

**CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF YPSILANTI
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
Tuesday, December 9, 2025
6:30 pm**

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

Elizabeth El-Assadi, Chair
Bill Sinkule, Vice Chair
Darrell Kirby, Secretary
Larry Doe
Gloria Peterson
Amy Kehrer

STAFF AND CONSULTANTS

Mark Yandrick, Planning Director
Dennis McLain, Township Attorney

• **CALL TO ORDER/ESTABLISH QUORUM**

MOTION: Ms. El-Assadi called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm.

• **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Ms. El-Assadi recommended moving the new business up to do Public Hearing A, followed by the preliminary site plan, followed by Public Hearing B and the preliminary site plan.

MOTION: Mr. Sinkule **MOVED** to approve the agenda as amended. The **MOTION** was **SECONDED** by Mr. Kirby and **PASSED** by unanimous consent.

• **APPROVAL OF THE NOVEMBER 25, 2025, REGULAR MEETING MINUTES**

MOTION: Mr. Kirby **MOVED** to approve the November 25, 2025, regular meeting minutes. The **MOTION** was **SECONDED** by Mr. Sinkule and **PASSED** by unanimous consent.

- **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

SPECIAL LAND USE – PHOENIX HOUSE – 1241 E CROSS – PARCEL K-11-03-484-011 – TO CONSIDER THE SPECIAL LAND USE APPLICATION OF PHOENIX HOUSE/ANGELINI ARCHITECTS TO PERMIT AN ADULT FOSTER CARE SMALL GROUP HOME ON A SITE ZONED R-4, ONE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL.

Planning Staff informed the Commission on the application for the Special Land Use for Phoenix House. This application would allow the expansion of the allowed number of residents from six to nine. The site is located on the north side of E Cross Street and is just under half an acre in zone R-4. All of the adjacent properties are zoned R-4, except for those across Cross Street as a Regional Corridor. In 2024, the site changed from residential to foster care for zero to six residents, which was a permitted use. The approvals were received through the Township as appropriate. This application was to extend the use to seven to 12 residents. There is an ability to park cars in the front, and the rear yard has a limited area for parking.

Planning Staff noted the area on the plan that was proposed to add pavement. There were two egress points on Cross, and two access points were approved. The Master Plan designated the site as Neighborhood Preservation, and the assessment from the planning consultant was that the small group should remain consistent with the Master Plan. The site plan did not have any natural features, the existing building complied with zoning requirements, and there was a request to modify the scope that limits the site to nine residents. For the type of facility needed, each resident required 2,000 square feet of parcel area, and the site was approximately 19,000 square feet. The number of parking spaces required was six, and the proposed number was three to four. The proposed spaces were too small, and the parallel spaces were six feet too short. The proposed spaces would be occupied by facility providers, limiting parking spaces for staff and visitors. The applicant could go to the ZBA for parking variances, but it did not seem feasible because it would not alleviate the issue of parking. The parking spaces were 8.5 by 18 feet, but needed 24 feet for parallel parking.

The Planning Commission was allowed to modify the number of required parking spaces, but neighbors had been complaining over the last few years regarding haphazard parking and too many vehicles on the site. Circulation was also discussed, and the circulation pattern showed that the front area was too small to accommodate parking with the pattern. A visitor could park on a street, but it could not be part of the

required parking spaces. Parking was not permitted in the front yard, and expansion of the lot would require a variance. Getting parking in the side or rear yard was nearly impossible.

In summary, the increase in residents also increased the number of staff and visitors. There were complaints about hazardous parking. There did not seem to be evidence that supported the variance, and the proposal showed that the site did not have enough room in the front yard. The parking counts from the zoning code were intended for contracted staff and visitors.

The plans needed additional information from a registered landscape architect. There was a request to add one deciduous tree between the parking lot and street frontage and 10 narrow evergreen trees along the west property line. The lack of space to accommodate on the east side could be considered an existing non-conformity and allowed to continue if it was determined that adding landscaping would serve no purpose. The landscape plan was presented.

No lighting information was provided, and the applicant was asked to describe whether existing light fixtures would be used or if new ones would be installed. If new fixtures were proposed, then a photometric plan was needed.

