



CITY OF CHELSEA

CHELSEA PLANNING COMMISSION NOTICE OF WORK SESSION

Notice is hereby given that the Chelsea City Planning Commission will hold a Work Session on **Tuesday, August 5, 2014 at 7:00 pm**, at the Chelsea Municipal Building (Council Chamber) located at 311 S. Main Street, Chelsea, Michigan.

The purpose of the meeting will be to discuss the following items:

Magellan Properties Rezoning Request: To amend the Chelsea City Zoning Ordinance (Ordinance No. 166) to revise the Zoning Map from **(I-1 to PUD)** in the area described as: Tax Code:# 06-06-12-435-005, **425 Congdon** and # 06-06-12-435-015, **500 S. Main St.**, Chelsea, MI. (Commonly known as the Federal Screw Plant.)

Persons requiring reasonable accommodations due to disabilities in order that the meeting is accessible to them are requested to notify the Chelsea Planning Commission of such disability no later than five (5) business days prior to the date of the meeting.

George Kinzer, Chair

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
AUGUST 5, 2014
CHELSEA MUNICIPAL BUILDING COUNCIL CHAMBERS
311 S. MAIN ST., CHELSEA, MI

NAMES OF THOSE PRESENT: George Kinzer, Erik Larsen, Nick Helmholdt, Sarah Haselschwardt, Larry Ledebur, Cary Church
MEMBERS ABSENT: Marcia White
MEMBERS VACANT: Two
OTHERS PRESENT: Cheri Albertson, Carl Schmolt, Christine Linfield

George Kinzer called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

- **Magellan Properties Rezoning Request:** To amend the Chelsea City Zoning Ordinance to revise the Zoning Map from (I-1 to PUD) in the area described as: Tax Code 06-06-12-435-005, **425 Congdon** and 06-06-12-435-015, **500 S. Main St.**, Chelsea, MI (Commonly known as the Federal Screw Plant).

George Kinzer performed an inventory of all the documents in the commission's packet and outlined the next steps facing the commission regarding this project.

Carl Schmolt clarified that the Findings document is non-binding but that it is intended to show how the planning commission reached its decisions.

Christine Linfield stated that the petitioner's engineer asked about the exclusion of child care centers from the list of approved uses. George Kinzer reminded the commission about the site contamination issues. Discussion continued regarding heavy traffic along M-52 and the potential conflict this would have with young children. No members of the commission asked to reconsider the inclusion of child care centers as an approved use.

Discussion turned to the draft Findings document.

Erik Larsen stated his biggest concern with the site was the NW wall along Congdon. Carl Schmolt clarified the petitioner's plan for the wall and that glass in the window sashes will be removed. He further said that he would revise both the Findings and Resolution documents to clearly state the removal of glass. Sarah Haselschwardt stated that the solution described in the Findings may violate building codes. Larry Ledebur stated that he would prefer if the Findings were written in a way that doesn't state the planning commission's intent.

George Kinzer clarified the grading issue regarding the retaining wall on the NE section of the site. Carl Schmolt stated that since the petitioner owns the property adjacent to the wall, he may be able to remove the retaining wall and achieve an acceptable grade.

Sarah Haselschwardt stated that she sees the petitioner's choices as key factors that limit the setbacks. She explained that the choice to locate a drive thru bank and provide more parking spaces than the code requirement were both choices that minimized the available setbacks. Erik Larsen asked how the site may change if there was no drive thru teller window. Carl Schmolt stated that a final site plan for each building will be presented to planning commission for review.

Sarah Haselschwardt stated that the elimination of 6 parking spaces along the SE corner of the site would partially restore the setback along a residential edge. George Kinzer stated that the proposed 4' wall between these parking spaces and the adjacent residence should allow the petitioner more

flexibility regarding setbacks. Carl Schmolt stated that it may be possible to convert the six angle parking spaces into three parallel parking spaces. Christine Linfield suggested that the planning commission continue this discussion with the petitioner at the next meeting.

Christine Linfield stated that the fire chief had reviewed the plans and asked for some minor modifications to landscape elements to allow for truck turning thru the site. Carl Schmolt reminded the commission that the city's engineering review will also be included with the next draft Resolution.

