



REGULAR MEETING AGENDA

Tuesday, July 14, 2026

6:30 P.M.

Township Civic Center Board Room

If you need any assistance due to a disability, please contact the Planning Department at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting at planning@ypsitownship.org or 734-544-4000 ext. 1.

1. CALL TO ORDER
2. ROLL CALL
3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
4. APPROVAL OF THE JUNE 17TH AND JUNE 23RD, 2026 REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
5. PUBLIC HEARINGS
 - A. **ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT- APPENDIX A, ARTICLE 4 – DISTRICT REGULATIONS, ARTICLE 5 – FORM BASED DISTRICTS AND ARTICLE 18 – CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS. THE AMENDMENTS INCLUDE:**
 1. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO SEC. 420. – *BUSINESS DISTRICT USE TABLE; AND*
 2. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO SEC. 502. – *APPLICABILITY AND ORGINAZATION; AND*
 3. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO SEC.504 THROUGH 506. – *NEIGHBORHOOD CORRIDOR, REGIONAL CORRIDOR, AND TOWN CENTER; AND*
 4. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO SEC. 507. – *DESIGN STANDARDS; AND*
 5. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO SEC. 1802. – *APPLICATION PROCEDURE; AND*
 6. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO SEC. 1805. – *CONDITIONAL REZONING PROCEDURES.*
6. OLD BUSINESS

CONTINUE TO SECOND PAGE



7. NEW BUSINESS

A. **ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT- APPENDIX A, ARTICLE 4 – DISTRICT REGULATIONS, ARTICLE 5 – FORM BASED DISTRICTS AND ARTICLE 18 – CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS. THE AMENDMENTS INCLUDE:**

1. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO SEC. 420. – *BUSINESS DISTRICT USE TABLE; AND*
2. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO SEC. 502. – *APPLICABILITY AND ORGINAZATION; AND*
3. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO SEC.504 THROUGH 506. – *NEIGHBORHOOD CORRIDOR, REGIONAL CORRIDOR, AND TOWN CENTER; AND*
4. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO SEC. 507. – *DESIGN STANDARDS; AND*
5. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO SEC. 1802. – *APPLICATION PROCEDURE; AND*
6. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO SEC. 1805. – *CONDITIONAL REZONING PROCEDURES.*

8. OPEN DISCUSSION FOR ISSUES NOT ON THE AGENDA

- A. CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED
- B. PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS
- C. MEMBERS OF THE AUDIENCE

9. TOWNSHIP BOARD REPRESENTATIVE REPORT

10. ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS REPRESENTATIVE REPORT

11. TOWNSHIP ATTORNEY REPORT

12. PLANNING DEPARTMENT REPORT

13. OTHER BUSINESS

14. ADJOURNMENT – NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING, JULY 28TH, 2026, 6:30PM

**CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF YPSILANTI
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

Tuesday, June 17, 2026

6:30 pm

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

Elizabeth El-Assadi, Chair

Bill Sinkule, Vice Chair

Darrell Kirby, Secretary

Bianca Tyson

Gloria Peterson

Amy Kehrer

Crystal Lecoq

STAFF AND CONSULTANTS

Mark Yandrick, Planning and Development Director

- **CALL TO ORDER/ESTABLISH QUORUM**

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

Planning Director Yandrick welcomed the new Planning Commission member.

- **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

MOTION: Ms. Peterson **MOVED** to **APPROVE** the agenda as presented. The **MOTION** was **SECONDED** by Mr. Sinkule and **PASSED** by unanimous consent.

- **APPROVAL OF THE MAY 12, 2026, REGULAR MEETING MINUTES**

MOTION: Mr. Kirby **MOVED** to **APPROVE** the May 12, 2026, regular meeting minutes. The **MOTION** was **SECONDED** by Mr. Sinkule and **PASSED** by unanimous consent.

- **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

CLASS A NONCONFORMING DESIGNATION – CAR WASH “GROVE STREET AUTO WASH” – 2171 GROVE ROAD – TO CONSIDER THE CLASS A NONCONFORMING DESIGNATION APPLICATION TO PERMIT THE

RENOVATION OF A VEHICLE WASH OF AN EXISTING LEGAL NONCONFORMING STRUCTURE

Planning Staff informed the Commission on the application for the Class A Nonconforming Designation. The proposal was from the Black Star Building Group to renovate the existing car wash at 2171 Grove Road. The car wash, located on the northeast side of the road between Grove Road and Lakeview Avenue, was just over 1.1 acres and in the general business (GB) district. The Domino's next door was in the same zoning district, and there were many multi-family and single-family residential units in the adjacent facility. The car wash had been occupied for the past six or seven years.

Planning Staff informed the Commission that the site plan was the most involved process for larger, more intensive projects. Article 9 of the Zoning Code outlined the standards and what the applicant needed to provide for review.

Planning Staff reviewed the approval process for the Special Land Use criteria. Planning Staff reported that a Class A nonconformity was a nonconforming structure or use of land that has been designated by the Planning Commission to be allowed to be perpetuated and improved in accordance with the provisions of the article and approved site plan. The existing car wash had been vacant for a long time, but it still stood, and the applicants sought to modify and enhance the site. The location was presented. Some of the private improvements of the subdivision, when the County Road Commission expanded Grove Road, were taken.

The proposed site plan was presented. Most of the improvements were behind the building in creating a more cohesive planting for stacking and drying. The stacking would allow for the required number of spaces. The proposed building renovations were presented.

The existing building was too close to Grove Road at 13.4 feet. The Class A nonconforming designation allowed the building to be reutilized. The current requirement was 20 feet, and the specific use for vehicle washes was 50 feet.

Planning Staff reviewed the Special Land Use criteria. The analysis from Planning Staff showed that the criteria for harmony, in accordance with the purpose of the ordinance, would be met, depending on the Commission's decision on the flexible ordinance provisions. There was no natural environment in the vicinity. Ford Lake was nearby, but residential uses were across the street, and the applicant proposed steps to

mitigate on-site waste. It would be compatible with the Master Plan. The analysis showed that the criteria for the site being adequately served by public facilities and services were met. The site would not be detrimental or hazardous to existing or future neighboring uses, persons, property, or public welfare, provided that security systems limit unauthorized use of the site. The site would not create additional public costs for public facilities or services that would be detrimental to the community's economic welfare.

Planning Staff reviewed the designation criteria for Class A. The structure was non-conforming due to its existing setback. The non-conforming did not negatively impact nearby property values, and the renovations would have a positive impact. The criteria for non-conformities contrary to public health, safety, and welfare could be met, with renovations improving vehicular circulation if the pathway is added along Grove Road. Granting the Class A designation would allow the re-use of the building and site to be renovated and also allow the property owner to make other improvements to the building in the future. Based on staff review, the Planning Commission would determine the adequacy, but there was a positive recommendation regarding the site plan. Other conditions could be attached to ensure structural support.