The existing building had 10 rooms that could be bedrooms.

Planning Staff read the requirements for Special Use. The analysis was that the front yard area was not large enough for parking. Since there were concerns and complaints from the neighbors, the application did not meet all of the requirements for Special Use approval.

Applicant Daniel Bogosian provided information on the Eisenhower Center and stated that they took care of individuals who suffered from traumatic brain injuries or had autism, developmental disorders, or mental health disorders. The goal was to provide the individuals with a good quality of life and help them reach as much independence as possible. None of the residents drove or had a driver's license, but staff did come to the facility, and there were work vehicles for transportation. Phoenix House had shift exchanges at 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM, when there were staff coming and going. The residents lived at Phoenix House full-time. Mr. Bogosian discussed the requirements of the Special Land use, highlighting that there should be no extra use of public resources, there is a need for people to live in a facility such as Phoenix House, and there was no disturbance to the future use. A rental inspection was conducted in

November, and a two-year compliance was received. Fire Marshall approval was received. The applicant discussed one of the neighbors' complaints and worked with the neighbor regarding parking complaints. Adding parking would help to mitigate complaints. The applicant reiterated that they were not a daycare, so people were not coming and going, and there were not often visitors. There was a parking lane that was wide enough for on-street parking.

Mr. Sinkule (Commissioner) asked if the applicant was planning on adding asphalt or concrete. Mr. Bogosian stated that they were planning to add concrete. Mr. Sinkule noted that the application had stated at the pre-application meeting that there were two to three vehicles on site, and he about additional vehicles for staff at shift changes. Mr. Bogosian explained that there were two company vehicles and two to three staff at the shift changes. There was a short time frame for staff clocking in and out. Mr. Bogosian explained that it was being viewed as a business, but it was a home.

Ms. El-Assadi (Commissioner) asked whether the two work vehicles were larger. The applicant reported that one was a Sedan and the other was a van. Ms. El-Assadi asked whether the typical number of vehicles on site would be four to five, excluding visits. The applicant confirmed that this was correct. Ms. El-Assadi asked whether the three to four spaces were sufficient for the cars and raised concerns about on-street parking if snow plowing or other issues prevented it. The applicant stated that they would carpool or move one of the work vehicles to avoid being consistently on site. The plan was to use street parking for short periods each day.

Ms. Peterson (Commissioner) raised concerns about the neighbor's complaints and how vehicles would back up safely. Mr. Bogosian explained that a vehicle would move out of the way or onto the street to allow others to leave. The house was empty for a few years, and the applicant believed that the neighbor was unhappy with suddenly having people in the area. He noted that there had been no issues with cars leaving. Mr. Bogosian confirmed that they planned to install a circular driveway. Ms. Peterson asked about the license and if it would allow for up to 12 residents. Mr. Bogosian stated that the site's size did not allow for more than nine residents. The square footage area of the common area and the bedrooms constrained the number of residents. Ms. Peterson asked if they ever planned to build out to accommodate additional residents. Mr. Bogosian stated that they did not ever plan to accommodate more than nine individuals.

Ms. Kehrer (Commissioner) raised concerns about vehicles in the ADA parking space having no room to back out if anyone was in the rightmost parallel parking spot. Mr. Bogosian stated that he believed there was sufficient room. Ms. Kehrer discussed that it did not feel workable to get six cars in the area. Mr. Bogosian explained that there were only five cars and they would not be present for more than 20 minutes.

Mr. Kirby (Commissioner) agreed with the other Commissioners' concerns about parking. He discussed that he was seeking a more factual process and outcome for the parking.

Mr. Sinkule (Commissioner) asked if a landscape plan by a registered landscape architect was planned to be provided to include the additional trees. Mr. Bogosian confirmed that he was. Brian (Architect) reported that Beckett and Raeder provided a landscape architect plan. He explained that they had not understood that the landscape plan was needed as soon as it was. He discussed the on-street parking and his confusion about the worry about using that area. Ms. El-Assadi explained that there were requirements for parking spaces based on the site, which did not include street parking. Brian explained that parking on the street provided additional safety because it slowed vehicles down. He asked why asphalt was being required. Ms. El-Assadi clarified that they were requiring parking spaces, not asphalt specifically. Brian asked the Board to consider a variance that allowed parking in front of the building and not have asphalt in an area that could have landscaping.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED AT 7:13 PM

Kathy McClure stated that her house was behind Phoenix House, and they had not bothered her at all. She stated that her friend lived across the street and that she noticed a lot of parking.