Sarah Haselschwardt pointed out that item #11 in the draft Findings were not reflected in the draft Resolution.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 8:49 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Nick Helmholdt", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Nick Helmholdt
Planning Commission Secretary

CITY OF CHELSEA - PLANNING/ENG. DEPARTMENT

TO: Chelsea Planning Commission
FROM: Christine Linfield
SUBJECT: Magellan Properties Rezoning Request
DATE: 08/01/14

Discussion at the work session could include comments on all aspects of the Rezoning Petition to PUD. Since a PUD is a special zoning district, the Area Plan (Preliminary Site Plan) is also part of the rezoning petition discussions.

Please review the Draft Resolution and Draft Findings for determination of final language. So far, staff has only received comments from Sarah which are included in your packet. If you have any additional comments on the above documents, please bring them to the meeting for discussion.

Also, please review the List of Proposed Uses. The applicant's engineer has questioned the removal of Child Care Centers from the list. Staff notes show that this use was to be removed but please review and confirm the intent of the Commission regarding Child Care Centers.

Updates:

1. City Council approved the Planning Commissions recommendation to amend the Comprehensive Plan at their 07/21/14 meeting to remove the residential component. It went into effect immediately.
2. Staff has been working with the applicant regarding modifications to the Area Plan (Preliminary Site Plan).
3. The entire rezoning petition will be in front of the Planning Commission at the regular meeting on 08/19/14 for possible recommendation to City Council.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Chelsea City Planning Commission
FROM: Carl V. Schmult, Jr., Professional Community Planner
DATE: June 24, 2014
Revised July 24, 2014

RE: 500 South Main PUD Rezoning Petition
Draft of Resolution for Approval – For Discussion Only

WHEREAS The Chelsea City Planning Commission has reviewed the petition as required by Articles 13 and 15 of the Zoning Ordinance; and

WA The CPC has made the findings required by the ZO by a separate resolution;

Now Therefore Be It Resolved The CPC recommends that the Chelsea City Council approve the 500 South Main petition to rezone the property from I-1 to PUD;

Be It Further Resolved The area plan, dated ___ and consisting of ___ sheets shall be the area plan part of the approved petition;

BIFR The CPC hereby approves the area plan as the preliminary site plan for the entire property in the petition, said approval to be in effect only after the CC approves the petition;

BIFR The CC should attach the following conditions to its approval of the petition, said conditions to be part of the regulations of the approved PUD district:

1. A phasing plan for the entire property shall be submitted at the time the first site plan for development of the site is submitted for PC review. The phasing plan shall be approved by the PC before the Commission may approve any final site plan. No site work of any kind may commence on the property until after the Planning Commission has approved the phasing plan.
2. Condominium documents shall be submitted for approval by the City Council with the first final site plan for approval by the CPC. The documents shall be reviewed by the PC and the PC shall make recommendations thereon to the CC. No division of the property may be made until after the CC has approved the condo docs. The docs shall cover the entire property in the approved PUD district.
3. A structural review of the north retaining wall, by an engineer registered in the State of Michigan, shall be submitted to the City with the first final site plan for the property in the petition. The east segment of that retaining wall, north of proposed building #1, shall be replaced or repaired, based on said report, at the time of construction

of proposed building #1 or immediately after failure of the wall, whichever occurs first. If the petitioner still owns the adjacent property at the time of replacement or failure, grading on that property may be substituted for a retaining wall, upon approval by the City Engineer.

4. A grading plan for the entire property shall be submitted with the first final site plan for the property. The plan shall include existing contours at one foot intervals for the entire site, including existing pavement areas.

5. The petitioner shall replace the existing joint driveway opening on Main Street, at the SE corner of the property. The new driveway opening shall provide access only to the residential property adjacent to the south and shall be constructed as part of the development of proposed building #2.

6. The petitioner shall replace the sidewalk along the property's Main Street frontage as part of the construction of either proposed building #1 or 2, whichever occurs first.

