SPECIAL NOTICE

Due to Governor Whitmer’s Stay Home Stay Safe Executive Order and to minimize the spread of COVID-19, this meeting will be held electronically. Please see instructions below for participating in this ZOOM video/phone conference.

AGENDA

1. Roll Call
2. Setting the Agenda
3. Consent Agenda
   a. Approval of Minutes
   b. Approval of Invoices
   c. Resolution establishing 2021 Council Meeting dates
4. Planning Commission
   1. Public Hearing - Special Use Request – 17200 Mack Avenue – Pilates Studio
      1. City Planner presentation
      2. Open Public Comment
      3. Close Public Comment
      4. Consideration of special use request
   2. Site Plan Review – 17200 Mack Avenue – Pilates Studio
5. New Business
   a. Presentation of 2019-20 Fiscal Year Audit
   b. Redevelopment Ready Communities Report
      1. Presentation by Elizabeth King, MEDC
      2. RRC Resolution
   c. Proposed 2021 Road Program
   d. Appointments to Historic District Study Committee
6. Public Comment – for agenda and non-agenda items
7. Staff Reports
8. Council Comment
9. Adjournment

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ALL PERSONS TO PARTICIPATE IN VIRTUAL MEETING

You are invited to a Zoom webinar.
When: Dec 14, 2020 07:00 PM Eastern Time (US and Canada)
Topic: Council meeting

Please click the link below to join the webinar:
https://us02web.zoom.us/j/88123041486?pwd=c1lkVUJmcnAyTEcraU1wcDVyTkVVT09
Passcode: GPCouncil
Or iPhone one-tap: US: +13017158592,,88123041486#,,,,0#,,068021103# or +13126266799,,88123041486#,,,,0#,,068021103#
Or Telephone: Dial(for higher quality, dial a number based on your current location):
US: +1 301 715 8592 or +1 312 626 6799 or +1 929 205 6099 or +1 253 215 8782 or +1 346 248 7799 or +1 669 900 6833
Webinar ID: 881 2304 1486
Passcode: 068021103
INSTRUCTIONS FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES

Michigan Relay is a communications system that allows hearing persons and deaf, hard of hearing, or speech impaired persons to communicate by telephone. Dial 7-1-1 to reach Michigan Relay and have the operator then connect with Zoom conference number above. There is no additional charge to use this service.

Please contact city@grossepointecity.org at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting with any other requests for accommodations.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

The following public comment instructions are for use by members of the public during the virtual Council meetings held using the Zoom video and phone conferencing program:

A. During this electronic virtual meeting, individuals who wish to address the Council on any agenda or non-agenda item may do so during the designated public comment period or during a public hearing listed on the agenda. An individual wishing to make a public comment should indicate so by using the raise hand feature on the Zoom application. This is typically found in the upper right hand corner when you click on “View Participant list”. This opens a pop-out screen that includes a “Raise Hand” icon that you may use to raise a virtual hand when the chair of the meeting calls for public comments. If you are using the audio only call-in feature, you can hit *9 on the phone keypad to activate the raise hand feature.

B. Public comment during a virtual Council meeting is welcome. Individuals have a maximum of three (3) minutes to address the Council and present any comments. Councilmembers will listen to concerns but will not interact or answer questions.

C. Each speaker should begin comments by providing their name and address.

D. Disorderly Conduct: The chair may call to order any person who is being disorderly by speaking out of order or otherwise disrupting the proceedings, failing to be germane, speaking longer than the allotted time or speaking vulgarities, engaging in hate speech, or otherwise breaching the peace.

E. Alternatively, public comments can also be submitted by email to city@grossepointecity.org no later than 5:00 pm on the day of the meeting. All electronic comments received will be distributed to the City Council in advance of the start of the meeting.

The meeting was called to order at 7:01 p.m.

ROLL CALL
Present: Mayor Tomkowiak, Council Members Juip, Parthum, Stempfle, Thomas, Walsh, Williams
All Council Members indicated their physical location as: Grosse Pointe, Michigan

In Attendance: City Manager Dame, Attorney Kennedy, City Clerk Arthurs, Finance Director Kleinow, Public Safety Director Poloni, Deputy Chief Alcorn, Public Service Director Randazzo, and Parks and Recreation Director Hardenbrook.

CONSENT AGENDA

Motion by Council Member Parthum, second by Council Member Williams, to approve the Consent Agenda consisting of the following:

1. Minutes from the special workshop meeting held on September 1, 2020, minutes from the special workshop held on October 17, 2020 and minutes from the regular meeting held on October 19, 2020 and minutes from the closed session meeting held on October 19, 2020.

2. Invoices
   a) Inland Waters Pollution Control, Inc. Rathbone Storm Sewer Rehab, Final, $53,032.32
   b) Santoro
      - V Plow Snow Pusher, October 2020, $11,000
      - Leaf Cage with Gutter Broom, October 2020, $9,535
   c) Deborah L. Gordon, PLC - Legal Costs, October 2020, $35,000
   d) G2 Consulting - 2020 Street Improvement, 9/1/20 – 9/30/20, $6,502.50
   e) GFL - Recycling, November 2020, $9,875
   f) Bobcat
      - Utility Vehicle, September 2020, $51,954.55
      - Utility Vehicle 2020, $51,954.55
   g) Great Lakes Water Authority - Sewer Charges, October 2020, $74,600
   h) Traffic & Safety Control Systems, Inc.
      - Luke II Equipment and Tiba Equipment, 50% Down payment, $181,279
   i) Michigan Municipal League - Workers Compensation, Installment 3, $23,525

3. Authorize the purchase of a 2021 Chevrolet Tahoe from Berger Chevrolet in an amount not to exceed $38,963.

4. Authorize the purchase of a 2008 Ford F-150 from Ray Laethem Motor Village in the amount not to exceed $6,641.25.

5. Authorize the purchase of 300 Toter recycling, refuse and yard waste carts from Toter LLC of Statesville, NC in the amount of $16,542.91 and authorize the City Manager to purchase toter carts in the future to replenish stock at the same or lower price per unit.

6. Authorize the sale of surplus Public Service equipment to the highest competitive bidder.

7. Award of Bid to Zeppelin Cleaning in the amount not to exceed $21,580 for building maintenance and cleaning services for public facilities.
ROLL CALL VOTE

Ayes: Juip, Parthum, Stempfle, Thomas, Walsh, Williams, Mayor Tomkowiak

Nays: None.

MOTION CARRIES.

COUNCIL HEARING – 37 CRANFORD LANE – PETITION FOR PLACEMENT OF AIR CONDITIONER UNIT

City Planner Connochie made the following report:

The City has received a petition to the City Council for a modification from the standards of Section 42-9 Refrigeration Systems or Units Used for Central Air Conditioning of the Grosse Pointe Code of Ordinances regarding the placement of an air conditioning (A/C) condenser unit. Section 42-9 only permits units for refrigeration or central air on the outside of a residential dwelling if they are located on the side or rear of a building, unless an alternative location is approved by the City Council.

The applicant, John Cameron, is proposing to install an A/C Carrier condenser, measuring 32" w x 32" d x 36" h, on the front of his property within the Cranford Terraces condominiums at 37 Cranford Ln. The A/C unit is proposed to be located to the right of the property’s front facing window. The unit will be screened by four-foot arborvitae to conceal the unit from view from the street. The applicant has submitted an aerial site plan with a graphic scale that shows the placement and approximate size of the unit, and a street view image showing the proposed screening. The proposed air conditioning unit measures 32" w x 32" d x 36" h and will be placed on the front right of the property, screened by four-foot Emerald Green arborvitae that will fully conceal the unit from the street. The site plan points out that 10 neighbors have installed A/C units on the front of their condo. Many of these air conditioning units are not screened. The applicant has indicated in a letter to the Council that there is no practical alternative to installing the unit in the front yard. The applicant has demonstrated practical difficulty due to the type of home and HOA restrictions. The applicant’s condominium is located at the end of a row of attached units, adjacent to an access drive. The A/C unit cannot be installed on the side of the building, as it would interfere with the driveway.

Mayor Tomkowiak opened public comment.

One letter in support of the petition was received from Paula Leto, 35 Cranford Lane, and was submitted as part of the public record. Mayor Tomkowiak closed public comment.

Motion by Council Member Stempfle, second by Council Member Walsh, to approve the petition to place an air conditioning unit in the front yard of 37 Cranford Lane, as submitted.

ROLL CALL VOTE

Ayes: Juip, Parthum, Stempfle, Thomas, Walsh, Williams, Mayor Tomkowiak

Nays: None.

MOTION CARRIES.

W. GEORGE ELWORTHY FIELD LEASE AGREEMENT RENEWAL

On March 31, 2021, the 50-year lease agreement between the Grosse Pointe Public School System and the City of Grosse Pointe for W. George Elworthy Field will expire. A newly drafted ten-year lease agreement was reviewed by Council. The modifications in the new agreement were noted on the agenda review form, and were discussed and reviewed by Council. City staff recommends approval of renewal of the 10-year lease agreement.

Council discussion took place regarding the agreement language pertaining to the Little League, who determines eligible activities or modifications to the field, the Field Use Policy and the City’s yearly maintenance costs.
Motion by Council Member Stempfle, second by Council Member Williams, to execute a 10-year lease agreement with the Grosse Pointe Public School System, for W. George Elworthy Field, for one dollar per year, payable in advance.

ROLL CALL VOTE
Ayes: Juip, Parthum, Stempfle, Thomas, Walsh, Williams, Mayor Tomkowiak
Nays: None.

MOTION CARRIES.

LICENSE TO USE LOT 4 – EV CHARGING

City Manager Dame made the following report:

The Big Three automotive manufacturers are making a big push into electric vehicles. However, there currently is no EV chargers available for public use anywhere in the Grosse Points. Due to the cost of commercial level charging machines, it is expensive to install without subsidizing either the upfront and/or operational costs. Hage Automotive is a company based in Detroit, that has worked in the electric vehicle field for many years installing EV chargers. Hage uses credits and grants offered by entities such as DTE, to encourage adoption of electric vehicles and to offset upfront costs. Hage Automotive is working with Michigan communities to install EV chargers at no cost to the municipality. In exchange for use of the public parking spaces, Hage Automotive pays for all the costs of the chargers including the installation, maintenance and operation. A ten-year agreement with the City for use of four spaces in Lot 4, behind CVS, is proposed. The EV chargers proposed for installation can accommodate all the different types of electric vehicles on the market.

Mr. Abass, from Red E Charging, LLC, presented an overview of the proposed EV charging machines and charging services for the City. He described equipment, reporting and how future upgrades would be implemented. Mr. Abass answered Council questions pertaining to how charging fees would be applied to users, options for fast chargers, and other charging adapter availability. Council discussion took place regarding the proposed agreement.

Motion by Council Member Parthum, second by Council Member Stempfle, to approve the agreement with Hage Automotive to install pedestals with ports, for charging vehicles in four parking spaces in Lot 4.

ROLL CALL VOTE
Ayes: Juip, Parthum, Stempfle, Thomas, Walsh, Williams, Mayor Tomkowiak
Nays: None.

MOTION CARRIES.

LICENSE TO PLACE PARKING PAY STATIONS

1. NEIGHBORHOOD CLUB – 17150 WATERLOO

The City is installing new pay stations in Lot 3. After a final survey to determine the most convenient spots for payment stations, it is recommended that two pay stations and a video camera near the main entrance of the Neighborhood Club building under the canopy be installed. In this area of the lot, only people utilizing the Neighborhood Club would be using the stations and having the pay station located under the canopy would provide protection from the elements and would be advantageous for users. The Neighborhood Club has indicated its support of the proposed placement, but an agreement is needed to formally grant this permission. The Neighborhood Club is also reviewing the agreement.

2. ASCENSION – 17141 KERCHEVAL AVENUE

The City is installing new pay stations is Lot 3. After a final survey to determine the most convenient spots for payment stations, it is recommended that one pay station be placed in the lobby, near the parking lot, of the Ascension St. John Hospital health care building. In this corner of the lot, the only people that would be using the station would be those
entering the Ascension building. Locating the station indoors protects the equipment from the elements and is advantageous for the user. Ascension has indicated its support of the proposed placement location, but a license agreement is needed to formally grant this permission. Ascension is reviewing the proposed license drafted by the City Attorney.

Council discussion took place regarding both proposed license agreements for parking pay stations in Lot 3.

Motion by Council Member Williams, second by Council Member Thomas, to execute an agreement with the Neighborhood Club to place two pay stations and a video camera at 7150 Waterloo, near the entrance to the facility, and to execute an agreement with Ascension St. John Hospital to place a pay station in the lobby off of Lot 3, in the building located at 17141 Kercheval, and with final consent for the language of both licenses to be approved by the City Attorney.

ROLL CALL VOTE
Ayes: Juip, Parthum, Stempfle, Thomas, Walsh, Williams, Mayor Tomkowiak
Nays: None.

MOTION CARRIES.

COUNCIL GOALS

Mayor Tomkowiak advised that the City Council met in a workshop on October 17, 2020 to discuss Council goals to work on from now and until the end of 2021. Mayor Tomkowiak listed the following as stated goals:

1. Implement adjusted parking system with new equipment.
2. Initiate and complete rezoning on Mack Avenue consistent with the Phase II plan.
3. Create and begin implementation of a historic district plan and standards process.
5. Align Council and Main Street Grosse Pointe goals.

The Mayor further noted that the City Manager will identify key objectives to be accomplished in each goal area and, when possible, identify timelines for completion of the objectives and goals.

Motion by Council Member Parthum, second by Council Member Williams, to adopt the Council goals, noted above, until the end of 2021.

ROLL CALL VOTE
Ayes: Juip, Parthum, Stempfle, Thomas, Walsh, Williams, Mayor Tomkowiak
Nays: None.

MOTION CARRIES.

The City Council convened as the Planning Commission.

PUBLIC HEARING – PROPOSED ZONING AMENDMENT – MINIMUM MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL UNIT SIZES FOR ALL DISTRICTS THAT PERMIT MULTI-FAMILY USES

The City’s Master Plan calls for multi-family or mixed use residential dwelling development in The Village and it is permitted elsewhere in the City in designated zones. The City’s current minimum size per dwelling unit in districts that allow for multi-family uses is 1,000 square feet. In light of national trends, Grosse Pointe’s zoning ordinance is out of date and staff recommends amending the code to allow for smaller size dwelling units such as studio, one bedroom, and two-bedroom unit types.

City Planner Conniochie made the following report.
As requested by City Council, we have conducted a review of the Grosse Pointe ordinance standard against other comparable communities’ ordinances and market data as the basis for an ordinance update. A draft of the proposed ordinance amendment to Section 90-351. A schedule for all districts that permit multi-family uses was submitted to Council.

Research was performed and compiled regarding minimum residential unit sizes in several comparable communities: Plymouth, Northville, Ferndale, Royal Oak, and Rochester by unit type. Of those communities with minimum sizes for studios, 500 square feet was most common. One-bedroom units were on average 533 square feet in size, two-bedroom units were approximately 680 square feet, and three-bedrooms 833 square feet. Having a clear definition of how floor area is calculated is critical to how zoning ordinance changes will be interpreted and administered. A review of the ordinances from each comparable municipality for how they defined floor area was conducted. Most of these communities use gross square footage, which includes the total floor area contained within the building, measured to the external face of the external walls, but excludes hallways or other circulation space, and unfinished spaces such as attics or basements. The definition of “usable floor area” in the Grosse Pointe ordinance closely matches how other municipalities calculate floor area for minimum unit sizes. An analysis and comparison of market data was also done. Specifically, a look at the average and minimum dwelling unit size on the market in each community. Units in comparable communities were smaller than in Grosse Pointe, and far more consistent with the minimum unit sizes permitted by their respective ordinances. Research of comparable ordinance standards and market data helped us determine “right-sized” standards for minimum multi-family unit sizes in the City of Grosse Pointe. Rather than set one standard for all multi-family units, it is proposed that minimum size standards by unit type be set (number of bedrooms or terrace dwelling). It was further noted that the City Planner recommends modifying the footnote (i) within Sec. 90-351. Schedule, which defines what is or is not included in the floor area calculation to state: “The minimum floor area per dwelling unit shall be calculated based on usable floor area, as defined in Section 90-3. Definitions.” It should be noted the published version of this ordinance incorrectly used the term “square footage” instead of “floor area.”

City Planner Connochie answered various Council questions regarding how floor area is calculated, comparable municipalities and market trends driving the need for smaller residential units. Council discussion took place regarding the proposed amendment. It was noted that having minimum guidelines for unit sizes for developers is a good step forward while still providing Council control under the review process.

Mayor Tomkowiak opened public comment. The following comments were made:

Stephanie Blatt, 388 Lincoln, asked why Council would consider smaller units which would be or become rental units. More rental units drive down property values because renters have less of an investment in the community.

Robert Hindelang, 235 Lincoln, stated he does not want smaller residential units anywhere in the City.

Jimmy Saros, property owner of the Seros Building at Cadieux and Mack, stated that there is a huge market demand for condos, and Grosse Pointe does not have many condo units available. There is a lot of demand for downsizing in Grosse Pointe, without options to do so.

Brian Blatt, 388 Lincoln, stated that Grosse Pointe is not an average community and smaller units make it less of a desirable area.

After hearing no further comments, Mayor Tomkowiak closed public comment.

Motion by Council Member Williams, second by Council Member Parthum, that the Planning Commission recommends approval of the proposed draft ordinance establishing new minimum size standards for multi-family housing units. The record of the public hearing shall be forwarded to Council.
ROLL CALL VOTE

Ayes:  Parthum, Stempfie, Thomas, Walsh, Williams, Mayor Tomkowiak
Nays:  Juip.

MOTION CARRIES 6 votes AYE to 1 vote NAY.

The Planning Commission reconvened as the City Council.

ORDINANCE ADOPTION

Motion by Council Member Williams, second by Council Member Parthum, that the City Council adopt Ordinance 443, including the proposed amendment to Footnote (i) as modified by the City Planner, amending and restating in its entirety the chart contained in Section 90-351, Article VII, Area, Heigh, Bulk, and Placement Requirements.

ORDINANCE NO. 443
An Ordinance to amend and re-state the chart contained in Section 90-351, Article VII, of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Grosse Pointe, Area, Height, Bulk, and Placement Requirements.
(For complete text of Ordinance No. 443 - see Ordinance Book of the City of Grosse Pointe)

ROLL CALL VOTE

Ayes:  Parthum, Stempfie, Thomas, Walsh, Williams, Mayor Tomkowiak
Nays:  Juip.

MOTION CARRIES 6 votes AYE to 1 vote NAY.

STAFF REPORTS

City Manager Dame updated Council on work at the Tot Lot and that the DTE project will soon be ending. City Clerk Arthurs thanked the election workers, who persevered through a long day, City Hall staff, who did a tremendous amount of work to prepare for the November election, and staff from other City departments, especially Pete Randazzo and Christopher Hardenbrook, for their help during the November 2020 election.

COUNCIL COMMENT

The City Council commented on the following topics:

- Residents were encouraged to remain vigilant about COVID-19 precautions.
- Residents were encouraged to shop and dine locally, when possible.
- Appreciation was expressed to the City Clerk for a job well done on recent elections.
- The Public Safety and Public Works buildings are completed, look great and are receiving positive feedback.

On Motion, the meeting was adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

Julie E. Arthurs, City Clerk
City of Grosse Pointe
**Council Meeting**  
**December 14, 2020**

**TITLE:** Approval of Invoices – Confirming  
**DATE:** December 14, 2020

**SUMMARY:** The following invoices are submitted for review:

a) Anderson, Eckstein & Westrick, Inc.
   - Loraine Sewer & Paving, 9/28/20 – 10/25/20, $16,640.00
   - Resurface Neff Park Parking Lot, 9/28/20 – 10/25/20, $5,796.32
   - 2020 Street Improvement Program, 9/28/20 – 10/25/20, $11,523.48
   - Loraine Sewer & Paving, 10/26/20 – 11/22/20, $23,510.79

b) State of Michigan
   - Marina Bottom Lands Rental, December 2020, $16,180.00

c) Fildew Hinks
   - Legal Costs, October 2020, $6,871.26

d) Florence Cement Company
   - 2020 Street Improvement, Estimate #4, $238,513.45

e) GFL
   - Recycling, December 2020, $10,070.00

f) Morrison Industrial Equipment Co.
   - Forklift, November 2020, $28,806.00

g) Great Lakes Water Authority
   - Sewer Charges, November 2020, $74,500.00

h) Traffic & Safety Control Systems, Inc.
   - Luke II Equipment and Tiba Equipment, 2nd payment, $90,639.50

i) Plante Moran
   - Annual Audit, Progress Bill #1, $36,000.00

j) Oakland County
   - Clemis, 7/1/20 – 9/30/20, $5,219.25

k) Business Communication System
   - Telecom Equipment, November 2020, $11,196.85

l) ISCG
   - Furniture, December 2020, $23,147.00

**FINANCIAL IMPACT:**  $598,613.90

**RECOMMENDATION:** Motion to approve invoices. Invoices listed represent budgeted or council approved expenditures. Invoices which exceed $5,000 are required to be presented to council for approval.