PUBLIC HEARING ENDED AT 7:15 PM

Planning Staff reminded the Commission that there were variances that were required. The applicant would have to go to the ZBA to get the variances and return to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Sinkule (Commissioner) asked if the special use was denied if there was a time period. Planning Staff stated that if the application was denied, they could not resubmit an application for one year unless there were substantial changes.

The Commissioners discussed postponing the vote. Planning Staff advised the Commissioners that a postponement did not require a date, but that the applicant should return within a reasonable timeframe. Planning Staff stated that they would be happy to meet with the applicant to discuss the challenges.

Ms. El-Assadi (Commissioner) noted her concerns about the parking.

MOTION: Ms. Kehrer **MOVED** to postpone the Special Land Use application at 1241 E Cross, Parcel K-11-03-484-011 submitted by Phoenix House/Angelini Architects to permit an adult foster care small group home on a site zoned R-4, one-family residential, to give the applicant time to address the comments made at the meeting, particularly related to parking, and resubmit with additional information as discussed.

The **MOTION** was **SECONDED** by Mr. Doe.

Roll Call Vote: Mr. Doe (Yes), Ms. Kehrer (Yes), Mr. Sinkule (No), Ms. Peterson (Yes), Mr. Kirby (Yes), and Ms. El-Assadi (Yes). **MOTION PASSED.**

SPECIAL LAND USE – URBAN AIR ADVENTURE PARK – 2850 WASHENAW – PARCEL K-11-06325-015 – TO CONSIDER THE SPECIAL LAND USE APPLICATION OF URBAN AIR ADVENTURE PARK/SOMESHWAR BALDAWA TO PERMIT AN INDOOR COMMERCIAL RECREATIONAL FACILITY ON A SITE ZONED REGIONAL CORRIDOR WITH A SITE TYPE C DESIGNATION.

Planning Staff informed the Commission that the location was at the Fountain Plaza Shopping Center. The applicant proposed adding additional landscaping and maintaining the existing parking and building façade. The application came in on October 16, and the public hearing notice was live on November 23. If approved, the applicants could continue with getting their other approvals. The property map and zoning maps were presented, and it was noted that there were multi-family zones to the east and west. The site had a primarily brick façade that matched the rest of the existing shopping center. The site plan was presented to the applicant, and the highlighted area where trees would be added was noted. During the final site plan, a landscape architect would present the trees, species, and materials, and would ensure that there was clear vision distance. The site was approximately 32,000 square feet, and large changes were not proposed. Two ground signs along Washenaw Avenue

could remain as long as they stayed in good condition. The outside area was proposed to remain unchanged, but Planning Staff proposed gating the area and installing security cameras to deter any crime. The detention basin needed to be cleaned up, and there was a chain-linked fence that was in poor condition. It was often a requirement of the County Water Resource Commission, so Planning Staff will verify through the process if the fence needed to be kept. The applicant would need to work with the engineer to clear the site. There was a condition requiring an ornamental fence to help with the aesthetic. Indoor recreation had certain standards, and structures had to be set back a specified distance from residential properties. However, it was an existing non-comfort and was not an issue. The shrubbery was 100 feet from any development. There were some questions regarding the off-street parking and passenger loading, but the amount of parking should be sufficient to meet the requirements. No additional screening from parking was needed. The operating hours were typical business hours, but if there were any expansion of the building or use of the outdoor area would require a future special land use. All buildings were required to be permanent structures, and the building met that requirement.

Along with the applicant's responses, there were a few small safety and aesthetic improvements to the site under the conditions. The standards of approval for the site plan were generally met. The seven items the applicant sought to address were presented.