7. The petitioner shall pay the costs of replacing sidewalk sections along Congdon Street. The replacement shall be part the City's reconstruction of Congdon Street, a final site plan for use of either existing building #1 or 2, or construction of the parking lot and driveway south of existing building #1, whichever occurs first.

8. A final site plan shall be submitted for reuse of existing building #1 and/or 2, and shall show any site changes associated with reuse of these buildings.

9. The existing walls along Congdon Street shall be repaired by the petitioner as necessary, as part of the final site plan for each existing building.

10. The final site plan for existing building #2 shall include a structural analysis of the existing wall north of the building. The analysis shall be made by an engineer registered in the State of Michigan. If the analysis concludes that the wall is structurally sound, the wall shall be repaired as needed and either painted or resurfaced by brick veneer on any side visible to the public. The existing window sashes shall be cleaned and painted and shall be retained as safety barriers. If the analysis concludes that the wall is structurally unsound, the wall shall be replaced by wall of decorative brick and stone that meets all building code requirements. Treatment or replacement of the wall shall be a requirement of the final site plan for existing building #2.

11. The canopy of existing building #1 shall be repaired, or replaced if repair is not reasonable.

12. The existing walls along Congdon Street as finished in accordance with the approved final site plan for each building shall not exhibit any evidence of retail activity within the buildings to the street frontage.

13. The petitioner shall be responsible for planting street trees along both street frontages. The plantings shall be part of the final site plan for each phase of development.

14. Construction traffic shall use only Main Street for all access or egress. Staging areas for materials, spoils, equipment, and employee vehicles shall be located only on the property; such storage or parking shall be prohibited on any public street.

15. Each final site plan shall be consistent with the area plan of the approved PUD district.

16. The landscaping proposed in the area plan is acceptable as a concept only. A detailed landscape plan shall be submitted for PC approval in each final site plan.

BIFR The petitioner should enter into a PUD agreement with the CC before the CC approves the petition. The agreement should contain, at a minimum, the preceding recommended conditions of approval.

BIFR The PUD agreement should be entered into record before the CC approves the petition.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Chelsea City Planning Commission
FROM: Carl V. Schmult, Jr., Professional Community Planner
DATE: June 24, 2014
Revised July 21, 2014

RE: 500 South Main PUD Rezoning Petition
Draft of Findings – For Discussion Only
Ref. Sections 13.06 and 15.02D, Zoning Ordinance

1. Conditions have changed on the subject site since the property was zoned I-1. The former occupant, Federal Screw Works, vacated the site ___ years ago and most of the buildings have been removed. The site is still vacant. The current I-1 zoning does not permit a reasonable use under prevailing conditions. Therefore rezoning the property, as proposed in the petition, is necessary to encourage and permit redevelopment of the property in a manner that is compatible with the surrounding residential neighborhood.

2. Rezoning the property to the PUD district requested, and the property's subsequent development, is expected to stabilize the surrounding residential neighborhood by eventually removing an unsightly, derelict condition and creating a new activity center in its place.

3. The petition is consistent with the city's master plan as amended. The petition proposes uses that, located and arranged as proposed in the petition's area plan, will be compatible with the neighboring residences. The Planning Commission finds that orientation of commercial uses to Main Street and to the interior of the site, away from Congdon Street, is essential to compatibility with the residential neighborhood.

4. The PC finds that the development proposed in the petition is consistent with applicable provisions of the zoning ordinance, as follows.

4.01 The PC finds that the PUD district is the appropriate zoning district for this property. The CP designates the property for redevelopment, consisting of mixed uses with specific layout characteristics that will assure that the new development will be compatible with the surrounding residential neighborhood. The PC further finds that the PUD district is the only district in the ZO that will enable the City to attain these objectives. (Section 4.32B)

4.02 The PC finds that the uses listed in the area plan are compatible with the CP as amended. (Section 4.32C-1)

4.03 The PC finds that the proposed maximum lot coverage of 23% is acceptable. The property is identified in the CP as a redevelopment site. The PC further finds that the

proposed lot coverage will encourage redevelopment of the property with mixed uses and is consistent with the ZO's authority to increase the maximum lot coverage as high as 25%. The PC further finds that the proposed FAR of 0.25 is less than the maximum permitted of 0.35. (Section 4.32D2 and 3)

