

**CITY OF LIVONIA
PUBLIC HEARING**

Minutes of Meeting Held on Monday, March 21, 2022

A Public Hearing of the Council of the City of Livonia was held at the Livonia City Hall Auditorium on **Monday, March 21, 2022**.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jim Jolly, President
 Scott Bahr
 Rob Donovic
 Brandon McCullough
 Kathleen McIntyre
 Scott Morgan

MEMBERS ABSENT: Laura Toy, Vice President

OTHERS PRESENT: Leo Neville, Assistant City Attorney
 Mark Taormina, Planning and Economic Dev. Director
 Sara Kasprowicz, Recording Secretary

The Public Hearing was called to order at 7:01 p.m. with President Jim Jolly presiding. This item is regarding **Petition 2022-01-06-01** submitted by the City of Livonia Planning Commission on its own motion pursuant to Section 13.15 of the Livonia Vision 21 Zoning Ordinance, as amended, and in accordance with Public Act 110 of 2006 (Michigan Zoning Enabling Act), as amended, to consider multiple revisions to the LIVONIA VISION 21 Zoning Ordinance in order to correct certain defects, add and delete provisions, and provide clarification to others.

This item will move to the Regular Meeting of **April 4, 2022**.

The Public Hearing is now open. There were 0 persons in the audience.

Jolly: I'll note that the entire Council with the exception of Vice President Toy is present here with us. Mr. Taormina, will you be taking this on?

Taormina: Yes, I will. Thank you. Again, this item involves changes to the Livonia Vision 21 zoning ordinance. As you know, the new ordinance was adopted last August. After six months of applying the new regulations, we have discovered a number of missing items. Adding these back also presents a good opportunity to make other desired changes and refinements which I will briefly describe. So, the requested changes affect thirty-five different sections of the Livonia Vision 21 zoning ordinance. A few of the more significant changes include expanding the use of planned developments in the city's residential district. Changing and giving services of local and suburban passenger bus taxicab and trucking transportation terminals from permitted uses to a waiver use in the city's industrial district. This is important in order to maintain control over the possible future development of large-scale trucking and other transit-

oriented operations. So, it was felt that it was appropriate to place these under the waiver use category. We're adding back provisions for industrial parks that previously existed in ordinance number 543. This issue, as you know, recently surfaced with the proposed development of several platted industrial lots on Rosati Drive. We're increasing the allowable floor area ratio in the NM-2 Multifamily district from 30 to 35%. We're recommending to reinstate language that restricts the storage of material and equipment in the front, side, and rear yards of the city's commercial districts. Not including this language in the new zoning ordinance was actually just a clumsy oversight on our part, there were a few of those that I'll mention in a minute. We're eliminating accessory dwelling units as a permitted use in one family residential districts. The reason for this is because the regulations pertaining to accessory dwellings is now part of the form-based development option of section 5.04. So, there are two sections that we can delete. And we're eliminating the zones within the required minimum house sizes. These are all obsolete today. And so, these applied years ago when we specified minimum house sizes in each one of the residential zoning districts, but they were such minor or such small minimum thresholds that they're no longer applicable today. We're including retail sales and the C-4, High Residential, Commercial zoning district adding a provision that will allow limited projections of chimneys, eaves and other common architectural features into required yard setbacks of residential properties and impact the allowance for reduced parking stall dimensions in the case of office developments. Again, all of those the ones I just mentioned, were omitted from the new ordinance inadvertently so we're reinstating. We're making sure that screen walls are the preferred means by which to buffer non-residential developments from residential properties. Adding back language, which allows for property separation agreements between abutting landowners who want to avoid the need for variances. This is something that we had under with ordinance 543. Increasing the allowable area monument signs in the C-1 Local zoning district from twenty square feet to thirty square feet that would be consistent with our C-2 district and actually consistent with what we previously had. Why it was changed to twenty square feet, I'm not sure, but we caught that error and we're fixing it. Adding back a provision that requires site plan review for certain commercial and other nonresidential developments as well as for condominiums. Site condominium projects, again, another oversight, but an extremely important one to have in the ordinance. We're eliminating the application fee requirement for site plan reviews since this was recently moved to the code of ordinances. And lastly, we're removing the requirement for the City Clerk to provide inserts in the case of rezoning notification signs. This is something that is in the ordinance, but quite frankly, they've never done that. In our opinion, the changes as outlined will result in a better overall zoning ordinance, one that helps achieve the overall goals and objectives of the Master Plan. The Planning Commission after holding a Public Hearing on February 22, is recommending approval changes that submitted. Thank you.

Jolly: Thank you, sir. Anybody from the Council have any questions or any motions?

Bahr: Mr. Chairman, I would offer an approving.

Jolly: Okay, anybody else on the Council have anything to add? I will note for the record that we have a roomful of blue chairs with nothing in them. So, with that being said, we have an approving motion. I'll thank Mr. Taormina. I presume the Law Department helped you with this, or not are much? Mr. Neville, were you involved with that?

Neville: Which aspect?

Jolly: I will just give you all the credit. All right. Public Hearing is closed. Thank you all for being here.

As there were no further questions or comments, the Public Hearing was declared closed at 7:08 p.m.