Planning Staff recommended Special Land Use approval with the following five conditions:

1. Revise plans based on the Planning Commission's discussion at this evening's meeting for the Final Site Plan.
2. The applicant or property owner shall clean out the existing detention basin to the satisfaction of the Township Engineer.
3. The applicant shall replace the existing chain link fence around the stormwater pond to be replaced with a four-foot-tall ornamental fence, and the Planning Director may approve the design of the ornamental fence; if, during this process, it is determined that fencing is no longer required, then the basin shall be landscaped in compliance with ordinance standards.
4. The Outdoor area on the west end of the building shall be enclosed with tall fencing, including the two openings in the brick, to eliminate unauthorized use, and security cameras shall be installed to monitor the west and north sides of the outdoor area.

5. No outdoor storage is permitted for the Urban Air proposal.

Planning Staff recommended approval of the site plan with the following three conditions:

1. The applicant must obtain all required permits from the relevant agencies, along with final Site Plan approval, before submitting any building permit application.
2. The applicant shall provide a full landscape plan, including species and proof of clear vision for intersections, before the Final Site Plan is approved.
3. In addition to the above, the applicant shall provide revised plans illustrating the changes to the proposal discussed by the Planning Commission at this evening's meeting.

Planning Staff noted that they believed the business was consistent with the Master Plan and would bring families and positive activity to the Washtenaw Corridor.

Ms. Kehrer (Commissioner) asked for clarification on the recommendations and conditions. Planning Staff confirmed that the five conditions were for the land use and the three conditions were for the site plan.

Ms. Peterson (Commissioner) asked for clarification on what else would be in the building. Planning Staff stated that, from their understanding, it was a trampoline park, but the applicant could go into additional detail.

Applicant Someshwar Baldawa provided information on the proposal and Urban Air. Urban Air had more than 200 parks across the country and was the fastest-growing indoor park. In addition to the trampolines, there were slides, bumper cars, rope climbing, and other physical activities. Mr. Baldawa discussed the youth involvement and preparing employees for the job market, bringing traffic to the mall and surrounding businesses, and an effort on non-profits.

Mr. Kirby (Commissioner) asked how many activities were planned for the facility. Mr. Baldawa reported that there were typically 10 to 12 activities in total, including an air court with basketball, a warrior course, laser tag, and more. Mr. Kirby asked if adults could also participate. Mr. Baldawa stated that adults could participate, but the majority of participants were youth.

Ms. Peterson (Commissioner) asked how many employees there would be. Mr. Baldawa stated that there would be anywhere from 40 to 60 employees to operate the park. Ms. Peterson asked about the hours of operation. Mr. Baldawa reported that the hours were from 4:00 PM to 8:00 PM on weekdays and 10:00 AM to 8:00 PM on Saturdays and Sundays.

Mr. Kirby (Commissioner) asked if there would be food and liquor. Mr. Baldawa reported that there was no liquor, but there was food such as chicken wings and fries. There would be no open flames or friers.

Ms. El-Assadi (Commissioner) asked how long the construction would take and when the anticipated open date was. Mr. Baldawa reported that it would take approximately seven to eight months.

Ms. Peterson (Commissioner) asked where the closest open park was. Mr. Baldawa reported that the closest was in Grand Rapids.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED AT 7:43 PM

Hearing None.

PUBLIC HEARING ENDED AT 7:43 PM

MOTION: Ms. Kehrer **MOVED** to **APPROVE** the Special Land Use application for Urban Air Adventure Park at 2850 Washtenaw, PARCEL K-11-06325-015 submitted by Someshwar Baldawa on a site zoned Regional Corridor with a Site Type C Designation as the proposal meets the criteria in Article 10, Special Land Use, with the following five (5) conditions:

1. Revise plans based on the Planning Commission's discussion at this evening's meeting for the Final Site Plan.
2. The applicant or property owner shall clean out the existing detention basin to the satisfaction of the Township Engineer.
3. The applicant shall replace the existing chain link fence around the stormwater pond to be replaced with a four-foot-tall ornamental fence, and the Planning Director may approve the design of the ornamental fence; if, during this process, it is determined that fencing is no longer required, then the basin shall be landscaped in compliance with ordinance standards.