The conditions were reviewed. The project shall meet the accessibility requirements in the Building Code, as determined by the Building Official. The final site plan shall show the security camera and alarm system information on the plans, as required by Section 812. Suggested doors to enclose the bays were proposed, but the applicants stated that doors could not be added because they would conflict with the equipment. The property would use on-site cameras, and it was recommended that the security proposal be discussed. The proposal for the landscape screen along the eastern property line was deficient by 16 large evergreen trees and 83 narrow evergreen trees. There was a limited area, but it was a requirement based on the distance from the property line. The proposed Grove Road street-yard landscaping did not meet the intent of the ordinance and was deficient by five large deciduous trees and two other trees, but there was not much area to plant them. The possibility of cut-through traffic between Grove Rd. and Lakeview Ave. was likely to be/not likely to be an issue, and on-site signage prohibiting cut-through traffic is/is not required needed to be discussed. There was a pedestrian pathway in the vehicle lanes, but a path could not be added due to the road's slope. A pathway was added on the pavement itself. The proposed CMU block for the dumpster screen is/is not compatible with the materials used on the building facades, which was used to determine whether another material

should be used. The proposed dimension of the loading area would accommodate the businesses' needs.

Mr. Kirby (Commissioner) asked how far away residential properties were. Planning Staff reported that there were none immediately adjacent. There were residential zones across the street on the north side of the property. The neighborhood to the north and the multi-family residential homes across Grove Road were the closest residential homes. Mr. Kirby asked whether the Road Commission had reviewed traffic flow. Planning Staff reported that traffic was evaluated, there was no change in use, and no increase in traffic was expected compared to when there was a car wash previously. The queuing on site would be the larger aspect to control. There were many self-serve car lanes, which were expected to mitigate traffic congestion.

It was asked when the property was rezoned to create the non-conformity. Planning Staff reported that it was non-conforming because the property had been vacant for over a year and was a new business. The zoning ordinance had changed in 2022.

The engineer for the project, Matt Cole, discussed the site plan. The Road Commission was contacted, and an agreement was reached. The pavement in the front was reduced somewhat, and green space of shrubs was added to focus the traffic. The Road Commission had asked for no plants to be planted in that space. On the site, there were six self-service bays and two automatic bays. In the automatic bays, the total time from pay to driving out was five minutes. There would be eight cars able to stack, but realistically, only three spaces were needed due to the time required. The ordinance was met by keeping the added green space, but it could also be made into grass if the Commission wanted that instead. Along the church property, the new vacuums were being added, and the setback requirements were met. There were some pine trees, and they were being infilled with more pines. The greenery looked nicer than a fence, so the applicant was proposing that instead of a fence.

Mr. Sinkule (Commissioner) asked about the eastern side and the deficiency of trees. Matt Cole explained that the deficiency was based on the entire property line, and the screening was only needed between the adjacent property and the vehicle use. The number of trees was calculated based on the number of vacuum spaces rather than the entire car wash area. The only other deficiency was on Grove Road, where the Road Commission asked that no trees be planted. Mr. Sinkule stated that he would defer to the Planning Staff for clarification on the two different interpretations. When examining the entirety of the east side, the number of trees was large. If the

Commission did not decide to add a wall, Mr. Sinkule stated that he would like to see more trees.

Ms. Kehrer (Commissioner) asked for more details on the security plan and how the security issues were being prevented, particularly during the night hours. She also asked if there were any concerns about the 24-hour facility impacting neighbors. It was reported that there would be cameras and a professional monitoring system. The bays would be wide open, helping prevent security issues. The area would be actively monitored 24 hours per day. Ms. Kehrer asked how the monitoring worked and if someone would be actively watching the cameras. The property owner, Jeff Hanson, stated that he would likely not have someone watching the cameras 24 hours a day. He asked whether there were any issues during the prior car wash or only after the building was vacant. He anticipated that having the business open and with lights would prevent crime. Ms. Kehrer asked if the applicant had consulted with the sheriff. Jeff Hanson reported that he had not.

Ms. Peterson (Commissioner) stated that it was important for the residents to feel comfortable. She asked how far the bushes were from housing. Tom Alsman reported that the houses were quite far away, and the bushes were closer to the church. The bushes would be shielding the property from the church. Ms. Peterson stated that they needed to know if the security would be sufficient since the business was open 24 hours a day. She noted the importance of security and stated that the prior car wash was not open 24/7. It was reported that it was only open 24 hours per day since it was self-service. There would be lighting, cameras in each corner to monitor activity and who was present, and cameras on all light poles. If the business had to be shut down from 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m., they could find a way to turn off the self-service bays. It was assured that the doors for the automatic washes were secured. Ms. Peterson asked which security company's proposal was submitted. She stated that they should be able to see what was occurring in the automatic washes and with the cameras. The applicant confirmed that they would work it out.

A Commissioner asked about staffing and whether any staff would be present. It was confirmed that staff would be present daily during the day to clean up and collect trash. Ms. Peterson asked about a heater that melted ice and snow to prevent accidents. It was confirmed that a heating system would be installed underground as part of the final plan.

Mr. Sinkule (Commissioner) asked if the vacuum arms would contain a light fixture. It was confirmed that there was an LED light along the length of the arm, and it would be shown in the final plan. Mr. Sinkule asked how the lighting would be reduced after hours. It was reported that the lighting did not go down and met the site's photometric requirements. Mr. Sinkule asked whether the pole feet's mounting height would be reduced to 18 feet. It was confirmed that they would comply with the ordinance.

Ms. Peterson (Commissioner) asked if the applicant would consider fewer hours. Jeff Hanson stated that he wanted the car wash to be available to those working third shift or late shifts. He stated that he wanted the car wash to be open 24 hours a day. He discussed that there would only be a few people going through every hour. There would be no loud music, and the business would be low-volume. Ms. Peterson expressed concerns about the community's safety and stated that she believed security was important. Jeff Hanson ensured he would run a professional, safe business, and he noted that he lived nearby.

Mr. Kirby (Commissioner) stated that the main concern was ensuring proper security cameras and a timely response. He acknowledged that many self-service car washes were open 24 hours a day and that it was low volume. Jeff Hanson assured that there would be plenty of cameras and lighting.

Ms. El-Assadi (Commissioner) asked whether there was any study on people who used 24-hour car washes. It was reported that the volume of people overnight dropped dramatically. Ms. El-Assadi asked whether the cleaning hours could be adjusted occasionally to allow someone to check in during the overnight hours. Jeff Hanson stated that they could explore that option.

It was asked if the automatic car washes were also open 24 hours. It was confirmed that they were.

Ms. Lecoq (Commissioner) asked if there were any other similar facilities in the area. Jeff Hanson reported that there were fewer, since they did not generate a large volume. He stated that he had experience refurbishing some self-serve car washes but had not built a new one in a long time. It was added that the closest self-serve car wash was on Carpenter, across from the Meijer Store. Ms. Lecoq asked about Jeff Hanson's experience operating car washes and what he invested in the property. Jeff Hanson reported that he was a mechanical engineer and a project manager, so he knew a lot about project management. He also discussed reading a lot about how car washes

worked and ran. Ms. Lecoq asked what drew Jeff Hanson to the property. Jeff Hanson stated that he was looking for an post-corporate opportunity that was closer to home, challenging, and exciting.