4.04 The PC finds that the proposed reduction of the required yards is acceptable, as follows.

a. The area plan provides a front yard of 14.5 feet on the Main Street frontage. The PC previously accepted this setback as providing an appropriate setting for proposed buildings 1 and 2 in an urban setting and as an approach to the CBD. (The south edge of the CBD as designated in the CP is a little over 200 feet north of the property and the CBD (C5) zoning district has no setback requirements.)

b. The proposed setback along Congdon Street, 1.2 to 4.1 feet, is established by the existing structures, which are to be retained. The PC previously agreed to keeping these two buildings as a means of continuing the historical nature of the property and providing architectural diversity of any future development thereon. Preserving the existing wall along Congdon Street, north of building 2, will provide architectural continuity and a visual screen/safety barrier along the sidewalk, if all the following conditions are met: (Section 4.32G-1)

1) The wall is determined to be structurally sound by a professional engineer registered in the State of Michigan;

2) The existing window sashes will be retained but will be cleaned and painted; and

3) All existing surfaces that are painted concrete, including the east surface (facing Main Street) are painted or resurfaced with brick veneer.

If any of these conditions are not met, the existing wall should be replaced with a decorative brick and stone retaining wall with a safety barrier that meets the building code.

c. The required 20 foot setback along the north property line cannot be provided because of existing site conditions and the constraints these apply to design of the site. The existing retaining walls protect the higher elevations (5-8 feet) of the adjacent properties to the north along most of the north property line. The petition proposes to keep these walls, with necessary repairs, although the east segment of the wall might be replaced if engineering analysis concludes that is structurally unsafe. These walls, along with existing fences and vegetation on the adjacent properties, together with those properties' higher elevations, provide a physical and visual separation from the proposed parking lots that will be more effective than a 20 foot wide landscaped yard.

Along the south property line, a decorative masonry wall, 4 feet high, will provide adequate screening between the adjacent residential property and the proposed bank parking lot, in lieu of a 20 foot wide landscape yard. The proposed decorative masonry wall in the setback along 118 Lincoln Street will provide adequate screening if the wall is extended the entire length of the parking spaces. Existing and proposed vegetation in the 10 foot setback between proposed building #3 and the adjacent residential property will provide adequate screening in lieu of 10 feet of the required yard, provided the south wall of the building is finished with the same materials as the north (front) wall. The remainder of the south part of the area plan provides 28 feet or more of landscaped yard. (Section 4.32G-2)

The PC further finds, with respect to the setback issue, that the decision to keep the existing buildings on Congdon Street, the offset of the Main Street properties from the Congdon Street properties, and the location of Van Buren Street, which fixes the location of the proposed Main Street driveway (required by MDOT), together basically determine the layout of the site and severely limit the setbacks that can be provided.

4.05 The PC finds that all buildings will be less than 2 ½ stories or 40 feet high. (Section 4.32I)

4.06 The PC finds that a phasing plan cannot be included in the petition at this time because of market uncertainties. The PC further finds that a phasing plan for the entire property can reasonably be delayed until the first development on the property is imminent. Therefore, the PC finds that the intent of including a phasing plan in the area plan can be attained if a phasing plan for the entire property is submitted and approved as a revision to the petition at the time that a final site plan is submitted for the first development on the site. That phasing plan will be subject to the regulations of Section 15.06 of the Zoning Ordinance. (Section 15.06)

4.07 The PC finds that each building will have access to Main and Congdon Streets via internal driveways. The PC further finds that each building will have pedestrian access either directly from sidewalks along each street or from the internal pedestrian path system. The PC further finds that the sidewalk along Main Street should be replaced along the property's entire frontage and that sections of the sidewalk along Congdon Street should be replaced, all at the petitioner's expense. (Section 15.07)

4.08 The PC finds that each building will be connected to the City's water mains and sanitary sewers. The PC further finds that the storm water management system proposed will provide first flush treatment for runoff but will not provide on-site detention of runoff because contamination of the soil by previous operations prevent disturbance of the soil on much of the property. The PC further finds that, even with these site limitations, the quality of stormwater will be improved over existing conditions, based on the proposed stormwater management plan. The PC further finds that the existing overhead electric line will be relocated underground and that all franchise utility services to each building will be underground. (Section 15.08)