4. The Outdoor area on the west end of the building shall be enclosed with tall fencing, including the two openings in the brick, to eliminate unauthorized use, and security cameras are installed to patrol the west and north sides of the outdoor area.
5. No outdoor storage for the Urban Air proposal is permitted.

The **MOTION** was **SECONDED** by Mr. Sinkule.

Roll Call Vote: Mr. Doe (Yes), Ms. Kehrer (Yes), Mr. Sinkule (Yes), Ms. Peterson (Yes), Mr. Kirby (Yes), and Ms. El-Assadi (Yes). **MOTION PASSED.**

- **OLD BUSINESS**

None to Report.

- **NEW BUSINESS**

- a. **PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN FOR SPECIAL LAND USE – PHOENIX HOUSE – 1241 E CROSS – PARCEL K-11-03-484-011 – TO CONSIDER THE PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN APPLICATION OF PHOENIX HOUSE/ANGELINI ARCHITECTS TO PERMIT AN ADULT FOSTER CARE SMALL GROUP HOME ON A SITE ZONED R-4, ONE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL.**

MOTION: Ms. Kehrer **MOVED** to postpone the preliminary site plan for special land use application at 1241 E Cross, Parcel K-11-03-484-011 submitted by Phoenix House/Angelini Architects to permit an adult foster care small group home on a site zoned R-4, one-family residential, to give the applicant time to address the comments made at the meeting, particularly related to parking, and resubmit and/or provide additional information as discussed.

The **MOTION** was **SECONDED** by Mr. Kirby.

Roll Call Vote: Mr. Doe (Yes), Ms. Kehrer (Yes), Mr. Sinkule (No), Ms. Peterson (Yes), Mr. Kirby (Yes), and Ms. El-Assadi (Yes). **MOTION PASSED.**

- b. **PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN FOR SPECIAL LAND USE – URBAN AIR ADVENTURE PARK – 2850 WASHENAW – PARCEL K-11-06325-15 – TO CONSIDER THE PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN APPLICATION OF URBAN AIR ADVENTURE PARK/SOMESHWAR BALDAWA TO PERMIT AN INDOOR RECREATIONAL FACILITY ON A SITE ZONED REGIONAL CORRIDOR (RC) WITH A SITE TYPE C DESIGNATION.**

MOTION: Ms. Kehrer **MOVED** to **APPROVE** the Preliminary Site Plan application for Urban Air Adventure Park at 2850 Washtenaw, PARCEL K-11-06325-015 submitted by Someshwar Baldawa on a site zoned Regional Corridor with a Site Type C Designation as the proposal meets the criteria in Article 10, Special Land Use, with the following three (3) conditions:

1. The applicant must receive all required permits from agencies, along with Final Site Plan approval, before submitting any application for building permits.
2. The applicant shall provide a full landscape plan, including species and proof of clear vision for intersections, before the Final Site Plan is approved.
3. In addition to the above, the applicant shall provide revised plans illustrating the changes to the proposal discussed by the Planning Commission at this evening's meeting.

The **MOTION** was **SECONDED** by Mr. Kirby.

Roll Call Vote: Mr. Doe (Yes), Ms. Kehrer (Yes), Mr. Sinkule (No), Ms. Peterson (Yes), Mr. Kirby (Yes), and Ms. El-Assadi (Yes). **MOTION PASSED.**

- **OPEN DISCUSSIONS FOR ISSUES NOT ON AGENDA**
 - **Correspondence Received**
None to Report.
 - **Planning Commission members**
None to Report.
 - **Members of the audience**
None to Report.
- **TOWNSHIP BOARD REPRESENTATIVE REPORT**

None to Report

- **ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS REPRESENTATIVE REPORT**

None to Report

- **TOWNSHIP ATTORNEY REPORT**

None to Report

- **PLANNING DEPARTMENT REPORT**

Planning Staff reported that the zoning for the data center would be going through its second reading on Wednesday, December 17. The training was moved from December to January.

- **OTHER BUSINESS**

None to Report

- **ADJOURNMENT**

MOTION: Mr. Sinkule **MOVED** to adjourn at 7:49 pm. The **MOTION** was **SECONDED** by Mr. Doe and **PASSED** by unanimous consent.

=====

Respectively Submitted by Minutes Services