Mr. Sinkule (Commissioner) asked whether the applicants would be open to signage prohibiting cut-through traffic. Jeff Hanson stated that he would add signage.

Ms. Peterson (Commissioner) asked if the applicant understood that the gate should be made of wood. It was reported that a metal frame was installed to prevent sagging, and composite deckboards were recommended. Planning Staff reported that the Commission had the flexibility to allow the different material. Ms. Peterson asked if the safety path would be put in or put in escrow for a later date. Matt Cole reported that they planned to add it. The planned path was a small, five-foot-wide path.

Ms. Kehrner (Commissioner) asked to see the safety path on a plan. The safety path was shown on the plan, and the reasoning for the location and width was explained. Ms. Kehrner asked if there would be a separate path. It was confirmed that there was no separate path in some of the areas. Planning Staff requested markings to improve safety for vehicles and pedestrians.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED AT 7:33 PM

A resident whose house faced the back of the car wash commented. She stated that she was happy to see the business, but raised concerns about the lighting and sound of the automatic wash bays. The resident noted that she was the only homeowner in the area, but two other houses were under construction. She commented that most foot traffic was behind the car wash, not in front. She asked if the entrance was only on Lakeview. The applicant clarified that people could enter off of Lakeview or Grove Road. The resident raised concerns about potential traffic backups. Clarity was provided on how people could easily exit. Planning Staff assured that every commercial business had to follow lighting standards and that the light would not spill onto the public road. The applicant reported that the automatic doors at the back of the car wash bays would close, preventing sound from exiting.

PUBLIC HEARING ENDED AT 7:39 PM

MOTION: Mr. Sinkule **MOVED** to **APPROVE** the Class A Non-Conforming Designation application for the non-conforming front yard of the Grove Road Auto Wash Renovation project at 2171 Grove Rd. – PARCEL K-11-23-105-001

submitted by Blackstar Building Group on a site zoned GB, General Business District, with the following conditions:

1. The property owner shall comply with all current Township Ordinance standards regarding all other aspects of the site design, as determined by the Planning Commission.

The **MOTION** was **SECONDED** by Ms. Kehrler.

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

SPECIAL LAND USE – CAR WASH “GROVE STREET AUTO WASH” – 2171 GROVE ROAD – TO CONSIDER THE SPECIAL LAND USE APPLICATION TO PERMIT A RENOVATION OF A VEHICLE WASH ON A SITE ZONED GB, GENERAL BUSINESS.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED AT 7:39 PM

Hearing None.

PUBLIC HEARING ENDED AT 7:40 PM

Planning Staff noted that the landscaping requirement applied to both automotive and institutional land uses. The regulation intended to protect against sound. While landscaping did not eliminate sound, it helped mitigate it. Staff stated that it was a large deficiency. The amount required was based on the entire frontage, which created the amount needed.

Ms. Kehrler (Commissioner) asked whether the frontage applied only between the church and the car wash. Planning Staff confirmed that this was correct. Ms. Kehrler asked whether the automotive designation was the type of business. Planning Staff confirmed that this was correct.

Ms. El-Assadi (Commissioner) asked if the vacuums would also make a larger noise. Planning Staff stated that they could. Ms. El-Assadi asked whether the church had a walkway that the safety path would meet up with. Planning Staff stated that part of the requirement was township-wide and county-wide, that part of it placed the

improvement on the property owner, and that the goal for Grove Road was eight feet. Staff stated that, in certain circumstances, eight feet was logistically challenging and that the Planning Commission should discuss it. The master plan's long-term goal was to improve connectivity.

Mr. Sinkule (Commissioner) stated that he was okay with the five-foot safety path along the frontage due to logistical constraints. He stated that there needed to be a middle ground on the number of trees. He raised concerns about the neighbors' exposure to the light and recommended further discussion.

Ms. El-Assadi (Commissioner) recommended adding markings as a requirement for the five-foot safety path.

Mr. Kirby (Commissioner) agreed with the concern about lighting but raised concerns about dimming lighting for safety reasons. He recommended increasing the number of trees to make it more sufficient.

Ms. Kehrner (Commissioner) requested that the applicant or engineer discuss the CMU block and its consistency with the building's façade. It was reported that the height of the two center bays was being increased, and masonry blocks would be used on the walls. On the sides, the existing brick would be repaired and painted. The masonry units would be painted to match the building's color.

Ms. El-Assadi (Commissioner) noted that the loading area still needed to be addressed. It was reported that large semi-trucks typically came in, but only a van was delivering, resulting in a smaller parking space and loading zone.

Mr. Kirby (Commissioner) stated that he was still unsure how much the business would be monitored. It was explained that it would be sporadic and could potentially use artificial intelligence (AI) support. The shields would help protect the lighting. Planning Staff noted that the Commission had previously required that the videos from the camera system be available for 30 days.

Ms. Peterson (Commissioner) asked if the security cameras would not run 24/7. It was clarified that they would run 24/7, but they would not be monitored 24/7. Ms. Peterson recommended adding conditions to make clear that the police department should assess them, keep them for 30 days, and that the cameras must be in the ports. Planning Staff agreed that it would be helpful to add conditions under the preliminary site plan.

Mr. Sinkule (Commissioner) agreed that it was important to have cameras on both the Lakeview and Grove Road sides, the back parking lot, and the bays 24/7, and to have the video be available for 30 days.

The Commissioners agreed that the CMU block was compatible, provided it was painted in line with the rest of the area. The Commissioners were comfortable with the smaller loading area as presented.

The Commissioners and Planning Staff discussed the number of trees. Planning Staff recommended eight large trees and 41 narrow trees. The landscaper was encouraged to use Michigan-native plants to increase the longevity of the trees.

Mr. Kirby (Commissioner) asked if it was feasible to increase the number. Planning Staff stated that it was reasonable to add the narrow trees. The applicant stated that they could alternatively add the fence if the number of trees was not possible. Mr. Kirby asked to get in as many trees as they could. Planning Staff stated that if they could not plant the tall evergreen trees, they could plant two smaller trees in place of each tall tree. Staff noted that the decision was up to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Sinkhule (Commissioner) suggested recommending working with staff on the final site plan, focusing on the two-to-one ratio and some trees around the vacuums where it would be noisier.

Ms. Peterson (Commissioner) asked whether they were setting a precedent regarding the trash can area gate by allowing wood. She also asked about the cost difference. It was reported that the required enclosure would cost \$3,600 to \$5,000, and the proposal would cost approximately \$21,000. A metal substructure was in the proposal with the composite deckboard. Planning Staff noted that the CMU block would be acceptable in another location and that it was compatible with the dumpster screen and the principal structure.

MOTION: Mr. Sinkule **MOVED** to **APPROVE** the Special Land Use application for the Grove Road Auto Wash Renovation project at 2171 Grove Rd. – PARCEL K-11-23-105-001 submitted by Blackstar Building Group on a site zoned GB, General Business District, as the proposal meets the criteria in Article 10, Special Land Use, with the following conditions:

1. The project receives Preliminary Site Plan approval and approval of the requested Class A Non-Conforming Designation.
2. Revise plans based on the Planning Commission's discussion at this evening's meeting, and review comments made by Planning, Engineering, and outside agencies, for the Final Site Plan.