**REVIEWED BY:** Peter Dame  
**TITLE:** City Manager

**PREPARED BY:** Kim Kleinow  
**TITLE:** Finance Director/Treasurer
CITY OF GROSSE POINTE
ATTN: PETE RANDAZZO
17147 MAUMEE
GROSSE POINTE, MI 48230

Project 0155-0204-0
LORAIN Sewer & PAVING- WATERLOO TO MACK
FOR: PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS

Professional Services from September 28, 2020 to October 25, 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost</td>
<td>1,024,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee Percentage</td>
<td>6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fee</td>
<td>66,560.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Earned</td>
<td>33,280.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Fee Billing</td>
<td>16,640.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Fee Billing</td>
<td>16,640.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fee</td>
<td>16,640.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total this invoice $16,640.00

Outstanding Invoices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0127524</td>
<td>8/26/2020</td>
<td>4,659.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0127812</td>
<td>10/9/2020</td>
<td>11,960.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>16,640.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please include the project number and invoice number on your check.
**ANDERSON, ECKSTEIN & WESTRICK, INC.**
*CIVIL ENGINEERS SURVEYORS ARCHITECTS*
51301 SCHOENHERR RD. SHELBY TOWNSHIP, MI 48315
[www.aewinc.com](http://www.aewinc.com)  p(586)726-1234

---

**November 5, 2020**
**Project No:** 0155-0208-0
**Invoice No:** 0128456

CITY OF GROSSE POINTE
ATTN: PETE RANDAZZO
17147 MAUMEE
GROSSE POINTE, MI 48230

**Project** 0155-0208-0  **RESURFACE NEFF PARK MARINA PARKING LOT**

**Professional Services from September 28, 2020 to October 25, 2020**

**Professional Personnel**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRINCIPAL ENGINEER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANGORI, STEPHEN</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>125.46</td>
<td>100.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEAM LEADER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYSLINSKI, CHARLES</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>92.82</td>
<td>185.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time, Mileage, Data Transfers, Staffing ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYSLINSKI, CHARLES</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>92.82</td>
<td>46.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Visit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENIOR PROJECT ENGINEER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KERN, RICHARD</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>125.46</td>
<td>37.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss asphalt patching completed, Review of correspondence from Florence, Discuss scheduling with inspect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KERN, RICHARD</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>125.46</td>
<td>25.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss delay of striping until Spring 2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KERN, RICHARD</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>125.46</td>
<td>25.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss scheduling with inspector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KERN, RICHARD</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>125.46</td>
<td>62.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Visit, Discuss scheduling for movie production equipment storage at lot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KERN, RICHARD</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>125.46</td>
<td>25.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respond to punch list questions by Contractor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KERN, RICHARD</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>125.46</td>
<td>25.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review pavement striping schedule with Florence, Update on movie production crew mobilizing to site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KERN, RICHARD</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>125.46</td>
<td>12.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review ponding issues with inspector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEETINGS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENIOR PROJECT ENGINEER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KERN, RICHARD</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>125.46</td>
<td>125.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCTION OBSERVATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING AIDE III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMMERS, DAVID</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>77.07</td>
<td>1,156.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMMERS, DAVID</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>77.07</td>
<td>809.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMA patches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMMERS, DAVID</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>77.07</td>
<td>616.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMA paving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMMERS, DAVID</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>77.07</td>
<td>693.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMA prepping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please include the project number and invoice number on your check.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>RESURFACE NEFF PARK MARINA PARKING LOT</th>
<th>Invoice</th>
<th>0128455</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOMMERS, DAVID</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>77.07</td>
<td>616.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paved Phase I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMMERS, DAVID</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>77.07</td>
<td>770.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paved Phase II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMMERS, DAVID</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>77.07</td>
<td>462.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pour concrete on ADA ramps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>72.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,796.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Labor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total this invoice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,796.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outstanding Invoices**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0127984</td>
<td>10/12/2020</td>
<td>13,357.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,357.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Signature]

492.903 - 970.712
November 5, 2020
Project No: 0155-0203-0
Invoice No: 0128453

CITY OF GROSSE POINTE
ATTN: PETE RANDAZZO
17147 MAUMEE
GROSSE POINTE, MI 48230

Project 0155-0203-0 2020 STREET IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
FOR: CONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING
Professional Services from September 28, 2020 to October 25, 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Personnel</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCTION STAKEOUT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEAM LEADER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAYESKI JR., JOSEPH</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>92.82</td>
<td>232.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule, proposed from 00engineering, calc proposed for layout, update files and plots.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECRETARIAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BICKHAM, BRENDA</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>37.70</td>
<td>37.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDR checklist (help out Michelle)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRINCIPAL ENGINEER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANGORI, STEPHEN</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>125.46</td>
<td>37.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANGORI, STEPHEN</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>125.46</td>
<td>62.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reviewed response to resident e-mail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEAM LEADER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYSLINSKI, CHARLES</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>92.82</td>
<td>92.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time, Mileage, Data Transfers, Staffing ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYSLINSKI, CHARLES</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>92.82</td>
<td>46.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Visit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMITH, BRADLEY</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>92.82</td>
<td>232.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2 invoice/report review, correspondence, filing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING AIDE III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILLER, THOMAS</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>77.07</td>
<td>192.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review IDRs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING AIDE II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANKAWI, MICHELLE</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>69.76</td>
<td>34.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create Draft estimate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANKAWI, MICHELLE</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>69.76</td>
<td>69.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generate estimate and emalicy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANKAWI, MICHELLE</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>69.76</td>
<td>34.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upload, log and email G2 invoice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANKAWI, MICHELLE</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>69.76</td>
<td>34.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2 invoices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENIOR PROJECT ENGINEER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KERN, RICHARD</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>125.46</td>
<td>376.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss errors with grading, Review grades and revise and provide to survey, Discu discussing operations with Contractor, Follow up on punch list items, Field Visit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please include the project number and invoice number on your check.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project 0155-00203-0</th>
<th>2020 STREET IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM</th>
<th>Invoice 0128453</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KERN, RICHARD</td>
<td>1.50 125.46</td>
<td>188.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Visit, respond to Resident E-mail per City, Follow up on sod restoration and Grosse Pointe HMA Conditioning and Paving Schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KERN, RICHARD</td>
<td>30 125.46</td>
<td>37.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow up on punch list completion, Resident Call, Review ponding issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KERN, RICHARD</td>
<td>20 125.46</td>
<td>25.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow up on resident call</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KERN, RICHARD</td>
<td>.50 125.46</td>
<td>62.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow up on restoration status, Discussion of pavement patches on Grosse Pointe Court and issues with scheduling with G2, Resident Call</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KERN, RICHARD</td>
<td>.50 125.46</td>
<td>62.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow up on status of project, Respond to contractor questions for Grosse Pointe Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KERN, RICHARD</td>
<td>2.50 125.46</td>
<td>313.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grosse Pointe Court Final Top of Asphalt Grades Summary, Coordinate survey for Grosse Pointe Court, Resident Calls, Respond to Pete Damen e-mail regarding G2 GP Court concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KERN, RICHARD</td>
<td>20 125.46</td>
<td>25.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Status, Respond to inspectors questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KERN, RICHARD</td>
<td>30 125.46</td>
<td>37.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Call, Follow up on removal of temporary signage on Goethe per complaint, Status with inspector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KERN, RICHARD</td>
<td>30 125.46</td>
<td>37.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Calls, Follow up on restoration status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KERN, RICHARD</td>
<td>.70 125.46</td>
<td>87.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respond to inspectors questions on pay items, Resident Calls, Follow up on punch list Items on Award and Goethe, Review Specs for Joint Rehabilitation Work to review Florence extra claim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KERN, RICHARD</td>
<td>.30 125.46</td>
<td>37.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and Submit Punch Lists, Resident Call</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KERN, RICHARD</td>
<td>.30 125.46</td>
<td>37.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of Final Quantities, Resident Calls, Follow up on final restoration schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KERN, RICHARD</td>
<td>.80 125.46</td>
<td>100.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly Update Notice, Discuss quote of skin patching for dead end of Goethe Street with City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KERN, RICHARD</td>
<td>.50 125.46</td>
<td>62.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly Update, Review Force Account Request</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KERN, RICHARD</td>
<td>.70 125.46</td>
<td>87.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly Updates, Project Status with Inspector, Discussion of project with Contractor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MEETINGS**

**SENIOR PROJECT ENGINEER**

KERN, RICHARD

Progress Meeting

**CONSTRUCTION OBSERVATION**

**TEAM LEADER**

DIGIORLAMI, PIETRO

brick pavers left to do at Neff Park.

**ENGINEERING AIDE III**

DE SANDRE, DAVID

4.50 77.07 346.82

SOMMERS, DAVID

2.00 77.07 154.14

Brick pavers and brick edging

SOMMERS, DAVID

2.00 77.07 154.14

Brick pavers

SOMMERS, DAVID

8.00 77.07 616.56

Concrete pour on Grosse Pt Court

SOMMERS, DAVID

13.00 77.07 1,001.91

Detail 7 and hand patching

Please include the project number and invoice number on your check.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOMMERS, DAVID Grosse Pt Court concrete pour</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>77.07</td>
<td>616.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMMERS, DAVID Paved Grosse Pt Court</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>77.07</td>
<td>693.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMMERS, DAVID Pavement removal on Grosse Pt Court</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>77.07</td>
<td>770.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMMERS, DAVID Pavement repair on Grosse Pt Court</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>77.07</td>
<td>231.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMMERS, DAVID Pavement repair on Grosse Pt Court</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>77.07</td>
<td>809.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMMERS, DAVID Rain out</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>77.07</td>
<td>231.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMMERS, DAVID Restoration quantities</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>77.07</td>
<td>462.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMMERS, DAVID Sodding on Goethe</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>77.07</td>
<td>732.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMMERS, DAVID Updated punch list</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>77.07</td>
<td>231.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>119.40</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,959.48</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Labor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>9,959.48</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unit Billing**

2 PERSON CREW-CONSTRUCTION STAKEOUT 10.0 HOURS @ 156.40 1,564.00
Total Units 1,564.00 1,564.00

**Total this Invoice** $11,523.48

**Outstanding Invoices**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0127528</td>
<td>8/26/2020</td>
<td>37,175.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0127911</td>
<td>10/9/2020</td>
<td>24,824.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>62,000.66</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please include the project number and invoice number on your check.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>0155-0204-0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Invoice No.</td>
<td>0128761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF GROSSE POINTE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTN: PETE RANDAZZO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17147 MAUMEE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROSSE POINTE, MI 48230</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FOR: PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS AND HOURLY CHARGES FOR LEAD WATER SERVICE LINE INVESTIGATION

Professional Services from October 26, 2020 to November 22, 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fee</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost</td>
<td>1,624,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee Percentage</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fee</td>
<td>66,560.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Complete</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Earned</td>
<td>39,936.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Fee Billing</td>
<td>33,260.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Fee Billing</td>
<td>6,656.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fee</td>
<td>6,656.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professional Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRINCIPAL ENGINEER</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>125.46</td>
<td>752.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEAM LEADER</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>92.82</td>
<td>139.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING AIDE III</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>77.07</td>
<td>770.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING AIDE II</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>69.76</td>
<td>6976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEETINGS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>92.82</td>
<td>928.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCTION OBSERVATION</td>
<td>46.80</td>
<td>77.07</td>
<td>3606.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING AIDE III</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>77.07</td>
<td>770.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS UPDATES</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>92.82</td>
<td>1856.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>58.40</td>
<td>92.82</td>
<td>4854.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Labor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4854.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reimbursable Expenses

REIMB. MISC. EXPENSE 11/19/2020 DOE TSCH ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES Invoice# 71438 12,000.00 Total Reimbursables 12,000.00 12,000.00 Total this invoice 23,510.79

Outstanding Invoices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0127524</td>
<td>8/26/2020</td>
<td>4,659.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0127912</td>
<td>10/9/2020</td>
<td>11,980.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>16,640.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please include the project number and invoice number on your check.
CITY OF GROSSE POINTE  
17147 MAUMEE 
GROSSE POINTE, MI 48236 
US 

Failure to submit payment by the due date will result in penalties as prescribed by law.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Invoice Item</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Sales Tax</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part 325 Annual Fee, 2021 ML-132, LSC-643 - ST CLAIR - GROSSE POINTE - MARIN</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$16,180.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$16,180.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Payment for Marina invoices can be processed through MiWaters at https://miwaters.deq.state.mi.us. Please provide proof of surety bond or other financial instrument, if required by your lease or agreement.

Information and a video tutorial about MiWaters can be found at www.michigan.gov/miwaters. Payment can be made through your MiWaters account, select Financials from the side panel.

For questions, please call (517) 290-5732

MARINA - BOTTOM LANDS RENTAL (STATE)  
594-540-945.00  
11/30 COMM  

REMIT PAYMENT TO:  
STATE OF MICHIGAN  
TO ENSURE PROPER CREDIT, SEND THIS PORTION WITH PAYMENT TO:  
EGLE - MAR  
CASHIERS OFFICE  
PO BOX 30657  
LANGSING, MI  48909-8157  

(Account No: ML-132)
November 11, 2020

City of Grosse Pointe
Attn: Mr. Peter J. Dame
17147 Maumee Ave
Grosse Pointe MI 48230-1534

For professional services and disbursements from October 1, 2020 through October 31, 2020 as described in the attached summary.

**Municipal Court**
Services provided by Attorney Charles S. Kennedy $594.00

**Auditor's Letter**
Services provided by Attorney Charles S. Kennedy 150.00

**Elworthy Field**
Services provided by Attorney Charles S. Kennedy 270.00

**Plats, Abstracts and Maumee/City Office Deeds**
Services provided by Attorney Charles S. Kennedy 225.00

**Vacating of Streets**
Services provided by Attorney Charles S. Kennedy 150.00

**Licenses and Special Use Permits**
Services provided by Attorney Charles S. Kennedy 150.00

**FOIA Requests**
Services provided by Attorney Charles S. Kennedy 60.00
City of Grosse Pointe  
Attn: Mr. Peter J. Dame  
November 11, 2020  
Page 2

**General**  
Services provided by Attorneys Charles S. Kennedy and Tomasz M. Dow  
4,590.00

**Monticciolo-EEOC #2**  
Services provided by Attorney Charles S. Kennedy  
1,605.00

**Hindelang vs City of Grosse Pointe**  
Services provided by Attorney Charles S. Kennedy  
120.00

**Stephen D. Walworth v. City of Grosse Pointe**  
Services provided by Attorney John J. Conway  
90.00

FEES:  
8,004.00

PLUS: Disbursements  
3,867.26

LESS: Retainer  
5,000.00

**Balance due for October 2020**  
$6,871.26

==================================================================================
November 13, 2020

Pete Randazzo
Public Service Department Supervisor
City of Grosse Pointe
17147 Maumee Avenue
Grosse Pointe, Michigan 48236

Reference: 2020 HMA Street Improvements Project
AEW Project No. 0155-0203

Dear Mr. Randazzo:

Enclosed please find Construction Pay Estimate No. 4 for the above referenced project. For work completed through October 25, 2020, we recommend issuing payment for the **Net Earnings this Period (see Page 4)** in the amount of **$238,513.45** to Florence Cement Company, 51515 Corridor, Shelby Twp., MI 48315

If you have questions or require additional information, please feel free to contact our office.

Sincerely,

R. Ryan Kern, PE
Project Manager

cc: Mike Randazzo, Florence Cement Company
**GFL ENVIRONMENTAL**
22001 HOOVER RD
WARREN, MI 48089-2554

**SERVICE ADDRESS:**
CITY OF GROSSE POINTE
17147 MAUMEE AVE
GROSSE POINTE, MI 48230-1534

**BILLING CONTACT #:**
(313) 417-1188

**ACCOUNT #: 001661539**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12-01-20</td>
<td>RESIDENTIAL HAND PICK UP On-Call</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2400.00</td>
<td>2400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub Total Services Only:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub Total Taxes, Oil/Environmental &amp; Fees:</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site Sub Total:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,200.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total New Charges: 10,200.00**

---

**TO AVOID LATE FEES AND SERVICE INTERRUPTION, PAYMENTS MUST BE RECEIVED BY THE DUE DATE.**

For Customer Service and Account Inquiries, please call (586) 864-1500.

CF: Environmental Offers Pay-By-Phone! 1-844-464-3887. Choices: Checking, Visa, American Express, and Mastercard are accepted.

For Customer Service and Account Inquiries, please call (586) 864-1500.

Convenience. It's fast! Your statement is online right now. Control. You decide how and when to pay. To Enroll: myaccount@gflusa.com

**GFL ENVIRONMENTAL**
22001 HOOVER RD
WARREN, MI 48089-2554

**INVOICE NUMBER:** 0047039179
**INVOICE DATE:** 11-13-20
**SERVICE PERIOD:** DECEMBER

**PAYMENT DUE:** UPON RECEIPT

---

**Amount Enclosed** $10,070.00

**Federal Tax ID:** 81-536-580-806

---

**GFL ENVIRONMENTAL**
PO BOX 791619
BALTIMORE, MD 21278-1519

---

Date: 12.1.2020
**INVOICE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EQ0066026 FGC25H-LE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25,598.00</td>
<td>25,598.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT0002640 SIDESHIFTING FORK POSITIONER</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,358.00</td>
<td>2,358.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIGHTLINE MODEL: H-2772 40 X 40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL: 28,806.00**

---

**ACCOUNT REP:** Joe Leach  
**EQUIPMENT ORDER:** S0002341  
**DELIVERY TERMS:**

---

**Signature:**

**Note:**

"Capital projects"

---

**TOTAL PURCHASE:** 28,806.00  
**"LESS TRADE-IN(S)"**  
**SALES TAX:** 0.00  
**TOTAL AMOUNT (USD):** 28,806.00
GLWA
Great Lakes Water Authority

www.glwater.org

CITY OF GROSSE POINTE
BONNIE KLOBUCAR, ACCT. PAY
17147 MAUMEE AVE
GROSSE POINTE, MI 48230

SEWER BILL

Account Name: GROSSE POINTE
Account Number: 200-0631-S
Billing Date: 12/02/2020
Due Date: 01/19/2021

Billing Inquiries: (313) 964-9027

REMIT TO:
Great Lakes Water Authority
Attn: Treasury
P.O. Box 441370
Detroit, MI 48244-1370

PREVIOUS BALANCE
ADJUSTMENTS AND PAYMENTS APPLIED

CURRENT CHARGES
11/01/2020 - 11/30/2020

SEWAGE MONTHLY FIXED CHARGE

PREVIOUS AMOUNT DUE
$0.00

TOTAL DUE
$74,500.00

PLEASE DETACH AND RETURN THIS PORTION WITH YOUR PAYMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account Name</th>
<th>Account Number</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Amount Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GROSSE POINTE</td>
<td>200-0631-S</td>
<td>01/19/2021</td>
<td>$74,500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AMOUNT REMITTED $__

REMIT TO: Great Lakes Water Authority
Attn: Treasury
P.O. Box 441370
Detroit, MI 48244-1370

24 200063119 000007450000 7
TRAFFIC & SAFETY CONTROL SYSTEMS, INC.

#8584 Downing  *  Wixom, MI  48393-3501
(248) 348-0570  *  FAX (248) 348-8595

INVOICE

INVOICE DATE  INVOICE NO.  PAGE
12/1/2020  054262  1

SOLD TO:  CITY OF GROSSE POINTE
BRIAN KRESS
17147 MAUMEE
GROSSE POINTE, MI  48230

SHIP TO:  GROSSE POINTE - 2, 3 & RAMP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORDER DATE</th>
<th>CUSTOMER NO.</th>
<th>SALE PERSON</th>
<th>PURCHASE ORDER NO.</th>
<th>TERMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GIGR04</td>
<td>BRIAN KRESS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Net 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUANTITY ORDERED</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>QTY. SHPD</th>
<th>PRIC UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>EXTENDED PRICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2ND INVOICE (25% OF ORDER TOTAL) FOR LOT 2, LOT 3 AND RAMP PARKING EQUIPMENT.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>90,839.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Balance Due $90,839.50

If paying by credit card, a 4% fee will be added to your credit card transaction.
INVOICE

City of Grosse Pointe
17147 Maumee Avenue
Grosse Pointe, MI 48230

Date: October 31, 2020
Client No: 69235
Invoice No: 1921297
Page: 1

For Professional Services Rendered
Progress bill in connection with the June 30, 2020 basic financial statement audit.

36,000.00 USD

Remittance Information:

Check:
Plante & Moran, PLLC
15060 Collections Center Drive
Chicago, IL 60693

Bank
Routing/ABA#
026009593
Bank Address
109 West 33rd Street
New York, NY 10001
Account Number
9890996003
Account Name
Plante & Moran, PLLC
Make Checks Payable to  
OAKLAND COUNTY  
TREASURERS-CASH ACCTG BLDG 12 E  
1200 N TELEGRAPH RD  
PONTIAC MI 48341-0479  
United States  

CITY OF GROSSE POINTE DEPT PUBLIC SAFETY  
ATTN: ACCOUNTS PAYABLE  
17145 MAUMEE AVE  
GROSSE POINTE MI 48230  
United States  

Make Checks Payable to  
OAKLAND COUNTY  
TREASURERS-CASH ACCTG BLDG 12 E  
1200 N TELEGRAPH RD  
PONTIAC MI 48341-0479  
United States  

BILLING PERIOD: JUL-SEP 2020

For billing questions, please call 248-858-5259

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit Amt</th>
<th>Net Amt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CLEMIS Membership Usage Fee</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1,575.50</td>
<td>1,575.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CLEMIS MDC Participation Fee</td>
<td>6.0000</td>
<td>1,641.00</td>
<td>1,641.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CLEMIS Livescan OCT-DEC 2020</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>927.75</td>
<td>927.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CLEMIS Mug Capture Site Maint OCT-DEC 2020</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Crime Mapping</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal: $5,219.25

Amount Due: $5,219.25

PLEASE INCLUDE YOUR INVOICE NUMBER WHEN SUBMITTING PAYMENT.
Business Communication Systems, Inc.
5680 Eighteen Mile Rd.
Sterling Heights, Mi  48314

Voice:  (586) 276-3600
Fax:     (586) 276-3650

Bill To:
CITY OF GROSSE POINTE
ATTN: ACCTS PAYABLE
17147 MAUMEE
GROSSE POINTE, MI  48230

Ship to:
CITY OF GROSSE POINTE
COURT HOUSE, PUBLIC SAFETY
& DPW
GROSSE POINTE, MI  48230

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Customer ID</th>
<th>Customer PO</th>
<th>Payment Terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CITYOFGRO17147</td>
<td></td>
<td>Net Due</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sales Rep ID</th>
<th>Shipping Method</th>
<th>Ship Date</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JG</td>
<td>Courier</td>
<td>11/30/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MAC</td>
<td>TELECOM EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>18,425.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MAACLBR</td>
<td>INSTALLATION</td>
<td>1,984.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LESS DEP.</td>
<td>LESS CUSTOMER DEP.  CK #85712</td>
<td>-9,212.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal                  | 11,196.85
Sales Tax                  |             
Total invoice Amount       | 11,196.85   
Payment/Credit Applied     |             
TOTAL                      | 11,196.85   

Check/Credit Memo No:  

signature

capital projects  

499-463-4766  ace
WORKPLACE INSPIRED

BILL TO:  INSTALL AT:

CLIENT: GROSSE POINTE DEPT OF PUBLIC SAFETY
        17145 MAUMEE AVE
        GROSSE POINTE, MI 48230

INSTALL AT: GROSSE POINTE DEPT OF PUBLIC SAFETY
           17145 MAUMEE AVE
           GROSSE POINTE, MI 48230

YOUR P/O: 

TERMS: DUE UPON RECEIPT

SALESPERSON: MARY JO WARNER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>PRODUCT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>SELL</th>
<th>EXTENDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>DEPOSIT</td>
<td>OFFICE FURNITURE ON</td>
<td>823,147.00</td>
<td>823,147.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROPOSAL 114869</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUBTOTAL........: $ 23,147.00

AMOUNT TO PAY....: $ 23,147.00
**TITLE:** Resolution  
2021 Council Meeting Dates  

**DATE:** December 3, 2020  

**SUMMARY:** Following is a schedule of designated meeting dates for the calendar year 2021. Please review the dates and calendar attached. Modifications or corrections to the schedule can be made at the meeting.

