

**CITY OF LIVONIA
PUBLIC HEARING**

Minutes of Meeting Held on Monday, July 18, 2022

A Public Hearing of the Council of the City of Livonia was held at the Livonia City Hall Auditorium on **Monday, July 18, 2022.**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jim Jolly, President
 Laura Toy, Vice President

Scott Bahr
Rob Donovic
Kathleen McIntyre
Scott Morgan

MEMBERS ABSENT: Brandon McCullough

OTHERS PRESENT: Paul Bernier, Assistant City Attorney
 Mark Taormina, Planning and Economic Development Director

The Public Hearing was called to order at 7:00 p.m. with President Jim Jolly presiding. This item is regarding an appeal of the denial of the Planning Commission regarding Petition 2021-12-02-27 submitted by Maple Real Estate Group, L.L.C. requesting special waiver use approval to develop a Planned Residential Development consisting of an apartment complex made up of three (3) buildings and twenty-four (24) dwelling units, on the properties at 9106 and 9120 Middlebelt Road, located on the east side of Middlebelt Road between Joy Road and West Chicago Avenue in the Southwest ¼ of Section 36.

This item will move to the Regular Meeting of **August 8, 2022.**

The Public Hearing is now open. There were 3 persons in the audience.

Jolly: We will go to Mark Taormina, our Planning and Economic Development Director to give us a brief description of what this is in regard to.

Taormina: Thank you, Mr. President. Again, this is a request to develop a plan residential development that would consist of an apartment complex made up of three buildings and 24 units. The property in question is located on the east side of Middlebelt, just south of Grandon. The property is 1.45 acres in size, with 100 feet of frontage on Middlebelt Road. The property is currently divided into two zoning classifications, C-1, Local Business and R-U-F, Rural Urban Farm. The R-U-F portion of the property is in the process of being changed to C-1. City Council gave first reading to that rezoning on April 4. The site plan shows three apartment buildings, each building would contain eight units for a total of 24 units. Building number one is located towards the front portion of the

site. Building number two would occupy the rear including the small R-U-F district, that is in the process of being rezoned, and then building number three is located between buildings number one and two along the south side of the property. There would be a two-way private street from Middlebelt that would provide access to all three buildings. Parking is distributed throughout the site available in the front and the sides of all three buildings. The plan shows a total of 42 parking spaces, which represents a ratio of 1.75 spaces per unit. All three apartment buildings are identical in size, shape, and design. The buildings would be two stories in height and contain four apartments on each floor. Each unit would have two bedrooms, a living, dining area kitchen, one and a half baths and a walk-in closet. All units would be approximately 813 square feet in area. The gross floor area per building total 7,130 square feet, and each building would have a footprint area of about 3,774 feet. The combined total floor area of all three buildings would be 21,390 square feet, which represents a usable floor area in percentage of live area or floor area ratio of roughly 34%. Building height would be roughly 29 feet from grade to roof peak and as you can see from the site plan, there are a network of sidewalks that are shown around the buildings as well as the parking areas. Looking at the design of the buildings themselves, they would be constructed out of brick with stone accents the roofs would be peaked and would consist of asphalt shingles. Fiber cement siding would be used on the gable ends of the apartment buildings. To the north and the east and south are single family homes. Zone N-1 and R-U-F. The lots along Grandon Avenue measure about 62 feet by 113 feet and consists mostly of ranch style homes with detached garages. Buildings number one and two at their closest point would be roughly 20 feet and 30 feet from the rear lot lines, respectively. The plan proposes to separate the residential district from the apartment complex with a six-foot-high vinyl flat fence and plantings to the south are homes that are part of the Newport Park condominium development. The Livonia Vision Master Plan designates the subject property as medium density residential. This corresponds to a density of roughly 5 to 14 dwelling units per acre, with 24 units on 1.45 acres. The proposed multifamily housing development would have an overall density of 16 and a half dwelling units per acre. This is slightly more than what the Master Plan recommends by approximately four units. Planning Commission held a public hearing on this item on May 17. They failed to reach a unanimous decision on the on the petition and hence it was denied and as a reason for the appeal this evening. So, with that Mr. President, I will answer any questions you may have.

Jolly: Thank you sir. At this time, I'll call up the petitioner if there is anything you'd like to address at this time, please go to the podium and identify yourself.

Fakih: Good evening, my name is Sam Fakih. My address at 16030 Michigan Avenue Suite 200 Dearborn, Michigan. I am one of the partners and one of the developers of a company called Maple Real Estate Investment, which has this property under contract which has submitted this application. If I may continue. First, I want to thank you for the opportunity and the time that you've given me to present this project to you. This is a special project for me. We've

been going at it for close to close to a year now. We have had numerous meetings with the Planning Commission, between rezoning meetings, public meetings, as well as non-public meetings, discussion sessions, and we, I can stand in front of you today and say that we've listened and I think, with confidence, I can say that we probably addressed every single concern that has been raised in those numerous meetings. I would say, more than 10 meetings. The latest revisions that we've made, we have moved one of the buildings, the one to the rear, and I think it's building number two, we've moved that away from the property line to increase, the distance between that building and the homes on Grandon Street. At this point, with that being about maybe 20, I think 25 or 27 feet, to the property line and another 50 feet to the resident to the residences on Grandon, you have about safely about 80 feet from the building to the to the first residents on Grandon. We also changed the plans to have a six-foot fence, vinyl fencing all the way around, which encompasses and creates privacy. Not only did we do that, we also we also changed the plans so we can have evergreen trees. These are meant for privacy they are 10 to 12 feet in height that when planted. In years they grow sometimes to 15 to 20 feet in height. In discussing this subject matter with our architect, he's confident that complete sight line between any windows and our property and any windows in the ranch homes on Grandon, there is no direct sight line. So, that would give complete privacy when you have a 10 to 12-foot tree there with the heights of the windows in our property and the heights of the windows in the ground and residences along the side of Grandon. Not only did we massively change the landscaping to increase privacy, we have also moved the dumpsters away from the property line. We also lessened the parking and put more landscaping, just to make the property prettier. Lastly, I think I may have covered the last three or four changes that we did for the plans. So, with that being said, I stand here and I'm very excited to present this project and ask that you consider it and hopefully you will get your approval.

Jolly: Okay, thank you very much, sir. I'm going to correct something just very quickly. We have not had any nonpublic meetings in regard to this matter of the Council, the Planning Commission or the Zoning Board of Appeals. You may have met with individuals or other entities. So, there were no official nonpublic meetings.

Fakih: Let me correct myself, I meant to say study sessions.

Jolly: Thank you very much sir. At this, is there anyone from the Council who would like to, Mr. Bahr.