The **MOTION** was **SECONDED** by Ms. Kehrler.

Roll Call Vote: Ms. Tyson (Yes), Ms. Kehrler (Yes), Mr. Sinkule (Yes), Ms. Lecoq (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– CAR WASH “GROVE STREET AUTO WASH” – 2171 GROVE ROAD** – TO CONSIDER THE PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN APPLICATION TO PERMIT A RENOVATION OF A VEHICLE WASH ON A SITE ZONED GB, GENERAL BUSINESS.

MOTION: Ms. Kehrler **MOVED** to **APPROVE** the request for Preliminary Site Plan approval for the Grove Road Auto Wash Renovation at 2171 Grove Rd. – PARCEL K-11-23-105-001 submitted by Blackstar Building Group on a site zoned GB, General Business District, with the following conditions:

1. The project shall meet the accessibility requirements in ICC ANSI A.117.1 2017 in the Building Code, as determined by the Building Official.
2. The proposed camera and alarm system must operate 24/7; cameras must face both streets and into each bay; camera data must be retained for a minimum of 30 days and made available to the Washtenaw County Sheriff.
3. The final site plan shall show the security camera and alarm system information on the plans, as required by Section 812.
4. The proposed landscape screen along the eastern property line does not adequately screen the adjacent property from the proposed car wash use. Planning Commission sets a goal of adding eight large and 40 narrow evergreen trees. If it is not possible to add eight large trees, the applicant

may add two narrow trees for each large tree. If the number of evergreen trees could not be achieved, the final number of trees should be acceptable to the Planning Director.

5. The proposed Grove Road street-yard landscaping meets the intent of the ordinance.
6. The possibility of cut-through traffic between Grove Road and Lakeview Avenue is likely to be an issue, and on-site signage prohibiting cut-through traffic is required.
7. The safety path along the Grove Road frontage shown on the plans is adequate as proposed, and a minimum five-foot-wide safety path is required along this frontage. The five-foot path shall be striped along the edge of the driveway where a separate path cannot be provided.
8. The proposed CMU block used on the dumpster screen is compatible with the materials used on the building facades if painted to match.
9. The proposed dimension of the loading area will accommodate the businesses' needs.
10. The applicant shall revise all plan sheets to reflect the results of this evening's discussion.
11. The applicant shall address all outstanding comments from reviewing consultants and agencies as part of the final site plan review.
12. The applicant shall obtain all applicable internal and external outside agency permits before construction.

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

Roll Call Vote: Ms. Tyson (Yes), Ms. Kehrer (Yes), Mr. Sinkule (Yes), Ms. Lecoq (Yes), Ms. Peterson (Yes), Mr. Kirby (Yes), and Ms. El-Assadi (Yes).

- **OPEN DISCUSSIONS FOR ISSUES NOT ON AGENDA**

- **Correspondence Received**

None to Report.

- **Planning Commission Members**

Ms. Lecoq (Commissioner) introduced herself. Planning Staff noted that she was filling Larry Doe's term, which ran through the end of 2026, and that the position would then be considered for reappointment.

- **Members of the Audience**

None to Report.

- **TOWNSHIP BOARD REPRESENTATIVE REPORT**

Ms. Peterson reported that the Township held its car show, and there was a great turnout. There was a meeting on June 16 to discuss how to address senior citizens' issues and allocate funds. There was also a pickleball tournament.

Ms. Peterson noted the upcoming John E Lawrence summer jazz event.

- **ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS REPRESENTATIVE REPORT**

None to Report

- **TOWNSHIP ATTORNEY REPORT**

None to Report

- **PLANNING DEPARTMENT REPORT**

Planning Staff reported that a meeting would be held on Tuesday, June 23, 2026, at 6:30 p.m. He noted that one of the items was the extension of the Holiday Inn construction, as they had not been able to attend the May 26 meeting. A work session was scheduled to introduce a zoning text amendment. There were four categories of ordinances under work. There were no items scheduled for the July meetings, but there were many site plans and proposals in the queue.

The Planning Commission was requested to inform Staff in advance if they could not attend any meetings so that a quorum could be reached.

Planning Staff reported that the Township Board approved the year-long contract with Carlisle Wortman. The development agreement and final site plan for Urban Aire were approved, and a meeting will be held in the near future.

- **OTHER BUSINESS**

None to Report.

- **ADJOURNMENT**

MOTION: Ms. Peterson **MOVED** to adjourn at 8:30 pm. The **MOTION** was **SECONDED** by Mr. Kirby and **PASSED** by unanimous consent.

=====

Respectively Submitted by Minutes Services

**CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF YPSILANTI
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
Tuesday, June 23, 2026
6:30 pm**

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

Elizabeth El-Assadi, Chair
Bill Sinkule, Vice Chair
Darrell Kirby, Secretary
Bianca Tyson
Gloria Peterson
Amy Kehrer
Crystal Lecoq

STAFF AND CONSULTANTS

Mark Yandrick, Planning Director

- **CALL TO ORDER/ESTABLISH QUORUM**

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

- **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

MOTION: Mr. Sinkule **MOVED** to **APPROVE** the agenda as presented. The **MOTION** was **SECONDED** by Ms. Peterson and **PASSED** by unanimous consent.

- **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

None.

- **OLD BUSINESS**

None to Report.

- **NEW BUSINESS**

- a. **EXTENSION REQUEST OF PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN APPROVAL –
HOLIDAY INN EXPRESS – 350 AND 460 JOE HALL ROAD – TO
CONSIDER THE FINAL SITE PLAN APPROVAL FOR THE DEVELOPMENT
OF A HOLIDAY INN EXPRESS PROJECT.**

Planning Staff reported that on March 25, 2025, the applicant for the Holiday Inn Express got preliminary site plan approval from the Board. Under the zoning ordinance, they had to return and apply for and begin the final site plan process within a year of approval. The code allowed for a one-time 12-month extension. There had been ongoing communication over the past few months, as there were different circumstances than in most projects. The request was for an extension to submit and start the final site plan by March 25, 2027. As part of the site plan approval and future construction, the project triggered enough traffic volume on Joe Hall to require a traffic light. The Township's legal team, along with the Road Commission and the Township engineer, were working together. The applicant had been in communications and had provided some money to the Road Commission through their organization. Once in place, the applicant could move forward with the final site plan and the process. It was a standard extension as long as the Commission deemed it valid.

The applicant, Anant Patel, provided additional information on the project. He reported that they had finalized the legal documents in the second half of 2025 and were working toward financing, but there were backlogs due to the government shutdown. There was a tentative term sheet from a lender. The plans were expected from the architect by the end of July 2026, and then submitted to the franchise owner for approval. Before the final site plan meeting, the letter of credit to the Road Commission was the main barrier, and that had been addressed.