**FINANCIAL IMPACT:** None.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Motion to adopt the 2021 Council meeting date resolution:

RESOLVED, that in accordance with Public Act 267 of 1976, public meetings of the City Council of the City of Grosse Pointe are held each month at 7:00 p.m. virtually or in the Council Chambers and the following schedule denotes regular meeting dates for 2021:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(2nd Mon.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(2nd Mon.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(Budget Hearing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(2nd Mon.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REVIEWED BY:** Peter Dame  

**PREPARED BY:** Julie E. Arthurs  

**TITLE:** City Manager

**TITLE:** City Clerk
### Council Meeting
December 14, 2020

| TITLE: | Public Hearing – Planning Commission  
| Special Use Request – 17200 Mack Avenue  
| Feeling Good Feeling Great, LLC | DATE: | December 9, 2020 |

| SUMMARY: | William Thomas, on behalf of Feeling Good Feeling Great, LLC, has submitted an application for special land use approval for a Pilates studio at 17200 Mack Avenue. The project is being proposed for development under Section 90-268. Permitted Uses After Special Approval of the City of Grosse Pointe Zoning Ordinance, which allows fitness centers, such as yoga studios and other similar uses, in the RO-1 district, subject to several additional provisions. A detailed report by the City Planner is attached for your review. |

| FINANCIAL IMPACT: | None. |

| RECOMMENDATION: | Motion to approve the Special Land Use Request for 17200 Mack Avenue, subject to the conditions listed in the City Planner’s report dated December 11, 2020, with the proposed special use permit to be drafted by the City Attorney. |

| REVIEWED BY: | Peter Damo |
| PREPARED BY: | Julie Connochie |

| TITLE: | City Manager |
| TITLE: | City Planner |
NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING
CITY OF GROSSE POINTE, MICHIGAN PLANNING COMMISSION
MONDAY, DECEMBER 14, 2020, 7:00 PM

17200 MACK AVENUE
SPECIAL USE REQUEST

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that the City of Grosse Pointe Planning Commission will hold a public hearing as noticed above to consider the Special Use Application for the proposed Pilates studio project at 17200 Mack Avenue, the applicant is Feeling Good Feeling Great, LLC.

The project is being proposed for development under Section 90-268. Permitted Uses After Special Approval of the City of Grosse Pointe Zoning Ordinance, which allows fitness centers, such as yoga studios and other similar uses, in the RO-1 district, subject to several additional provisions.

The following specifications are proposed for the project:

- Project Type: Pilates Studio
- Current Zoning: RO-1, Restricted Office District
- Total Parcel Size: 5,523 Square Feet (0.13 Acres)

The applicant is requesting special use approval for a Pilates studio located at 17200 Mack.

Said hearing will be held virtually. Information regarding how to attend a virtual meeting can be found on the City’s website or by calling 313-885-5800.

Public comment is welcome. If you are unable to attend the hearing, written comments will be accepted until 12:00 noon on December 14, 2020. Public comments can be mailed to City Hall or sent via email to city@grossepointecity.org. If further information is needed, please contact Grosse Pointe Building Dept., 17147 Maumee, Grosse Pointe, MI 48230, Mon.-Fri., 8:30 am to 5:00 pm. Telephone: 313-885-5800.

Julie E. Arthurs,
City Clerk
December 11, 2020

Planning Commission
City of Grosse Pointe
17147 Maumee
Grosse Pointe, MI 48230

Subject: 17200 Mack Avenue: Special Use
Zoning: RO-1
Applicant: Feeling Good Feeling Great, LLC

Dear Commissioners:

We have reviewed the above referenced special use application. The applicant, Feeling Good Feeling Great, LLC, requests special use approval for a new Pilates studio, the Corner Studio, at 17200 Mack, located within the RO-1 district. Such uses are permitted after special approval in the RO-1 district.

The site is located at the northeast corner of Mack Avenue and Loraine. The building is a one-story brick building, with a side yard parking lot and alley access behind the building. The proposed use is a Pilates studio (the Corner Studio), featuring four classrooms, one for small-group classes and three studios for Private/Duet Pilates. In an email communication dated December 8, 2020, the business owner clarified the general operation hours, class types, and maximum number of clients. General hours of operation will be between 6:00 AM and 7:00 PM Monday through Friday, 6:00 AM – 12:00 PM on Saturdays, and 8:00 AM – 12:00 PM on Sundays. The maximum number of clients for group classes is five, and the maximum number for Private/Duet Pilates is 2, though private training is more typical. The maximum number of clients at a peak time is 11 (three Duet Pilates sessions and one group class), with a maximum of five employees. A more typical class time during the day is two private sessions and one group class. The applicant has indicated that rarely will all four studios be used at the same time, and that no loud music or noise emitted from the proposed activities.

The main floor of the building is split-level, with two studios, a reception area, and restroom on the main level, and two smaller studios on the lower level. The total building square footage is 2,473 square feet. The applicant has also submitted a site plan of the proposed façade improvements and signage for your review, which we have reviewed in a separate letter.

PERMITTED USES AFTER SPECIAL APPROVAL STANDARDS (SEC. 90-268)

Section 90-268 lists "dance studios, fitness centers, yoga studios, or similar uses" as permitted uses after special approval in the RO-1 district. There are no use-specific conditions for such approval, except that the Planning Commission may waive or modify the required parking.

This use is also consistent with the recommendations of the Mack Avenue Corridor Improvement Plan, which encouraged allowing for a broader mix of uses along Mack in the RO-1 district.
GENERAL CRITERIA FOR USES PERMITTED AFTER SPECIAL APPROVAL (SEC. 90-75)

Section 90-75 contains review criteria for special uses. These criteria are meant to ensure that the proposed use does not contradict the purpose or intent of the Zoning Ordinance in general, and the RO-1 district standards in particular. We offer the following comments on the review criteria.

1. In location, size and intensity of the principal and accessory operations, be compatible with adjacent uses and zoning of land.

   The size and intensity of the use is compatible with adjacent uses and the existing commercial zoning in the RO-1 district. The applicant is not expanding the existing square footage of the building, and class sizes will be small (maximum of five clients per class) and staggered throughout the day. The fitness use will draw customers for shorter periods of time throughout the day than an office use. A typical class time is likely to be one group class and two private Pilates sessions, for a total of seven clients and four employees. At full capacity, which the applicant expects to be rare, the total number of employees and clients would be 16. Hours of operation will be generally be between 6:00 AM – 8:00 PM Monday through Friday, and 6:00 AM – 12:00 PM on weekends. Peak class times will be before or after typical work hours. We consider this usage compatible with other uses along the Mack Avenue corridor.

2. Be consistent with and promote the intent and purpose of this section.

   The purpose of the RO-1 district is to permit office and restricted business uses which provide opportunities for local employment, promote walkability; provide clean, modern buildings in landscaped settings; and do not generate large volumes of traffic or create parking problems.

   The proposed use is not only consistent with the intent of the RO-1 district, but will uniquely benefit and strengthen the character of the district through well-designed improvements that will modernize both the interior and exterior of the building. The use will replace a currently vacant office space, providing new local employment opportunities. By maintaining its street-front entrance, the use will also promote walkability and increase awareness of the newly offered neighborhood service. The use, as previously discussed, is also small in scope and not anticipated to create significant traffic or parking impacts. The building has six available parking spaces on-site, and access to approximately 10 on-street spots on the south side of Mack Avenue between Lorraine and Notre Dame.

3. Be compatible with the natural environment and conserve natural resources and energy.

   The proposed use will not alter the existing built or natural environment of the area as proposed.

4. Be consistent with existing and future capabilities of public services and facilities affected by the proposed use.

   The applicant does not propose an expansion of the existing building or any substantial renovations that would affect existing or future capabilities of public services or facilities other than parking. The surrounding area has ample parking (see the "Parking Considerations" section below) that the applicant could use for employee and customer parking.

5. Protect the public health, safety, and welfare as well as the social and economic well-being of those who will use the land use or activity, residents, businesses and landowners immediately adjacent and the city as the whole.

   The proposed use does not pose any concerns for public health, safety, welfare, or social or economic well-being of those in the area. The proposed use will provide an added health and wellness benefit for the
adjacent residents, as there is not an immediately adjacent fitness center. Additionally, more frequent patron use of the proposed project will enhance the vibrancy of street activity within the district that is overwhelmingly office use.

6. **Promote the use of land in a socially and economically desirable manner.**
   The proposed use is filling a formerly vacant office space with a new, economically viable use that is still compatible with the overall purpose and intent of the district.

7. **Not be in conflict with convenient, safe and normal neighborhood vehicular and pedestrian traffic routes, flows, intersections, and general character and intensity of neighborhood development.**
   The small-scale, boutique nature of the use will likely not lead to significant impacts on vehicular or pedestrian traffic in the RO-1 district. Additionally, the use is more likely to attract patrons who may walk or bike to classes. Apart from minor façade improvements, it will also not significantly alter the building’s exterior, so as to remain consistent with the general character of development in this area.

8. **Be of such a design and impact that the location and height of buildings, the location, nature and height of walls, fences and the nature and extent of landscaping on the site shall not hinder or discourage the appropriate development and use of adjacent land and buildings or impair the value thereof.**
   Proposed changes to the building shall primarily be limited to interior renovations, façade improvements, parking lot resurfacing, and new signage consistent with the surrounding district and required design standards. Our full comments on site plan compliance are provided in a separate letter.

9. **In the nature, location, size and site layout of the use, be a harmonious part of the district in which it is situated taking into account, among other things, prevailing shopping habits, convenience of access by prospective patrons, the physical and economic relationship of one type of use to another and characteristic groupings of uses of said district.**
   The use will be harmonious with the rest of the district as it will not alter the existing building except for minor façade improvements and new signage. The use will front on Mack Avenue ensuring easy pedestrian and vehicular access to the site and nearby parking.

   While fitness center uses are not known to generate the same types of commerce and pedestrian traffic that storefronts and cafes do, the increase in visible usage during the morning and early evening should prove to be a positive for Mack Avenue.

10. **In the location, size, intensity and site layout be such that operations will not be objectionable to nearby dwellings, by reason of noise, fumes, glare or flash of lights.**
    The proposed fitness center use will not create any of these issues.

**PARKING CONSIDERATIONS**

*Section 90-268* of the Zoning Ordinance provides the Planning Commission flexibility in determining the appropriate parking requirements, “after considering the intensity of the proposed use, the hours of operation of the proposed use and other uses within the same block, public parking available within the same block, available on-street parking, or shared parking arrangements with other uses within the same block.” We offer the following comments on the parking proposed by the applicant, based on past precedents applied for similar uses both in the RO-1 and other districts in the City.
The City’s Zoning Ordinance does not have a specific standard to apply for fitness center uses, nor do ITE/ULI for facilities as small as this one. However, the standard applied to other similar uses in the City (including 17108 Mack Avenue) is one (1) space for every 200 square feet of usable floor area. This is the same standard that applies to the existing office use. Based on this standard, the proposed fitness center use requires 12 parking spaces. A peak class time, which the applicant notes would be rare, would have three Private/Duet Pilates sessions (max. 2 clients), and one class (max. 5 clients), for a total of 11 clients and five employees. A more typical schedule would be two Private sessions and one class, for a total of seven clients and four employees.

In general, as described in Section 90-266. Statement of Purpose the RO-1 district is designed and intended to promote local employment opportunities close to residential areas that do not generate large volumes of traffic, traffic congestions, or parking problems. The site is also walkable and bikeable from nearby neighborhoods, which may help reduce the number of clients who need to park. Therefore, we believe a shared parking strategy, using existing on- and off-street facilities, is appropriate for this use.

The site has an adjacent parking lot with six parking spaces. As mentioned in our site plan review letter, we believe the spot behind the building should be reserved as a turnaround space and not count as a permanent on-site parking spot. There are approximately 8-10 on-street parking spaces on Mack between Lorraine and Notre Dame, which we feel are most likely to be used by clients of this site (though there are additional spaces east of Notre Dame and on the opposite side of Mack on this block). These spaces are rarely used by patrons of the neighboring offices, as those uses have private parking available behind their buildings. There is also available parking on Lorraine, which is currently unrestricted. However, if there becomes a neighborhood parking problem, the City should reserve the right to restrict the parking on Lorraine to residents only.

In terms of peak usage periods, we find that peak times for this use will generally not conflict with surrounding office uses. Typical fitness class schedules submitted by the applicant show the majority of classes in the early morning before typical work hours (6:00 AM – 9:00 AM) and in the evenings starting at 4:00 PM, with very few classes scattered throughout the day. We anticipate that the surrounding office uses will only require use of on-street parking during standard business hours making shared street parking a viable concept at this location. The on-site parking spaces should help with those times during the day when peak parking demand overlaps.

Based on these considerations, we find the use could be adequately served by on-site and shared on-street parking and a modification from the required spaces is appropriate.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on our review, we recommend the proposed fitness center use for special use approval, subject to Planning Commission approval of a modification of the required parking.

If you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Respectfully submitted,

McKENNA

[Signatures]

Julie Connochie, AICP
Principal Planner

Stephanie Peña
Assistant Planner
Hi,

My name is Kelly Page-lacovoni, and I live at 880 Loraine. The proposed Pilates Studio at 17200 Mack Ave. is directly next door to my house, and I support the use of the building as a pilates studio. The building has been empty for quite some time now, and it would be in the best interest of our city to have this pilates studio up and running. Thank you for considering my opinion on this matter.

Sincerely,

Kelly Page-lacovoni
SPECIAL USE PERMIT

Permittee:  Feeling Good Feeling Great, LLC

Location:  17200 Mack Avenue
          City of Grosse Pointe
          Wayne County, Michigan

Zoning:  RO-1, Restricted Office

Application Received: __________, 2020  Permit Date: Issued __________, 2020
Permit Fee:  $_____.00  Paid __________, 2020

Pursuant to the Charter and Ordinances of the City of Grosse Pointe, Michigan ("City"), after
notice, public hearing and approval of the city planning commission, City allows the Permittee
named above (or its agent or lessee) to use the premises commonly known as 17200 Mack Avenue
for a Pilates Studio, subject to the following conditions:

1. All signage for the use must be approved by the City.

2. Use of the property shall be in conformance with the special use application submitted
   by the Permittee, and comply with any conditions contained in the City Planner’s
   recommendation dated December 11, 2020 and any conditions required by the
   Planning Commission as reflected in the Minutes of its December 14, 2020, meeting.

3. The applicant and its agents or lessees shall continue compliance with the applicable
   provisions of Section 90-299, design and locational criteria for uses permitted after
   special use approval, and Section 90-300, general criteria for uses permitted after
   special approval, and the approved site plan.

CONSTRUCTION

1. Not a Permit For Entire Project. This permit does not indicate that any other permit
   will issue or any other approval will occur; nor does it constitute assurance that any partial building
   or use permit will be followed by grant of a building or use permit for the entire project.
2. **Not a Building Permit or an Occupancy Permit.** The issuance of this special use permit shall not be construed as approval of the construction details of any proposed structure and shall not absolve the Permittee of its responsibilities to obtain and comply with any ordinance or law that may require a building or occupancy permit.

3. **Substantial Compliance with Site Plans.** Any construction proposed as part of the Permittee’s application to the planning commission shall be completed substantially in accordance with the application. No significant changes in, or deviation from, the site plan shall be permitted unless a revised site plan shall have been submitted to, and approved by, the City.

4. **Inspection Permitted.** The City or its representative may inspect any new construction or alteration to the structure, at reasonable times and on notice to the Permittee, to verify compliance with this use permit.

5. **Expiration.** This permit shall expire if any construction shown on the site plan has not started within one (1) year from the date of issue. The City may extend this period in writing, but only for reasonable cause shown.

**GENERAL CONDITIONS OF THE PERMIT**

6. **Compliance with Rules and Regulations.** The Permittee assumes all responsibilities for meeting the requirements of all applicable rules, regulations, ordinances and laws of local, state and Federal authorities, existing or changed from time to time. Issuance of this permit shall not constitute a waiver of any applicable requirements, and does not constitute a license to operate a business.

7. **Revocation.** In issuing this permit, the City has relied on the statements and representations made by the Permittee or its agent. Any incorrect statements or representations shall be cause for revocation of this permit, and all the rights of the Permittee hereunder shall immediately become null and void.

8. **Not a Guaranty.** *In issuing a Special Use Permit, the City does not insure or guarantee to the Permittee, to its assignee or other interested party, that there are no violations of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Grosse Pointe or statutes and regulations of the State of Michigan.*

9. **Indemnification.** The Permittee shall be solely responsible for, and shall defend, indemnify and save harmless the City of Grosse Pointe and its employees and agents from and against any and all claims, costs, damages or expenses it or they may suffer, incur, sustain or become liable for on account of any injury to, or death of, any person or persons, or any damage to, or destruction of, any real or personal property, that may be caused by the construction, use, state or repair, operation or maintenance of the proposed structures or resulting in any manner from the exercise of the privileges given under this permit.
10. **No Modification.** No officer, official or agent of City has the power to modify or alter this Permit or waive any of its conditions.

**THIS PERMIT DOES NOT CONSTITUTE ANY REPRESENTATION OR WARRANTY AS TO THE IDENTITY OF THE OWNER OR AS TO THE CONDITION OF ANY STRUCTURES ON THE PREMISES DESCRIBED HEREIN (OR ANY ASPECT OF SUCH CONDITION). INTERESTED PERSONS ARE ADVISED TO MAKE THEIR OWN INQUIRY AND INSPECTION OF THE PREMISES IN ORDER TO DETERMINE THE CONDITION THEREOF.**

Issued in triplicate on the Permit Date shown on the first page of this Special Use Permit.

CITY OF GROSSE POINTE

By: __________________________

Building Inspector

ACCEPTED BY PERMITTEE __________, 2020

____________________________

By: __________________________

____________________________

Title
| TITLE: Planning Commission – Site Plan Review 17200 Mack Avenue Feeling Good Feeling Great, LLC | DATE: December 9, 2020 |
| SUMMARY: William Thomas, on behalf of Feeling Good Feeling Great, LLC, has submitted an application for site plan review for a Pilates studio at 17200 Mack Avenue. The site plan was reviewed based on requirements of Section 90-74 of the City code and proposed improvements to the site are limited to building façade improvements and minor improvements to the parking lot. The applicants site plan proposes one logo wall sign and one window sign placed on the door. A detailed report by the City Planner is attached for your review. |
| FINANCIAL IMPACT: None. |
| RECOMMENDATION: Motion to approve the site plan for Feeling Good Feeling Great, LLC, 17200 Mack Avenue, subject to the conditions listed in the City Planner’s site plan report dated December 11, 2020, and to recommend that the brick exterior remain original, not painted. |
| REVIEWED BY: Peter Dame | TITLE: City Manager |
| PREPARED BY: Julie Connochie | TITLE: City Planner |
December 11, 2020

Planning Commission
City of Grosse Pointe
17147 Maumee
Grosse Pointe, MI 48230

Subject: Site Plan Review #2 (revisions dated November 11, 2020)
Address: 17200 Mack Avenue
Zoning: RO-1
Applicant: Feeling Good Feeling Great, LLC

Dear Planning Commissioners:

We have reviewed the above referenced revised site plan application for 17200 Mack Avenue, dated November 11, 2020. Special Land Use applications require a site plan to be submitted and reviewed by City Council at the same time as the special land use. Our review of the special use application is provided in a separate letter.

SITE PLAN REVIEW

We have based our review of the site plan on the requirements of Section 90-74 of the City of Grosse Pointe and offer the following comments. Improvements to the site are limited to building façade improvements, and minor improvements to the parking lot.

1. **Use.** Fitness center uses are permitted in the RO-1 district as a special land use. This use is also consistent with the recommendations in the Mack Avenue Corridor Improvement Plan, which encouraged broadening the number of permitted uses on Mack in RO-1 areas.

2. **Harmonious Character.** Aside from façade improvements, the building will not receive any modifications that will alter its present state. We believe the façade changes will align with surrounding properties.

3. **Setbacks and Dimensional Requirements.** Aside from façade improvements, no modifications will be made to the existing building. The building is one-story (approx. 19 feet) in height, setback 7.5 feet from the front property line and at least 10 feet on the west side and rear. *Section 90-351* allows for does not require a minimum front, side or rear yard where 50 percent or more of the block is built up, as it is on this block. *Complies.*

4. **Architectural Features.** The property is located in the RO-1 district, as such there are no design standards in the Zoning Ordinance that apply to this property. However, the City of Grosse Pointe Design Standards include standards that are applicable to any non-residential district in the City. We have reviewed the proposed façade improvements against those standards for consistency; they are not required for approval.

a) **Façades**

1. **Blank walls shall not face a public street or parking areas. Walls facing a public street or parking area shall include windows and architectural features customarily found on the front façade of a building, such as awnings, cornice work, edge detailing, or decorative finish materials.** New black shingled roof, standing seam metal awnings, and a boral cap on the Mack
Avenue façade will be added to provide clean, modern architectural accents on the building façade. Where architectural details are being removed, repair/infill of reclaimed brick is proposed.

2. **Main entry doors shall be primarily glass.**
3. **Glass shall not be mirrored, reflective, or darkened. Slight green tints are acceptable.** The new windows and doors will be clear, Low-E coated glass.

b) **Building Materials and Colors**

4. **Primary Materials.** The primary (more than 50%) exterior opaque materials on each elevation should be brick or stone. The primary façade of the existing building is brick and will remain as such. Applicant has confirmed and identified on the elevation drawings that brick infill will be reclaimed brick to match the existing brick on the structure.

5. **Colors.** Brick facades should be standard modular brick-textures varied from smooth or glazed to rough or distressed in a range of dark color tones that are consistent with the predominate brick colors throughout the City. Light pink, white, or yellow brick colors are discouraged. In general, painting natural colored brick is discouraged. The natural brick on the façade is proposed to be painted white in effort to maintain the branding established by their other studio locations (Mack Avenue, Grosse Pointe Woods). While painting brick and white façades are not expressly prohibited, we believe the existing brick is more in keeping with the intent of the ordinance/design guidelines and is the preferred façade treatment. We welcome the Commission’s opinion on this, but either treatment is technically permissible.

6. **Accent Materials.** The following are recommended for cornices, bases, and decorative accent trims: stone, cast stone, copper, rock faced stone, aluminum or painted steel structural shapes, wood trim, premium grade. Proposed accent materials include standing seam roofing over a steel frame. All accents are to be painted black, to match new window frames.

7. **Parapets, flashing, and coping.** The following materials are approved: copper (untreated), brick, stone, cast stone, and wood. Existing aluminum fascia and wood trim friezes will be replaced with bark cap trim, an engineered equivalent to wood trim.

c) **Roof.** The revised site plans detail black asphalt shingles on the main roof of the building and standing seam metal roofing on the new awnings as design accents.