Bahr: Thank you Mr. Chair. Through the Chair to Mark, when you made that comment, did you say four units more than the Master Plan, you're talking about density and about more units on the property than what the Master Plan would suggest or maybe help me figure out what it was.

Taormina: That's precisely it. So, the Master Plan has a suggestion relative to density. It's a guide and in the Master Plan, it recommends between 5 and 14 dwelling units per acre. In this case, we're looking at 16 and a half, so it's a slight increase over what is recommended.

Bahr: Ok so the Master Plan looked at this originally as a commercial property, right?

Taormina: Originally, that is correct. I'm not sure I'd have to go back, take a look at the prior versions of the Master Plan to see when it changed from non-residential to residential. The current Master Plan does show this as medium density residential.

Bahr: Then I had a question for the petitioner. Just in reviewing the planning commission notes, there was a potential issue with double fencing, you know, with existing fences that are here along the perimeter. Have you had a chance to talk to neighbors or have a plan for how we can potentially avoid that?

Fakih: I have not, but we are here and committed to this project with making everybody and all our neighbors happy. So, my suggestion would be, and we are willing to knock on every door and say, "Would you like us to remove your chain link fence and keep our six-foot vinyl fence?" If the answer is yes, we would pick that up and remove their fence. We are even willing to not place our vinyl fencing and put a gap in our fence if somebody doesn't want a six-foot vinyl fence and they'll still have the privacy because we're going to have the evergreens there. So, either we're willing to work with every neighbor, whether to remove the vinyl fence and put a gap or remove their fencing, or if they want to, if they prefer to keep both fences, that's fine too. I mean, we're committed to being good neighbors. So, whatever it takes, we will do.

Bahr: All right. Thank you.

Donovic: Mr. President.

Jolly: Mr. Donovic.

Donovic: Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you for you for being here tonight, sir. Thanks for wanting to invest in the city of Livonia and thank you to all the residents for being here as well. I have a few questions. One, I did want to touch base on the double fencing. As I was watching the Planning Commission, I know that was a topic that came up. So, you are just saying to clarify, that you would, at your expense, remove after talking to the residents, you would remove the chain link fence and then you erect the vinyl fencing? Correct?

Fakih: Absolutely. We have plans for vinyl fencing, but we're willing to put a gap if somebody has an issue with that vinyl fence if they don't want to vinyl fence.

Donovic: Thank you. I do realize that there is a double fencing in the city of Livonia, otherwise you'd have to have the ZBA, and I do appreciate that you would fix that because I don't want to see double fencing. Unfortunately, a resident doesn't want to move their chain link fence. I hope they wouldn't, because I think that if this was to pass that a nice vinyl fence would be a lot more aesthetically pleasing and just better for grass and weeds or whatnot. My question to add was, in regard to lampposts and others' lampposts around the perimeter, because it seems like there's a sidewalk around the entire development in the back corner, it would be the Northeast corner, is a pavilion of some sort of I believe?

Fakih: We wanted a sense of community. So, what we did is we did a walkway all around the project, as long as we put a gazebo in that corner. So, it's just a sense of community. If somebody wants to walk around the neighborhood, they could. There are a few benches, beautiful landscaping, so that's just a walkway with a gazebo in the back.

Donovic: Okay and those lampposts. Do you plan to make sure that you don't have any kind of light pollution that goes into neighbor's backyards? I know you talked about the big trees that those take years to grow. What kind of shielding and whatnot for those lampposts?

Fakih: I believe we discussed the lampposts early on with I think the building or planning department. We do have specs on those lampposts. The architect is here. He may be able to answer some questions, but we do have it in the package, in terms of the specs on the actual light posts.

Donovic: Okay, thank you and I will say, I like that the trash cans are moved. I don't want to see a dumpster enclosure. I remember the original plan was abutting to one of the properties along Oxbow side. I'm pleased to see those removed. I like the retention ponds. Another question, what is your take on what our Master Plan recommends, a certain amount of density, with you being four units over that 20 number? I'm not necessarily stuck on that, but I would like to understand kind of the idea behind that. Do you have to have 4 over or is there any discussion there?

Fakih: Sure, I think my answer to that is maybe twofold. One is, I mean, we're building a nice looking complex, three million probably. We're estimating costs of three to three and a half million dollars. Little bit over a million for each building. Why we're doing it, would have been higher end, nicer finishes. Why we're trying to attract a little bit more professionals, college graduates, or maybe somebody that's, that's retired and doesn't want to take care of their lawns. So, the from a cost basis, that extra four units helps cover those expenses, when you're rebuilding a three to three and a half million-dollar project. Now, can we slim it down to 20? We could, but that would require us to go down to two buildings and it would probably require us to make longer buildings. We wanted smaller buildings that look like a colonial home and that's what these buildings look like. It's a 3,700 square foot building for each

building. It looks like a 3,700 square foot home. So, if we slim it down by four and make the buildings longer, it will start looking more of an apartment building rather than someone who's more of a regular quality of home. So, that's why we chose to continue on with having three buildings, scattered them around to make it a community scene, and stick with the four units. We didn't think that four units was too overly, we thought that four units was still okay. Especially, when it's a recommendation by the Livonia Master Plan. It's not an ordinance or a law that requires that anymore.

Donovic: Ok, thank you sir, I appreciate that.

Toy: Mr. President.

Jolly: Miss Toy.

Toy: Thank you, Mr. President, if I may to the petitioner. Sir, you've alluded several times about how you want to be a friendly neighbor, but yet you never have even contacted the neighbors. I find that a little peculiar, that you haven't even made an attempt to go to them. You've had at least two meetings with the planning commission. Am I correct on that?

Fakih: Absolutely.

Toy: Okay. And they denied you. What, twice now?

Fakih: I don't know that I, we were denied twice. I think the last vote in front of the Planning Commission was a tie, which was to have the effect of a denial and that's why we're here. So, every time I've made a meeting and neighbors show up, I've taken the time to speak with every neighbor that's here and I've taken the time to address every issue that they have raised in those meetings. So, to answer your question, although I have not knocked on doors, I have spoken with every neighbor that has come out and any concerns that they've raised, whether publicly or through discussions with them personally, we have addressed.

Toy: How many would you say that was sir, about?

Fakih: Speaking with individual residents, at least three or four.

Toy: Three or four. How many people live in the area that surround your site that you're proposing sir, would you guess?

Fakih: Live in the area?

Toy: Where you're proposing sir, around the area where the residential is.

Fakih: Probably about nine.

Toy: Nine people live in that area? Alrighty, and I guess my other question would be, why apartments? Why not condos? That was asked of me as a Council person in the city. That's why I'm asking you as a petitioner.

Fakih: I guess why not apartments?