Ms. El-Assadi (Commissioner) asked for more information on the needed traffic light. Anant Patel reported that the traffic from the Holiday Inn was sufficient to warrant a traffic light. The first developer would pay for the traffic light. A bid from one of the state-approved civil engineering firms was received, which included the amount for the letter of credit.

Planning Staff noted that the Road Commission was also undertaking a signalization project, and one of the goals was to synchronize all traffic lights on South Huron Street.

Ms. Kehrer (Commissioner) asked what the current projection for starting construction was. Anant Patel reported that his goal was to start construction by the end of 2026.

MOTION: Mr. Kirby **MOVED** to **APPROVE** the one-year extension request of the Preliminary Site Plan approval, granted with conditions by the Planning Commission at their March 25, 2025, meeting. The approved plans were submitted by Andy Patel, InterContinental Hotels Group, to permit the construction of a 101-room, four-story hotel located at 350 & 450 Joe Hall Drive, Ypsilanti, MI 48197, Parcel K-11-38-363-029, and Parcel K-11- 38-363-003. The one-year extension of the Preliminary Site Plan approval will give the applicant additional time to submit Final Site Plans for their project. The **MOTION** was **SECONDED** by Ms. Kehrer.

Roll Call Vote: Ms. Tyson (Yes), Ms. Kehrer (Yes), Mr. Sinkule (Yes), Ms. Lecoq (Yes), Ms. Peterson (Yes), Mr. Kirby (Yes), and Ms. El-Assadi (Yes).

- **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 regular meeting would be held on July 14, 2026, at 6:30 p.m. During the work session in June, the zoning and text amendments would be discussed. A rezoning meeting was anticipated on July 28, 2026.

- **OTHER BUSINESS**

None to Report.

- **ADJOURNMENT**

MOTION: Mr. Sinkul **MOVED** to adjourn at 6:40 pm. The **MOTION** was **SECONDED** by Ms. Peterson and **PASSED** by unanimous consent.

=====

Respectively Submitted by Minutes Services



MEMORANDUM

To: Ypsilanti Township Planning Commission

From: Mark Yandrick, AICP, Planning Director
Sally Elmiger, AICP, Planning Consultant, Carlisle Wortman & Associates

cc: Brenda Stumbo, Ypsilanti Township Supervisor
Doug Winters, McLain and Winters

Date: July 2, 2026

Re: Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment: Cleanup (Various Items)

Process

A Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment is a change to the written regulations of a township's zoning ordinance. To evaluate a text amendment, the Michigan Zoning Enabling Act requires the Planning Commission to first hold a public hearing and then discuss and possibly refine the language before making a recommendation on the amendment to the Township Board. The Township Board is then required to hold at least two (2) readings of the Text Amendment before making a decision.

Background

The township passed the current Zoning Ordinance on February 15, 2022, and since that time occasionally proposed Township-initiated ordinance amendments. The current proposals aim to clean up or refine the ordinance for better regulations and process, while ensuring alignment with the Township's Master Plan. For this round, there are three (3) buckets of changes:

- Bucket #1: Land Use Table
- Bucket #2: Form Based Code
- Bucket #3: Changes and Amendments (Rezoning)

Proposal

Bucket #1 Land Use Table

Staff identified that Section 420. – Table of Uses does not align with *Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act*, which was passed by the Federal Government in 2000. This act protects individuals, houses of worship, and other religious institutions from discrimination in land use regulations. The law requires zoning to process Places of Worship not more restrictively than how it processes other places of assembly, such as theatres, concert halls, etc. Currently, the General Business District allows Places of Worship with a Special Land Use approval by the Planning Commission while Theatres and Places of Assembly are Permitted Uses. This amendment to the General Business district will require Special Land Use review of the following uses:

Theaters, public assembly halls, concert halls or similar places of public assembly.

There have been documented public safety issues and increased service calls with places of assembly in the Township in recent years. So, requiring Special Land Use review for places of assembly provides additional standards for the township to evaluate the use by, and determine if the use is appropriate at the proposed location.

Bucket #2: Form Based Code

Mixed-Use Development traditionally allows residential and commercial uses on the same property; however, the current Form Based Code Regional and Neighborhood Corridor zoning districts do not allow Use Group 4, including retail and restaurants on the same property as residential uses and other land uses from Use Groups 1, 2, and 3. This modification would allow mixed-use development to have a mix of land uses from Use Groups 1, 2, 3, and 4. The Town Center already allows a mix of Use Groups 1, 2, 3, and 4.

Additionally, there are some minor changes in the design element section that allow flexibility in transparency requirements. This follows multiple variance requests that were approved for Sheetz, Aldi's, and Culvers, and provides more avenues for applicants to meet the requirement and reduce variance requests.

Bucket #3: Changes and Amendments (Rezoning)

This proposal requires a pre-application meeting for rezoning requests. This aligns with the current pre-application meeting requirement for site plans. The rezoning and conditional rezoning pre-application meeting provides an opportunity to assess a request, provide feedback from the various technical agencies, if this is the best zoning district to request and lastly, if the rezoning is even needed.

Conclusion/Recommendation

This Ordinance proposes to clean up several sections of the Zoning Ordinance to provide a better process and flexibility for the Township and applicants and aligns with state and federal laws.

SUGGESTED MOTIONS:

Zoning Ordinance Text Amendments to amend various sections of the Zoning Ordinance, including Article IV. – District Regulations, Section 420. - Table of Uses; Article V. – Form Based Districts, Section 502. - Applicability and Organization, Section 504. - Neighborhood Corridors, Section 505. - Regional Corridors, Section 506. - Town Center, and Section 507. - Design Standards; and Article XVIII. – Changes and Amendments, Section 1802. - Application Procedure, and Section 1805. - Conditional Rezoning Procedures (collectively “Text Amendments.”)

Motion to Postpone:

“I move to POSTPONE the Township Initiated Zoning Ordinance Text Amendments relating to the various cleanup items in the Zoning Ordinance, including Article IV. – District Regulations, Section 420. - Table of Uses; Article V. – Form Based Districts, Section 502. - Applicability and Organization, Section 504. - Neighborhood Corridors, Section 505. - Regional Corridors, Section 506. - Town Center, and Section 507. - Design Standards; Article XVIII. – Changes and Amendments, Section 1802. - Application Procedure, and Section 1805. - Conditional Rezoning Procedures (collectively “Text Amendments.”) to give the Township staff time to address the comments made at this evening’s meeting and resubmit for Planning Commission consideration, and/or to provide additional information, as discussed tonight.

Motion to Approve:

“I move to recommend APPROVAL to the Township Board of the Township Initiated Zoning Ordinance Text Amendments relating to the various cleanup items in the Zoning Ordinance, including Article IV. – District Regulations, Section 420. - Table of Uses; Article V. – Form Based Districts, Section 502. - Applicability and Organization, Section 504. - Neighborhood Corridors, Section 505. - Regional Corridors, Section 506. - Town Center, and Section 507. - Design Standards; and Article XVIII. – Changes and Amendments, Section 1802. - Application Procedure, and Section 1805. - Conditional Rezoning Procedures (collectively “Text Amendments.”) to improve the health, safety, and welfare of the Township with the following conditions:

1. (Any other conditions based upon Planning Commission discussion.)”

