

**VILLAGE OF FRANKLIN  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
SPECIAL MEETING  
AUGUST 4, 2011  
Franklin Village Hall  
Franklin, Michigan**

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Pam Hansen called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. at the Franklin Village Hall.

**II. ROLL CALL**

Present: Calvin Cupidore, Dean Moenck, Mike Heisel, Pam Hansen, Al Beke, Connie Ettinger, David Goldberg  
Absent: Mary Hepler (excused)  
Also Present: Christopher Doozan, McKenna Associates, Inc.; Amy Sullivan, Village Administrator; Eileen Pulker, Village Clerk

**III. CONSIDER PARKING STUDY FINAL DRAFT**

Hansen gave a brief summary of the process the Planning Commission had gone through with the Parking Study.

Cupidore thanked all those involved and gave a brief background, including an overview of the charge that the Council gave the Planning Commission (PC), i.e. conduct a parking report, which in addition, could serve as a basic information document for the Charrette, which is scheduled for Aug. 9-11, 2011. He also acknowledged all those committee members involved (Gary Roberts, Historic District Commission; Bill Finnicum, Main Street Franklin (MSF); Amy Sullivan, Administrator; Vivian Carmody, MSF; Chris Doozan, McKenna Associates; Calvin Cupidore, PC), and explained the background information about the financial restraints on the fact-finding. The report gave a basic understanding of the parking spaces which currently exist within the Village Center, an understanding of potential parking spots should there be a reason/need for such in the Village, conceptual drawings of the current state of the four (4) quadrant areas in the Village, and the benefit of an unscientific survey which went out to Village residents and a small group of merchants (not owners) who were on email lists provided by the Franklin Community Association (FCA) and MSF. The purpose of the survey was to ascertain desires, concerns, and issues of the Village Center area. Oakland County Main Street also participated in some of the discussions and provided some aerial drawings.

Cupidore explained significant changes that were made as a result of the discussions at the last Planning Commission meeting. He mentioned that the Main Street Business Development Committee has scheduled a meeting with the property owners on August 25, 2011 which will hopefully touch on some of the areas of the parking report. The most significant changes involved the traffic flow in the Market Basket/Farmhouse parking lot and the possibility of connecting it to that of Comerica's lot.

After noting the efforts of various individuals in this endeavor and especially those who reviewed his critique and attempted to address and incorporate his concerns, Beke questioned whether this was a Planning Commission report or a committee report of those individuals who were deeply involved in it. In essence, it is his opinion that the study is still primarily relating to the survey that was conducted. The written report does not identify from where the addressees were obtained, thus, from where the results came. He mentioned several points where there were conflicting statements. Results are not based on professional recognized criteria or findings but he felt that it appeared to be a manipulation of the report to identify potential recommendations or concepts from the PC for the charrette.

Heisel re-emphasized that the study was "perception and opinion-based" not "data-based". Hansen stated that it was an opinion survey and it had gone through several drafts. The Design Committee of MSF designed the survey; it was reviewed by the PC working committee and Chris Doozan to make sure the questions were appropriately worded and not double-barreled. There were some major edits.

Discussion ensued about the renaming and authorship of the document. Each commissioner expressed her/his opinion on those and other matters. Moenck suggested that the "study" portion be at the front of the document, followed by the "survey" results portion.

Goldberg questioned the subject of procedural process. The Clerk stated that the Commission needed to accept the "report" and send it back to the Council. Ettinger supported Goldberg's opinion that it was misleading to refer to the document as a "parking study" and should be called a "parking survey". It would also be misleading to refer to it as having been created and endorsed by the PC.

Beke re-iterated his desire to include in the document the source of email addresses used for the survey. He personally needed to understand why the Market Basket and Farmhouse are in need of an immediate attention when the committee concluded that the parking spaces were sufficient. Sullivan explained that it was a circulation problem not a parking space deficiency and it was one area that could be addressed immediately.

Sullivan provided more historical background as to why and how the "report" was conceived. Cupidore repeated that this was a very limited budgeted, data-driven report with an unscientific (not demographically correct) survey of the community.

Sherry Sparks, Evelyn Ct., inquired as to what was the intent of the study and how it came into being, questioned how the data was going to be used, and how would it be perceived by the Villagers. Even though it wasn't commissioned specifically for the Charrette, it will be used at the Charrette. She asked if there would be a distinction in the minds of the Villagers if this data was presented as a "study" as opposed to a "survey".

Vivian Carmody briefed the Commission as to the purpose of the Charrette. She emphasized that the survey was initiated to find out what the parking issues were and how should we start to address them. The purpose of the Charrette is for the Villagers to give their opinions and their visions.

Goldberg led a discussion about the semantics of using words like "study", "survey", "analysis", "report", or "assessment" in the document title. It was also suggested that the objective portion be placed in the beginning, followed by the survey results.

**Motion by Goldberg, supported by Ettinger, to allow McKenna to rename the body of work to "Analysis of the Current State of Parking in the Village of Franklin, Oakland County, Michigan, August 4, 2011" without changing anything substantive to the document, to reverse the survey and study portions of the document so the study would be at the beginning, followed by the survey and to accept this revised analysis to be presented to the Village Council as they asked us to do.  
Motion carried unanimously.**

#### **IV. ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting adjourned at 8:55 PM.

Submitted,

---

Gail Beke

---

Eileen H. Pulker, Clerk