Toy: Sir, answer my question.

Fakih: Sure, I'll answer the question. In terms of cost-wise with the cost of construction, if you are to build condos on that site, they would cost an amount that you would not be able to sell it in the open market in that area. We did a study and that's what it shows. So, in terms of apartments, it made sense and made sense as an investment. Obviously, it made sense to develop a piece of land that's been sitting there, really vacant, for now probably 20-30 years. It's an oddly shaped piece of land and it's hard to develop commercial property on there. We thought it was a nice idea and we thought we'd put out a beautiful project that benefits the neighborhood. It's something that's nice, that's new, that's brick, that's stone and I think it not only complement, it improves the area, the surrounding areas.

Toy: Then what will your rents be around, sir?

Fakih: Rents are going to be \$1750 to \$1950.

Toy: You think you'll get that?

Fakih: Absolutely.

Toy: Okay. The reason I asked that is because we have another proposal just down the street from you, but yet we just developed some nice-looking homes in that area as well, and I think that, you know, the taxpayers in that area have been there an awful long time. That's an older part of our community and, quite frankly, I kind of like open areas a little bit. We have a beautiful park down there at Clement Circle as well, with a pool. People enjoy that living. I appreciate you trying to invest some money in this community, but I'm troubled by the fact, two things. You haven't really talked to the neighborhood about it yet and perhaps you'll do that by the time we vote on this. Also, sir, the vinyl fence bothers me. I haven't seen a lot of vinyl fences in Livonia, with commercial, even a greenbelt there would be very nice, and I know you're going to put some vegetation in there, I read that as well, sir. So, I appreciate your investment and your enthusiasm for our city, but I would hope you've carried that over.

Fakih: Thank you, I appreciate the comments.

Jolly: Any other comments, Ms. McIntyre.

McIntyre: Through the through the Chair to the Petitioner please. One of the issues that concerns me is, Sergeant Sczepanski had some concerns about limited parking, and I wanted to ask you, and maybe Mark, and that is concerning to me. We know that we have problems, whether it's a commercial site, or apartment homes, if there's not sufficient parking, and he indicated that he has some concerns about the limited number of parking relative to the number of units. So, how many parking spots, I didn't count? How many parking spots per unit? So, total units, 24 and how many parking spots?

Fakih: We originally had 2 per unit. So, we had 48 and I think when we increased the landscaping and rearranged the buildings to distance them from the neighboring residents, I think we lost three, am I correct, Mark?

Taormina: It went from 48 to 42, so 6.

McIntyre: 48 to 42 so we lost six. I am concerned if there's not sufficient parking for two vehicles per unit. I understand that not every unit is going to have two occupants, but you have visitors, right, you have guests, and that parking situation is concerning to me. I do appreciate the changes that you've made to increase the greenbelt and move things around a little bit to pull back from the property lines, but I am concerned about that.

Fakih: Sure, the trend is that a lot of city parking requirements are a lot more stringent than what it should be.

McIntyre: Excuse me, you're not going to get anywhere with me on this topic. Well, I'm just telling you, commercial is one thing, okay, and we know that the data indicates that parking requirements for commercial probably needs to be re-examined, residential, I don't think that there's data there that indicates that there's a decrease in the need for parking like there is commensurate with commercial or anything else.

Fakih: I believe we could address that by taking out one of the dumpsters and having two dumpsters and more pickups and more parking. So, if the, if that is an issue that needs to be addressed, I think we could do it. I don't think that there are requirements for having three dumpsters on this property. We just put it, just because we said let's put a dumpster for each building, but we could go down to two dumpsters and have more pickups and increased parking if need to.

Jolly: Okay if there's nothing else from the Council.

Donovic: Mr. President?

Jolly: Yes, sir.

Donovic: Thank you, Mr. President, to Mr. Taormina. What is the parking requirement then? I know that originally, he had the 48, now it's down to 42 to provide

more landscaping to shift that building number two away from the residential outlines. Is it within the ordinance for the parking spaces?

Taormina: So, the ordinance recommends two spaces per dwelling unit, but it also allows us to look at alternative standards. In particular, the Institute of Traffic Engineers Parking Generation manual. So, in referencing those standards, there's a 95% confidence interval that parking for these types of smaller rental projects, they can park as low as 1.16, or 1.26 parking spaces per unit. So, we're above that level at 1.75. We felt comfortable that the 1.75 would be adequate, but as was indicated, if it's something that Council is concerned with, they probably could make an adjustment and add a few more spaces in a manner that would not adversely impact the residents.

Donovic: Just a comment from me, I'd prefer to not lose trash cans. I think the more availability, accessibility to dumpster enclosures for residents, I think is a lot better for the success of this development and for the success of the surrounding community, as opposed to adding a few more parking spots. However, if you would maybe find some availability for parking spots, and not losing green space, the nice landscaping, but I just had comments. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Jolly: Okay, thank you. So, Mr. Petitioner, if you don't mind, please have a seat. At this time, I'm going to open up the hearing to public comments, as the petitioner, even though the comments will be directed towards me. A lot of these comments, I'm sure, will pose questions or concerns of the residents. I ask that you take notes and I'll leave you an opportunity at the end to address comments that you wish to address, okay? With that being said, anybody who's here to address the Council, in regard to this project, from the public, now's your opportunity to do so. If you would like to do so, please approach the podium on this side of the room and you have three minutes to address the Council at this time. Good evening, please tell me your name and address please.

S. Matusz: Sarah Matusz, I live at 29197 Grandon, first house, right there. And I just, I've been here for 45 years. I love the neighborhood. It's been good to us, but I would have never moved here if I thought it was going to be right next to apartment buildings. I just don't feel that people are going to take care of it that well, as if you own it. And I don't see where all this parking is going to be a big problem, I do see it, I'm sorry, because what if you have visitors? You're not even having two parking spots for one of the units. So, people, two people two cars, where they are going to park? So, this is my son.

G. Matusz: Yeah, hi, I'm Glen Matusz. I'm Sarah's son and I grew up in that property actually, and I am here to help out today, to express my mother's concerns for this development. What I did notice when he was showing the plan is that I didn't see any changes from the first time to this time. You made it sound like there was change or improvements made between the last meeting that you had and today. From the picture that I take, from last-time's meeting, it

didn't seem like there were any changes at all. So, it looks like the identical plan that was presented last time, that was denied. It was said multiple times that there's an excess of the density of the persons per square, the amount of people that are living on a property is already exceeding what's allowed. So, gives me a little bit of concern that it would even be considered in that case, but yet, it is. Parking is probably, as my mom's stated, is probably one of the worst issues I can see. You say 42 spaces, but I was sitting there listening. I'm thinking, well, some of those spaces are probably handicapped spaces. So, I can't see those would be used, you know. In the wintertime, where's the snow going to go? So that's going to consume some of the spaces, and if there's visitors, of course, you know, where are they going to end up parking? Right up and down Grandon, and there's really no other street to park on. So, you know, that just adds to the, what I think the overcrowding problem is probably going to happen on this property. The fence, it's a little disappointing that the developer didn't come to the homeowners to discuss the fencing with them. It was mentioned the vinyl fence, you know, talking in the parking lot with some of the other residents in the area. Sounded like they would prefer something a little more permanent, that a little long lasting. The lifespan of a vinyl fence, you know, what is that? It's not durable, right? It maybe lasts 10 years. We would certainly like to know if there's any information about the lifespan of the fence and should there be a problem with the fence, who's going to address it? What else?

