourth Avenue, at the corner of Rosa Parks and immediately adjacent to the parcels that are being rezoned north of Rosa Parks, north of Forest. I submitted comments in writing, I am opposed to SD1 zoning north of Forest, not opposed to it in the other areas. I am not opposed to an apartment building on that area; making a SD1 violates most of the approval criteria in the zoning code for a zoning change.

If the zoning change is approved to SD1, this is my only opportunity, as an adjacent homeowner, to have any legally binding impact on the development. My main concern is, the lack of setbacks from lot lines, specifically in the Forest Court parcel. When you build lot lines, the storm water mitigation will be on my property; there was allowance for that, and the other parcels that XYZ is developing, but not that one and honestly, I do not want to bear the brunt of stormwater mitigation for somebody's project.

Amy McLaughlin: About the implications of SD1 zoning, I am a member of the Woodbridge Citizens Council and we have submitted a letter in favor of the rezoning because we are generally in favor of Mr. Lockwood's proposal. However, we did feel that there is a bit of a gamble, and we certainly feel for Mr. Berkow, being the sole single family home next to proposed development. Mr. Lockwood is someone that I think we can work with, and he has been available to the community. He lives in the neighborhood but, once this land is rezoned, we do lose the ability to sort of negotiate and with this development or any other development if it does not move forward, we have gambled a bit on a significant lot in our neighborhood.

Rhonda Adams: I wanted to say that it is very important to look at the SD1 to establish accountability. No project should be moving forward until there is a new master plan or until further updates and approval; this process is putting the cart before the horse. Revisiting the AMI status or protocol is definitely necessary that ratio is terrible. Also, in reference to how many small businesses versus the developers, it should not just be for the developers.

Commissioner Lewis: We have had quite a few developers coming to us requesting this SD1 zoning classification, in some instances, it does not seem to me that the developers may not be absolute on what they are going to do once they receive that zoning classification. My concern is that once we make the decision to change the zoning classification, the SD1 opens up that community to various kinds by-right opportunities. I would like to ask the CPC staff to do some sort of training, I would like some more in-depth training on the pros and cons of SD1, as it impacts the surrounding community, it could be done by zoom.

My concern is that the earlier presenter and this presenter do not have concrete plans but are asking for an SD1 rezoning. This SD1 opens it up to so many other things that could impact that community. I wish it were a way that the developers could come with something more solid about the future of that land. I would like to ask the staff for more training on that SD1 classification.

There was no action taken during this public hearing due to various concerns from the Commission.

C. PUBLIC HEARING – The request of God’s Oldschool Ministry, Inc. and the City Planning Commission to amend Article XVII, Section 50-17-19, District Map No. 17 of the 2019 Detroit City Code, Chapter 50, Zoning, to show a B4 (General Business) zoning classification where an M4 (Intensive Industrial) zoning classification is currently shown at 18602, 18620, and 18632 John R, 28, 36, and 38 East Golden Gate, and 25, 33, and 35 East Hildale Avenues generally located on the east side of John R between East Golden Gate and East Hildale Avenues.

Chris Gulock and Roland Amarteifio, CPC staff members, provided a summary of report dated April 15, 2022 regarding request of God’s Oldschool Ministry, Inc. to rezone parcels generally bounded by John R between East Golden Gate and East Hildale Avenue to show a B4 (General Business) zoning classification where a M4 (Intensive Industrial) zoning classification currently exists.

The petitioner proposes to develop an academic learning center/daycare, with a gated playground, a parking lot and greenspace. The petitioner owns the church at 18633 John R, a distribution center at 18620 John R; and vacant land at 18621 and 18602 John R; has recently purchased three lots on the north side of E. Hildale Avenue and is currently in negotiations with the Detroit Land Bank to purchase three lots on the south side of E. Golden Gate. Angelina Property Investments (KR Enterprise Properties) owns several industrial buildings along the rail line and residential blocks that have houses and vacant lots. A company representative indicated they were not opposed to the rezoning but did not want their property rezoned.

The subject site is located within the State Fair area of Neighborhood Cluster 1 of the Detroit Master Plan of Policies. The Future Land Use map for this area shows Neighborhood Commercial for land along John R and Low Density Residential for the area east of John R with Light Industrial beyond.

Chairperson Hood: You are requesting same day action.

Christopher Gulock: This public hearing was supposed to be held on April 7 but, there were some difficulties. Staff did provide an overview on April 7th, but based on public comments if the Commission is comfortable to consider same day action; we have not received any negative feedback yet on this request.

Public Comments

Rhonda Adams: This is something that will assist this community; expressed concern regarding the industrial land owned by neighbor that does not want his property rezoned; is this necessary due to environmental reasons for our community and the health risks. Does this work with the EPA or decrease in pollutants in our community; can you override this corporate outsider with a community benefit agreement or assessment in that area, so that these people can get this property and do something to raise the quality of life in our community.