5. **Parking.** The applicant is proposing to mill, cap, and reconfigure the existing parking lot, but not alter the size of the parking area. The existing lot has five parking spaces on the side of the building and one behind in the vacated alley; the applicant is proposing to reconfigure the five spaces on the side of the building.

a) **Parking Space Dimensions.** The revised site plan indicates the location and dimensions of six on-site parking spaces. Each space is 10-feet by 20-feet. Section 90-159 of the Code of Ordinances requires parking lots to be built in compliance with the standards set forth in the Dimensions of Parking 5th Edition and the building code. The Dimensions of Parking requires minimum parking sizes of 9 feet by 18 feet.

b) **Parking Lot Dimensions.** Dimensions of Parking requires a minimum "module depth" (parking space plus maneuvering lane or drive aisle) depth of 41 feet for a single-loaded parking lot. The depth of the parking lot, with a 22-foot drive aisle, is 42 feet. The minimum permissible driveway width for 90-degree parking is 20 feet. That said, we believe the configuration of the parking lot requires the space behind the building to be used as a turnaround and should not count toward the available on-site parking. In addition, the actual driveway width (curb-cut) on Lorraine is narrower than the provided drive aisle, we recommend the applicant widen the access drive as well as resurface the driveway/apron to improve site access.
c) **Screening.** The adjacent property on Lorraine is zoned for parking and does not require any additional setback or screening, though the existing fence along the property line will be maintained. The existing landscaped hedge row along Mack will be maintained. Bumper blocks will be provided between the parking spaces and shrubs on the Mack Avenue side of the building to protect the shrubs, as required by the ordinance.

d) **Parking Spaces Required.** As discussed in our review letter, 12 parking spaces are required for this use, though the Planning Commission may modify that requirement based on surrounding conditions. In addition to the six on-site spaces

As discussed in our Special Land Use review letter, the peak usage times and availability of 8-10 on-street parking spaces on Mack on the block between Lorraine and Notre Dame supports a modification of the parking standards.

6. **Vehicular and Pedestrian Access.** No site changes to vehicle access are proposed at this time. **As noted in the parking discussion above, we recommend the applicant widen and resurface the existing driveway to improve access to and from the site.**

The building will maintain pedestrian access on both the parking and Mack Avenue sides of the building. The main entrance will be relocated on the Mack Avenue side, but will connect to existing sidewalks. There are no bike racks provided on site, however, **we recommend the applicant consider installing bike racks on Mack Avenue to encourage alternative modes of access to the site and to reduce parking demand.**

7. **Drainage and Utilities.** No changes are anticipated.

8. **Lighting.** Lighting details were updated on the revised site plan and lighting selections were included with the William J. Thomas Studios letter dated November 11, 2020. All proposed lighting will provide adequate shielding away from adjacent residential properties. **Complies.**

9. **Landscaping.** Existing landscaping will be maintained including existing street trees and shrubs along Mack Avenue and landscaping along the building façade.

**SIGNAGE PLAN**

The applicant's revised site plans propose one logo wall sign and one window sign placed on the door. **Section 58-11(c)1** governs sign proposals for buildings located in the RO-1 district on a major arterial, which includes Mack Avenue:

1. **A total of 50 sq. ft. of signage shall be permitted.** A total of 13 square feet of signage is proposed for the building façade. **Complies.**

2. **No wall sign shall exceed .75 square feet for each linear foot of the building façade on which the sign is located, or 24 square feet, whichever is less.** The one wall sign is nine square feet in size. **Complies.**

3. **One (1) wall sign shall be permitted for each 24 linear feet of building frontage.** The revised site plan has eliminated one of the originally two proposed wall signs. **Complies.**

4. **There are no specific standards for window signs provided in the ordinance. In the absence of such standards, the City typically limits signage to 10% of the total window/door glass area.** The applicant has reduced the size of the door sign to 4 square feet in size, which is approximately 10% of the clear glass area on the door. **Complies.**
RECOMMENDATION

At this time, we recommend the site plan application for approval, subject to the following conditions:

1. Planning Commission approval of the special land use for the fitness center, including modification of the parking standards for the required number of parking spaces.
2. That the applicant reserves the space behind the building as a turnaround and not permanent parking, widens the access drive, and resurfaces the driveway/apron on Lorraine to improve site access and circulation.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Respectfully submitted,

McKENNA

Julie Connochie, AICP
Principal Planner

Stephanie Peña
Assistant Planner
NOTICE TO APPLICANT: Applications for Site Plan Review by the Planning Commission must be submitted to the City in substantially complete form. The application must be accompanied by the data specified in the Zoning Ordinance and Site Plan Review Guidelines, including fully dimensioned site plans, plus the required review fees. Regular meetings of the Planning Commission are held on the fourth Monday of each month at 7:00 p.m. All meetings are held at Grosse Pointe City Hall, 17147 Maumee, Grosse Pointe, Michigan, 48230. Phone number (313) 885-5800.

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT:

I (we) the undersigned, do hereby respectfully request Site Plan Review and provide the following information to assist in the review:

Applicant: William J. Thomas Studios

Mailing Address: 527 Seven Mile Rd., Rochester, MI 48307

Telephone: 248-588-7242 Fax: 

Property Owner(s) (if different from Applicant): Feeling Good Feeling Great

Mailing Address: 121 Kercheval, Grosse Pointe Farms

Telephone: 313-885-1792 Fax: 

Applicant’s Legal Interest in Property: Architect

Location of Property: Street Address: 17200 Mack Ave.

Nearest Cross Streets: Cadieux

Sidewall Number: 

Property Description:

If part of a recorded plat, provide lot numbers and subdivision name. If not part of a recorded plat (i.e., “acreage parcel”), provide metes and bounds description. Attach separate sheets if necessary.

Noted on Site Plan

S.P.R. Appl: February 24, 2003
ATTACH THE FOLLOWING:

1. _____ ( ) individually folded copies of the site plans, sealed by a registered architect, engineer, landscape architect or community planner.

2. A brief written description of the existing and proposed uses, including but not limited to: hours of operation, number of employees on largest shift, number of company vehicles, etc.

3. Proof of property ownership.

4. Review comments or approval received from county, state, or federal agencies that have jurisdiction over the project, including but not limited to:
   - Wayne County Road Commission
   - Michigan Department of Environmental Quality
   - Wayne County Health Division
   - Michigan Department of Natural Resources
   - Michigan Department of Transportation

PLEASE NOTE: The applicant or a designated representative MUST BE PRESENT at all scheduled review meetings or the site plan may be tabled due to lack of representation.

Failure to provide true and accurate information on this application shall provide sufficient grounds to deny approval of a site plan application or to revoke any permits granted subsequent to site plan approval.

APPLICANT'S ENDORSEMENT:

All information contained herein is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge. I acknowledge that the Planning Commission will not review my application unless all information required in this application and the Zoning Ordinance have been submitted. I further acknowledge that the City and its employees shall not be held liable for any claims that may arise as a result of acceptance, processing, or approval of this site plan application.

[Signature]
Signature of Applicant

[Date]
Date

[Signature]
Signature of Applicant

[Date]
Date

[Signature]
Signature of Property Owner Authorizing this Application

[Date]
Date

TO BE COMPLETED BY THE CITY

Date Submitted:

Received By:

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

Approved: _________ Denied: _________

Case No.: Fee Paid:

Date of Public Hearing:

Date of Action:

S.P.R. Appl: February 24, 2003
appropriate, with the date the action was taken. One marked copy will be returned to the applicant and the other two copies shall be kept on file in the City Hall.

- **Step 9: Obtaining Permits.** After receiving Planning Commission approval, **construction may not begin until all required permits are obtained from the Building Department.** Please contact the Grosse Pointe City Building Department for further direction regarding preparation of construction documents and plans and obtaining required permits.

**APPLICANT'S ENDORSEMENT**

I acknowledge receiving of the copies of these **Site Plan Review Guidelines** as a part of the Grosse Pointe City Site Plan Review Application package.

[Signature(s) of Applicant(s)]

Date:
CITY OF GROSSE POINTE
APPLICATION FOR SPECIAL USE REVIEW

NOTICE TO APPLICANT: Applications for Special Use review by the Planning Commission must be submitted to the City in substantially complete form prior to being placed on the Planning Commission/City Council's agenda for consideration. The application must be accompanied by ____ ( ) individual folded copies of the site plan, plus the required review fees. Regular meetings of the Planning Commission/City Council are held on the third Monday of each month at 7:00 p.m. All meetings are held at the City of Grosse Pointe City Hall, 17147 MaumeeGrosse Pointe, MI. 48230. Phone number: (313) 885-5800.

Special Uses shall comply with the standards in Section 90-300 of the Zoning Ordinance. Accordingly, a public hearing shall be held by the Planning Commission before a decision is made on any Special Use request. Furthermore, a site plan shall be required, which shall be prepared in accordance with the appropriate section of the Ordinance.

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT:

I (we) the undersigned, do hereby respectfully request Special Use Review and provide the following information to assist in the review:

Applicant: William J. Thomas of William J. Thomas Studio

Mailing Address: 524 SEVENTH ST, ROCHESTER, MI 48307

Telephone: 248-568-7842 Fax:

Property Owner(s) (if different from Applicant): FELILIA GOOD FEEING, GREAT LLC

Mailing Address: 111 KERCHEFAC, GROSSE POINTE FARMS, MI.

Telephone: 313-885-1792 Fax:

Applicant=s Legal Interest in Property: ARCHITECT

Location of Property: Street Address: 17200 MACK Ave.

Nearest Cross Streets: CA刀IEux

Sidwell Number: SEE ATTACHED SURVEY

Property Description:

If part of a recorded plat, provide lot numbers and subdivision name. If not part of a recorded plat (i.e., acreage parcel), provide metes and bounds description. Attach separate sheets if necessary.

SEE ATTACHED SURVEY

February 27, 2003
PLEASE NOTE: The applicant or a designated representative MUST BE PRESENT at all scheduled review meetings or the site plan may be tabled due to lack of representation.

APPLICANT'S ENDORSEMENT:

All information contained herein is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge. I acknowledge that the Planning Commission will not review my application unless all information required in this application and the Zoning Ordinance have been submitted. I further acknowledge that the City and its employees shall not be held liable for any claims that may arise as a result of acceptance, processing, or approval of this application.

[Signature of Applicant]

Date

[Signature of Applicant]

Date

[Signature of Property Owner Authorizing this Application]

Date

February 27, 2003
Property Size  (Square Ft): \(24,500\) sq  (Acres): \(0.4\)

Existing Zoning (please check):

- R-1A  Single-Family Residential District
- R-1B  Single-Family Residential District
- R-2   Two-Family Residential District
- R-T   Terrace Residential District

Restricted Office District

Local Business District

Central Business District

Vehicular Parking District

Present Use of Property:  **OFFICE**

Proposed Use of Property: **WORK OUT STUDIO**

Please Complete the Following Chart:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Development</th>
<th>Number of Units</th>
<th>Gross Floor Area</th>
<th>Number of Employees on Largest Shift</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detached Single Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Mixed Use)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,173 sq</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ATTACH THE FOLLOWING:

1. \((\quad)\) individually folded copies of the site plan, sealed by a registered architect, engineer, landscape architect or community planner. (If copies are submitted simultaneously for site plan review, then submittal of 12 additional sets of prints is not necessary.)

2. Proof of property ownership.

3. A brief written description of the proposed use.
City or Grosse Pointe,  
17147 Maumee Avenue  
Grosse Pointe MI 48230

Special Land Use:

Description of Use of Property:

The property located at 17200 Mack will become the “Corner Studio” specializing in private Pilates Classes with class sizes of no more than 6 participants and 1 instructor per class in the largest Studio space. The smaller studios are meant for 1 on 1 training. Rarely will there be multiple classes going on at one time. There is no loud music or noises emitted from these activities. The hours of operation are generally 8-6 PM Monday through Saturday.

Thank you,

[Signature]
### TO BE COMPLETED BY THE CITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Submitted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee Paid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received By</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Public Hearing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION (RECOMMENDATION)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Approve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Deny</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons for Action Taken</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CITY BOARD ACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denied</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons for Action Taken</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CITY OF GROSSE POINTE
SPECIAL USE REVIEW GUIDELINES

Purpose of Special Use Review

The purpose of special use review is to determine if proposals for development of such uses are in compliance with the Zoning Ordinance and other applicable ordinances and laws. Standards in the Zoning Ordinance are intended to assure that the proposed use will conform to existing uses in the area and the Master Plan of the City, and will maintain satisfactory and harmonious relationships with existing and prospective development of contiguous land and adjacent neighborhoods.

Basis for Special Use Review

Section 90-300 of the Zoning Ordinance sets forth standards for review of special use proposals. A site plan is required, which should be prepared according to the standards in the appropriate section of the Zoning Ordinance. A public hearing will be held by the Planning Commission before a decision is made on any special use application. Planning Commission review of the special use proposal and site plan may occur simultaneously, but approval of the special use is required prior to final site plan approval.

Qualified Applicants

Any property owner or the owner's designated agent may submit an application for special use review, provided the property is correctly zoned for the intended use.

Review Fees

Review fees must be paid at the time the proposal is submitted. The review fees defray the cost of having the proposal and plan reviewed by City staff and the City Planner. A proposal will not be reviewed until the review fees have been paid.

Review Process

Procedures have been established to guide the Planning Commission, City Council, and the applicant through the special use review process. These procedures place certain responsibilities on the applicant. Compliance with all of the procedural requirements, as well as all Zoning Ordinance standards, will minimize delays and assure expeditious review of the proposal.

A step-by-step description of the review procedures follows:

- **Step 1 Submission Requirements.** The applicant is required to submit the following materials to the City of Grosse Pointe City Hall, 17147 Maumee Grosse Pointe, MI 48230:

  1. Three completed and signed copies of the Application for Special Use Review,

  2. ______ ( ) Individually folded copies of the site plan (if copies are submitted simultaneously for site plan review, then submission of _____ additional sets of prints shall not be required),

  3. The required review fee.

February 27, 2003
These materials must be submitted to the City Building Official in substantially complete form prior to being placed on the Planning Commission's meeting for consideration. The Planning Commission/City Council meets on the third Monday of each month at 7:00 p.m. at the City of Grosse Pointe City Hall, 17147 Maurnee Grosse Pointe, MI, 48230. Phone number: (313) 885-5800.

**Preliminary Review**

1. **Step 2: Distribution of Application Materials.** Upon submission of all required application materials, the application materials, including the site plan, will be distributed to the Police Department, Building Official, Department of Public Services, and City Planner for review. If deemed necessary, the plans may also be submitted to the City Engineer for review.

   - **Step 3: Reports from City Planner.** The City Planner will review the site plan and application to determine compliance with the Zoning Ordinance and Master Plan, and submit three (3) written reports as follows:

   1. One report, addressed to the Planning Commission, will identify major site plan issues which must be resolved with input from the Commission.
   2. The second report, addressed to the applicant, will identify all required site plan revisions, including the major issues identified in the report to the Planning Commission.
   3. The third report, addressed to the Planning Commission, will evaluate whether the proposal complies with adopted special use standards.

2. **Step 4: Planning Commission Consideration.** At the first regular meeting at which a special use proposal is considered, the Planning Commission will set the date for a public hearing and review the major site plan issues identified in the Planner's report.

3. **Step 5: Public Hearing:** Proposals involving a special use require a public hearing. Notification of the public hearing will be published in the newspaper and mailed to all property owners within 300 feet of the subject site.

4. **Step 6: Request for Revisions.** After Preliminary Review of the special use proposal and plan, the Planning Commission may request the applicant to complete certain revisions and submit the plans for engineering review prior to formal action being taken. It is recommended that the applicant consult with the City Planner and Engineer during the revision process. All required revisions must be completed or the special use proposal and plan will not be put on the agenda for Final Review.

5. **Step 7: Submission of Plans for Final Review.** Individually folded copies of the revised plan must be submitted for final review in substantially complete form at least fourteen (14) days prior to the Planning Commission meeting at which review is requested. The revised plan will be distributed to appropriate City officials, the City Planner, and the City Engineer for review. Note: the Applicant may submit final plans simultaneously to the City Hall, the Planner, and Engineer in order to expedite the review process.

*February 27, 2003*
Final Review

- **Step 8: Final Action by the Planning Commission.** The Planning Commission is authorized to approve, approve with conditions, or deny the special use proposal. If site plan review occurs simultaneously, a separate motion is required to take action on the site plan. However, final approval of the special use proposal by the Planning Commission is required prior to final approval subject to conditions, the applicant must submit a revised plan with a revision date, indicating compliance with the conditions.

- **Step 10: Distribution of the Final Plan.** After the Planning Commission has taken final action on a special use proposal and plan, the Planning Commission secretary will mark three copies of the application and plans APPROVED, APPROVED SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS, or DENIED, as appropriate, with the date that action was taken. One marked copy will be returned to the applicant and the other two copies will be kept on file in the City Hall.

APPLICANT’S ENDORSEMENT

I acknowledge receiving a copy of these Special Use Review Guidelines as a part of the application package I received from the City.

\[\text{Signature(s) of Applicant(s)}\]

\[10/26/20\]

Date

\[\text{Grosse Pointe/applicant/final/guideline.sur}\]
APPICLATION FOR SIGN PERMIT

Name of Business: THE CORNER STUDIO

Address: 17100 MACK Telephone: 313-821-4374

Owner: KEELING Groo KEELING GREAT
Address: 171 KIRCHER

Location of Sign on Building Property: MACK EVEN Telephone: 248-568-7842

Contractor: WILLIAM THOMAS STUDIOS

Address/Zip: 524 SEVENTH ST. ROCHESTER Telephone: 248-568-7842

Type of Sign: (2) 36" x 36" STAINLESS STEEL WALL GRAPHIC
(1) VINYL POOR SIGN

Lighted: No Yes No – If yes, describe

Size of Sign: (2) 36" x 36" (1) 30" x 36" Size of Letters: 7"

Exact Wording of Sign: THE CORNER STUDIO

Construction and Materials of Sign: VINYL POOR GRAPHIC + STAINLESS STEEL

Does sign encroach on sidewalk, street or City right-of-way? Yes X No

If yes, describe

Are there any other signs for this establishment? No

Estimate cost by applicant: $6,000.00

Applicant must file one set of plans, drawings, and specifications describing the proposed sign.

AFFIDAVIT: State of Michigan, County of Wayne

The undersigned, WILLIAM THOMAS, being duly sworn, deposes and says that he is the owner or the duly authorized agent of the owner of the premises described above and that the statements made in this application and in or on any papers, plans, or other matters made a part thereof are true to the best of his knowledge and belief.

Date: 10/14/82

Signature of Applicant: 

June 1982
Terry Brennan  
Building Inspector  
City of Grosse Pointe  
17147 Maumee  
Grosse Pointe, MI.

Subject: 17200 Mack Review Letter Remarks

Terry,

Below are the remarks and answers based off Julie’s Letter.

Facades:
1. The exterior complies, but the client has requested to change the main roof from standing seam metal roof to black asphalt shingles due to the fact that the pitch is low and you will barely be able to see the roof as it is currently built. This has been revised on the updated drawings and rendering. The standing seam metal awnings on the front of the structure will remain.
2. Complies
3. The new windows and doors are to be clear Low E coated glass. With the low E glass there is a very minor tint to the glass.

Building Materials and Colors:
1. As stated in your letter, the brick infill of the existing door will be reclaimed brick to match the existing brick on the structure. I will add a note to the drawings.
2. It is the clients request that we keep the white painted brick. This is done to maintain the style that the other studios that they own in order to maintain the brand.
3. Complies
4. Complies

Roof:
1. The only change will be to black shingles instead of the standing seam metal roof for the main roof as noted above.

Lighting:
1. I have updated the plans and elevations with the light locations. I have attached the light selections to this letter. There will be three black goose neck style lights, one above the entry door, one located above the alley entrance and one located and the far north east end of the building. There will be two wall pack parking lot lights fixed to the parking lot façade of the building. WPSLED10 in Black

Parking:
1. I have updated the parking layout to show the 6th parking spot along with the note for the parking lot to be milled and capped. There are 25 parallel parking spaces located on Mack with in 300’.
Signage

1. Complies
2. We have deleted one of the two wall signs. The wall sign located next to the door is the sign that we have eliminated
3. The wall sign closest to the door has been eliminated
4. For the Door sign, I have reduced the area to 10% of the double door area.