S. Matusz: Well, the condos right next door, he said the area didn't support the condos but there's condos right there. Right next door to it, there are condos.

G. Matusz: Let's see what else. What other problems did we have with this? The standoff distance, my mother lives to the closest building on the property and it was estimated that it was about 20 feet to the property, actually is less than 20 feet to her property line. I thought there was a rule that it can't be less than 20 feet? We're kind of already bending, it seems like every rule in the book, just to kind of force this on this little piece of property. The buildings look nice.

Jolly: I'm going to stop you sir; you did your three minutes. Just for the record, I did start the timer over when you started. Are there any other neighbors or people from the public who have comments, at this time? If you plan on making comments, I would ask that you move to the side of the room so that you're ready to go. If you plan on addressing anything, please be on the side, for time's sake. Good evening, ma'am. Tell me your name and address please.

Rowlands: Hi, I am Felicity Rowlands. I live at 9081 Newport right in the condominiums. We weren't able, my fiancé' and I, weren't able to make it for the last meeting. We were sick with COVID. So, when I saw the appeal come forward, we definitely wanted to be here today. I didn't decide to speak until I was able to hear the petitioner. So, I know you talked about the light pollution and the windows, and everything was referred to, as the homes, well the condos are two stories. So, what is the light pollution going to be for us? Right? The second thing is, is there's a lot of wooded area in between us and that lot.

There's a lot of wildlife that lives in there and it looked to me in the plan that most of those trees are going to be torn down. And why not condos? I agree with that. It keeps the value of our property. As far as the chain link fences are concerned, are they only going to offer to put the backside of the vinyl fence up, or are they going to put all the sides for the neighbors on Grandon? So, they're going to have chain links on the side and a big vinyl fence on the back? I would be concerned with that if I were them. Look, I lived there for six years. I love being there. I don't plan on going anywhere anytime soon, but the last thing I want to see is a vinyl fence between myself and apartment buildings. It's going to decrease the value of my property when it comes to resale value. There's definitely more than nine people that live in that area. We would see five buildings along with just the condos, and that's not even the whole complex. Not once has anybody came to talk to us to find out how we feel, to your point, and I appreciate and respect that. I just don't feel as though that apartments is the right fit for that location. Thank you.

Jolly: Anybody else with public comments? Good evening, sir. Your name address please.

D. Shekell: Good evening, my name is Don Shekell. I live at 29161 Grandon. A number of concerns with this whole project. I've been living there on this street for 66 years and open space behind us. The reference about moving out of the buildings away from the lot line. Ours is very close, he said he moved out there, how many people on feet that they moved it?

Jolly: This is not a question-and-answer period, sir. So please make your comments.

D. Shekell: Okay, it's too close, I don't care, you can put up the vinyl fencing, it's six feet. I got people in my neighborhood that are taller than six foot and you can see right over. You talked about putting in pine trees. It's going to take a long time for those pine trees to grow and the other thing about pine trees, is that you can see right in between. You got the buildings are going to be two stories right behind us. There's no privacy. They are talking about, oh, they don't have windows to see us. I can see out my window, what do I get to see, a brick wall from an apartment complex? I don't want to see that. The other issue I have with this whole thing was, everything got changed in the zoning to the C-1. Okay, the reason for the change in the C-1 was what? So, you could use all the waivers to put in more units that would be allowed in that area, less parking for a number of people. What is it, two-bedroom apartments? Okay, the two-bedroom apartments allows so many people to live in each apartment. So, I referenced the project they are trying to develop over on Plymouth Road, and there's a lot of issues with that. One of the things was the neighborhood is how it went in. Building those apartments would adversely affect our neighborhood, which it will, it's going to affect just a sampling with what we have to look around there, our property values, it's going to affect it. And I think as residents, the longtime residents of the city, I think we need a little more respect to that. One thing that I find very

interesting, the Planning Commission, when they were going for that the complex on Plymouth Road, it was denied. Part of the reason that it was denied because of the adverse effect of the neighborhood. The buildings didn't match the neighborhood homes, and all that, and I found that it was designed for a number of reasons, but definitely is that it didn't meet the look on your 21, whatever you guys want to call it, specs. And for a lot of the reasons, it was denied.

Jolly: Thank you, sir. That's your three minutes.

D. Shekell: Okay, I have one last comment.

Jolly: You're all set sir. The rules on the meeting allow for three minutes per person. If there's anybody else from the public that would like to speak at this time?

K. Shekell: My name is Karen Shekell. I live at 29165 Grandon. Sorry, we're just going to finish this up because we did this as a group venture, so here we go. Big concern of putting in such a large complex and maybe people don't think that's big, but you shove into that tiny little piece of land. It's too big. It's too much. It's too close.

Jolly: We can't do this during the meeting. We can't have two people talking.

K. Shekell: It's a concern. We have concerns, we don't want anybody that close. We don't want the noise level that's going to be there. We agree. Apartments are not a good fit, not a good fit. You want to throw some condos in there. I'd be happy if the city of Livonia just bought a piece of land. It doesn't cost that much for the city, and let it stay green. We don't have that much green space around us. Good gosh, let's take every tiny little piece on the south side Livonia and develop it into what, apartments? No, no, we have a problem with it. So, thank you very much.

Jolly: Thank you. Is there anybody else from the public? Going once. You've got about a minute left.

K. Shekell: My husband John talked to so many people in our neighborhood. People said they were going to write letters. Some people said they would come. I don't know if many letters got to you, but I know a lot of people email them to City Council and the Mayor. So, I'm hoping you've got those, and I thought maybe they would be read today.

Jolly: Just for your awareness. We don't read people's emails and meetings like that, within the purview of the Council. We did receive some emails, in regard to this project. At this time, any last public comments? Going once, going twice. Public comments are now closed on this matter. I will ask the petitioner to come back up to the podium. Sir, if you wish, please address any concerns that were raised by the residents at this time.