4.09 The PC finds that the property will be developed as condominium and that the condo owners' association will own and maintain all parts of the property outside buildings, including common areas and facilities. (Sections 15.09 and 15.12C)

4.10 The PC finds that the petition provides the required number of parking spaces, at the required minimum size of 10'x20'. A reduction in space width to 9 feet has not been requested. The PC further finds that the parking study dated April 24, 2014, confirms that the number spaces provided will be sufficient for the uses proposed. (Section 15.10)

5. The traffic study submitted by the applicant shows that the existing streets have capacity to serve the proposed uses. The existing water main in Main Street has sufficient capacity for the proposed development. The 4" main in Congdon Street is small by current standards and is old. Its eventual replacement will be caused by these two factors, not the development proposed in the petition. Sanitary sewer service is adequate. Storm water management on the site will be improved by addition of first flush capability, but provision of a complete storm water detention system is prevented by the presence of contaminated soils that resulted from the previous industrial operation. Fire access is provided by Main and Congdon Streets and by the internal driveways.

6. The site is to be developed as a condominium. A condo association will be created and will own and be responsible for maintenance and repair of all site areas and facilities.

7. The proposed public plaza will be improved with canopy trees, shrubs, and outdoor furniture to make it attractive for public use. Decorative paving should be added, if the surface elevation and finished floor elevations permit.

8. The site will have two vehicular access points, one each on Main and Congdon Streets. The Main Street driveway will function as the primary point of access and egress. The traffic study shows that these two driveways will have capacity to meet the street peak hour traffic demands of the proposed development.

9. The development is oriented toward Main Street and to the interior of the site, and away from Congdon Street. This design, and the uses permitted, is intended to minimize disturbance to the surrounding residential neighborhood.

10. The existing sidewalk along Main Street will be replaced as part of development of the street frontage. Sections of the Congdon Street sidewalk will be replaced as part of the Congdon Street reconstruction, at the petitioner's expense. The internal pedestrian path system will connect the two street sidewalks with each building and the public plaza.

11. Each existing and proposed building will be visible to the public and to the adjacent properties. Therefore, the PC finds that the architecture of these buildings should be of consistent design and materials on all facades.

Christine Linfield

From: Sarah Haselschwardt <shaselschwardt@kingscott.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 5:00 PM
To: Christine Linfield
Subject: RE: Staff Reports for Tomorrow's meeting
Attachments: 500NMain_Additional_Findings.pdf; 500NMain__Findings.pdf

Christine,

Since you and Carl asked for additional comments on the findings for 500 N Main development, please see attached for some I've prepared.

Hopefully, this will help with discussions at our work session in August.

Thanks for all of your work and patience with this.

Sarah

From: Christine Linfield [<mailto:clinfield@city-chelsea.org>]
Sent: Monday, July 14, 2014 6:11 PM
To: John Hanifan; Larry Ledebur; Sarah Haselschwardt; Marcia M. White; Nick Helmholdt; Erik Larsen; George Kinzer; Cheri Albertson; Hammer Frank; Cary Church (cshurch@comcast.net)
Subject: Staff Reports for Tomorrow's meeting

Good evening everyone,

Attached you will find the staff reports for both 500 S. Main Street and Speedway gas station. Please review prior to the meeting.

Also, please email me if you will not be able to attend so that we can ensure that we have a quorum for the public hearing and site plan reviews. So far we have two vacancies and Larry will be out of town, so we need everyone if you can make it.

Thank you and see you tomorrow!

Christine
Christine L. Linfield
*Planning, Engineering, Zoning &
Community Development Director*

City of Chelsea
305 S. Main Street
Suite 100
Chelsea, MI 48118
734.475.1771 ext. 210

MEMORANDUM

TO: Chelsea City Planning Commission
FROM: Carl V. Schmult, Jr., Professional Community Planner
DATE: July 10, 2014
RE: Additional Findings, 500 South Main PUD

The following is draft of detailed findings for item 4 of the draft of findings, dated 6-24-14. As with the previous memo, this draft is for discussion purposes only, to help the PC begin to formulate a formal resolution.