Chairperson Hood: I think we may have spoken about this in the last session. The environmental well-being for folks; it is a majority zoned industrial area; is there any threat from adjacent industrial activity to people's well-being.

Chris Gulock: There is some industrial use, it has been there a long time along the rail line. There is a developer who has purchased a lot of property in the area. Ms. Long started a dialogue with him to talk about what his plans are for the area; for now, he has asked the city not to rezone his parcels.

There is an active steel mill to the north, this is typical in some Detroit areas where you have a rail line with industry adjacent to residential, it is not ideal, but that is how it organically evolved in the early 1900s. Staff has started a dialogue with this person. I think we are still in a holding pattern, to see how this would develop. This area may be right for a planning study, particularly to the south. We can continue to work with Ms. Long and the Land Bank to see how this area is evolving.

Staff Recommendation

Based on the community feedback, staff feels that this proposal meets the criteria for the map amendment. Staff recommends approval of the rezoning.

Vice-Chairperson Smith motioned to waive the same day criteria; seconded by Commissioner Russell. Motion was approved.

Vice - Chairperson Smith motioned to accept staff recommendation for approval; seconded by Commissioner Markowicz. Motion was approved.

IV. Unfinished Business - None

V. New Business

- A.** Request of SDG Associates, LLC on behalf of the Detroit Regional Convention Facility Authority for PC/PCA (Public Center/Public Center Adjacent) Special

District Review of proposed signs and sculpture at the Huntington Place at 1 Washington Boulevard (formerly TCF Center/Cobo Center).

Jamie Murphy, CPC staff provided a summary of report submitted on April 19, 2022, regarding the request of SDG Associates, LLC, on behalf of the Detroit Regional Convention Facility Authority for a PC/PCA for proposed signs and sculpture to be located at 1 Washington Boulevard (the former TCF Center). The report focuses on exterior identification signs.

Three signs are proposed above the entrances on the eastern façade of the building, facing Washington Boulevard. One sign is proposed on the roof of the ballroom (formally Cobo Arena) and will not be visible from the ground or illuminated. Three signs are proposed on the ballroom, near the roofline, each facing north, south and east.

The installation of a new sculpture is proposed at the circular drop-off area, near the intersection of Washington Boulevard and West Jefferson Avenue. The spherical sculpture measures six feet across and will be installed in an existing landscape bed.

Of the eighteen PC and PCA District Review Criteria, staff finds that criteria (2), (3) and (11) are relevant to the request; *the proposed signs and sculpture are appropriate for the scale of the building; the proposed changes are compatible with the surrounding development; and appropriate signage is necessary to identify the building and assist the public in navigating.*

Conclusion and Recommendation

Staff has a minor concern with the wall mounted signs above the entry points. The method by which they are to be affixed to the exterior wall and appearance is acceptable, however, the depiction of the signs in the included materials is inconsistent with the description. The depictions provided show the signage fixtures applied directly to the wall, preserving more of the existing appearance than will be the case. The final set of drawings to be presented to the Council for approval should include more accurate depictions of the signage as it will be installed. With this understanding and based upon analysis, the City Planning Commission staff recommends approval of the proposed signs and sculpture.

Commission Markowitz motioned to approve the signage has proposed for Huntington Center with the condition that the backing of the sign on Washington Boulevard attempt to compliment the architecture as much as possible and to also approve the sculpture on that side as presented; seconded by Commissioner Esparza. Motion was approved.

VI. Committee Reports - None

VII. Staff Report

CPC Director Marcell Todd presented the following abbreviated staff report:

A week ago today City Council did approve the City's budget; included within that any number of changes to the Mayor's proposed budget. We can provide you with copies of the closing resolution and all the other documents. for you to see exactly what transpired but recognizing the discussion that took place at your last meeting concerning the Master Plan.

One of the actions that Council did take was to add an additional \$2 million to the budget of the Planning and Development Department to engage in a Master Plan update; be that a series of amendments or, a comprehensive update to the revision of the Master Plan. That action was taken in addition to the \$2 million, that is already in the budget to perform another set of neighborhood framework studies.

We are hoping to get together with our colleagues at the Planning and Development Department in the coming weeks to discuss further and bring information back to this body, as appropriate, we would be happy, after having conversation with the Chair, to provide you with a review of the provisions of the Planning Enabling Act as it concerns this matter consistent with the reporting that we shared with you and that we provided to City Council's Planning and Economic Development Standing Committee, at the request of Council Member Johnson.

We do expect that there will likely be additional actions of some sort that are taken by the by the City Council, or at least the two Council Members Johnson and Santiago Romero who are leading this charge. We will look to provide this honorable body with whatever information needed to play the role that the Commission should play, and to express any other desires that you have in this regard.

VIII. Member Report - None

IX. Communications - None

X. Public Comment

Rhonda Adams: We do need to take action on some of these things that is totally not looked at. I am glad that you all are moving forward with some of the things like the Master Plan. The mayor needs to go ahead on and sign it and you all can take it you from here. I see you are developing good so keep up the good work.

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 10:06 p.m.