Fakih: I want to thank all the residents who are coming out and I will try to address it. A lot of the concerns of the residents, I have heard them in the past, and we've tried to address them. In terms of density, I think we've discussed it at this at this session, as well as other sessions. We don't believe that we're violating or overly, there's a rule or an ordinance that that has that density that we have violated, it was a recommendation, and we don't think that we're that overly over that recommendation. In terms of the vinyl fencing and last thing, obviously, any vinyl fencing that we would install, we would maintain and replace as needed. So, we don't have an issue with, it's our fence. So, we would maintain that and replace it. We don't have any issue with writing that down and working with all the homeowners. With regards to maintaining the property, we're trying to build something nice. In doing so we've done all the landscaping, it's 24 units, it's three buildings. I believe, I kept on hearing that we're trying to jam this into such a small piece of property. I guess, you know, my thought is that it's not jamming a lot of buildings in a small piece of property. We thought we did a nice job of designing it. It really has probably very low, if not zero impact, on the neighborhood, because we have an exit and entrance off of Middlebelt. So, you don't have residents of the complex that are driving in the streets on Grandon or anywhere else, because they are entering and exiting the complex off Middlebelt. With regards to the mature trees between the condos and the complex, we don't have any plans of taking any trees. There's, I think a lot of the mature trees are on the condo property. So, in terms of, I don't know if that shows it, but there's a lot of mature trees on the condo property, as well as some of the mature trees that we're keeping. I think it shows in the landscaping plan that we've cut the few as well. So, I think there's still a lot of trees that would, I guess, keep that privacy between the condos next door and our property. Light pollution, again, I think we've addressed it in the light poles. I don't think that our light poles are that high, but obviously, if it means that we have to put some guards, if it bothers the neighbors, we could put guards so where they shine only in one direction to not, I guess, be a nuisance to the neighbors. Lastly, we do have a management company, and we're probably going to hire a local management company. We've done business with a few that are from Livonia, and we're planning on hiring of a Livonia management company for two reasons. One, it's close. Two, usually what these management companies do, they come onto the property, we have a schedule, come out to the property, different times of the day, do a walkthrough of the common areas, make sure that there's no trash and everything's in place. If there are any issues with the property, they will address it. That's what they're there for. They have contractors, they have maintenance people. We want to build and maintain something nice. We're not coming in here and dumping three and a half million dollars and walking away from this property. We want to maintain this property, so we can charge the rents that we need to charge for us to be successful in this project, and we can't do that if you don't maintain your property. We have brand new buildings, and we're going to maintain those buildings for us to attract the market that we are looking to attract. We're trying to attract millennials. That's what Livonia speaks for. Millennials, which are 25 to 41 years old. These are young professionals. These are people that are

starting out that may not qualify for a home or may not want to get into a commitment of a home, and they want to rent. I rented out of college. There's nothing wrong with having, renting, and there's nothing wrong with people that are renting. I feel like there's a lot of, I guess, negative comments that apartments are going to bring values down. Well, I mean, how do we know that? We have a brand-new project, a nice complex that's fully enclosed, and we are going after young professionals and people that that want to have a nice community, while living in Livonia and take advantage of what Livonia has to offer. So, I welcome the opportunity to continue with this project and hopefully, we can persuade you to approve it.

Toy: Mr. Chair?

Jolly: Miss Toy.

Toy: Part of the reason Livonia has been so successful is because it's been built by the families that live here and the businesses that thrive here. This area you're proposing, sir, you're forgetting you're four units over here, as well, according to our zoning laws, there have been your eight cars less as well. I'm having a problem with this and I'm sure you can tell that. I've lived here since the 50s. I grew up, in that part of Livonia, when we first moved here. I know that area. I know Livonia. This doesn't belong in that area. It really doesn't sir, it's too packed. If you were to bring us two buildings, with a lot of landscaping, and maybe another ingress and egress out on Middlebelt Road, I'd be clapping for you, but this just is very tight, sir. So, I'm going to offer a denying resolution on this. Thank you for coming to Livonia, but I want to keep it very nice. Thank you.

Fakih: May I respond?

Jolly: At this time, I'm going to look for direction from the Council. Mr. Bahr.

Bahr: I do have a few questions for the petitioner. You mentioned earlier, just with the question of whether condos would make sense here, and you said you looked at it. First of all, I understand the uniqueness of the shape of this property and the challenges that that presents to you, and I can see why you're looking at this with that. I can understand the economics you're dealing with, but if we were to look at this, this is a hypothetical to make a point, if this property would be developed with the property to the south where the condos currently are, it's not hard to envision a continuous street through there, that's an extension of those current condos. I'm not an architect, but it's not hard to envision what that might look like. Is that something that you guys looked at, as to whether there could be something of this piece of property that we essentially extend?

Fakih: The simple answer to that is no. We did not look for any extensions, we just looked at the project itself, and in terms of cost of construction, you know, in terms of building code...

- Bahr: You don't have go any further, because, actually, I'm looking at one view of it, but looking at the view that Mark put up there, it's not difficult to see challenges you would be facing, so don't even bother, I put my question back.
- Fakih: I wanted to point out that the condo is next door. I mean, the buildings are really next to each other, and I wonder, and I'm pretty sure that the density for that project is...
- Bahr: Obviously, it's in your best interest to let that question go right now. The other question I have for you is, those condos on Newport Way are two story, did you, by chance, know you weren't prepped with this question, but if you, by chance, know how height of your proposed buildings compare to the condo buildings that are currently there?
- Fakih: I think they're very comparable, if not the same. I mean, I believe ours is 29 feet, and I'm pretty, Ron, do you know?
- Unknown: Yeah, I don't know.
- Fakih: Are they comparable in terms of height here?
- Bahr: Okay, I can see. I know what my assumptions are based on, what I would assume that they're comparable, then the next question I have is in response to concerns Councilwoman Toy expressed about the density. The one building on your proposal here today has the most potential and I know the measures you're taking to eliminate the sightlines and I've seen enough of these projects to understand that, but is the building, what's the one South or outside of the northeast corner of that building?
- Taormina: Two.
- Bahr: Building two, have you considered making that a one-story building? Which would I believe take you down to the density that's required and eliminate any concerns about building sightlines to nearby neighborhoods?
- Fakih: I did not consider taking it to a one-story building. Again, in terms of just the project, when you're developing a project, especially with all of the funding that we're doing with landscaping and everything else to prep the site, so it just made sense with the 24 unit. I do want to say it again that I, you know, I was under the impression that it's a recommendation by the Master Plan. It's not. So had there been a requirement of certain density or a requirement that it be certain units we would have tried...
- Bahr: You're not wrong for proposing a two story. I mean, we're having a discussion here. So yeah, that's it on that. So I'll just say, obviously, I understand the resident's concerns with this and just, if for no other reason, than the aesthetics of backing up to what's right now a fairly wooded lot, I can understand Councilmembers probably say this, but that house where I grew