4.01 The PC finds that the PUD district is the appropriate zoning district for this property. The CP designates the property for redevelopment, consisting of mixed uses with specific layout characteristics that will assure that the new development will be compatible with the surrounding residential neighborhood. The PC further finds that the PUD district is the only district in the ZO that will enable the City to attain these objectives. (Section 4.32B)

4.02 The PC finds that the uses listed in the area plan are compatible with the CP as amended. (Section 4.32C-1)

4.03 The PC finds that the proposed maximum lot coverage of 23% is acceptable. The property is identified in the CP as a redevelopment site. The PC further finds that the proposed lot coverage will encourage redevelopment of the property with mixed uses and is consistent with the ZO's authority to increase the maximum lot coverage as high as 25%. The PC further finds that the proposed FAR of 0.25 is less than the maximum permitted of 0.35. (Section 4.32D2 and 3)

4.04 The PC finds that the proposed reduction of the required yards is acceptable, as follows.

a. The area plan provides a front yard of 14.5 feet on the Main Street frontage. The PC previously accepted this setback as providing an appropriate setting for proposed buildings 1 and 2 in an urban setting and as an approach to the CBD. (The south edge of the CBD as designated in the CP is a little over 200 feet north of the property and the CBD (C5) zoning district has no setback requirements.)

b. The proposed setback along Congdon Street, 1.2 to 4.1 feet, is established by the existing structures, which are to be retained. The PC previously agreed to keeping these two buildings ~~and the existing west wall of the previously demolished building north of building #2~~ as a means of continuing the historical nature of the property and providing architectural diversity of any future development thereon. ~~In addition, preserving the west wall provides screening of the parking lot north of building 2 from~~

The exterior wall that remains along Congdon Street sidewalk north of Existing Building #2, is only allowed to remain as long as it is determined to be structurally sound by a licensed professional structural engineer, meet current building codes as a retaining wall and guard rail, is thoroughly cleaned, window mullions removed or painted, and any surfaces that are existing painted Concrete masonry units (or concrete block), including the east surface facing main street be painted or refaced with brick veneer. In the event that these conditions can not be met, a new decorative brick and stone retaining wall or a salvaged portion of the existing wall should be provided that meet these criteria.

~~views from Congdon Street and provides a safety barrier for the sidewalk on the east side of the street (which is several feet higher than the future parking lot). The PC further finds that keeping the existing wall, while of value as noted, requires that its structural integrity be evaluated by competent engineering analysis. (Section 4.32G-1)~~

c. The required 20 foot setback along the north property line cannot be provided because of existing site conditions and the constraints these apply to design of the site. The existing retaining walls protect the higher elevations (5-8 feet) of the adjacent properties to the north along most of the north property line. The petition proposes to keep these walls, with necessary repairs, although the east segment of the wall might be replaced if engineering analysis concludes that is structurally unsafe. These walls, along with existing fences and vegetation on the adjacent properties, together with those properties higher elevations, provide a physical and visual separation from the proposed parking lots that will be more effective than a 20 foot wide landscaped yard.

~~Along the south property line, decorative masonry walls, 4 feet high, will provide adequate screening between the adjacent residential property and the proposed bank parking lot, in lieu of a 20 foot wide landscape yard. Existing and proposed vegetation in the 10 foot setback between proposed building #3 and the adjacent residential property will provide adequate separation in lieu of 10 feet of the required yard. The remainder of the south part of the area plan provides 28 feet or more of landscaped yard. (Section 4.32G-2) See revised paragraphs below~~

~~The PC further finds, with respect to the setback issue, that the decision to keep the existing buildings on Congdon Street, the offset of the Main Street properties from the Congdon Street properties, and the location of Van Buren Street, which fixes the location of the proposed Main Street driveway, together basically determine the layout of the site and severely limit the setbacks that can be provided.~~

