

October 15, 2002

Planning Commission  
City of Garden City  
Garden City, Mi. 48135

**Attention:** Willbey Pistor, Planning Commission Chair

**Subject:** SPR 02-018; Site Plan Review  
6689 Middlebelt Road; Proposed Carry-Out Restaurant

**Location:** 6689 Middlebelt Road  
Northwest corner of Middlebelt and Windsor

**Zoning:** C-1, Local Business

**Applicant:** Elias Daoud  
1900 Beech Daly  
Dearborn Heights, MI. 48127

Dear Planning Commission Members:

The applicant proposes to utilize an existing 2,121 square foot unit of the subject address for a carry-out restaurant. There is no indoor seating proposed in this plan. The site is zoned C-1, Local Business. Carry-out Restaurants are permitted in the C-1 District after Special Land Use approval by City Council is obtained.

*Special Land Use approval is required prior to Site Plan Approval.*

The following review is for Site Plan Review consideration only. A separate report will be submitted for the required Special Land Use.

#### **REVIEW AND ANALYSIS**

- A. Proposed Use and Zoning. The site is zoned C-1 Local Business District. Restaurants are permitted in the C-1 district after special land use approval is obtained through the City Council. The proposed use is new and therefore the application requires site plan review. Special land use approval will also be necessary to ensure the site plan complies with current Zoning Ordinance standards for the use. (A separate report has been provided regarding the special land use review for this application.)
- B. Lot Area and Frontage. No minimum lot area or maximum lot coverage standards are applicable to the site.

- C. Off-Street Parking and Loading. The site plan states that the proposed use is to be “*delivery*” only. Delivery Restaurants (see Definitions: Section 154.005) are not permitted to have customers pick up food from the site. All food from a “*delivery*” restaurant must be delivered *by* the restaurant. The stated designation would change the parking requirements and allow the site plan to conform, however, I believe this designation to be an error on the site plan. I believe the applicant is proposing a “*carry-out restaurant*”. This designation would require a minimum of ten (10) parking spaces. In addition to the required 10 spaces, the existing retail unit attached to the proposed use requires five (5) spaces. *Thus, a total of fifteen (15) parking spaces are required. The applicant shall specifically state on the revised site plan the type of restaurant.*

The existing site has twenty-four (24) foot of pavement along the façade. *Parking shall not be permitted along this façade.*

- D. Landscaping. The site plan illustrates two (2) trees and six (6) shrubs along Windsor Avenue, and one (1) tree and three (3) shrubs along Middlebelt. The Ordinance requires one tree and six shrubs per forty feet of frontage. Thus, the site plan must be revised to reflect the Ordinance requirements. Furthermore, I recommend the site provide a landscaped berm of not less than three (3) foot along Windsor Ave (1 foot of elevation per 3 feet of width). This berm shall extend the length of the property line along Windsor.
- E. Screening. The Ordinance requires a six (6) foot masonry wall between the commercial and residential uses. Currently, there is a partial six (6) foot wood fence and unkempt landscaping. The Ordinance lends the Planning Commission the discretion to call for a masonry wall, or other natural or manmade screening. *At the minimum, I recommend the applicant provide a six foot wood fence along the entire rear property line, and a row of evergreens (6 foot, balled and bur lapped, planted 3 feet on center) on the interior side of the fence.*
- F. Signs. A sign is proposed on the façade. The sign specifications, and dimensions shall be noted on the plan. *I recommend the applicant utilize neon to recapture the 50’s style restaurant.*
- G. Exterior Lighting. No additional lighting is proposed. If this is a case, a note on the revised plan shall state same. *Should the applicant desire façade lighting, I recommend the Planning Commission require the “goose-neck” style of lamp.*
- H. Solid Waste Disposal. A dumpster and enclosure are proposed to the southwestern corner of the property. The applicant proposes a single gate. *I recommend the gate be double gated and a detail be provided on the revised plan.*
- I. Outstanding Requirements. The Ordinance requires that the site plan indicate the zoning district of the subject property and surrounding properties. Furthermore, the Ordinance requires that the site plan illustrate all property and building lines within 100’ of the property. *The revised plan shall indicate as such.*

Application. The application does not have the property owner’s notarized signature. *PRIOR to formal review by the Planning Commission, the applicant shall provide a notarized letter by the owner, stating compliance with this project.*

- J. Fire Dept. Review. See attached review dated September 23, 2002, submitted by the Fire Marshal, Mike Frost

## **SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATION**

The above highlighted issues represent Zoning Ordinance requirements for which the current site plan is not in compliance. The proposed use involves a special land use. Therefore, per the Special Land Use regulations, these issues shall be resolved; a variance is not available.

I recommend the applicant revise the plan in accordance with the Planning Commission requirements. I further recommend the Planning Commission place this application on the next available Regular Meeting Agenda for consideration.

Sincerely,

G. Palmer  
Planning and Zoning Administrator

cc: Applicant  
File