up, had a field that we played in behind it for years, and it was developed into a neighborhood so I can get that. It's with any of these types of things there's always take seriously what the residents want. You also have to look at the fact that somebody owns this property too, and we can't just blanket statement, say, you need to keep this green space. I mean, there's property rights with the people that own this too. So, we have to consider what's being proposed. When you consider the fact that this property is currently zoned commercial, and I'm looking at, you know, a potential commercial property there versus this, particularly with the measures that have been taken with the changes that have been made, and there have been changes made because I've got the plans that were from the Planning Commission in front of us here, so I can see those changes. I do think that this is a potentially very nice development for that area. I honestly in balancing those things, have things before us and through us, I know Councilwoman Toy put a denying on this, and this is not because I plan to vote this way, but I'd like to offer improving for consideration. So, we have an approving and denying on the table when this goes in public meeting, and we'll have time between now and then to weigh factors in your vote. Thanks, Mr. Chair.

Jolly: Thank you.

Donovic: Mr. President.

McIntyre: I think Ms. McIntyre, Mr. Donovic.

Donovic: Thank you Councilwoman McIntyre. A couple of quick comments. I know that to the south, there's a 40-foot easement in between this property and the condos. So, I'm not sure how many trees sit on that easement currently. And then in terms of elevation, I'm assuming with the roof pitches, and just common residential building codes, those elevations should be similar, but that would be nice if we could figure out that answer to see what the elevation of the condos to the south and your proposal will be. I know you mentioned it's about 29 feet from the peak. I do hope that you would consider, and this is just something to think about, and I do understand the concerns about vinyl fences and their long-term maintenance. It would be nice to consider some sort of masonry wall however, I think that might be an issue, because I've had some conversations where there's also easements. So, you may not even be able to do some sort of masonry wall along the perimeter, because there are certain easements in terms of footings whether or not you can go so deep in the ground, so that would be nice to look into that. But I do think even when I talk about it, that might not be a possibility. I look forward to further discussions about this. Thank you and thank you to the residents and Petitioner points, thank you Mr. Chair.

Jolly: Ms. McIntyre.

McIntyre: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I appreciated all of the comments and concerns about this development. One of the things that we hear a lot is, why doesn't the city

buy this and turn it into parkland. Livonia has 1,400 acres of parkland and extensive recreational facilities. In fact, we have some little park green spaces here and there that it's not feasible for us to maintain. So, it's not in the City's economic best interest to buy up odd parcels of land and turn them into greenspace, because the tax dollars then have to pay for that and maintain it, etcetera, etcetera. Nobody ever likes development next to their houses, none of us would like it, but to Mr. Bahr's point, this is privately-owned property that is zoned commercial, and C-1 allows for retail establishments. I don't think that anyone would be in favor of a strip mall, I'm guessing, adjacent to your property either. I do think that the developer, there was additional opportunity to engage the residents beforehand with some discussions and hearing their concerns. I appreciate that you've responded. I would like to offer, we have an approving and a denying, I would like to offer a resolution for putting this into Committee of the Whole which would give us an opportunity to talk to the developer and residents at the same time and push these questions a little bit with further detail.

Jolly: Thank you Ms. McIntyre. So, at this time, we have three motions on the floor for consideration at the next voting meeting where this will come out. I'm not sure if we have a date for that just yet. It probably will not be the next regular meeting, but the meeting following that. We have a denying, an approving, and a Committee of the Whole. One, or probably one of those, or potentially more than one of those will be voted on at the next meeting, and that will be the direction of the council going forward. So, at this time, we appreciate the residents and the petitioner coming out this evening, giving us your perspectives and helping us to understand the situation a bit better. At this time, I will close public hearing number one.

As there were no further questions or comments, the Public Hearing was declared closed at 8:01 p.m.

**CITY OF LIVONIA
PUBLIC HEARING**

Minutes of Meeting Held on Monday, July 18, 2022

A Public Hearing of the Council of the City of Livonia was held at the Livonia City Hall Auditorium on **Monday, July 18, 2022.**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jim Jolly, President
 Laura Toy, Vice President

Scott Bahr
Rob Donovic
Kathleen McIntyre
Scott Morgan

MEMBERS ABSENT: Brandon McCullough

OTHERS PRESENT: Paul Bernier, Assistant City Attorney
 Mark Taormina, Planning and Economic Development Director

The Public Hearing was called to order at 8:05 p.m. with President Jim Jolly presiding. This item is regarding an appeal of the denial of the Planning Commission regarding Petition 2022-03-02-10 submitted by Excellerated Towing & Recovery requesting waiver use approval to operate a vehicle tow yard at 12780 Wayne Road, located on the east side of Wayne Road just south of Schoolcraft Road in the Northwest ¼ of Section 28. This item will move to the Regular Meeting of **August 8, 2022.**

The Public Hearing is now open. There were 2 persons in the audience.

Jolly: I will go to Mark Taormina, our Planning and Economic Development Director. Can you give us an initial presentation?

Taormina: Thank you, of course. Again, a request to operate a vehicle tow yard. In this case the property is located on East side of Wayne Road south of Schoolcraft Road. You can see from the zoning map on the screen that this site is zoned M-1 and is surrounded by properties that are under the light manufacturing classification. The existing building on the property measures roughly 6,000 square feet. The property itself is a little under seven tenths of an acre. Its 100 feet wide by 295 feet in depth. The 6,000 square foot building on the site includes a shop area which is about 4,800 square feet and then 1,200 square feet of office space. You'll pick up on the site plan better than the area here, that parking is available on both the south and the east sides of the building. The proposed tow storage yard is shown in the rear yard. So, that would be on the east side of the building. There's a fenced in area that's about 13,000 square feet in size, it does contain a gravel surface, it's gated. There is a truck well on the front of the building. However, I don't believe that is needed for the proposed operation. There are eight customer and employee spaces that

are available on the south side of the building and then the tow yard itself would have the capacity of storing roughly 25 recovered vehicles in company tow trucks. I'll just note that the site plan does not show any trash containers according to the petitioner. All refuse, including tires and auto parts would be stored inside the building until such time that they would be taken away by a contractor. The frontage does require one full sized tree as well as one ornamental tree and 10 shrubs. The plan shows one full sized tree two existing ornamental trees and then 18 shrubs. So, landscaping would be complied with. There are no exterior lights other than what's mounted on the rear wall of the building and then a single sign would be allowed for the business totaling 25 square feet. The Planning Commission reviewed this item at their May 17 public hearing and denied the petition. Hence the reason for tonight's appeal. Thank you.