4.05 The PC finds that all buildings will be less than 2 ½ stories or 40 feet high. (Section 4.32I)

4.06 The PC finds that a phasing plan cannot be included in the petition at this time because of market uncertainties. The PC further finds that a phasing plan for the entire property can reasonably be delayed until the first development on the property is imminent. Therefore, the PC finds that the intent of including a phasing plan in the area plan can be attained if a phasing plan for the entire property is submitted and approved as a revision to the petition at the time that a final site plan is submitted for the first development on the site. That phasing plan will be subject to the regulations of Section 15.06 of the Zoning Ordinance. (Section 15.06)

4.07 The PC finds that each building will have access to Main and Congdon Streets via internal driveways. The PC further finds that each building will have pedestrian access either directly from sidewalks along each street or from the internal pedestrian path system. The PC further finds that the sidewalk along Main Street should be replaced

along the property's entire frontage and that sections of the sidewalk along Congdon Street should be replaced, all at the petitioner's expense. (Section 15.07)

4.08 The PC finds that each building will be connected to the City's water mains and sanitary sewers. The PC further finds that the storm water management system proposed will provide first flush treatment for runoff but will not provide on-site detention of runoff because contamination of the soil by previous operations prevent disturbance of the soil on much of the property. The PC further finds that, even with these site limitations, the quality of stormwater will be improved over existing conditions, based on the proposed stormwater management plan. The PC further finds that the existing overhead electric line will be relocated underground and that all franchise utility services to each building will be underground. (Section 15.08)

4.09 The PC finds that the property will be developed as condominium and that the condo owners' association will own and maintain all parts of the property outside buildings, including common areas and facilities. (Sections 15.09 and 15.12C)

4.10 The PC finds that the petition provides the required number of parking spaces, at the required minimum size of 10'x20'. A reduction in space width to 9 feet has not been requested. The PC further finds that the parking study dated April 24, 2014, confirms that the number spaces provided will be sufficient for the uses proposed. (Section 15.10)

*Along the south property line, existing and proposed vegetation in the 10 foot setback between Proposed Building #3 and the adjacent residential properties will provide adequate separation. The design of the rear wall of Proposed Building #3 facing the residential properties should match the front elevation on the building with the identical materials. A decorative masonry wall, 4' high, installed in the 10' min setback will provide adequate screening between the east property line of 118 Lincoln Street and the proposed parking lot. This decorative masonry wall should extend the entire length of the parking spaces.

The only areas on the site that have the required 20 setback are along the south property line below Proposed building #2 and from proposed Building #3 west. (note to PC that this statement is only true if the (6) parking spaces south of the drive-thru are deleted.)

The PC further finds, with respect to the setback issue, that the decision to keep the existing buildings on Congdon Street, the fixed location by MDOT of the proposed Main Street drive across from Van Buren Street, the desire of the developer to maximize parking beyond that required by the zoning ordinance, the desire of the developer to maximize usable building area on the site, and the decision by the developer to include a drive-thru bank on the site, together limit the setbacks that can be provided and affect the possible site layout options.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Chelsea City Planning Commission
FROM: Carl V. Schmult, Jr., Professional Community Planner
DATE: June 24, 2014

RE: 500 South Main PUD Rezoning Petition
Initial Draft of Findings – For Discussion Only
Ref. Sections 13.06 and 15.02D, Zoning Ordinance

1. Conditions have changed on the subject site since the property was zoned I-1. The former occupant, Federal Screw Works, vacated the site ___ years ago and most of the buildings have been removed. The site is still vacant. The current I-1 zoning does not permit a reasonable use under prevailing conditions. Therefore rezoning the property, as proposed in the petition, is necessary to encourage and permit redevelopment of the property in a manner that is compatible with the surrounding residential neighborhood.
2. Rezoning the property to the PUD district requested, and the property's subsequent development, is expected to stabilize the surrounding residential neighborhood by eventually removing an unsightly, derelict condition and creating a new activity center in its place.
3. The petition is consistent with the city's master plan as amended. The petition proposes uses that, located and arranged as proposed in the petition's area plan, will be compatible with the neighboring residences. The Planning Commission finds that orientation of commercial uses to Main Street and to the interior of the site, away from Congdon Street, is essential to compatibility with the residential neighborhood.
4. The PC finds that the development proposed in the petition is consistent with applicable provisions of the zoning ordinance.
5. The traffic study submitted by the applicant shows that the existing streets have capacity to serve the proposed uses. The existing water main in Main Street has sufficient capacity for the proposed development. The 4" main in Congdon Street is small by current standards and is old. It's eventual replacement will be caused by these two factors, not the development proposed in the petition. Sanitary sewer service is adequate. Storm water management on the site will be improved by addition of first flush capability, but provision of a complete storm water detention system is prevented by the presence of contaminated soils that resulted from the previous industrial operation. Fire access is provided by Main and Congdon Streets and by the internal driveways.
6. The site is to be developed as a condominium. A condo association will be created and will own and be responsible for maintenance and repair of all site areas and facilities.