Please let me know if there are any further questions,
10% of the total window/door area = 4 sf

Project: the CORNER STUDIO
17200 Mack Ave.  
City of Groose Pointe Michigan

Window Vinyl Graphic on Door

Stainless Steel Graphic on 2” Standoffs on wall above door
### Electrical
- 120V input (277V available in arm and post option only)
- Integrated power supply allows the fixture to be connected directly into line voltage
- Pre-wired and ready for install
- LED is dimmable with Incandescent/Triac dimmers

### Mounting
- 1/2” or 3/4” IP for arms. Flush mount, stems and post available only in 1/2”
- 9’ Pendant cord available in black or white cord (includes 5” canopy with the same finish as the shade)

### Finishes
- Shade and mounting finish options
- Available in 21 standard and 2 specialty finishes with optional coastal coating to protect finish in coastal environments (add “-C” to the finish)
- Inner shade is painted gloss white
- Consult factory for custom finish options

### Optional Accessories
- Glass, Cast Guard, Wire Cage or Wire Guard options available

### Listing
UL listed to US and Canadian standards for wet locations

---

**Standard Order Matrix** (Example: RS16MBK-2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diameter</th>
<th>Lamp</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Coastal Coating Option</th>
<th>Optional Accessories</th>
<th>Mounting Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RS16 (16&quot;)</td>
<td>LED1227 1,2,3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ABL (Aegean Blue)</td>
<td>-C (Coating)</td>
<td>-2 (1/2” IP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LED1230 1,2,3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>BB (Burnished Bronze)</td>
<td>-F (Frosted Glass)</td>
<td>-3 (3/4” IP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LED1235 1,2,3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>BK (Gloss Black)</td>
<td>-GG (Clear Glass w/ Cast Guard)</td>
<td>-B (Black Cord Pendant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LED1240 1,2,3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>BLU (Blue)</td>
<td>-FG (Frosted Glass w/ Cast Guard)</td>
<td>-W (White Cord Pendant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LED1827 1,2,3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>DVG (Dove Gray)</td>
<td>-CGG (Clear Glass w/ Wire Cage)</td>
<td>-F (Flush Mount)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LED1830 1,2,3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>FLG (Flannel Gray)</td>
<td>-FGWC (Frosted Glass w/ Wire Cage)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LED1835 1,2,3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>LG (Lime Green)</td>
<td>-WG (Wire Guard)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LED1840 1,2,3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>MB (Matte Black)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LED1845 1,2,3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>MBL (Midnight Blue)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LED1850 1,2,3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>PNA (Painted Natural Aluminum)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LED1855 1,2,3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>PNC (Painted Natural Copper)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LED1860 1,2,3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>RD (Red)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LED1865 1,2,3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SGR (Sage Green)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LED1870 1,2,3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SGW (Semi Gloss White)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LED1875 1,2,3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SND (Sand)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LED1880 1,2,3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SS (Satin Silver)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LED1885 1,2,3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>TBZ (Textured Bronze)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LED1890 1,2,3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>TGP (Textured Graphite)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LED1900 1,2,3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>TNG (Tangerine)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LED1910 1,2,3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>TTL (Tahitian Teal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LED1920 1,2,3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>WT (Gloss White)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LED1930 1,2,3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>YEL (Yellow)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Lamps must be specified, and are not included in shade cost
2. Glass enclosure must be specified
3. Lumen are raw LED value

---

**KEY: Standard Finishes**

- **ABL** (Aegean Blue)
- **BB** (Burnished Bronze)
- **BK** (Gloss Black)
- **BLU** (Blue)
- **DVG** (Dove Gray)
- **FLG** (Flannel Gray)
- **RD** (Red)

**FINISHES**

- **LG** (Lime Green)
- **MB** (Matte Black)
- **MBL** (Midnight Blue)
- **PNA** (Painted Natural Aluminum)
- **PNC** (Painted Natural Copper)
- **SGR** (Sage Green)
- **SGW** (Semi Gloss White)
- **SND** (Sand)
- **SS** (Satin Silver)
- **TBZ** (Textured Bronze)
- **TGP** (Textured Graphite)

**SPECIALTY FINISHES**

- **TNG** (Tangerine)
- **TTL** (Tahitian Teal)
- **WT** (Gloss White)
- **YEL** (Yellow)

---

**Spec-00040 Revised 09/16/2020**
Lumark
WP Wall Pack LED
Wall Mount Luminaire

Typical Applications
Outdoor • Parking Lots • Walkways • Building Areas

Quick Facts
• Lumen packages range from 4,700 - 15,500 lumens (40W - 120W)
• Replaces up to 450W HID equivalent
• Efficacies up to 128 lumens per watt
• Energy and maintenance savings up to 89% versus HID solutions
• Heat and impact resistant borosilicate glass lens

Dimensional Details

WPSLED
10-5/8” [270mm]
7-9/16” [193mm]

WPLLED
18-15/16” [481mm]
9-1/2” [242mm]

WPMLED
14-5/8” [370mm]
7-3/4” [197mm]

Product Certifications

UL Listed
DLC Listed
DLC Premier
FCC
RoHS
IP66
### Ordering Information

**SAMPLE NUMBER:** WPMLED15-C-PC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Number</th>
<th>Voltage</th>
<th>Color Temperature</th>
<th>Options (Add as Suffix)</th>
<th>Accessories (Order Separately)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WPSLED10</td>
<td>Universal, 120-277V</td>
<td>[Blank]</td>
<td>Photocell 120-277V</td>
<td>WPS/VS=Full Cutoff Visor for WPSLED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPMLED10</td>
<td>HV=High Voltage, 347-480V</td>
<td>4000K, Neutral C=5000K, Cool</td>
<td></td>
<td>WPM/VS=Full Cutoff Visor for WPMLED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPSLED2S</td>
<td>Medium LED Wall Pack, 50W, 6,200lm</td>
<td>[Blank]</td>
<td></td>
<td>WPS/WG=Wire Guard for WPSLED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPMLED2S</td>
<td>Medium LED Wall Pack, 80W, 10,200lm</td>
<td>[Blank]</td>
<td></td>
<td>WPM/WG=Wire Guard for WPMLED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPLLED2S</td>
<td>Large housing, 80W, 15,640 Lumens</td>
<td>[Blank]</td>
<td></td>
<td>WPC/WG=Wire Guard for WPLLED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPSLED4S</td>
<td>Large housing, 120W, 15,960 Lumens</td>
<td>[Blank]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**
2. Standard lead times apply.
3. Not available w/ HV High Voltage.
4. For use with WPSLED housing size only.
5. For use with WPMLED housing size only.
6. For use with WPLLED housing size only.

### Product Specifications

#### Construction
- Die-cast aluminum housing with hinged, removable die-cast aluminum door
- 1/2” threaded conduit entry points (3 on small housing, 4 on medium and large housing)

#### Optics
- Impact and heat resistant borosilicate refractive glass lens
- Full cutoff IESNA complaint visor accessory available
- 80CRI minimum

#### Electrical
- -40°C minimum operating temperature
- 40°C maximum operating temperature
- >9 power factor
- <20% total harmonic distortion
- Class 2 driver incorporates internal fusing designed to withstand 6kV surge test
- 0-10V dimming driver is standard

#### Finish
- UV stabilized polyester powder coat paint for protection against fade and wear; Standard color is bronze

#### Shipping Data
- Small: 7.5 lbs (3.4 kgs.)
- Medium: 13.1 lbs (5.9 kgs.)
- Large: 19.7 lbs (8.9 kgs.)

### Energy and Performance Data

#### Power and Lumens (Small)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Light Engine</th>
<th>WPSLED10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power (Watts)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input Current @ 120V (A)</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input Current @ 277V (A)</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input Current @ 347V (A)</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000K Lumens</td>
<td>4,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUG Rating</td>
<td>B1-U3-G3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000K Lumens</td>
<td>4,805</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Power and Lumens (Medium)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Light Engine</th>
<th>WPMLED10</th>
<th>WPMLED15</th>
<th>WPMLED2S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power (Watts)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input Current @ 120V (A)</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input Current @ 277V (A)</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input Current @ 347V (A)</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000K Lumens</td>
<td>4,700</td>
<td>6,203</td>
<td>10,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUG Rating</td>
<td>B1-U3-G3</td>
<td>B2-U3-G3</td>
<td>B2-U3-G4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000K Lumens</td>
<td>4,766</td>
<td>6,264</td>
<td>10,358</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Power and Lumens (Large)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Light Engine</th>
<th>WPLLED15</th>
<th>WPLLED2S</th>
<th>WPLLED4S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power (Watts)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input Current @ 120V (A)</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input Current @ 277V (A)</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input Current @ 347V (A)</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000K Lumens</td>
<td>6,075</td>
<td>10,198</td>
<td>15,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUG Rating</td>
<td>B2-U3-G3</td>
<td>B2-U3-G4</td>
<td>B3-U4-G5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000K Lumens</td>
<td>6,169</td>
<td>10,355</td>
<td>15,678</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Lumen Multiplier

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ambient Temperature</th>
<th>Lumen Multiplier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10°C</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15°C</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25°C</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40°C</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Lumen Maintenance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ambient Temperature</th>
<th>TM-21 Lumen Maintenance (50,000 Hours)</th>
<th>Theoretical L70 (Hours)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 80W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25°C</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>146,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40°C</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>146,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 120W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25°C</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>146,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40°C</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>121,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. NOTES AND SPECIFICATIONS

All notes and specifications contained herein or on any other individual sheet shall apply to all the architectural sheets listed in the Sheet Index on sheet T100.

5. CONFLICTING NOTATIONS

It is the responsibility of the General Contractor and/or Sub-contractors to check for conformance of the project drawings, Product Data and Samples, but only for the limited purpose of checking for conformance.

6. SAFETY REQUIREMENTS

The Architect's review of such submittals is not conducted for the purpose of determining the accuracy and completeness of other details such as dimensions and quantities, or for substantiating the responsibility of the General Contractor and/or Sub-contractors. The Architect's review of such submittals is limited to confirming that the plans and specifications are consistent with the applicable Project Codes and to otherwise detail every condition and/or aspect thereof. All persons, structural and non-structural, shall be required to wear appropriate personal protective equipment while working on or off the project site. The Architect and the Architect's Assistant are not responsible for the accuracy and completeness of the plans and specifications, nor for the responsibility of the General Contractor and/or Sub-contractors.

7. ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

All codes, standards, and specifications referenced herein or on any other individual sheet shall apply to all the architectural sheets listed in the Sheet Index on sheet T100.

8. CONSULTANT DOCUMENTATION

The Architect's review of such submittals is not conducted for the purpose of determining the accuracy and completeness of any drawings or specifications, nor for the responsibility of the General Contractor and/or Sub-contractors. The Architect's review of such submittals is limited to confirming that the plans and specifications are consistent with the applicable Project Codes and to otherwise detail every condition and/or aspect thereof.

9. SECURITY REQUIREMENTS

The Architect's review of such submittals is not conducted for the purpose of determining the accuracy and completeness of any drawings or specifications, nor for the responsibility of the General Contractor and/or Sub-contractors. The Architect's review of such submittals is limited to confirming that the plans and specifications are consistent with the applicable Project Codes and to otherwise detail every condition and/or aspect thereof.

10. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Architect's review of such submittals is not conducted for the purpose of determining the accuracy and completeness of any drawings or specifications, nor for the responsibility of the General Contractor and/or Sub-contractors. The Architect's review of such submittals is limited to confirming that the plans and specifications are consistent with the applicable Project Codes and to otherwise detail every condition and/or aspect thereof.

11. CONSTRUCTION TYPE

The Architect's review of such submittals is not conducted for the purpose of determining the accuracy and completeness of any drawings or specifications, nor for the responsibility of the General Contractor and/or Sub-contractors. The Architect's review of such submittals is limited to confirming that the plans and specifications are consistent with the applicable Project Codes and to otherwise detail every condition and/or aspect thereof.

12. FIRE SUPPRESSION, ALARM SYSTEM, and PORTABLE FIRE EXTINGUISHERS

The Architect's review of such submittals is not conducted for the purpose of determining the accuracy and completeness of any drawings or specifications, nor for the responsibility of the General Contractor and/or Sub-contractors. The Architect's review of such submittals is limited to confirming that the plans and specifications are consistent with the applicable Project Codes and to otherwise detail every condition and/or aspect thereof.

13. MATERIALS

The Architect's review of such submittals is not conducted for the purpose of determining the accuracy and completeness of any drawings or specifications, nor for the responsibility of the General Contractor and/or Sub-contractors. The Architect's review of such submittals is limited to confirming that the plans and specifications are consistent with the applicable Project Codes and to otherwise detail every condition and/or aspect thereof.

14. GENERAL CONDITIONS

The Architect's review of such submittals is not conducted for the purpose of determining the accuracy and completeness of any drawings or specifications, nor for the responsibility of the General Contractor and/or Sub-contractors. The Architect's review of such submittals is limited to confirming that the plans and specifications are consistent with the applicable Project Codes and to otherwise detail every condition and/or aspect thereof.

15. DRAWING NAME

The Architect's review of such submittals is not conducted for the purpose of determining the accuracy and completeness of any drawings or specifications, nor for the responsibility of the General Contractor and/or Sub-contractors. The Architect's review of such submittals is limited to confirming that the plans and specifications are consistent with the applicable Project Codes and to otherwise detail every condition and/or aspect thereof.

16. CODE COMPLIANCE

The Architect's review of such submittals is not conducted for the purpose of determining the accuracy and completeness of any drawings or specifications, nor for the responsibility of the General Contractor and/or Sub-contractors. The Architect's review of such submittals is limited to confirming that the plans and specifications are consistent with the applicable Project Codes and to otherwise detail every condition and/or aspect thereof.
The design concepts and creative forms or systems graphically or literally expressed on this drawing have been generated by the designer for exclusive application to this project. They are the sole property of the designer and can only be used, of and by written permission of the designer.
The design concepts and creative forms or systems graphically or literally expressed on this drawing have been generated by the designer for exclusive application to this project. They are the sole property of the designer and can only be used, of and by written permission of the designer, duplicated, or reproduced at the exclusive discretion of the residential design.
The design concepts and creative forms or systems graphically or literally expressed on this drawing have been generated by the designer for exclusive application to this project. They are the sole property of the designer and can only be used, of and by written permission of the designer. 
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The design concepts and creative forms or systems graphically or literally expressed on this drawing have been generated by the designer for exclusive application to this project. They are the sole property of the designer and can only be used, of and by written permission of the designer.
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Hi Julie,

Regarding your notes, the private/duet pilates will be max 2 clients per session, three sessions per hour max. The additional third session will be rare and majority of the time will be two sessions per hour. Your notes on classes looks good! So yes, 11 clients at most per hour with 5 employees.

Thanks,
Aimee

On Tuesday, December 8, 2020, 11:58:58 AM EST, Julie Connochie <jconnochie@mcka.com> wrote:

Hello Aimee,

Thank you for sending additional information about the class schedule. I want to make sure I understand this schedule and your maximum anticipated number of clients, because this differs from the information sent with the initial application.

I’ve added some notes in red below that I think help clarify. If I’m understanding this correctly, the maximum number of clients in each Private/Duet Pilates session is 3, and the maximum number in each group class is 5. The most you would have going at once is one group class and two Private/Duet classes for a total of 11 clients? With four employees?

I think I get it, I just want to be absolutely sure so I can explain it clearly in my review letter. Thanks!

Best,

Julie Connochie, AICP

—

Principal Planner

MCKENNA

O 248.596.0920 | C 734.489.9364 | F 248.596.0930
From: wjthomas@wjtstudios.com <wjthomas@wjtstudios.com>  
Sent: Monday, December 7, 2020 1:39 PM  
To: Julie Connochie <jconnochie@mcka.com>  
Subject: FW: 17200 Mack

Julie,

Here is the anticipated schedule for the facality.

Let me know if you need anything else,
Hi Bill,

Here is the anticipated class schedule:

Private/Duet Pilates (Max. 3 clients per session, two sessions per hour max.)
M-F 6am-2pm & 4-7pm (1-6 people per hour)
Saturday 7am-12pm (1-6 people per hour)

Classes (Max. 5 clients per class, one class per hour max.)
M-F 6-11am & 4-8pm (1-5 people per hour)
Saturday 6am-12pm (1-5 people per hour)
Sunday 8am-12pm (1-5 people per hour)

If both private/duet pilates is maxed out (which is rare, usually 2 people per hour for those) & full class we'll have 11 clients in the building.

Let me know if you need anything additional!

Thanks,

Aimee

On Monday, December 7, 2020, 09:30:28 AM EST, <wjthomas@wjstudios.com> wrote:

Absolutely, as soon as I have the details I am going to send it over. All that I know right now is that it is on Monday at 7:00. She is going to send the meeting notice out soon.
MEMORANDUM

To: Mayor and Councilmembers

Thru: Pete Dame, City Manager

From: Kim Kleinow, Finance Director/Treasurer

Date: December 14, 2020

Re: Annual Financial Report

Attached for your review is the Annual Financial Report for the Fiscal Year ending June 30, 2020 along with audit transmittal letters from our independent auditors, Plante Moran.

Plante Moran representatives will be presenting the results of the audit at the council meeting and will be available to answer any questions.
December 4, 2020

To the Mayor and Members of the City Council
City of Grosse Pointe, Michigan

We have audited the financial statements of the City of Grosse Pointe, Michigan (the "City") as of and for the year ended June 30, 2020 and have issued our report thereon dated December 4, 2020. Professional standards require that we provide you with the following information related to our audit, which is divided into the following sections:

Section I - Communications Required Under AU 260

Section II - Other Recommendations and Legislative Items

Section I includes information that current auditing standards require independent auditors to communicate to those individuals charged with governance. We will report this information annually to the members of the City Council of the City of Grosse Pointe, Michigan.

Section II contains updated legislative and other recommendations that we believe will be of interest to you or are best practice recommendations.

We would like to take this opportunity to thank the City's staff, especially Kim Kleinow and Peter Dame, for the cooperation and courtesy extended to us during our audit. Their assistance and professionalism are invaluable.

This report is intended solely for the use of the members of the City Council and management of the City of Grosse Pointe, Michigan and is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.

We welcome any questions you may have regarding the following communications, and we would be willing to discuss these or any other questions that you might have at your convenience.

Very truly yours,

Plante & Moran, PLLC

Joe Kowalski, CPA
Partner

Spencer Tawa, CPA
Manager
Section I - Communications Required Under AU 260

Our Responsibility Under U.S. Generally Accepted Auditing Standards

As stated in our engagement letter dated September 18, 2020, our responsibility, as described by professional standards, is to express an opinion about whether the financial statements prepared by management with your oversight are fairly presented, in all material respects, in conformity with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles. Our audit of the financial statements does not relieve you or management of your responsibilities. Our responsibility is to plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable, but not absolute, assurance that the financial statements are free of material misstatement.

As part of our audit, we considered the internal control of the City of Grosse Pointe, Michigan. Such considerations were solely for the purpose of determining our audit procedures and not to provide any assurance concerning such internal control.

We are responsible for communicating significant matters related to the audit that are, in our professional judgment, relevant to your responsibilities in overseeing the financial reporting process. However, we are not required to design procedures specifically to identify such matters.

Planned Scope and Timing of the Audit

We performed the audit according to the planned scope and timing previously communicated to you in our letter about planning matters dated October 22, 2020.

Significant Audit Findings

Qualitative Aspects of Accounting Practices

Management is responsible for the selection and use of appropriate accounting policies. In accordance with the terms of our engagement letter, we will advise management about the appropriateness of accounting policies and their application. The significant accounting policies used by the City are described in Note 1 to the financial statements.

No new accounting policies were adopted, and the application of existing policies was not changed during the year ended June 30, 2020.

We noted no transactions entered into by the City during the year for which there is a lack of authoritative guidance or consensus.

There are no significant transactions that have been recognized in the financial statements in a different period than when the transaction occurred.

Accounting estimates are an integral part of the financial statements prepared by management and are based on management’s knowledge and experience about past and current events and assumptions about future events. Certain accounting estimates are particularly sensitive because of their significance to the financial statements and because of the possibility that future events affecting them may differ significantly from those expected.
The most sensitive estimates affecting the financial statements are as follows:

- Pension and OPEB (other employment benefits) costs (actuarial methods and assumptions), including the future rate of return on investments, employee eligibility rates, life expectancies, health care cost trends, and projected salary increases.

- Value of alternative investments included in the pension system. These estimates are based on audited financial statements.

We evaluated the key factors and assumptions used to develop the estimates in determining that they are reasonable in relation to the financial statements taken as a whole.

The disclosures in the financial statements are neutral, consistent, and clear.

**Difficulties Encountered in Performing the Audit**

We encountered no difficulties in dealing with management in performing and completing our audit.

**Disagreements with Management**

For the purpose of this letter, professional standards define a disagreement with management as a financial accounting, reporting, or auditing matter, whether or not resolved to our satisfaction, that could be significant to the financial statements or the auditor’s report. We are pleased to report that no such disagreements arose during the course of our audit.

**Corrected and Uncorrected Misstatements**

Professional standards require us to accumulate all known and likely misstatements identified during the audit, other than those that are trivial, and communicate them to the appropriate level of management. Management has corrected all such misstatements.

**Significant Findings or Issues**

We generally discuss a variety of matters, including the application of accounting principles and auditing standards, business conditions affecting the City, and business plans and strategies that may affect the risks of material misstatement, with management each year prior to our retention as the City’s auditors. However, these discussions occurred in the normal course of our professional relationship, and our responses were not a condition of our retention.

**Management Representations**

We have requested certain representations from management that are included in the management representation letter dated December 4, 2020.
Management Consultations with Other Independent Accountants

In some cases, management may decide to consult with other accountants about auditing and accounting matters, similar to obtaining a second opinion on certain situations. If a consultation involves application of an accounting principle to the City's financial statements or a determination of the type of auditor's opinion that may be expressed on those statements, our professional standards require the consulting accountant to check with us to determine that the consultant has all the relevant facts. To our knowledge, there were no such consultations with other accountants.
Updated Uniform Chart of Accounts

In April 2017, the State released an updated Uniform Chart of Accounts. Originally, local units of government were expected to comply with the changes beginning with June 30, 2018 year ends. However, the State has extended the deadline for compliance. On April 20, 2020, the State issued a memo that sets an implementation date for fiscal years ending on October 31, 2022 and thereafter. The State has committed to releasing various tools to help local units with implementation, including FAQs and clarification on which accounts should be used when implementing GASB 84. A significant revision to the current version of the chart of accounts will be issued in the future that will incorporate feedback that the Treasury has received. This revision will include significant changes to the expenditure accounts 700-999, which will now mirror the old approach that allowed for various numbers within certain ranges. Going forward, the Treasury will issue the following three documents for any future revisions: a revised chart of accounts, a marked-up version of the chart showing the changes, and a summary of the revisions report. Local units can sign up for alerts at this link:

https://public.govdelivery.com/accounts/MITREAS/subscriber/new?qsp/MITREAS_1

Upcoming Accounting Standards Requiring Preparation

GASB Statement No. 95 - Postponement of the Effective Dates of Certain Authoritative Guidance

This new pronouncement was adopted in May 2020 and is effective immediately. This statement postpones the effective dates of the following pronouncements and implementation guides by one year:

- Statement No. 83, Certain Asset Retirement Obligations
- Statement No. 84, Fiduciary Activities
- Statement No. 88, Certain Disclosures Related to Debt
- Statement No. 89, Accounting for Interest Cost Incurred before the End of a Construction Period
- Statement No. 90, Majority Equity Interests
- Statement No. 91, Conduit Debt Obligations
- Statement No. 92, Omnibus 2020
- Statement No. 93, Replacement of Interbank Offered Rates
- Implementation Guide No. 2019-2, Fiduciary Activities

The effective dates of the following pronouncement and implementation guide are postponed by 18 months:

- Statement No. 87, Leases
- Implementation Guide No. 2019-3, Leases
Section II - Other Recommendations and Legislative Items
(Continued)

**GASB Statement No. 84 - Fiduciary Activities**

This new pronouncement is effective for reporting periods beginning after December 15, 2018 (December 15, 2019 after extension within GASB Statement No. 95). This statement provides criteria for state and local governments to use in identifying whether an activity is fiduciary and should be reported as a fiduciary fund type in its financial statements. In addition, once fiduciary activities are identified, GASB 84 also provides specific reporting requirements.

This statement has the potential to significantly impact what governments currently report as a fiduciary activity. Upon adoption, we anticipate that some governments' fiduciary activities will need to move to governmental funds, while other activities that previously were not considered fiduciary may now be reported as such under certain circumstances. It is also possible that certain pension and OPEB fiduciary funds will no longer be reported in a local unit's financial statements.

Given the potential to have a major impact on many governments, not only to their external financial statements, but also to their accounting system requirements and budget documents, we encourage you to start analyzing the impact of this standard now. The first step to implementation is identifying the types of activities that should be analyzed and then running those activities through the lens of this standard.