Jolly: Thank you, Mr. Taormina. Is the petitioner here? Please give us your initial remarks, your name and address.

Sever: Good Evening. Terry Sever, representing the petitioner, 37172 6 Mile Road, Century 21 real estate office. I just want to first thank the Councilmembers that have worked with us. You know, we were here for another project that did not go very far with us, and the owner still wants to locate in Livonia. That project was looking like it was further and further away from us to the one on Rosati. So, we looked around and found a location that was an existing building that was for lease. So, I'd like to thank the Councilmembers that have met with us in Committee of the Whole, other things. It's good to see Councilwoman Toy and meet her in in the Council Chambers. They say a picture's worth 1000 words, 1000 words. So, there's 50,000 words in there. You know, I've been involved with this, I met Mr. Fields back last fall, and started working with him. I've stayed involved because I believe in him. He's a young man, as far as I'm concerned, has talent. He's working on trying to get his business to grow. He's dedicated to the location in Livonia. He feels that such an important location for him to improve his business and grow. It's located centrally from where his service is. I just want to say that I am here tonight, and I covered the cost of this hearing, because the night that we were supposed to do a Planning Commission, I had a presentation to make, similar to what I did back the first time at Planning Commission, and I had an emergency come up just before the meeting. I wasn't able to attend. So, I needed to be able to handle it. I saw that the video gave me was very nervous and was deadly some of the points that needed to be made. So, what I like to do is, you have my package there. First, like to start with the pictures that are eight and a half by eleven like this. What we have here, is these are pictures of the business that was there prior to us looking to do something with this property. You can see from the pictures that it was an automotive use, there's a lot of vehicles in and about the building. Some that, in our mind, you would be able to regulate more in terms of those vehicles outside would not be outside. They would not be permitted that side of the where those vehicles are. That would be employee parking, as well as some customer parking. The next page shows a little bit more of that, a lot of, I would say unsightly items on the outside. Then the rear yard. This is a picture of the rear yard. I

don't know if you happen to notice, but when the picture was above there a photograph was shown above, there was even more vehicles or trailers in the backyard. And then the last picture depicts what we would continue to do, that was done in the past, and that is have a roll out trash reception, where it would be kept indoors and on the days it would be emptied, it would be rolled outside. Now go to the big sheet here. What I did is made, since the Planning Commission made reference to a neighborhood and made reference to small manufacturing businesses, what I've done here is, on the far left, you'll see where it says original site. That's the site that we were looking at with Rosati and the Planning Commission passed unanimously to recommend his business go. The current site is just north of that, not more than a block or two. So, we're in the same neighborhood. I think the proposal meets a lot of characteristics that we had on Rosati. It's a dead-end street. It's not really used by the public that much. You can see the number of businesses that have outside storage. Interesting enough. I'm sure when this industrial park was built back 50 years ago, like a lot of buildings that were built, Farmington Hills and other communities, there was a lot of industrial buildings. It was actually an industrial park. There's a lot of manufacturing, but you can see here the extra across the top pictures of the businesses in the area, shows that it's more of a service-oriented businesses occupying this. There's very few, might be 35-40% of the actual businesses, are small manufacturing businesses anymore. So, what I did here was took pictures of the types of businesses that were in the neighborhood, some of which are on the exact same street. The lower left larger picture is a neighbor to the south. It's a pool company. They get regular deliveries to that business. When I was there, it wasn't unusual to see a semi parked in front of our building, as well as two others waiting to get in there. So, addressing the issue of traffic, the towing company is going to offer far less traffic in terms of the day-to-day business. I think we're probably looking at 12 trips maybe 14. A lot of those would be between eight o'clock at night and seven o'clock in the morning. The picture to the right, there's a dance studio right next door. Not a small manufacturing business. The picture below that shows the trucks and a fenced area that's just around the corner. Storage and moving company is just around the corner, and the armory is there, where they have a lot of vehicles that are parked outside along Industrial Drive, and just to point out that there an electric company, there's a graphic company, there's a trade company, there's an auction company and there's service companies. So, in terms of what the ordinance allows or indicates, the ordinance first makes the statement towing companies are allowed. So, if you expanded that thought about a towing company and what kind of towing company would you say fits in this particular area? He's a small-sized towing company, less than 30 parking spots, which is similar to what we have proposed on Rosati Drive. The amount of customers that he'd have come in are minimal. Most of his tows are going to be to a repair shop or collision shop or something like that. And in the picture, you can see the number of outside storage components that are associated with every business. As you go to the east off of Glendale, Stark Road comes into play, and then Stark Road is right at the entrance to this neighborhood, which is Glendale Avenue. I think it's the GFL or GFS or whatever it is, the trash company. And just north of the trash company is the

City of Livonia DPW yard, and you can see that the City of Livonia, obviously DPW is going to have outside storage with their equipment and the vehicles on site.

Jolly: Sir. I think we can appreciate your perspective that you're trying to share with us. I don't think we need to go through every spot on the map here. All of the visual to be developed, I appreciate that.

Sever: Yeah, well, that was my point. Let me just finish by saying this. The larger picture, 8 1/2 x 14 one. The reason I put that in there, is that if you look at it closely, the site I have, okay, if you put Glendale, so you can read it, that's going north. I circled in a black magic marker our location. If you follow the road, Industrial comes down, stop, and then it comes down Wayne Road stops at Glendale. That's kind of a little curve in the road. And you can see that road travels to the west. It doesn't go anywhere. It actually stops and goes right into those two businesses there, those properties. So, this area does not attract through traffic that would be impacted by any additional. And then lastly, I'd just like to make comment that the ordinance allows quite a few different uses, all of which are pictured there. I would venture to say at least 90% of those businesses would be allowed in this location without a waiver and would offer a lot more traffic patterns than this business. And then lastly, difference between our first proposal and this one, is that first proposal was Mr. Fields was looking to build and own and operate. In this particular case, it's going to be a leased building. So, the added protection, you might say to the city, is the owner of the property, who was Ben Crabill, he's a very respected property owner, industrial as well, he has a lot of properties in the area. So, there's that added aspect of making certain that this business could go there. So, I urge you to take a look at the recommendation of the first meeting from the Planning Commission and set the tone and set the requirements and conditions from that particular recommendation, excluding all the building components, and we're not obviously building now, but the screening, those types of things would be in effect, obviously.

Jolly: Thank you sir. If I can have you stay right there, I'm going to go to Council. Mr. Donovic.