Motion to Deny:

“I move to recommend DENIAL of the Township Initiated Zoning Ordinance Text Amendments relating to the various cleanup items in the Zoning Ordinance, including Article IV. – District Regulations, Section 420. - Table of Uses; Article V. – Form Based Districts, Section 502. - Applicability and Organization, Section 504. - Neighborhood Corridors, Section 505. - Regional Corridors, Section 506. - Town Center, and Section 507. - Design Standards; and Article XVIII. – Changes and Amendments, Section 1802. - Application Procedure, and Section 1805. - Conditional Rezoning Procedures (collectively “Text Amendments.”), for the following reasons:

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

YPSILANTI CHARTER TOWNSHIP

PROPOSED ORDINANCE NO. 2026-XXXX

An Ordinance Amending Appendix A – ZONING, Township Zoning Ordinance of Ypsilanti Charter Township to Amend Various Sections of the Zoning Ordinance, including Article IV. – District Regulations, Section 420. - Table of Uses; Article V. – Form Based Districts, Section 502. - Applicability and Organization, Section 504. - Neighborhood Corridors, Section 505. - Regional Corridors, Section 506. - Town Center, and Section 507. - Design Standards; Article XVIII. – Changes and Amendments, Section 1802. - Application Procedure and Section 1805. - Conditional Rezoning Procedures.

Ypsilanti Charter Township hereby ordains that Appendix A. – Zoning, adopted February 15, 2022, in the Code of Ordinances of Ypsilanti Charter Township is hereby amended by adding and modifying the following described text.

*[Modify Article IV. – DISTRICT REGULATIONS]***Section 420. – Table of Uses**

4. Business districts table of uses identifies the uses allowed in the following commercial districts:

Business Districts Use Table	NB	GB	Notes
P = Permitted Use SL-PC = Special Use Planning Commission Approval			
SL-TB = Special use Township Board Approval A = Accessory Use — = Not Permitted			
Civic/Institutional			
Houses of worship	SL-PC	SL-PC	
Public/government buildings	P	P	
Public utility buildings, without storage yards; water and sewage	—	—	Water and sewage pumping stations are excluded in the OS-1 and B-1 districts.
Business schools and colleges or private schools operated for profit	—	SL-PC	
Recreation			
Theaters, public assembly halls, concert halls or similar places of public assembly	—	P SL-PC	Conducted completely within enclosed buildings.
Outdoor batting cages, archery ranges, and similar uses	—	SL-PC	Subject to conditions in Section 1130 .
Outdoor children’s amusement parks, miniature golf courses, golf driving ranges, and similar uses	—	SL-PC	Subject to conditions in Section 1130 .
Small group or one-on-one exercise studios	P	P	

Fitness, gymnastics, and exercise centers	—	SL-PC	
Indoor recreational facility, including bowling alley, archery range, tennis/racquet ball court, skating rink, athletic field, swimming pool, and other similar uses	—	SL-PC	Must be located at least one hundred (100) feet from any front, rear, or side yard of any residential lot in an adjacent residential district

[NO OTHER CHANGES ARE PROPOSED TO THIS SECTION.]

[Modify Article V. – FORM BASED DISTRICTS]

Sec. 502. - Applicability and organization:

2. *Regulating plan:* The Form Based District shall be governed by a Regulating Plan that is specific to the area.
 - A. The Regulating plan based on the site type determines building form and allowable use for each property within a form-based district.
 - B. The Regulating plan is based on four (4) factors: Corridor Type, Site Type; Building Form; and Use Group.
 - (1) Corridor Type: Corridor types are identified as Neighborhood, Regional, or Town Center as determined by the Master Plan.
 - (2) Site Types: Site Types are determined by street orientation, lot size, lot configuration, location, and relationship to neighboring sites. Site type provides the basis for building forms and authorized use groups.
 - (3) Building Form Standards and Types: Building form standards and types establish the parameters for building form, height, and placement; specifically applied to each district based upon the regulating plan.
 - (4) Authorized Use Groups: Authorized land uses are organized by use groups. Authorized use groups are specifically applied to each District based upon the regulating plan.
 - C. The steps to determine the regulations that apply to a specific property within a form-based district are as follows:
 - (1) Find the site in question on the regulating plan map.
 - (2) Identify the corridor type: Corridors will be classified Neighborhood, Regional, or Town Center.
 - (3) Identify the site type for the site in question. Sites will be classified Site Type A, B, ~~or C~~, or D, as applicable in each district.

[NO OTHER CHANGES ARE PROPOSED TO THIS SECTION.]

[NO CHANGES ARE PROPOSED TO SECTION 503. - STANDARDS.]

Sec. 504. - Neighborhood corridors:**2. Use groups by category-neighborhood corridors:**

Neighborhood Corridors
Use Group 1
Residential Uses:
One-Family detached and attached dwellings, subject to regulations in Section 1101 .
Two-Family dwellings.
Use Group 2
Misc. Residential/Related Uses:
Mixed-use. Any combination of uses located in group 1, 2, or 3 , <u>or 4</u> that is mixed vertically in a building or horizontal on one (1) parcel.
Multiple-Family dwellings.
Live/Work units.
Child care centers, subject to regulations in Section 1155 .
Bed and breakfast operations, subject to regulations in Section 1107 .
Use Group 3
Office/Institutional:
Civic buildings.
Place of worship.
Professional and medical office.
Publicly owned/operated office and service facilities.
Use Group 4
Retail, Entertainment, and Service Uses:
Financial institution without drive-through.
General retail.
Quick serve food or restaurant use without a drive-through.
Personal services.
Business services.
Small group or one-on-one exercise or art studio.
Use Group 5
Misc. Uses:
Adaptive Reuse, subject to regulations in Section 1167 .
Any single use building over ten thousand (10,000) sq/ft.
Veterinary clinics or hospitals, subject to regulations in Section 1116 , or Section 1117 .
Commercial kennels/pet day care, subject to regulations in Section 1161 .
Technology centers/office research.

Mortuaries/Funeral homes, subject to regulations in Section 1115 .
Senior assisted/independent living, subject to regulations in Section 1160 .
Group day care homes, subject to regulations in Section 1155 .
Lodging, subject to regulations in Section 1122 , Section 1123 , or Section 1124 , as applicable.
Fitness, gymnastics, and exercise centers.
Theatres and places of assembly.
Indoor commercial recreational facilities, subject to regulations in Section 1135 .
Use Group 6
Automotive Uses:
Vehicle car wash, subject to regulations in Section 1129 .
Financial Institution with drive-through, subject to regulations in Section 1118 .
Vehicle fueling/multi-use station, subject to conditions in Section 1126 .

[NO OTHER CHANGES ARE PROPOSED TO THIS SECTION.]

