

costs of removal against the property described above.

Respectfully submitted,  
CREIGHTON C. LEDERER,  
Director

**Buildings and Safety  
Engineering Department**

January 25, 1985

Honorable City Council:

Re: 1507 Parkview, Bldg 101, DU's 1, Lots 81 & 82, Sub of James B McKays Sub (Plats), Ward 19, Item 006203-4, Cap 19/0031, between Pontiac and St. Paul.

On J.C.C. page 1911 published October 5, 1983, your Honorable Body returned jurisdiction of the above-mentioned property to Buildings and Safety Engineering Department to reinvestigate and provide Council with additional information on said property for final disposition by your Honorable Body.

The last inspection made on October 22, 1984 revealed that: the building is vacant, open and fire damaged.

It is respectfully requested that your Honorable Body approve the original recommendation of this Department published August 3, 1983 (J.C.C. page 1540), to direct the City Engineering Department to have this dangerous structure removed and to assess the costs of removal against the property described above.

Respectfully submitted,  
CREIGHTON C. LEDERER,  
Director

By Council Member Peoples:

Resolved, That the City Engineering Department be and it is hereby authorized and directed to take the necessary steps as recommended by the Buildings and Safety Engineering Department in proceedings of June 30, 1982 (JCC p. 1623), February 15, 1984 (JCC p. 277), September 6, 1984 (JCC p. 1636), January 12, 1983 (JCC p. 31), January 18, 1984 (JCC p. 90), October 3, 1979 (JCC pp. 2675-6), and August 3, 1983 (JCC p. 1540), for the removal of dangerous structure on premises known as 3818 Manistique, 3645 Maryland, 715 E. McNichols, 3767 Monterey, 8398 Montlieu, 682 Newport, and 1507 Parkview, and to assess the costs of same against the property more particularly described in the seven (7) foregoing communications.

Adopted as follows:

Yeas — Council Members Cleveland, Eberhard, Hood, Kelley, Mahaffey, Peoples, Ravitz, and President Henderson — 8.

Nays — None.

**Buildings and Safety  
Engineering Department**

February 4, 1985

Honorable City Council:

Re: 5210-12 Lakeview.

This is in response to a request by Rollins Investment, Clifton Rollins, P.O. Box 02729, Detroit, Michigan for a rescission for the referenced location.

Our inspection revealed the building has been repaired and reoccupied, therefore, we respectfully recommend your Honorable Body rescind the order to demolish.

Respectfully submitted,  
CREIGHTON C. LEDERER  
Director

By Council Member Ravitz:

Resolved, That resolution adopted September 12, 1984 (J.C.C. pgs. 1697-99), for the removal of dangerous structures at various locations be and the same is hereby amended for the purpose of rescinding the removal order as it pertains to property located at 5210-12 Lakeview only, in accordance with the foregoing communication.

Adopted as follows:

Yeas — Council Members Cleveland, Eberhard, Hood, Kelley, Mahaffey, Peoples, Ravitz and President Henderson — 8.

Nays — None.

**City Engineering Department**

February 6, 1985

Honorable City Council:

Re: Petition No. 3322, Detroit Edison Company, Request to encroach into the right-of-way of Elizabeth between Second and Third with building addition.

Returning, herewith, print and petition No. 3322 of the Detroit Edison Company requesting permission to construct an addition to their building which will encroach into the right-of-way of Elizabeth Street between Second and Third Avenues.

The City Engineering Department has no objection to the proposed encroachment provided the work is done as shown on plans submitted by the petitioner, drawn by Giffels Associates, Inc., project number 84053, drawing number 6A1183-83.

All other City departments and privately owned utility companies have reported that they have no objections to the proposed encroachment.

An appropriate resolution granting the petition is attached for consideration by your Honorable Body.

Respectfully submitted,  
CLYDE R. HOPKINS

Director



By Council Member Ravitz:

Resolved, That the City Engineering Department be and it is hereby authorized and directed to issue permits to the Detroit Edison Company to encroach into the right-of-way of Elizabeth Street between Second and Third, property described as:

Lots 1, 10, 11 and 12 of Block 63, Subdivision of Blocks 55 and 63, Cass Farm, Detroit, Wayne County, Michigan as recorded in Liber 1, Page 75, Plats, Wayne County Records;

Encroachment to consist of a building addition which will encroach approximately two (2) feet into the right-of-way of Elizabeth Street, 50 feet wide, abutting the north line of the above described lots;

Provided, That said permit shall be issued only after a certified copy of this resolution has been duly recorded by and at the permittee's expense in the Office of the Register of Deeds for Wayne County; and further

Provided, That petitioner file with the Finance Department an indemnity agreement approved by the Law Department, saving and protecting the City of Detroit from any and all claims which may arise therefrom; and

Provided, That no right in the public street shall be considered waived by this permission which is granted expressly on the condition that the obstruction in connection therewith shall be removed at the expense of the grantee at any time when so directed by the City Council; and further

Provided, If at any time in the future it becomes necessary to repair or replace the sewers or other utilities located or to be located in said street by the acceptance of this permission, the owners for themselves, their heirs and assigns, waive claims for any damages to the encroaching installations and agree to pay the costs incurred in their removal, if their removal becomes necessary, and to restore the property affected to a condition satisfactory to the City Engineering Department at the owner's expense; and further

Provided, That this resolution is revocable at the will, whim or caprice of the City Council, and the grantees by the acceptance of this permission waive any right to claim damages or compensation for any structures constructed and maintained hereunder, or for removal of the same, and they acquire no implied nor any other privileges not expressly stated herein.

Adopted as follows:

Yeas — Council Members Cleveland, Eberhard, Hood, Kelley, Mahaffey, Peoples, Ravitz and President Henderson — 8.

Nays — None.

### City Planning Commission

February 7, 1985

Honorable City Council:

Re: Materials to be submitted by petitioners for plan approval. (Recommend Adoption of Attached Resolution).

The City Planning Commission has expressed concern that there frequently is not enough material to adequately illustrate development proposals that come before the Commission for review and approval.

The Zoning Ordinance provides for design review and approval by the Commission and the City Council in Planned Development (PD), Public Center (PC) and Restricted Central Business District (PCA) zones. In the case of PD, the Zoning Ordinance requires "a site plan, elevations, and other data in sufficient detail" to allow the Commission to ensure that the requirements of the PD policy statement are met. One of the elements of this policy statement addresses "visual appeal," a concern with "the overall appearance of the development, including building massing, exterior elevation and materials, open space arrangement and landscaping, and appropriateness and compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood in terms of scale and materials."

In the case of both the PC and PCA zones, the Ordinance requires that the "exterior design, appearance, and location" of any proposed development be reviewed and approved by the Commission. No specific requirements are given as to what documents should be provided, although the usual practice has been to require site plans and elevations, as with the PD zones.

It has become increasingly apparent that some form of visual illustration beyond site plans and architectural elevations are needed to adequately evaluate the appearance of a proposed project. Often, developers have provided a model, colored renderings or material samples to help illustrate their proposals, and these have always been very helpful. However, these are not required at present.

Therefore, the Commission, at its regular meeting of December 6, 1984, voted to recommend the adoption of the attached resolution being submitted requiring the submittal of additional illustrative material to aid the Commission and the Council in the review of development proposals.

Respectfully submitted,

MARY E. ROBINSON

Chairperson

MARSHA S. BRUHN

Director

Prepared by J. L. Stearns