Donovic: Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you for being here this evening and actually coming before us. I'll start off by saying one, as one Councilmember, I know you went on about what other businesses are doing. I don't have any jurisdiction over what other businesses in the community are doing. That's the Building and Ordinance. All I have to do, in this moment, is the petition in front of me. I'm not happy with the dumpster situation. I just don't think that's a practical, long-term solution. I understand how busy businesses get, especially a small business, you can be short-staffed, a whole list of things can happen. So, this concept, this idea of rolling out a dumpster on a weekly basis, or bi-weekly basis, determining on when your pickup is, I just don't think that's a good solution. I think that if you're going to be coming here with this building, with this kind of business, you're going to have trash and that trash needs to be disposed of properly and that means having an adequate

dumpster enclosure. Looking at this site, it looks like it was in pretty rough condition. What do you guys intend to do to clean this? I documented a ton of debris everywhere, which again, doesn't help the case of not having a dumpster enclosure. So, what do you plan on doing to clean up all the debris?

Sever: Well, when we took those pictures, that was the current tenant and we entered into an agreement with the owner, that if we got approval from the city to occupy it, we would move in after that was approved. That company there hasn't moved out. After they moved out, Mr. Fields went and did some cleanup. There was an issue with the landscaping. I think they had gotten a warning from Zoning, and he went in cleaned it up, trimmed the trees, did all that. He's in the process of cleaning the vegetation, the back there, he's cleaned up most of it, actually looks 100% better than it did before. So, he will, given the approval from the city, and he can actually occupy before he goes in, he will finish cleaning the back. He's been pulling out some of the weeds and stuff that's been meandering through the cyclone fence. So, his intention is to clean the place up entirely.

Donovic: Okay and pertaining to the actual tow business. Reading through the minutes of the Planning Commission meeting, apparently, this isn't the same purpose, looking through Fields' comments. This isn't the same kind of tow company? Now you're going to target a different type of business? Not insurance vehicles anymore? Maybe I'll search through the minutes, that's what I understand.

Sever: It's the exact same.

Jolly: Your name please.

Fields: Mike Fields.

Donovic: What kind of tow business is this? What kind of vehicles are you targeting? Is this for people on the side of the road, that are stranded, are these insurance vehicles? I think reading through the minutes, I was just kind of trying to clarify what kind of tow business this is.

Fields: We're still doing roadside. I'd say, at this point, that's probably about 90% of our business, especially with the fuel costs, as high as they are right now, and we're on contract to up our rates with a lot of that stuff.

Donovic: And then how many parking spots are back here. So how many vehicles will you park back there at any given time?

Fields: At this point in time, I'd say less than ten, because two of our locations that we use for storage, we no longer needed those. So, within the last two months, we got rid of those. It's a much smoother operation for us just to do roadside only.

Donovic: Okay, and then my last question to Mr. Taormina. If we were to approve this waiver use, does this waiver use stay indefinitely with this property, or does it stay with the tenant, the petitioner and then if that petitioner were to vacate after the lease is over, that waiver use approval goes away?

Taormina: Typically, it would run with the land. Unless Council adopts as part of its resolution, a limit that it would be to this petitioner only, it would have to come back for approval to transfer to a new owner or petition.

Donovic: Thank you, Mr. Taormina. Thank you, Mr. President.

Jolly: Mr. Bahr.

Bahr: Yeah, I'm going to make this pretty simple. Actually, you know, we obviously had the property before and I'll just tell you, I was actually pretty favorable to what you were asking last time. Much to the chagrin of our residents, I thought it made a lot of sense. I believed in what you guys were telling us. Unfortunately, some things came to my attention that gave me reason to question some of my trusts there, and so I asked some questions at the public meeting, and received answers at the time, may have seemed satisfactory, but unfortunately, one of those things was some issues with some statements that we made about the business on Grand River. I was told that night that you were no longer there, and you had completely moved out. Later on that night, and the next morning, we had evidence to the contrary to that. So, just to put it bluntly, and I am purposely saying this here versus in our public meeting, because it's not my intention to embarrass anybody, and I take no delight in this, bottom line is, I don't trust you. And quite frankly, I'm surprised that you're talking about this tonight. I wanted to before and I have a lot of reason to believe I don't trust this place. So, I wouldn't recommend it now. Thanks.

Jolly: Mr. Bahr, are you offering that motion?

Bahr: Yeah, I'm offering a denial.

Jolly: Anybody else from the Council? At this time, we will open up. If I can get both of you sit down, if you don't mind. We will open up the floor to public comments. Anybody would like to address this issue has three minutes to address the Council. Please direct your comments to me specifically. I would ask the petitioner at this time to take note and I'll give you a chance to respond. Go ahead, sir, your name and address please.

Amar: Charles Amar, Vice-President of Steelcraft Tool, 12930 Wayne Road, two buildings to the north of the subject property, between that building and our building, is a building that's been divided in half. Half of it is a gymnastic studio, that has a constant flow of traffic with children, some of whom run in the street. We've been in our buildings since 1977. I'm not aware of a lot of service industries there. I'm aware of manufacturing, in almost every building, but one. That results in semis coming and going all day long, significant traffic,

and everyone in the area is concerned about pollution. Since that property was vacated, I believe that the petitioner is the one who's putting up screening on the cyclone fence. There's already been one car fire back there one night. That's obviously a concern for the neighboring businesses. We would ask that you deny this proposal. I don't think it's appropriate to have it in this particular area. There are areas where tow yards are appropriate, but I think that the traffic back and forth, potential for more pollution, when all of us in the manufacturing area are striving to keep Livonia a safe and clean environment for all of us. Thank you.

Jolly: Thank you sir.

McIntyre: Mr. Chair, I'd like to get clarification. So, the petitioner already has vehicles there and a screen up?

Jolly: Petitioner, if you wouldn't mind, please come to the podium.

McIntyre: Mr. Fields, so are you currently using this facility?

Fields: No, we are just going to vehicles, we are not operating. The gates are closed, there is nothing for us to do.

McIntyre: But you had some vehicles stored there?

Fields: Yes ma'am, just in one car and we did it all the vegetation cleanup.

McIntyre: There was a, there was a vehicle fire?

Fields: No there was not a vehicle fire. If it was a vehicle fire, I'm sure the Livonia Fire Department would have been out there.

McIntyre: Okay, thank you.

Jolly: Okay, anybody else for public comments on this issue? Going once, going twice. Public comment is closed. I'll go back to the Council. We do have a denying motion offered by Councilman Bahr. Do we have any other motions from the Council? I see no additional motions from the Council, at this time. Just by way of explanation, there's no votes tonight of the Council. These matters of the public hearings were held for this evening will be voted on at a future Regular council meeting. The Public Hearing is now closed. Thank you all very much.

As there were no further questions or comments, the Public Hearing was declared closed at 8:37 p.m.