**GASB Statement No. 87 - Leases**

This new accounting pronouncement will be effective for reporting periods beginning after December 15, 2019 (June 15, 2021 after extension within GASB Statement No. 95). This statement requires recognition of certain lease assets and liabilities for leases that previously were classified as operating leases and recognized as inflows of resources or outflows of resources based on the payment provisions of the contract. It establishes a single model for lease accounting based on the foundational principle that leases are financings of the right to use an underlying asset. Under this statement, a lessee is required to recognize a lease liability and an intangible right-to-use lease asset, and a lessor is required to recognize a lease receivable and a deferred inflow of resources.

We recommend beginning to accumulate information now related to all significant lease agreements in order to more efficiently implement this new standard once it becomes effective.

Plante & Moran, PLLC will be providing trainings and other resources to our clients in the coming months to help prepare for the implementation of all these new standards. In the interim, please reach out to your engagement team for assistance in getting started.

**GASB Statement No. 89 - Interest Incurred During Construction**

This new accounting pronouncement will be effective for reporting periods beginning after December 15, 2019 (December 15, 2020 after extension within GASB Statement No. 95). This statement eliminates capitalized interest and instead requires all interest expense, including the portion incurred during construction of a capital asset, to be expensed. Early adoption is encouraged.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE: Resolution to Implement Redevelopment Ready Community Report</th>
<th>DATE: December 14, 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUMMARY:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After a presentation from state officials last year, the City Council approved a resolution authorizing City staff to begin the process to become a Michigan Economic Development Corporation (MEDC) Redevelopment Ready Community (RRC). This certification is an indication that a city meets benchmarks MEDC has established for having redevelopment tools and processes that promote economic development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City staff then conducted a self-evaluation as the first part of the process. MEDC has just finished its review of the City’s submittal and the City’s RRC representative will share a summary of the report with its assessment of the steps needed to meet the MEDC’s RRC program benchmarks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since the City of Grosse Pointe wishes to promote future investment and redevelopment of the City and continues to strive for a streamlined and business-friendly planning and development process, staff recommends approval of the attached resolution demonstrating the City Council’s support for taking the step necessary to reach RRC certification.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINANCIAL IMPACT: N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDATION: Approve the resolution to implement the RRC recommendations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREPARED BY: Peter Daney</td>
<td>TITLE: City Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memorandum

TO: Grosse Pointe City Council

FROM: Elizabeth King, MEDC Redevelopment Ready Communities Planner

DATE: December 8, 2020

RE: City of Grosse Pointe RRC Baseline Report

As the City of Grosse Pointe’s Redevelopment Ready Communities (RRC) Planner, I am pleased to inform you that we have completed the City’s formal RRC evaluation. The findings of our evaluation and recommended actions to assist the City in ultimately achieving RRC certification are included in the RRC Baseline Report. This briefing memo is intended to provide key highlights of the report and lay out the City’s next steps in the RRC process.

Redevelopment Ready Communities: RRC is a free technical assistance program offered through the Michigan Economic Development Corporation (MEDC) which aims to help communities incorporate best practices in planning, zoning, and economic development to encourage redevelopment and new investment. MEDC Community Development also uses RRC as a prioritization factor when determining investments through our programs (visit www.miplace.org for more information on those programs). Communities who fully align with the best practices can become RRC certified which come with its own set of benefits. Grosse Pointe has been formally engaged with RRC since October 2019. There are currently more than 270 communities across Michigan engaged in the program including nearby communities such as Roseville, Eastpointe, and Detroit.

Baseline Report: The Baseline Report completes a key step in the RRC process. Using responses from Grosse Pointe’s self-evaluation, the RRC program took a deeper dive into the City’s plans, zoning ordinance, site plan review process, training practices and more to make initial determinations regarding how well the City’s existing practices align with the RRC Best Practices. Key findings include:

- The City’s existing practices already align with 32% of the RRC Best Practices including:
  - A 2015 DDA/TIF Plan.
  - A 6-year Capital Improvements Plan that is updated annually.
  - A zoning ordinance that aligns with many RRC Best Practices.

- The City is partially aligned with another 50% of the RRC Best Practices. Areas of partial alignment that need some work to meet the Best Practices include:
  - Updating the 2012 Master Plan and annually reporting on its implementation to the governing body.
  - Creating a Public Participation Plan.
  - Updating the website to include more planning information.
- Zoning ordinance updates to allow more diverse housing style by right and more green infrastructure options.

**Reaching Certification:** With this Baseline Report in hand, the City is now ready to move into the third and final phase of the RRC process. During this final phase, the City will work to address each of the Best Practice criteria identified as yellow and red. The report includes specific recommendations for each criterion; however, RRC is a dynamic program and is always willing to have open discussions if the City has a different idea for how to meet a best practice criterion. During this phase the City will have access to RRC technical assistance tools such as the RRC Library (www. miplace.org/rrclibrary), guidance from your RRC Planner, and matching technical assistance funds to help with the cost of larger projects. There is no deadline for reaching certification and RRC understands that your community will approach this phase at their own pace given available resources at any given time.

**Next Steps:** The next formal step in the process is for the City to review the report and, if there is a desire to continue, the City Council will need to pass a resolution to proceed with RRC. Upon passage of that resolution the City can begin to access the aforementioned tools to assist with reaching full alignment (and therefore certification). *We ask that the resolution be passed within 30 days of receiving this memo.*

I look forward to working with the City as it seeks to align with the Best Practices. Michigan is experiencing an unprecedented economic climate at this time however, it is our hope that through the RRC Best Practices communities of all shapes and sizes will be in a strong position to leverage continued excitement around Michigan and attract additional redevelopment and investment. If you have any questions on RRC or this Baseline Report, please feel free to contact me at your convenience.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Elizabeth King, MPA
RRC Planner, Region 10
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Redevelopment Ready Communities* (RRC) is a certification program supporting community revitalization and the attraction and retention of businesses, entrepreneurs and talent throughout Michigan. RRC promotes communities to be development ready and competitive in today’s economy by actively engaging stakeholders and proactively planning for the future—making them more attractive for projects that create places where people want to live, work and invest.

To become formally engaged in the RRC program, communities must complete the RRC self-evaluation, send at least one representative to the best practice trainings, and pass a resolution of intent, outlining the value the community sees in participating in the program. Grosse Pointe city council passed a resolution to participate in the RRC program in July 2019 and the city officially became engaged in October 2019.

Developed by experts in the public and private sector, the RRC Best Practices are the standard to achieve certification, designed to create a predictable experience for investors, businesses and residents working within a community; communities must demonstrate that all best practice criteria have been met to receive RRC certification. This evaluation finds the community currently in full alignment with 32 percent of the best practice criteria and partially aligned with another 41 percent. Grosse Pointe has an excellent DDA plan and capital improvements plan. The city will need to make updates to the zoning ordinance, development review process, and website to align with RRC Best Practices.

This report includes several recommendations for how the community can fully align with the best practices. Each recommendation has been customized to fit Grosse Pointe and is backed by research and conversations specific to the community; however, these recommendations are just the beginning of the conversation. RRC is focused heavily on intent versus prescriptive “to-dos.” As the community works through the process, it may identify other ways to meet the intent of a best practice. The community’s RRC planner will be there every step of the way to discuss those ideas, direct the community to resources, and provide general guidance. In addition to the community’s RRC planner, other partners should be at the table including the Grosse Pointe Main Street, state partners, and individual residents. RRC is a collaborative effort and is most successful when all parties are willing to engage in open dialogue so that Michigan communities can be on the forefront of developing unique identities and prosperous businesses.

Once the community has had a chance to digest the contents of this report, it will need to decide whether to continue with the RRC process. If it chooses to pursue certification, the community will benefit from a fully streamlined, predictable and transparent development process that is guided by a shared community vision. This will increase the community's ability to grow local investment and attract outside investment. It will also allow the Michigan Economic Development Corporation to better understand the community's desires for the future and how state tools and resources can help achieve that goal. MEDC looks forward to working with Grosse Pointe on its efforts to reach certification and to a prosperous relationship for many years to come.
The basic assessment tool for evaluation is the RRC Best Practices. These six standards were developed in conjunction with public and private sector experts and address key elements of community and economic development. A community must demonstrate all of the RRC Best Practice components have been met to become RRC certified. Once received, certification is valid for three years.

Measurement of a community to the best practices is completed through the RRC team's research and interviews, as well as the consulting advice and technical expertise of the RRC advisory council. The team analyzes a community's development materials, including, but not limited to: the master plan; redevelopment strategy; capital improvements plan; budget; public participation plan; zoning regulations; development procedures; applications; economic development strategy; marketing strategies; meeting minutes; and website. In confidential interviews, the team also records the input of local business owners and developers who have worked with the community.

A community's degree of attainment for each best practice criteria is visually represented in this report by the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>indicates the best practice component is currently being met by the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>indicates some of the best practice component may be in place, but additional action is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>indicates the best practice component is not present or is significantly outdated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This report represents the community's current status in meeting all the redevelopment ready processes and practices. This baseline establishes a foundation for the community's progress as it moves forward in the program. All questions should be directed to the RRC team at RRC@michigan.org.
Grosse Pointe has fully aligned with 32 percent of the Redevelopment Ready Communities®
criteria and is in the process of completing another 50 percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.1.1</th>
<th>1.1.2</th>
<th>1.1.3 (N/A)</th>
<th>1.1.4</th>
<th>1.2.1</th>
<th>1.2.2</th>
<th>1.2.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1</td>
<td>2.1.2</td>
<td>2.1.3</td>
<td>2.1.4</td>
<td>2.1.5</td>
<td>2.1.6</td>
<td>2.1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.8</td>
<td>3.1.1</td>
<td>3.1.2</td>
<td>3.1.3</td>
<td>3.1.4</td>
<td>3.1.5</td>
<td>3.1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.7</td>
<td>3.1.8</td>
<td>3.2.1</td>
<td>3.2.2</td>
<td>4.1.1</td>
<td>4.1.2</td>
<td>4.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.2</td>
<td>4.2.3</td>
<td>4.2.4</td>
<td>5.1.1</td>
<td>5.1.2</td>
<td>5.2.1</td>
<td>5.2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Best Practice findings

Best Practice 1.1—The plans

Best Practice 1.1 evaluates community planning and how the redevelopment vision is embedded in the master plan, downtown plan, and capital improvements plan. The master plan sets expectations for those involved in new development and redevelopment, giving the public some degree of certainty about their vision for the future, while assisting the community in achieving its stated goals. Local plans can provide key stakeholders with a road map for navigating the redevelopment process in the context of market realities and community goals.

MASTER PLAN

The Michigan Planning Enabling Act (MPEA), Public Act 33 of 2008, requires that the planning commission create and approve a master plan as a guide for development and review the master plan at least once every five years after adoption. City of Grosse Pointe's master plan was adopted by the city council in November of 2012. Because of its 2012 adoption date, the Master Plan is overdue for its five-year review and update.

Grosse Pointe's 2012 master plan includes a plan for the Village Business District, which outlines the vision of a pedestrian-oriented and accessible central commercial services district with a variety of retail, commercial, office, civic, and residential uses. The city's master plan does not clearly identify priority redevelopment areas but does include a discussion of tools to be utilized for redevelopment. When the city completes a master plan update it should be sure to identify priority redevelopment areas, including basic strategies for redevelopment. A discussion of utility, facility, and transportation infrastructure is included within the plan.

Complete streets are highlighted in the master plan, along with a map of bicycle routes, a circulation plan, traffic calming plan, and streetscape enhancements. The “Future Land-Use Plan and Policies” chapter in the master plan outlines the future land use categories, but it is unclear how the zoning ordinance should be updated based on the master plan. When Grosse Pointe updates the master plan, the city should be clear to include a zoning plan that explains the relationship between zoning and future land use, as well as recommendations for updates to the zoning ordinance. Chapter 3 of Grosse Pointe's master plan includes an extensive list of community goals and objectives. A smaller version of goals, objectives, timelines, and responsible parties can be found in Chapter 7, "Implementation Plan." Most recently, the 2019 planning commission annual report indicated that the master plan is due for an update, but does not report on the implementation progress of the master plan's goals and objectives. As Grosse Pointe moves forward with their master plan update, progress on the implementation of the plan should be annually reported to the governing body. The 2012 master plan is available on the city website. When the city updates their master plan, the updated master plan should also be made available on the city website.

DOWNTOWN PLAN

A key aspect of any community is its downtown district. This district plays several critical roles from showcasing the community’s history to serving as a gathering space for events. The density levels natural to downtowns also make the district a fiscal engine to support efforts in other areas of the community which may not be in net-positive revenue situations. For all these reasons and more, it is essential that a community have a clear, up-to-date plan for its downtown. Grosse Pointe has a downtown development plan and tax increment financing plan that was amended and readopted in 2015 and is set to expire in 2044. The plan contains maps that outline the DDA boundaries, existing land uses, and desired future land uses. Project time frames span from 2009 through 2044 and include estimated costs and descriptions. Projects outlined in the plan, several of which have been completed, include transforming an alley into a “European street,” enhancing the St. Clair Streetscape, updated wayfinding and gateway signage, parking structure, utility upgrades, traffic system improvements, Notre Dame streetscape upgrade, and Lot 3 reconfiguration. Additionally, the DDA will maintain the Kercheval streetscape, the Notre Dame crosswalk, may explore acquiring property, install dumpster enclosures, make parking system improvements, district marketing, professional technical assistance, and provide capital support for
Best Practice 1.1—The plans continued

redevelopment. It is clear that Grosse Pointe has a plan for their DDA district, the city and the DDA should make sure this plan is taken into account as the city proceeds through the Michigan Main Street program.

**CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PLAN**

Communities, much like businesses, create many plans to guide their future. In addition to the plans mentioned above, communities typically have plans for parks and recreation, streets, and water/sewer asset management (and sometimes more). Departments also typically have their own strategic and capital investment plans. Combined, these plans typically call for capital investment levels that exceed a community’s ability to fund each year. As such, it is vital that the community prioritize projects. Redevelopment Ready Communities’ handle this need to prioritize and coordinate by creating a capital improvements plan (CIP). Updated annually, this plan helps the community plan out the upcoming six years of investments and serves as a key tool for budget discussions. City of Grosse Pointe has an adopted 2020—2026 capital improvements plan that was presented to city council on May 11, 2020. The city put together a very informative presentation explaining the importance of the CIP and its projects, and this is included on the website with the CIP. Projects outlined in the CIP include improvements to building, city equipment, and vehicles, street reconstructions, water/sewer main improvements and replacement, and parking improvements. Road and water/sewer projects are coordinated to in order to minimize construction costs. Grosse Pointe is meeting this best practice and should continue to annually produce a six-year CIP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Evaluation criteria</th>
<th>Recommended actions for certification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1</td>
<td>The governing body has adopted a master plan in the past five years.</td>
<td>□ Create a master plan that meets MPEA and RRC Best Practices (missing priority redevelopment areas and zoning plan) □ Make updated master plan available online □ Provide annual documentation of master plan implementation progress to governing body and RRC planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2</td>
<td>The governing body has adopted a downtown plan.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3</td>
<td>The governing body has adopted a corridor plan.</td>
<td>N/A (While a corridor plan is not an RRC requirement for communities with a traditional downtown, it is important to note the Grosse Pointe recently adopted a SEMCOG funded corridor plan for Mack Avenue and is now working on implementation with adjacent cities.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.4</td>
<td>The governing body has adopted a capital improvements plan.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Best Practice 1.2—Public participation

Best Practice 1.2 assesses how well the community identifies and engages its stakeholders on a continual basis. Public participation aims to prevent or minimize disputes by creating a process for resolving issues before they become an obstacle. Communities who regularly engage their residents also build long term trust and see greater support for plans and other initiatives.

EXISTING PRACTICES

Every community approaches public engagement differently depending on their own needs, expectations from residents, and municipal resources. Grosse Pointe utilizes announcements at public meetings and the Open Meetings Act to engage residents. The city also utilizes the website and newsletter to inform residents. When looking for additional feedback, the city utilizes focus groups and committees. When developing a public participation strategy it is important to include additional and creative proactive methods of public engagement.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN

Public engagement activity can vary dramatically depending on who serves on the community’s boards and who sits in key staff roles. Redevelopment Ready Communities’ aim to reduce some of that variation by developing a documented public engagement strategy to outline what residents, officials and other stakeholders can expect from its local government. Such a strategy proactively identifies key individuals or groups to engage, what tools the community will use, possible venues outside of city hall to consider for public meetings/events, how the community will use and report back on input and how the community will continue to assess its engagement actions to ensure it’s using its limited resources and time in the most effective manner. To meet RRC Best Practices, Grosse Pointe should develop a public participation plan that includes all the aforementioned items. The plan should also include a strategy for regular updates.

REPORTING RESULTS

In addition to conducting engagement, it is important that information from those activities is shared afterward. Whether it be posting survey results online, including a summary chapter in the master plan, or sending follow up emails to meeting attendees, reporting out shows that the community heard the input and is using it. It increases the willingness of residents to engage. Grosse Pointe most off shares the results of public participation through the website and adopted city plans. The city should enshrine the methods for sharing the results of public participation within the public participation strategy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Evaluation criteria</th>
<th>Recommended actions for certification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1</td>
<td>The community has a documented public participation plan for engaging a diverse set of community stakeholders.</td>
<td>□ Develop a public participation strategy as outlined in Best Practice 1.2.1, include proactive methods for public engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.2</td>
<td>The community demonstrates that public participation efforts go beyond the basic methods.</td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3</td>
<td>The community shares outcomes of public participation processes.</td>
<td>□ Track success of various outreach methods and incorporate ways of communicating community participation results, include methods as part of the public participation strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Best Practice 2.1—Zoning regulations

Best Practice 2.1 evaluates the community’s zoning ordinance and assesses how well it implements the goals of the master plan. Zoning is a significant mechanism for achieving desired land use patterns and quality development. An up-to-date, comprehensive zoning also helps protect existing investments by ensuring that incompatible uses are not built in proximity to each other, thus providing a level of predictability for those looking to develop in the community.

ALIGNMENT WITH THE 2012 MASTER PLAN

Foundationally, the Michigan Zoning Enabling Act (MZEAA), Public Act 110 of 2006, requires that a zoning ordinance be based on a plan to help guide zoning decisions. Similarly, RRC Best Practice 2.1.1 outlines the expectation that a community’s zoning code is supportive of the master plan. Parts of the Central Business District and Neighborhood Commercial District zoning ordinance were updated in 2013 and 2014, presumably to align with Grosse Pointe’s 2012 master plan. The only section where Grosse Pointe city staff indicated that the zoning map needs to be updated to align with the master plan is the zoning for Mack Avenue. The master plan calls for a more general business district zoning classification for the entire stretch of Mack Avenue, from Fisher Road to Cadieux Road, instead current of the alternating blocks of restricted office (RO-1) and commercial zoning. Grosse Pointe should be sure to include a zoning plan in the updated master plan. Once the city updates their master plan, it should be sure to conduct a zoning audit to determine if additional changes to the zoning ordinance or map are needed.

CONCENTRATED DEVELOPMENT

This criterion looks at whether the ordinance supports the creation of context-sensitive density in appropriate locations by establishing at least one district which allows for vertical mixed-use development by-right (permitted), incorporates placemaking provisions, and addresses historic preservation where appropriate. Such provisions are commonly found in a community’s downtown or along major corridors. Grosse Pointe’s zoning ordinance allows for residential units above non-residential uses, by right, in the Central Business District (C-2, Section 90-297) and Neighborhood Commercial District (NC, 90-275). Outdoor cafes and outdoor seating areas are permitted uses, with conditions, in the Central Business District (C-2, Section 90-297) and Mixed-use Transition Districts (T-1 Section 90-336, T-2, Section 90-346). The development standards in the Central Business District (Section 90-305) require a minimum ground floor transparency of 70 percent. Additional development standards require the façade to be broken up into various bays, require a variety of façade design elements, limit blank walls, and more. In general, the city’s ordinances in the Central Business District that dictate design and development standards protect the historic character of the city (Section 90-305).

HOUSING DIVERSITY

“Missing Middle" housing is a term referring to a range of multi-unit or clustered housing types with a range in affordability, compatible in scale with single family homes that help meet the growing demand for walkable urban living. Missing middle housing continues to be in short supply across the nation and is limiting business development in some areas as housing shortages can have major impacts on employee recruitment. Communities who adopt zoning ordinances allowing for missing middle housing will be more competitive in attracting business development deals and the residents who come with them. This criterion looks to see that the ordinance clearly allows at least three type of missing middle housing by-right. As previously stated, Grosse Pointe’s zoning ordinance allows for residential units above non-residential uses, by right, in the Central Business District (C-2, Section 90-297) and Neighborhood Commercial District (NC, 90-275). In the R-T Terrace District, the city allows Terrace Dwellings, which are a form of medium-density housing, whereby a row of attached dwellings share side walls; these are essentially townhomes/rowhouses. Live/work housing is permitted as a special land use in the in the Neighborhood Commercial District (Section 90-275) however this does not count to meet this best practice because it is not a by-right use. To meet this RRC Best Practice, and to provide a greater diversity of housing choice, the City of Grosse
Best Practice 2.1—Zoning regulations continued

Pointe should update the zoning ordinance to allow more housing types by-right, this could include accessory dwelling units, stacked flats, live/work housing, cluster housing, micro-units, or an additional housing types that fits the community’s desires.

NON-MOTORIZED TRANSPORTATION

This criterion evaluates the ordinance’s support for alternative modes of transportation, primarily walking and biking. Ordinance provisions such as requiring the completion of sidewalk systems, bike parking, traffic calming measures or streetscape standards can all assist the community in encouraging non-motorized transportation which reduces automobile trips and creates healthier, more equitable communities. Grosse Pointe’s “Site Plan Review Standards” (Section 90-74) outline the requirement for a pedestrian circulation system. While the city is meeting this best practice, when updating the zoning ordinance, it may consider additional non-motorized transportation standards, such as traffic calming, bicycle parking, and pedestrian scale lighting.

PARKING FLEXIBILITY

Frequently, parking requirements define urban design, land use density, and a person’s experience of place more than any other zoning regulation. Emerging technologies in the mobility industry and increasing land values are also leading communities to reconsider the long-term impact of parking requirements as meeting parking requirements is often the decisive factor in the viability of a project because of both the physical and financial demands associated with parking lots. Considering these factors, Redevelopment Ready Communities* are working to find a balance between existing needs and future trends by including at least two tools to allow for creative solutions or exemptions to parking minimums. Parking and loading requirements for Grosse Pointe can be found in Article V of the zoning ordinance. Shared parking agreements are permitted, given that there is no reduction in required parking (Section 90-156 [11]). Grosse Pointe allows payment in lieu of parking in the Village Parking District area (Section 90-156 [14]). While Grosse Pointe provides some additional parking flexibility for required church parking, the city should consider adopting additional flexible parking provisions, such as the reduction or elimination of required parking when on-street parking is available as found in the NC District, parking maximums, parking waivers, bicycle parking, and a reduction in required parking for complementary uses.