The turning radii shown along the main internal east drive near the Public Plaza shall be increased and/or reshaped to allow safe and clear passage by a typical large vehicle traveling in each direction at the same time. Reference truck traffic path shown on sheet PSP-03

7. The proposed public plaza will be improved with canopy trees, shrubs, and outdoor furniture to make it attractive for public use.
and decorative paving.

8. The site will have two vehicular access points, one each on Main and Congdon Streets. The Main Street driveway will function as the primary point of access and egress. The traffic study shows that these two driveways will have capacity to meet the street peak hour traffic demands of the proposed development.

9. The development is oriented toward Main Street and to the interior of the site, and away from Congdon Street. This design, and the uses permitted, is intended to minimize disturbance to the surrounding residential neighborhood.

10. The existing sidewalk along Main Street will be replaced as part of development of the street frontage. Sections of the Congdon Street sidewalk will be replaced as part of the Congdon Street reconstruction, at the petitioner's expense. The internal pedestrian path system will connect the two street sidewalks with each building and the public plaza.

11. Because the buildings on the property have a "presence" on all sides, the architecture shall be of consistent design and materials on all sides, including those facades abutting its neighbors.

CITY OF CHELSEA - ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

TO: City of Chelsea Planning Commission
FROM: Christine Linfield
SUBJECT: Magellan Properties Rezoning Request
DATE: 07/22/14

List below you will find the list of uses that was approved at the 07/16/14 PC meeting.

- A. Offices of executives, administrative, legal, accounting, insurance, real estate and uses of similar nature.
- B. Offices of architects, engineers, surveyors, community planners, and other professions of a similar nature.
- C. Studio for professional work.
- D. Business services such as mailing, copying, data processing and computer centers.
- E. Studios for art, photography, music, dance and similar uses.
- F. Banks, savings and loans, credit unions and similar financial institutions including ones with drive-through teller window facilities or automatic teller drive-through lanes. Canopy materials shall be consistent with the principal building. The canopy shall be no higher than the principal building.
- G. Banking centers including ATM's (automatic teller machines) and twenty-four-hour ready tellers which are separate from a financial institution.
- H. Personal services including barber shops and beauty salons; medical and dental offices or clinics; dry cleaners and self-service laundromats; and sale and repair shops for watches, shoes, radios, and televisions.
- I. Medical and dental laboratories.
- J. Establishments serving food and/or alcoholic beverages but not including drive-in types.
- K. Indoor commercial amusements and recreation service, including theaters, bowling alleys, and uses of a similar nature.

- L. Fitness centers and health clubs.
- M. Retail sale of food, drugs, hardware, notions, book, and similar convenience goods.
- N. Drive through windows for pharmacy/drugstores.
- O. Manufacturing of beverages when assessory to a bar, restaurant or lounge.
- P. Business Schools; including dance schools, music schools, and art schools.
- Q. Business, vocational and technical training schools.
- R. Indoor retail sales establishments.
- S. Printing establishments.
- T. Banquet, dance, lodge, and union halls, private clubs, and other similar places of assembly.
- U. Essential services.
- V. On-site signs in accordance with the regulations in Article 6.
- W. Assessory buildings, structures, and uses in accordance with Section 3.10.
- X. Outdoor sales & display pursuant to 5.13.
- Y. Churches and other buildings for religious worship.
- Z. Government or community owned buildings, but not including schools.