Sec. 505. - Regional corridors:*2. Use groups by category-regional corridors:*

Regional Corridors
Use Group 1
Residential Uses:
One-Family detached and attached dwellings, subject to regulations in Section 1101 .
Two-Family dwellings.
Use Group 2
Misc. Residential/Related Uses:
Mixed-use. Any combination of uses located in group 1, 2, or 3 , <u>or 4</u> that is mixed vertically in a building or horizontal on one (1) parcel.
Multiple-Family dwellings.
Live/Work units.
Child care centers, subject to regulations in Section 1155 .
Bed and breakfast operations, subject to regulations in Section 1107 .
Use Group 3
Office/Institutional:
Civic buildings.
Professional and medical office.
Primary/secondary schools (private).
Publicly owned/operated office and service facilities.
Place of worship.
Veterinary clinics or hospitals, subject to regulations in Section 1116 or Section 1117 , as applicable.
Use Group 4
Retail, Entertainment, and Service Uses:
Financial institutions without a drive-through.
General retail.
Food use without a drive-through.
Personal services.
Business services.
Small group or one-on-one exercise or art studio.
Use Group 5
Misc. Uses:
Adaptive Reuse, subject to regulations in Section 1167 .
Retail over 30,000 sq/ft.
Commercial kennels/pet day care, subject to regulations in Section 1161 .

Hospitals.
Technology centers/office research.
Mortuaries/Funeral homes, subject to regulations in Section 1115 .
Senior assisted/independent living, subject to regulations in Section 1160 .
Group day care homes, subject to regulations in Section 1155 .
Lodging, subject to regulations in Section 1122 , Section 1123 , or Section 1124 , as applicable.
Fitness, gymnastics, and exercise centers.
Theatres and places of assembly.
Use with a drive-through, subject to regulations in Section 1118 .
Indoor commercial recreational facilities, subject to regulations in Section 1135 .
Outdoor commercial recreational facilities, subject to regulations in Section 1130 .
Use Group 6
Automotive Uses:
Vehicle car wash, subject to regulations in Section 1129 .
Vehicle fueling/multi-use station, subject to conditions in Section 1126 .
Dealership for sales of new or used vehicles, boats, house trailers or rental of trailers or vehicles, subject to regulations in Section 1121 .

[NO OTHER CHANGES ARE PROPOSED TO THIS SECTION.]

Sec. 506. – Town center:**2. Use groups by category-Town Center:**

Town Center Corridors
Use Group 1
Residential Uses:
One-Family detached and attached dwellings, subject to regulations in Section 1101 .
Two-Family dwellings.
Use Group 2
Misc. Residential/Related Uses:
Mixed-use. Any combination of uses located in group 1, 2, 3, or 4 that is mixed vertically in a building or horizontal on one (1) parcel.
Multiple-Family dwellings.
Live/Work units.
Child care centers, subject to regulations in Section 1155 .
Bed and breakfast operations, subject to regulations in Section 1107 .
Use Group 3
Office/Institutional:
Civic buildings.
Professional and medical office.
Primary/secondary schools (private).
Publicly owned/operated office and service facilities.
Place of worship
Veterinary clinics or hospitals, subject to regulations in Section 1116 or Section 1117 , as applicable.
Use Group 4
Retail, Entertainment, and Service Uses:
Financial institutions without a drive-through.
General retail.
Food use without a drive-through.
Personal services.
Business services.
Small group or one-on-one exercise or art studio.
Use Group 5
Misc. Uses:
Commercial kennels/pet day care, subject to regulations in Section 1161 .
Retail over 10,000 sq/ft.
Technology centers/office research.

Senior assisted/independent living, subject to regulations in Section 1160 .
Group day care homes, subject to regulations in Section 1155 .
Lodging, subject to regulations in Section 1122 , Section 1123 , or Section 1124 , as applicable.
Fitness, gymnastics, and exercise centers.
Theatres and places of assembly.
Light industrial/warehousing.
Research and development.
Indoor commercial recreational facilities, subject to regulations in Section 1135 .
Use Group 6
Automotive Uses:
Drive-through use, subject to regulations in Section 1118 .

[NO OTHER CHANGES ARE PROPOSED TO THIS SECTION.]

Sec. 507. - Design standards:

1. *Design standards:* In addition to standards set forth in this ordinance, all proposed development shall comply with the standards set forth herein.

[NO CHANGES ARE PROPOSED TO PARAGRAPHS A - C.]**D. Architectural design and building materials:**

- (1) Intent: To create a character for the form-based district that encourages the greatest amount of visual interest, architectural consistency, and high-quality material use. The standards are not intended to limit imagination, innovation, or variety.
- (2) Building materials: Building materials should be of high quality and durable, such as but not limited to stone, brick, glass, and metal. E.I.F.S. or material equivalent shall only be used as an accent material.
- (3) Architectural design standards:
 - a. Building massing and scale:
 - i. Rooflines and pitches shall be proportionate to nearby structures so as to provide transition or mitigation of significant changes to scale. Variety in massing can occur though step-backs as a building ascends upward.
 - ii. Buildings shall maintain a consistent street wall with the longest edge of the buildings oriented parallel to the roadway, where possible.
 - iii. Buildings within the same development shall be designed to provide a unified and easily identifiable image. Methods to achieve this include using similar architectural styles and materials, complementary roof forms, signs, and colors.
 - b. Façade variation:
 - i. Façade articulation or architectural design variations for building walls facing the street are required to ensure that the building is not monotonous in appearance, using the following architectural techniques: Building wall offsets (projections and recesses); cornices, varying building materials or pilasters used to break up the mass of a single building; staggering of vertical walls; recessing of openings; providing upper-level roof overhangs; contrasting compatible building materials; use of variety and rhythm of window and door openings; use of horizontal and vertical architectural elements, use of horizontal bands of compatible colors; and providing changes in roof shape or roof-line.
 - ii. Materials shall be selected for suitability to the type of buildings and the architectural design in which they are used.
 - iii. Material selection shall be consistent with architectural style in terms of color, shades, and texture; however, monotony shall be avoided.

E. Transparency:

- (1) Intent: The first floors of all buildings shall be designed to encourage and complement pedestrian-scale activity and crime prevention techniques. It is intended that this be accomplished principally by the use of windows and doors arranged so that active uses within the building are visible from or accessible to the street and parking areas are visible to occupants of the building.
- (2) Transparency standards:
 - a. Façade transparency shall be defined as the use of glass or transparent material that provides from the building exterior a view into the building of interior habitation and human scale. Signs covering windows, and the use of tinted, reflective, or opaque glass do not meet the definition of façade transparency. Visibility through the required transparency must portray the principal use of the operation and shall not portray secondary or back-of-house operation areas, including but not limited to, laundry, cleaning supply, stock or storage areas.
 - b. The first floors of all buildings shall be designed to encourage and complement pedestrian-scale activity and crime prevention techniques. It is intended that this be accomplished principally by