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE

Like transportation, our understanding of the long term environmental and fiscal impacts of sustainable green infrastructure continues to evolve. Communities who incorporate provisions to support such infrastructure show a forward-thinking approach to development which is attractive to investors and residents alike. Sustainable infrastructure investments also reduce a community’s long-term costs by reducing the need for more costly “gray” infrastructure instead. Street tree planning standards can be found in the Neighborhood Commercial District, Section 90-277 (B). While Grosse Pointe’s zoning ordinance does have provisions for protective screening (Section 90-39) it is not robust enough to meet RRC Best Practices. To meet RRC Best Practices, the city should update the zoning ordinance to include and encourage at least two additional green infrastructure provisions, these could include rain gardens and bioswales, tree preservation standards, landscaping that requires native, noninvasive species, green roofs, renewable energy, and more.

FLEXIBLE DEVELOPMENT

Even the best ordinance cannot predict every possible development scenario. As such, Redevelopment Ready Communities* include tools that allow them to be flexible in certain circumstances and maintain up-to-date lists of land uses to reduce uncertainty. Grosse Pointe’s zoning ordinance provides for nonconforming uses and buildings in Article IV. The city has some elements of form-based code in the development standards for the Central Business District (Section 90-305), including façade design, colors, and lighting. Grosse Pointe is meeting this RRC Best Practice, but if the city wanted to go above and beyond in preparation for the future, it could consider integrating density bonuses and new economy uses into the zoning ordinance.
Best Practice 2.1—Zoning regulations continued

**USER FRIENDLINESS**
Not typically a word associated with legal frameworks such as zoning ordinances, user-friendliness works to increase the ease with which an applicant can find the information they need as they conduct initial research into whether the community is a good fit. It also helps remove a mental barrier to first time investors who may have never read a zoning ordinance before. At a minimum, RRC Best Practices call for the community to provide an online version of the zoning ordinance with clear definitions. Grosse Pointe’s zoning ordinance is available on the city’s website. The city utilizes Municode to host the zoning ordinance. While its availability online makes Grosse Pointe’s zoning ordinance accessible, to become fully user friendly, the city should update the zoning ordinance to utilize more tables for permitted uses and area, height, bulk, and placement requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Evaluation criteria</th>
<th>Recommended actions for certification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1</td>
<td>The governing body has adopted a zoning ordinance that aligns with the goals of the master plan.</td>
<td>□ Once the master plan is updated, a zoning audit should be conducted to determine if additional changes to the zoning ordinance or map are needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2</td>
<td>The zoning ordinance provides for areas of concentrated development in appropriate locations and encourages the type and form of development desired.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.3</td>
<td>The zoning ordinance includes flexible tools to encourage development and redevelopment.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.4</td>
<td>The zoning ordinance allows for a variety of housing options.</td>
<td>□ Update the ordinance to allow at least one additional housing type by-right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.5</td>
<td>The zoning ordinance includes standards to improve non-motorized transportation.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.6</td>
<td>The zoning ordinance includes flexible parking standards.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.7</td>
<td>The zoning ordinance includes standards for environmental preservation and green infrastructure.</td>
<td>□ Update the zoning ordinance to include and encourage at least two additional green infrastructure provisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.8</td>
<td>The zoning ordinance is user-friendly.</td>
<td>□ Update the zoning ordinance to utilize tables for permitted/special uses and area, height, bulk, and placement requirements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Best Practice 3.1—Development review policy and procedures

Best Practice 3.1 evaluates the community’s development review policies and procedures, project tracking and internal/external communications. An efficient site plan review process is integral to being redevelopment ready and can assist a community in attracting investment dollars while ensuring its zoning ordinance and other laws are followed. Much like all RRC Best Practices, aligning with this best practice looks different for communities based on several factors such as population, staff capacity, development activity and whether the community handles building inspections directly. And while each solution may look different, together they build a development review process which is predictable, transparent, and efficient. Each best practice criterion is described in greater detail throughout this section.

DEFINED PROCESSES

This best practice looks to ensure the community’s development review processes are clearly laid out in the zoning ordinance and the responsibilities of various bodies are clearly established. Grosse Pointe’s site plan review process is laid out in Section 90-74 of the zoning ordinance, the special land-use review process is laid out in Section 90-75, and the planned unit development review and approval procedures are laid out in Section 90-67. In all of the aforementioned sections it is made clear that the planning commission is the final review and approval body for City of Grosse Pointe. The ordinance establishing the Board of Zoning Appeals can be found in Article III, Section 90-96; according to this section, city council shall act as the Zoning Board of Appeals. Within the zoning ordinance, it is difficult to find the article or section that establishes the planning commission; this information, however, can be found in the Section 11A of the city charter, which designates city council to act as the planning commission. The city charter references repealed statute PA 285 of 1931. According to PA 33 of 2008, the Michigan Planning Enabling Act, 1931 PA 285, MCL 125.31 to 125.45 was repealed, and planning commissions created under that act could continue to exist but would need to amend the ordinance or charter to comply with the PA 33 of 2008, the MPEA. However, it has been brought to the attention of the RRC program that City of Grosse Pointe’s city council acting as planning commission has been grandfathered in. Furthermore, it has been brought to the attention of the RRC program that the city council/planning commission combination is efficient and effective for City of Grosse Pointe. With that acknowledgment, it is still possible that there are numerous potential conflicts of interest in having one body serve in both the deciding body (planning commission) and appellate body (zoning board of appeals). To meet RRC Best Practices, the city may want to consider a charter update, or the creation of an independent zoning board of appeals.

INTAKE PROFESSIONAL (ZONING ADMINISTRATOR)

Having a clearly defined point person for the development review process ensures an applicant can quickly get answers to their questions. It also ensures someone can identify next steps and keep the process moving. While Grosse Pointe’s website has a “Business Development” page that contains helpful development-related forms, it is not clear from the website who potential applicants would speak to about development projects, or who acts as the zoning administrator in the city. To meet RRC Best Practices, the city should include on the website, contact information for the development point of contact and/or the zoning administrator.

CONCEPTUAL REVIEW MEETINGS

Conceptual review meetings—sometimes called pre-application meetings—offer applicants a chance to discuss their project with staff prior to investing significant time and money into application materials. These meetings typically cover the review process, identify key zoning provisions, and connect the applicant with other resources that may be helpful. Identifying what type of information should be known before having such a meeting and expected outcomes will ensure the meetings are productive and consistent. Section 90-74 of Grosse Pointe’s zoning ordinance indicates that pre-site plan review is required for most site plans and outlines the pre-site-plan review committee and application requirements. Grosse Pointe’s website does not advertise
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Best Practice 3.1—Development review policy and procedures continued

the availability of pre-site plan review/conceptual review meetings, who to contact, the expectations of the meetings, or a checklist of items to be reviewed. To meet RRC Best Practices, Grosse Pointe should advertise the availability of the conceptual review/pre-site plan meeting directly on the city website, along with the expectations for those meetings, contact information, and a checklist of materials to be reviewed at those meetings.

JOINT REVIEWS
Development projects are complex and impact communities in many ways from land use and traffic to utilities and public safety. Site plan review approval standards touch on many of these and in order to ensure the planning commission has all the information it needs to make a decision on those standards, communities should ensure that appropriate staff, consultants, and outside agencies are looking at site plans during the internal review process. Many communities establish a core joint review team who look at all applications and bring in other reviewers on a case-by-case basis. No matter the approach, the team (and when to include others) should be clearly established. Section 90-74(L), “Site Plan Review,” of Grosse Pointe’s zoning establishes the city’s joint site plan review committee and includes the city manager, departments of public works and public safety, city engineer and city planner.

INTERNAL REVIEW PROCESS & STANDARDS
Zoning ordinances address overall steps of a development review process, but they do not typically address what happens internally between when an application is submitted and when a decision is rendered. This process is just as important as it includes vital activity such as determining if an application is complete, whether it meets the standards based on staff review, and how the applicant can address any potential deficiencies prior to the final decision. How this process is handled can also impact predictability and fairness if it is not done in a consistent way. This is especially true when longtime staff leave, and someone must take over the process as a temporary or new zoning administrator. As such, RRC communities take the time to determine the internal review process and document key steps, roles, responsibilities, and timelines. Grosse Pointe’s development review standards are clearly defined in Section 90-74(F). To meet RRC Best Practices, Grosse Pointe will need to clearly document their internal review process, along with roles, responsibilities, and timelines.

PROMPT ACTION
There is no one way to conduct a development review process—it varies from community to community. As such, there is no single time frame that makes a community “prompt” in their approvals. But there are a few common ways that communities can reduce unnecessary delays: allowing permitted uses to be approved administratively or by the Planning Commission, having active coordination between zoning and building officials, and displaying the development review process visually to help applicants easily understand the steps and time frames. Grosse Pointe’s administrative review and approval standards can be found in Section 90-74(O) under the heading “Minor Modifications,” these are changes that can be approved by the city manager or is designated representative. While all site plans in Grosse Pointe can be approved the planning commission, there is a conflict because the city council acts as the planning commission. As previously recommended, Grosse Pointe should establish an independent planning commission. Additionally, to provide a visual representation and assist applicants in understanding the process, Grosse Pointe should create development review flow charts with timelines for the key development review processes (site plan, special land use, board of zoning appeals, rezonings). Because Grosse Pointe runs a compact operation, coordination between the planning and building departments is smooth.

TRACKING SYSTEM(S)
Tracking development applications through the process has many benefits including increased transparency, accountability, and predictability. While this best practice does not recommend a specific tracking system, it does look to see that the community is recording the application’s major steps as they occur.
Best Practice 3.1—Development review policy and procedures continued

Common milestones include submittal, distributed for internal review, issuing of staff report (if any), planning commission date, final decision, issuing of permit(s), and occupancy. There may be other steps for processes such as special land uses, variances, and rezoning. It is unclear how Grosse Pointe tracks development projects from submission, through review, permitting, inspections, and to completion. To meet RRC Best Practices a simple project tracking mechanism should be created.

**CUSTOMER FEEDBACK AND REVIEW**

While development review is a required process in many communities, it is also a service. And as with all services, the experience an applicant has can play a large role in whether they decide to return and if they recommend the community as a place for others to invest. In order to ensure the community is always providing the best service it can, it should establish some way to collect feedback on the experience. In addition to collecting the feedback, a community should be sure to assess the process at least annually to determine if any changes are needed. Perhaps feedback shows a form is confusing, or there was some internal confusion about when internal reviews are due. These can be identified and fixed to improve the experience. Grosse Pointe does not have a formal process to obtain customer feedback its development review, permitting, and inspections processes or if the joint site plan review meets annual to capture lessons learned and amends the process accordingly. To meet RRC Best Practices the city should establish a customer feedback tool for site plans, permitting, and inspections. The city should then meet, at least annually to review the feedback and amend the process accordingly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Evaluation criteria</th>
<th>Recommended actions for certification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1.1</td>
<td>The zoning ordinance articulates a thorough site plan review process.</td>
<td>□ Consider an update to the city charter or the creation of an independent Zoning Board of Appeals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.2</td>
<td>The community has a qualified intake professional.</td>
<td>□ Update city website to include contact information for the development review and zoning administrator point of contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.3</td>
<td>The community defines and offers conceptual site plan review meetings for applicants.</td>
<td>□ Directly offer conceptual review/pre-site plan meetings on the website, including contact information, expectations, and a checklist of what will be reviewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.4</td>
<td>The appropriate departments engage in joint site plan reviews.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.5</td>
<td>The community has a clearly documented internal staff review policy.</td>
<td>□ Clearly document internal review process, along with roles, responsibilities, and timelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.6</td>
<td>The community promptly acts on development requests.</td>
<td>□ See recommendation 3.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.7</td>
<td>The community has a method to track development projects.</td>
<td>□ Create development review flowcharts with timelines for the key development review processes (site plan, special land-use, Board of Zoning Appeals, rezonings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.8</td>
<td>The community annually reviews the successes and challenges with the development review process.</td>
<td>□ Create a simple mechanism to track development projects from submission through permitting and inspections, to completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Establish a formal way to collect feedback on the development review, permitting, and inspection experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Annually assess feedback and development review, permitting, and inspection process to determine if changes are needed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Best Practice 3.2—Guide to Development

Best Practice 3.2 evaluates the availability of the community’s development information. Having all the necessary information easily accessible online for developers and residents alike creates a transparent development process that can operate at any time. This information creates a smoother process overall and reduces the amount of time staff spend answering basic questions.

GUIDE TO DEVELOPMENT

The main avenue for aligning with this best practice is to create a “Guide to Development.” This document or web page provides valuable guidance and information to applicants ranging from contact information and meeting dates to key ordinances to review, process overviews and financial assistance tools. By gathering this information in a single location, the community can help make the process easier for new and experienced applicants alike. While Grosse Pointe’s business development page contains vital information such as business license applications, site plan applications, sign permit applications, portable sign applications, building permit applications, ROW obstruction permits, parking permit applications, zoning board of appeals variance applications, liquor license guidelines, and application, and the city’s zoning map. While this collection of links is helpful, it is not a guide to development and key items mentioned in pervious sections are missing from this page. To meet RRC Best Practices, Grosse Pointe should create a guide to development and update their business development page to contain all development-related materials, including the master plan, zoning ordinance, fee schedule, contact information, and conceptual meeting procedures.

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW FEES/COSTS

In addition to understanding the process upfront, it is important that an applicant can determine their development review costs as well. Nearly all communities charge an application/permit fee while some also require escrow accounts to fund external review costs by the community’s consultants. Other common costs include building review, utility connections and/or performance bonds. While fees are unlikely to change each year, they should be reviewed at least annually to ensure they remain relevant to the community’s desired level. Grosse Pointe’s fee schedule is not available on the city website. To meet RRC Best Practices the city should make its comprehensive fee schedule available on the Business Development page of the website; additionally, the fee schedule should include an effective date to indicate that it is reviewed and updated annually.

CREDIT CARDS

Credit cards are a lifeline for many businesses and individuals when paying for goods or services. Fees for government services are no different. A local applicant may find the flexibility of a credit card to be helpful in the early stages of the process to conserve cash while an out-of-town applicant can more easily pay fees this way without needing to mail a check or drop-off in person. As such, the RRC Best Practices look for communities to accept credit cards for at least basic development fees. There are several tools available to help communities offer this service and communities often charge a convenience fee to cover their costs—a fee most applicants are more than happy to pay. While the city does accept credit cards at the counter, it is not clear on the website how applicants can pay their development-related fees or which payment methods the city accepts. To meet RRC Best Practices the city should clearly indicate on business development page how applicants can pay their development-related fees and that the city accepts credit cards (for development-related fees) at city hall.
Best Practice 3.2—Guide to Development continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Evaluation criteria</th>
<th>Recommended actions for certification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3.2.1  | The community maintains a “Guide to Development” that explains policies, procedures and steps to obtain approvals. | ☐ Create a “Guide to Development”  
☐ Update the business development page to include all planning and zoning information |
| 3.2.2  | The community annually reviews the fee schedule.                                       | ☐ Make the comprehensive development fee schedule available on city website (business development page)  
☐ Include an effective date for the fee schedule, either on website or directly on the document  
☐ Clearly indicate on business development page how applicants can pay their development-related fees and that the city accepts credit cards (for development-related fees) at city hall |
Best Practice 4.1—Recruitment and orientation

Best Practice 4.1 evaluates how a community conducts recruitment and orientation for newly appointed or elected officials. Such officials sit on the numerous boards, commissions and committees that advise community leaders on key policy decisions. Ensuring that the community has a transparent method of recruitment, clearly lays out expectations/desired skill-sets, and provides orientation for appointed officials is key to ensuring the community makes the most of these boards and commissions. In cases where a community currently struggles to find interested applicants, these best practices help build long term capacity over time and prepare for it for a day when that may not be the case.

DEVELOPMENT BOARDS & COMMISSIONS

RRC Best Practice 4 should be applied to all boards which play a direct role in approving development applications or financial incentives. For Grosse Pointe, this includes the city council/Zoning Board of Appeals, planning commission, and downtown development authority.

DOCUMENTING THE APPOINTMENT PROCESS

When applying for any position, it is important to provide clear direction on the process and next steps. Appointments to local boards and commissions are no different. The appointment process need not be long or cumbersome but interested applicants should be able to easily find, on the city’s website, information such as when the community accepts applications, who oversees the process, who makes recommendations and/or final appointments, when appointments are made, and what he process entails. Currently, there is no information on the board and commission appointment process available on the city website. To meet RRC Best Practices, Grosse Pointe should add information about the board and commission appointment process to the city website.

APPLICATION AVAILABILITY

While many communities require an application for boards and commission appointments, others opt to simply ask for resumes and letters of interest. No matter how a community collects applicant information, it should make that process or form clear on its website. Grosse Pointe’s board and commission application is a simple one-page document that is available on the “Board and Commissions” page of city’s website.

SKILL-SETS AND EXPECTATIONS

Much like a job, it is helpful to assess if someone has a background that might make them uniquely prepared to serve on a board or commission. Also like a job, sometimes organizations find someone who is still a good fit even without the technical knowledge. Establishing desired skill-sets and expectations helps set that foundation. For example, to be on the planning commission it may help to have a background in real estate, planning, or architecture. If someone does not have that background, they could still be a good fit but should be prepared to learn about those things. The expectations should also make it clear how often the board meets, their responsibilities, how to prepare for meetings and other key information. Grosse Pointe does not have any information about the planning commission or Zoning Board of Appeals on the website; information about these boards and commissions should be added, including board membership, meeting dates/times/locations. While it is clear to the RRC program that all these boards are made up by city council, that may not be clear to people who are new to or less familiar with the city of Grosse Pointe. Even though the planning commission and Zoning Board of Appeals are made up of city council information should be included about these boards on the website. Desired skill-sets for DDA members should also be included on the website.

ORIENTATION

To help newly appointed or elected members get up-to-speed, Redevelopment Ready Communities will have established orientation procedures or packets. These packets should include local information such as copies or links to key plans, ordinances as well as local policies, meeting dates, times, and locations, and “Robert’s Rules of Order.” They should also include information on available training resources and general information to prepare a member for the decisions they
Best Practice 4.1—Recruitment and orientation *continued*

will be asked to make. Newly elected and appointed members to boards and commissions in Grosse Pointe are provided with the DDA bylaws and DDA TIF plan, a zoning officials guide, and opportunities to attend newly elected officials training through the Michigan Municipal League. Orientation packets also include the Grosse Pointe master plan, city council handbook, planning commissioners guidebook, the handbook for municipal officials, and a new council member memo.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Evaluation criteria</th>
<th>Recommended actions for certification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1.1</td>
<td>The community sets expectations for board and commission positions.</td>
<td>[ ] Add information about the board and commission appointment process to the city website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[ ] Add information about planning commission and Zoning Board of Appeals to city website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[ ] Establish desired skill-sets and expectations for development-related board and commission members and include them on the website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.2</td>
<td>The community provides orientation packets to all appointed and elected members of development-related boards and commissions.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Best Practice 4.2—Education and training

Best Practice 4.2 assesses how a community encourages training and tracks educational activities for appointed and elected officials and staff. Trainings provide officials and staff with an opportunity to expand their knowledge and ultimately make more informed decisions about land use and redevelopment issues. Training is also an essential activity to help communities manage risk. An effective training program includes four components: financial resources to support training, a plan to identify priority topics and track attendance, consistent encouragement to attend trainings and sharing of information between boards and commissions to maximize the return on investment for the community.

DEDICATED FUNDING

There is an old saying that if you want to understand an organization’s priorities, look at how they budget and spend their money. The same holds true for communities. The first step in making training a priority is to show that it is a priority by having a dedicated spot in the budget for it. There is no perfect amount of money to make a training program work. Some RRC communities are fortunate enough set aside thousands each year while some might set aside $100 to cover a group membership to one organization. City of Grosse Pointe budgets for conferences and training for city council, the city administration, and the downtown development authority.

IDENTIFYING TRAINING PRIORITIES/SETTING GOALS

Much like how a community prioritizes projects in its plans, it should understand its priorities for training. Do members need a refresh on the basics of being a planning commissioner? Or maybe there is a special project such as a zoning update planned for next year which could benefit from some pre-project training. Or maybe there is a strong interest in learning more about housing, non-motorized transportation, community capital or some other hot topic. The community understands its priorities best, but it should discuss them at least annually and write them down. Having them written down helps to sort through the plethora of training opportunities out there (free or not). Currently, Grosse Pointe staff and board/commission members work together informally identify and request training and development opportunities. The city should formalize training goals and priorities for development-related boards, commissions, and staff.

IDENTIFYING TRAINING AVENUES

Whenever someone hears the word training, it typically conjures images of traveling to an event, sitting in a chair all day, taking some notes, and coming home. This can be time and cost prohibitive for many communities. As such, RRC encourages communities to also consider free online training resources, sharing articles in meeting packets for discussion, asking partner organizations to come to a meeting and provide in-house training or other less resource intensive methods. Identifying the best avenues for training reduces barriers and increases the likelihood of training occurring.

TRACKING TRAINING

RRC Best Practices call for communities to track attendance at training events. The purpose of tracking is so that the community can see who is consistently doing training and where knowledge gaps may exist. It also builds a level of accountability to encourage officials to stay updated on the topics they are making legally binding decisions about. To meet RRC Best Practices, Grosse Pointe should begin to document training tracking for development-related boards, commissions, and staff.

CONSISTENT REMINDERS

Ensuring the community has a way of gently reminding officials of training opportunities keeps training at the top of mind. In order to keep board, commission members, and staff informed of upcoming training opportunities, the Grosse Pointe city manager regularly sends emails to city council/planning commission, encouraging them to attend upcoming trainings and educational opportunities. It may be worthwhile to formalize this process.
Best Practice findings

Best Practice 4.2—Education and training continued

TRAINING REPORT-OUTS
Asking members who attend training to report out to fellow officials helps share information and increases the community’s return on its investment (time and monetary). Currently, there is no formal method or requirement that information gained at trainings is shared with those not in attendance. The information process should be encouraged and formalized.

JOINT MEETINGS
While communities have master plans and common goals, it is easy to head in different directions when doing the day-to-day work. Even in smaller communities where officials may live next to each other or see each other at the grocery store, it is important to connect in an official capacity. Having some type of joint meeting or event between council/planning commission, and the DDA at least annually gives the community that chance to connect and ensure everyone is pulling in the same direction. It is unclear when Grosse Pointe last held a joint meeting. To meet RRC Best Practices, a joint meeting or training including the planning commission/city council, and the DDA should be held annually. This can be a virtual meeting but should be focused on planning and development-related topics.

PLANNING COMMISSION ANNUAL REPORT
The Michigan Planning Enabling Act (MPEA) requires that the planning commission provide a report annually to the governing body on the commission’s activities. Providing something as brief as a one-page memo satisfies the legal requirement under the MPEA. However, RRC encourages communities to use the report as a vehicle for incorporating a number of the other best practices such as identifying training priorities, reporting out on training activity, reviewing any development review feedback (see Best Practice 3 for details), and reporting progress on the master plan implementation. Grosse Pointe most recently produced a “2019 Planning Commission Annual Report;” this practice should continue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Evaluation criteria</th>
<th>Recommended actions for certification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.2.1</td>
<td>The community has a dedicated source of funding for training.</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.2</td>
<td>The community identifies training needs and tracks attendance for elected and appointed officials and staff.</td>
<td>☐ Formalize training goals and priorities for development-related boards, commissions, and staff ☐ Create and provide documentation of a training tracking mechanism for development-related boards, commissions, and staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.3</td>
<td>The community encourages elected and appointed officials and staff to attend trainings.</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.4</td>
<td>The community shares information between elected and appointed officials and staff.</td>
<td>☐ Formalize how board and commission members share information gleaned at training ☐ Annually hold a joint meeting/training on development-related topics with development-related boards and commissions (city council/Zoning Board of Appeals, planning commission, and downtown development authority) ☐ Continue to produce planning commission annual reports</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Best Practice 5.1—Economic development strategy

Best Practice 5.1 evaluates goals and actions identified by the community to assist in strengthening its overall economic health. Strategic economic development planning is critical to attract jobs and new investment in communities.

LOCAL STRATEGY & CONNECTION TO REGIONAL STRATEGIES

Economic development is oftentimes a local and regional partnership. It is important for communities to understand who those regional partners are and how community’s local goals tie into those larger regional goals. Grosse Pointe’s 2012 master plan includes an economic profile of the city. Additionally, the goals and objectives related to commercial development in could be considered an economic development strategy. To meet RRC Best Practices and assist in the implementation of the economic development strategy, Grosse Pointe should take the commercial development goals and objectives in the master plan and add timelines and responsible parties.

ASSESSING PROGRESS

The second aspect of this best practice focuses on ensuring the economic development strategy is reviewed on a regular basis. This ensures that the community’s economic development goals and actions remain front of mind and so that it can correct course as needed to react to changing circumstances. Once an implementation matrix has been completed, Grosse Pointe should be sure to annually review the economic development strategy and report on the progress of implementation annually to the governing body.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Evaluation criteria</th>
<th>Recommended actions for certification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1.1</td>
<td>The community has approved an economic development strategy.</td>
<td>□ Create an implementation matrix with timelines and responsible parties for the commercial development goals and objectives found in the 2012 master plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.2</td>
<td>The community annually reviews the economic development strategy.</td>
<td>□ Annually review the economic development strategy and report on the progress of implementation annually to the governing body</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Best Practice 5.2—Marketing and promotion

Best Practice 5.2 evaluates how the community promotes and markets itself. Marketing and branding are essential tools in promotion of a community’s assets and unique attributes. Consumers and investors are attracted to places that evoke positive feelings and to communities that take pride in their town and their history.

EXISTING PRACTICES & OVERARCHING MARKETING STRATEGY

Grosse Pointe utilizes social media and the city website to market itself, however, the city does not have an overarching marketing strategy. Marketing is a team effort and a community typically has numerous partners doing marketing on its behalf—some it may not even be aware of. A strategy can help the community understand all the players and ensure a consistent story about the community’s strengths is getting out there. To meet RRC Best Practices, Grosse Pointe should develop an overarching marketing strategy for the city, including the downtown Main Street district. When creating a marketing strategy, the community should focus on including the following:

1. An inventory of its existing marketing assets and partners. Think about what the community is already doing to market itself? Who else is out there marketing the community? Does the community have a page on www.michigan.org?

2. Identify key audiences to focus on when attracting new residents, new businesses, and new development. For example, maybe encouraging accessory apartments could help existing residents bring family closer to together. Encouraging accessory dwelling units could let young families move into familial homes while letting their parents age in place.

3. Identify key messages for each of those audiences—telling your average person that the community approves site plans quickly means almost nothing but to a business owner looking to expand into a new market, it could be appealing.

4. Identify key avenues for those messages. Social media is nice, but will it really hit those out of town developers who you might need to kickstart a priority site project? Where else should you be advertising?

5. Identifying what success looks like. This way you know if you are on the right path or need to shift course.

While not required for certification, it is common for communities to create a brand as part of their marketing strategy. A brand can help tell a community’s story and create consistent feelings. If the community chooses to create a brand, it should be aware that a brand does not equate to an actual strategy.

MUNICIPAL WEBSITE

The second element of Best Practice 5.2 is the promotion of the community through a website. A municipal website serves multiple functions. On a fundamental level, it is a means to share information—including information about public meetings, community plans, policies, events, and related organizations. Beyond this, a municipal website is an important expression of a community’s character and image. People who are unfamiliar with a community will often first look to a website for information. They will be forming their first impressions and reaching conclusions from the website; therefore, it is imperative that the website is visually appealing and key information is easily accessible in a centralized location. Grosse Pointe’s website is clean and well organized, but planning, building, and community development information is difficult to find and is spread across the website. Some of the information can be found under the “Business Development” heading, but this was not intuitive. To meet RRC Best Practices the city should create a centralized web page for all planning, building, zoning, and development-related forms and information. As Grosse Pointe works through the RRC Best Practices, the city should continue to add information to these web pages.
Best Practice 5.2—Marketing and promotion continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Evaluation criteria</th>
<th>Recommended actions for certification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.2.1</td>
<td>The community has developed a marketing strategy.</td>
<td>☐ Develop an overarching marketing strategy for the city that meets the expectations in Best Practice 5.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.2</td>
<td>The community has an updated, user-friendly municipal website.</td>
<td>☐ Create a centralized web page for all planning, building, zoning, and development-related forms and information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The RRC program assists communities in maximizing their economic potential by embracing effective redevelopment tools and best practices. Upon receipt of this report, community staff and leadership should review the recommendations and determine if they align with the community's priorities and vision. If, after review, the community believes that RRC is still a good fit, the governing body should pass a resolution of intent to continue with the process. Upon receipt of that resolution, the community will enter final phase of the process: officially working toward certification. During that phase, the community will be able to make progress on RRC items at its own pace and receive regular support from its RRC planner. It will also have continued access to the RRC online library of resources and extensive network of other RRC-engaged communities while also becoming eligible for matching technical assistance dollars from RRC (once the community has shown some progress on its own). In order to guide this next phase, RRC recommends the creation of an RRC work group consisting of community staff, officials and community representatives and encouraging multiple staff and officials to learn more about RRC via in-person or online training. RRC looks forward to working with the community on reaching certification and a long, positive partnership for many years to come.
Best Practice 6.1—Redevelopment Ready Sites®

Best Practice 6.1 assesses how a community identifies, visions for and markets their priority redevelopment sites. Communities must think strategically about the redevelopment of properties and investments and those investments should be targeted in areas that can catalyze further development. Instead of waiting for developers to propose projects, Redevelopment Ready Communities® identify priority sites and prepare information to assist developers in finding opportunities that match the community’s vision. It is best to begin working on identifying and prioritizing a list of 5–10 sites once a community has completed a majority of the previous best practices. When a community is ready to begin identifying priority redevelopment sites, the Redevelopment Services Team (www.miplace.org/rsteam) will be available to assist communities in identifying sites that meet can help the community implement their vision. It would be best for communities to put together a list of potential redevelopment sites, both publicly and privately owned, before meeting with the Redevelopment Services Team.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Evaluation criteria</th>
<th>Recommended actions for certification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1.1</td>
<td>The community identifies and prioritizes redevelopment sites.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.2</td>
<td>The community gathers basic information for at least three priority sites.</td>
<td>Complete the other five best practices. Once those are complete, the RRC planner will connect the community with the Redevelopment Services Team to complete this best practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.3</td>
<td>The community has development a vision for at least three priority sites.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.4</td>
<td>The community identifies potential resources and incentives for at least three priority sites.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.5</td>
<td>The community assembles a property information package for at least one priority site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.6</td>
<td>Prioritized redevelopment sites are actively marketed in accordance with the marketing strategy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESOLUTION TO PROCEED WITH IMPLEMENTATION OF THE REDEVELOPMENT READY COMMUNITIES PROGRAM

WHEREAS, the City of Grosse Pointe wishes to promote future investment and redevelopment of the City, and

WHEREAS, the City of Grosse Pointe includes within its boundaries properties that present opportunity for redevelopment, and

WHEREAS, the City continues to strive for a streamlined and business-friendly planning and development process, and

WHEREAS, the City of Grosse Pointe City Council has previously approved a resolution initiating the Michigan Economic Development Corporation review process for participating in the Redevelopment Ready Communities (RRC) program, and

WHEREAS, the City of Grosse Pointe desires to achieve RRC certification by implementing best practices and recommended strategies for development, and

WHEREAS, after review of the RRC Report of Findings, the City of Grosse Pointe is willing to complete the outlined tasks,

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the City of Grosse Pointe authorized the implementation of the recommendations made by MEDC that are necessary for the City to attain RRC certification.

Adopted by the City of Grosse Pointe City Council on the 14th day of December, 2020.

Yeas: 

Nays: 

Absent: 

I, Julie E. Arthurs, City Clerk of the City of Grosse Pointe, do hereby certify that the attached excerpt is a true and exact copy of the resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Grosse Pointe on December 14, 2020, as it appears in the City Council minute books on file in my office.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the corporate seal of the City of Grosse Pointe on _____________, 2020.

____________________________________
Julie E. Arthurs, City Clerk
**Title:** 2021 Road Improvements  
**Date:** December 14, 2020

**Summary:**
The City Engineer will present the proposed updated six-year rolling year road improvement plan. A new road condition survey was conducted this fall, as it is annually after that year's road projects are completed. This road improvement plan is made possible by the voters' approval of a 15-year, 2.5 mill road improvement levy. The six-year plan denotes both the fiscal year the work will be charged to and calendar year the work will be done. Each winter, the Council reviews the actual projects for the upcoming construction year and authorizes that work to be engineered and bid out early in the calendar year to ensure the best possible bids.

The 2021 projects will be the seventh year of the Road Improvement Program. Only the 2020 projects are proposed to be approved for preparing the bid specs at this time. It is important to note that the later years in the plan are simply projections for planning purposes. As the City approaches the half way point of the program, after 2021, road priorities were given extra scrutiny after this year's road conditions that showed more deterioration on asphalt street than concrete streets were factored in. In addition, in response to some past comments, planned improvements on different blocks of the same or adjacent streets were grouped for construction in the same year.

The road projects proposed to be completed in calendar year 2021 are:
- Rivard – Kercheval to Waterloo
- Rivard -- Waterloo to 270° north of Waterloo
- Rivard – Jefferson to Maumee
- Charlevoix -- Lorraine to Neff (funded by the Highway Fund Major Roads account)
- Lorraine -- Mack to Waterloo (funded from the Utility Fund as that entire street will undergo a complete sewer replacement)

**Financial Impact:** The levy will generate an estimated $900,000 in FY 2020-21 to be used for the 2021 Road Improvement program on Rivard. The remainder of the program will be funded by the Highway Fund (Act 51 motor fuel tax revenue) for Charlevoix and the Utility Fund for Lorraine.

**Recommendation:** Approve the 2021 Road Improvement Plan

**Reviewed By:** Peter Dame

**Title:** City Manager
Pavement Condition Survey

Conducted in October of 2020. The condition survey has been conducted annually since December of 2006.

All surveys were completed using RoadSoft software and the PASER rating system consistent with state asset management requirements.
Pavement Condition Survey (cont.)

PASER rating system

- **Good** - Rating of 8-10
  - Little to no maintenance

- **Fair** – Rating of 5-7
  - Capital Preventative Maintenance (CPM)

- **Poor** - Rating of 1-4
  - Rehabilitation or Reconstruction Required
2020 Condition Survey Results

Federal Aid Streets
- Minor Arterial (Kercheval, Cadieux) – 1.745 miles
  - Average PASER Rating – 6.629 (6.440 in 2019)
- Major Collector (Waterloo, St. Clair) – 1.838 miles
  - Average PASER Rating – 5.591 (5.939 in 2019)

Local Streets – 14.840 miles
- Average PASER Rating 6.109 (6.235 in 2019)
  - Concrete – 5.867 (6.09 in 2019)
  - Brick – 2.0 (2.0 in 2019)
2020 PASER Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating (surface) - Latest</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Very Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2020 Condition Survey Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Miles</th>
<th>% of System (2018 %)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>3.2% (5.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>13.2% (12.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>13.0% (13.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>19.5% (18.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>12.9% (17.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>14.6% (11.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>4.2% (8.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>13.5% (8.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>5.6% (4.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.3% (0.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Surface Condition Trend

- 2014 Rating: 57% Poor, 32% Fair, 12% Good
- 2015 Rating: 51% Poor, 29% Fair, 19% Good
- 2016 Rating: 49% Poor, 29% Fair, 22% Good
- 2017 Rating: 47% Poor, 28% Fair, 25% Good
- 2018 Rating: 50% Poor, 26% Fair, 24% Good
- 2019 Rating: 47% Poor, 22% Fair, 31% Good
- 2020 Rating: 47% Poor, 24% Fair, 29% Good
### Proposed Treatment Types

#### Asphalt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASER</th>
<th>Min RSL</th>
<th>Max RSL</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Cost/Syd</th>
<th>Cost/Mile</th>
<th>PASER Reset</th>
<th>Pre RSL</th>
<th>Post RSL</th>
<th>ESL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>None - New Street</td>
<td>CPM</td>
<td>$ 2.86</td>
<td>$ 46,980.27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>CPM</td>
<td>$ 2.86</td>
<td>$ 46,980.27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Crack Seal/Slurry Seal</td>
<td>CPM</td>
<td>$ 61.50</td>
<td>$ 1,010,240.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mill &amp; Resurf, 1-1/2&quot; + Curb Cap</td>
<td>CPM</td>
<td>$ 61.50</td>
<td>$ 1,010,240.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mill &amp; Resurf, 1-1/2&quot; + Curb Cap</td>
<td>CPM</td>
<td>$ 100.00</td>
<td>$ 1,642,666.67</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Mill &amp; Resurf, 3-1/2&quot; + Curb/Gutter</td>
<td>RH</td>
<td>$ 100.00</td>
<td>$ 1,642,666.67</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>Mill &amp; Resurf, 3-1/2&quot; + Curb/Gutter</td>
<td>RH</td>
<td>$ 146.00</td>
<td>$ 2,398,293.33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>Reconstruction - 5&quot; HMA/8&quot; Agg</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>$ 146.00</td>
<td>$ 2,398,293.33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Concrete

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASER</th>
<th>Min RSL</th>
<th>Max RSL</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Cost/Syd</th>
<th>Cost/Mile</th>
<th>PASER Reset</th>
<th>Pre RSL</th>
<th>Post RSL</th>
<th>ESL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>None - New Street</td>
<td>CPM</td>
<td>$ 0.80</td>
<td>$ 14,080.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>CPM</td>
<td>$ 0.75</td>
<td>$ 13,200.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>CPM</td>
<td>$ 26.50</td>
<td>$ 466,400.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Joint and Crack Seal</td>
<td>CPM</td>
<td>$ 38.25</td>
<td>$ 673,200.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Minor Patch</td>
<td>RH</td>
<td>$ 57.50</td>
<td>$ 1,012,000.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>Major Patch</td>
<td>RH</td>
<td>$ 156.50</td>
<td>$ 2,754,400.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>Reconstruction - 7&quot; Conc/6&quot; Agg</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>$ 156.50</td>
<td>$ 2,754,400.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>Reconstruction - 7&quot; Conc/6&quot; Agg</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>$ 156.50</td>
<td>$ 2,754,400.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2021 Candidate Projects

PASER 1-2 – Reconstruct – 1.08 Miles @ $2,398,000/Mile = $2,589,840
PASER 3-4 – Heavy Rehabilitation (3” to 3-1/2”) – 3.27 Miles @ $1,643,000/Mile = $5,372,610
PASER 5-6 – CPM Resurfacing (1-1/2” to 2”) – 5.08 Miles @ $1,010,000/Mile = $5,130,800
Proposed 6-Year Street CIP
### Proposed 6 Year CIP for Streets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Work Year</th>
<th>Street From</th>
<th>Street To</th>
<th>2021 PASER</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Description of Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2021/22</td>
<td>2021 Rice</td>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>Maumee</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>$512,512</td>
<td>3-1/2&quot; Mill and Resurface, New Curb &amp; Gutter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2021 Rice</td>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>270 N of Waterloo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$83,776</td>
<td>3-1/2&quot; Mill and Resurface, New Curb &amp; Gutter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2021 Rice</td>
<td>Kercheval</td>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$228,331</td>
<td>3-1/2&quot; Mill and Resurface, New Curb and Gutter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$824,619</td>
<td>Total Road Improvement Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022/23</td>
<td>2022 Charlevoix</td>
<td>Loraine</td>
<td>St. Clair</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$196,416</td>
<td>3-1/2&quot; Mill and Resurface, Curb Capping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2022 Charlevoix</td>
<td>St. Clair</td>
<td>Noff</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$111,848</td>
<td>1-1/2&quot; Mill and Resurface, Curb Capping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$308,264</td>
<td>Major Street Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023/24</td>
<td>2023 Neff</td>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>Charlevoix</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$292,395</td>
<td>3-1/2&quot; Mill and Resurface, New Curb &amp; Gutter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2023 Neff</td>
<td>St. Paul</td>
<td>Kercheval</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$165,679</td>
<td>1-1/2&quot; Mill and Resurface, Curb Capping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2023 Neff</td>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>Maumee</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$386,027</td>
<td>3-1/2&quot; Mill and Resurface, New Curb &amp; Gutter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2023 Neff</td>
<td>Kercheval</td>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$140,425</td>
<td>1-1/2&quot; Mill and Resurface, Curb Capping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2023 Maumee</td>
<td>St. Clair</td>
<td>Noff</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$170,955</td>
<td>3-1/2&quot; Mill and Resurface, New Curb &amp; Gutter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,155,479</td>
<td>Total Road Improvement Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023/24</td>
<td>2023 Cadieux</td>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>Kercheval</td>
<td>3/4/5/6</td>
<td>$664,425</td>
<td>Major Street Fund (54%5,206 in Federal Funds anticipated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2024 Lakeland</td>
<td>Maumee</td>
<td>Kercheval</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>$503,067</td>
<td>3-1/2&quot; Mill and Resurface, New Curb &amp; Gutter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2024 Lakeland</td>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>Charlevoix</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$254,000</td>
<td>3-1/2&quot; Mill and Resurface, New Curb &amp; Gutter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$767,067</td>
<td>Major Street Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025/26</td>
<td>2025 Woodland Place</td>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$200,429</td>
<td>5&quot; HMA on 8&quot; Aggregate Base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2025 Fisher Road</td>
<td>Kercheval</td>
<td>Mack</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>$664,593</td>
<td>3-1/2&quot; Mill and Resurface, New Curb &amp; Gutter (50% GPF, 50% GP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$865,122</td>
<td>Major Street Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026/27</td>
<td>2026 St. Clair</td>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>St. Paul</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>$768,840</td>
<td>Major Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2026 St. Clair</td>
<td>St. Paul</td>
<td>Kercheval</td>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>$167,777</td>
<td>Major Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2026 St. Clair</td>
<td>Kercheval</td>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>$254,613</td>
<td>Major Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,186,225</td>
<td>Major Street Fund</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Changes

➢ 2021/22
  ➢ Moved Maumee – St. Clair to Neff to 2023/24
  ➢ Moved Neff – St. Paul to Kercheval to 2023/24
  ➢ Added Charlevoix – Loraine to Neff (Major Street Funds)
  ➢ Added Loraine – St. Clair to Neff (Sewer Funds)

➢ 2022/23
  ➢ Added Cranford – Cadieux to Notre Dame

➢ 2023/24
  ➢ Removed Lincoln – St. Paul to Mack *
  ➢ Removed Lakeland – 350’ N. of Charlevoix to Mack *
  ➢ Removed Lakeland Ct. – Lakeland to End *
  ➢ Removed University – Maumee to Mack *
  ➢ Added Neff – St. Paul to Kercheval
  ➢ Added Neff – Jefferson to Maumee
  ➢ Added Neff – Kercheval to Waterloo
  ➢ Added Maumee – St. Clair to Neff
  ➢ Added Cadieux - Jefferson to Kercheval (Fed Aide and Major Street)
Summary of Changes

➢ 2024/25
   ➢ Moved Woodland Place – Jefferson to End to 2025/26
   ➢ Removed the concrete streets south of Jefferson *
   ➢ Added Lakeland – Maumee to Kercheval
   ➢ Added Lakeland – Waterloo to Charlevoix

➢ 2025/26
   ➢ Moved Loraine – Charlevoix to Mack to 2021/22
   ➢ Added Woodland Place – Jefferson to end

➢ 2026/27
   ➢ Added St. Clair – Jefferson to St. Paul
   ➢ Added St. Clair – St. Paul to Kercheval
   ➢ Added St. Clair – Kercheval to Waterloo

* Due to the increase in deterioration of the asphalt roads that we recognized this year, asphalt roads are being prioritized to keep these roads from falling into the reconstruction category. Concrete roads do and will need attention but none are currently in danger of falling into that category
Additional Items to Consider

Based on:
- Current Ratings and Projected Deterioration
- Current Estimated Pricing
- Selected Treatments

Review Ratings, Pricing, Treatments Annually
Assumes Regular Joint & Crack Sealing
2021-2026 Street Capital Improvement Plan

THANK YOU
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE:</th>
<th>Appointments to the Historic District Study Committee</th>
<th>DATE:</th>
<th>December 14, 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**SUMMARY:**

Earlier this year the City Council authorized a study of whether to create a local historic district in and near the neighborhoods zoned estate residential. This is an area between Maumee and Lake St. Clair. Under state law for creating such districts, this review requires formation of a historic district study committee to review historic district experts reports, take public comment, and make a recommendation to City Council for further review and action.

Applications were sought through the City website, via eblast, and through articles in the local papers. After review of the applications, the following appointments are made by the Mayor, subject to the consent of the City Council.

Dale Srace, Chair
George Bailey (representative of the Grosse Pointe Historical Society)
Kay Burr-Willson
Brian Connors
Julie Jones
Bob Lucas
Terri Steimer
Anne Eatherly, Alternate

The committee will start meeting in early January and meet about once a month with the assistance of City staff and the historic preservation consultant. The Committee is expected to complete its work in May of 2021. If one of the people are not able to meet these commitments, Anne Eatherly will be the next in line for serving on the Committee.

**FINANCIAL IMPACT:** None

**RECOMMENDATION:** Approve motion to concur with the Mayor’s appointments

**PREPARED BY:** Peter Dame  
**TITLE:** City Manager