- the use of windows and doors arranged so that active uses within the building are visible from or accessible to the street, and parking areas are visible to occupants of the building. The first floor of any front façade facing a right-of-way shall be no less than fifty percent (50%) windows and doors, and the minimum transparency for facades facing a parking area shall be no less than thirty percent (30%) of the façade.
- c. First-floor transparency is measured between ~~two (2)~~ three (3) and eight (8) feet above the first-floor elevation.
 - d. Nothing shall be placed on or inside windows to reduce transparency less than the fifty percent (50%) requirement.
 - e. For multiple tenant buildings, the minimum transparency requirement must be met by each suite or tenant.
- (3) Transparency alternatives. The following alternatives may be used singularly or in combination for any side or rear facing facade which requires transparency. If used in combination, they may count toward no more than 50% of the transparency requirement. Transparency alternatives may be used but cannot be counted towards the transparency requirements for facades that face on a right-of-way.
- a. Wall design. Wall designs must provide a minimum of three of the following elements, occurring at intervals no greater than 25 feet horizontally and 10 feet vertically:
 - i. Expression of structural system and infill panels through change in plane not less than three inches.
 - ii. System of horizontal and vertical scaling elements, such as: belt course, string courses, cornice, pilasters.
 - iii. System of horizontal and vertical reveals not less than one inch in width/depth.
 - iv. Variations in material module, pattern, and/or color.
 - v. System of integrated architectural ornamentation.
 - vi. Green screen or planter walls.
 - vii. Translucent, frosted, fritted, patterned, or colored glazing/glass.
 - b. Outdoor dining/seating: inclusion of outdoor dining/seating located between the building and the primary street lot line.
 - c. Permanent art: noncommercial art or graphic design of sufficient scale and orientation to be perceived from the public right-of-way and rendered in materials or media appropriate to an exterior, urban environment and permanently integrated into the building wall.
 - d. Flag poles on masonry base surrounded by landscaping.

[Modify ARTICLE XVIII. – CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS]**[NO CHANGES ARE PROPOSED TO SEC. 1801.]****Sec. 1802. - Application procedure:**

Before formally requesting an amendment to this ordinance text or the Official Zoning Map, the applicant shall schedule a pre-application meeting with the Township to discuss the request, submittal requirements, and review procedures and criteria. The purpose of this meeting is to discuss applicable standards and technical issues, and to determine any additional required review procedures related to the amendment. Requesting a pre-application meeting requires submission of a meeting application form, fee, and materials that illustrate the proposed amendment.

After the pre-application meeting is conducted, An-an applicant shall formally request an amendment to this ordinance text or the Official Zoning Map ~~shall be initiated~~ by submission of a completed application on a form supplied by the Zoning Administrator, including an application fee, which shall be established by resolution of the Township Board. Amendments initiated by the Township Board or Planning Commission do not require an application or fee.

[NO OTHER CHANGES ARE PROPOSED TO THIS SECTION.]**[NO CHANGES ARE PROPOSED TO SEC. 1803 or 1804.]****Sec. 1805. - Conditional rezoning procedures:**

1. Authorization and limitations. The Township Board shall have the authority to place conditions on a rezoning, provided the conditions have been voluntarily offered in writing by the applicant and are acceptable to the Township Board. In exercising its authority to consider a conditional rezoning, the Township is also authorized to impose the following limitations:
 - A. An owner of land may voluntarily offer written conditions relating to the use and/or development of land for which a conditional rezoning is requested. This offer may be made either at the time the application for conditional rezoning is filed, or additional conditions may be offered at a later time during the conditional rezoning process as set forth below.
 - B. The owner's offer of conditions may not authorize uses or developments not permitted in the requested new zoning district. The owner's offer of conditions shall bear a reasonable and rational relationship to the property for which the conditional rezoning is requested.
 - C. Any use or development proposed as part of an offer of conditions that would require special use approval under the terms of this ordinance may only be commenced if special use approval for such use or development is ultimately granted in accordance with the provisions of this ordinance.
 - D. Any use or development proposed as part of an offer of conditions that would require a variance under the terms of this ordinance may only be commenced if a variance for such use or development is ultimately granted by the Zoning Board of Appeals in accordance with the provisions of this ordinance.
 - E. Any use or development proposed as part of an offer of conditions that would require site plan approval under the terms of this ordinance may only be commenced if site plan approval for such use or development is ultimately granted in accordance with the terms of this ordinance.
2. Amendment of conditions. The offer of conditions may be amended during process of conditional rezoning consideration, provided that any amended or additional conditions are entered voluntarily by the owner and confirmed in writing. An owner may withdraw in writing all or part of its offer of conditions any time prior to final rezoning action of the Township Board, provided that, if such withdrawal occurs subsequent to the Planning Commission's public hearing and recommendation of the original rezoning request, then the rezoning application shall be referred back to the Planning Commission for a new public hearing with appropriate notice and a new recommendation.

3. Procedure. The procedure for consideration of Conditional Rezoning request shall be the same as provided in Section 1804 for other rezoning requests and the requirements of said Sections shall be applicable to Conditional Rezoning Agreement shall include the following:
- A. Before formal application for a Conditional Rezoning, the applicant shall schedule a pre-application meeting with the Township to discuss the request, submittal requirements, and review procedures and criteria. The purpose of this meeting is to discuss applicable standards and technical issues, and to determine any additional required review procedures related to the . Requesting a pre-application meeting requires submission of a meeting application form, fee, and materials that illustrate the proposed amendment.
 - B. After a pre-application meeting is conducted, an applicant shall formally request a Conditional Rezoning request ~~shall be initiated~~ by the submission ~~by the applicant~~ of a proposed Conditional Rezoning Agreement. A Conditional Rezoning Agreement shall include the following:
 - (1) A written statement prepared by the applicant that confirms the Conditional Rezoning Agreement was proposed by the applicant and entered into voluntarily.
 - (2) A written statement prepared by the applicant that confirms that the property shall not be used or developed in a manner that is inconsistent with conditions placed on the rezoning.
 - (3) A list of conditions proposed by the applicant.
 - (4) A time frame for completing the proposed improvements.
 - (5) A legal description of the land.(6)A Sketch Plan in sufficient detail to illustrate any specific conditions proposed by the applicant.

[NO OTHER CHANGES ARE PROPOSED TO THIS SECTION.]

Severability

In the event that any one or more sections, provisions, phrases or words of this ordinance shall be found to be invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, such holding shall not affect the validity nor the enforceability of the remaining sections, provisions, phrases or words of this Ordinance unless expressly so determined by a Court of competent jurisdiction.

Non-Exclusivity

The prohibitions and penalties provided for in this Ordinance shall be in addition to, and not exclusive of, other prohibitions and penalties provided for by other law, ordinance, or rule/regulation.

Publication

This Ordinance shall be published in a newspaper of general circulation as required by law.

Effective Date

The Ordinance shall become effective upon publication in a newspaper of general circulation as required by law.

I, Debra A. Swanson, Clerk of the Charter Township of Ypsilanti, County of Washtenaw, State of Michigan hereby certify approval of the first reading of Proposed Ordinance No. 2026-514 by the Charter Township of Ypsilanti Board of Trustees assembled at a regular meeting held on April 7, 2026. The second reading is scheduled to be heard on April 21, 2026.

Debra A. Swanson
Clerk Charter Township of Ypsilanti