



# PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

CITY OF NOVI

Regular Meeting

**September 26, 2018 7:00 PM**

Council Chambers | Novi Civic Center

45175 W. Ten Mile (248) 347-0475

## CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 PM.

## ROLL CALL

**Present:** Member Avdoulos, Member Greco, Member Lynch, Member Maday, Chair Pehrson

**Absent:** Member Anthony (excused)

**Also Present:** Barbara McBeth, City Planner; Sri Komaragiri, Planner; Lindsay Bell, Planner; Darcy Rechten, Staff Engineer; Rick Meader, Landscape Architect; Thomas Schultz, City Attorney; Peter Hill, Environmental Consultant; Maureen Peters, Traffic Consultant; Doug Necci, Façade Consultant

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Member Avdoulos led the meeting attendees in the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance.

## APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Moved by Member Lynch and seconded by Member Avdoulos.

## VOICE VOTE TO APPROVE THE SEPTEMBER 26, 2018 AGENDA MOTION MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER AVDOULOS.

**Motion to approve the September 26, 2018 Planning Commission Agenda. *Motion carried 5-0.***

## AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

Nobody in the audience wished to speak.

## CORRESPONDENCE

There was no correspondence.

## COMMITTEE REPORTS

There were no Committee Reports.

## CITY PLANNER REPORT

City Planner McBeth said there were a couple of items that City Council considered on Monday. The City Council granted tentative approval for the Zoning Map Amendment and Planned Rezoning Overlay agreement for the Adell Center, which is proposed for 21 acres located south of I-96 and west of Novi Road. We expect that that matter will return to

the City Council for consideration of a Planned Rezoning Overlay Agreement. Also on Monday, the City Council tentatively approved the request for Carvana as an unlisted use to allow the automotive vending machine fulfillment center as a Special Land Use in the Town Center district, subject to a number of conditions and anticipated as a part of the Adell Center project.

City Council also granted final approval of the rezoning with Planned Rezoning Overlay Concept Plan and PRO Agreement for Villa D'Este, which is a project located on the north side of Nine Mile at Garfield Road. Staff expects the Preliminary Site Plan for that development will be presented to the Planning Commission in the upcoming months.

## **CONSENT AGENDA**

There were no items on the consent agenda.

## **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

### **1. LAKEVIEW JSP18-16 AND ZONING MAP AMENDMENT 18.723**

Public hearing at the request of Robertson Brothers Homes for Planning Commission's recommendation to City Council for a Planned Rezoning Overlay Concept Plan associated with a Zoning Map amendment, to rezone from R-4 (One Family Residential) and B-3 (General Business) to RM-2 (High-Density, Mid-Rise Multiple Family). The subject property is approximately 3.15 acres and is located south of 13 Mile Road on the east and west sides of Old Novi Road (Section 10 and 11). The applicant is proposing 21 single family homes and a storm water detention pond.

Planner Bell said as you just stated, the applicant is proposing 21 single family homes along Old Novi Road, south of Thirteen Mile. The surrounding properties are single family neighborhoods to the south, east, and west. There are business uses north of the area: the Lakeview Bar & Grill, a Veterinary office, and Lakeview grocery store. These areas are zoned B-3, and the surrounding residential neighborhoods are zoned R-4.

The Future Land Use Map identifies this property and parcels to the north as Pavilion Shore Village, which is called out in the Master Plan as a Redevelopment Site. To quote the Master Plan: "It is envisioned that redevelopment of this area could establish a unique sense of place at the corner of Old Novi Road and Thirteen Mile Road by providing housing and commercial uses that are inspired by the natural and recreational features of the park and lake."

The City is working with a consultant to develop Zoning Ordinance language for a new overlay or its own district to address the goals of the Master Plan based on comments received from a public workshop that was held last month. That new district or overlay has not been completed and the applicant desires to move forward. Therefore, they've applied for adapting an existing zoning district to the site through the use of the Planned Rezoning Overlay option.

The applicant has held meetings with community members and with staff over the past year. Based on feedback received, the applicant has modified their proposal to reduce the density and rework the design a couple of times. Originally the plans proposed all townhomes with a density of 18 du/ac, which was later reduced to 32 townhomes and 6

single family homes for an overall density of 12 du/ac. A concept plan was submitted in May, and went before the Master Planning and Zoning Committee, largely because the density proposed by the applicant at that time (9.9 du/ac) conflicted with the residential density map in the Master Plan, which calls for 7.3 du/ac. The applicant has further scaled back their proposal to 21 single family lots, which results in an overall density of 6.67 du/ac, and is within the Master Plan guidelines.

Planner Bell said the PRO Concept Plan before you shows 10 single family homes on the east side of Old Novi Road with driveways off Linhart and Wainwright Streets. Eleven single family homes are proposed to front on the west side of Old Novi Road. Each single family home has a two-car garage, either attached or detached. The Concept Plan also includes pedestrian walks along Old Novi Road to connect the existing and proposed homes to the Pavilion Shore Park to the north on Walled Lake. A storm water detention pond is shown just south of the existing Lakeview Bar & Grill.

Rezoning to the RM-2 category requested by the applicant would accommodate the single family housing density proposed, with individual lots evaluated by R-4 standards. The applicant is requesting 6.67 dwelling units per acre, which is under the maximum density allowed with RM-2 for 3-bedroom units (maximum 15.6 DUA). A high density multi-family residential district is not the logical extension to single family residential. However, with the PRO process the conditions and requirements placed on the development could make it compatible with the existing area. Many deviations to the R-4 standards are requested due to the depth of the lots and fitting the density into the area available. The proposed layout creates a moderately dense development in order to maximize the number of units on site. However there is little room to provide transitions to the commercial uses to the north, as well as leaving little space for some elements, such as driveways.

Erma Street on the north side of the proposed development west of Old Novi Road was previously vacated. However, the City Council motion from June 5, 2000 shows that the City reserved an easement over the entire width of the vacated area, so this area is not buildable. The applicant has formally requested this 50' easement be abandoned by the City, and a new 20' easement over the proposed utility locations would be established. If the City does not agree to abandon the easement, the home on lot 11 would not be able to be built as currently shown on the plans.

The ordinance requires a 6 to 8 foot berm or wall as a buffer between residential and commercial uses. The applicant has proposed a 6 foot vinyl fence as an alternate way to provide a buffer. City staff believe a solid masonry wall would provide a more appropriate visual and noise buffer between the proposed lot on the west side of Old Novi Road and the convenience store to the north. However either a fence or wall would conflict with the easement required over the utilities in this area.

Planner Bell said a vinyl fence would be acceptable to provide at the rear lot line adjacent to the existing homes, and perhaps north of the stormwater detention basin to provide visual screening of the existing bar & grill.

The applicant has submitted public benefits being offered to meet the objective of the benefits to the public for PRO. Staff comments on those are included in the packet and addressed in the motion sheet.

Staff and consultants are recommending approval of the Concept Plan. Additional information has been provided by the applicant to address specific requests in the review letters. The proposal helps fulfill objectives contained in the Master Plan for Land use, as well as other positive outcomes, such as the following: providing an update to the visual aesthetic in a unique area of the City; removing non-conforming structures from the Right-of-Way; the proposed single family homes are consistent with the surrounding residential neighborhoods; the density proposed is within the density recommended in the Master Plan; the traffic impacts have been evaluated to be less than what would be expected if the properties were to develop under the current B-3 and R-4 zoning; submittal of a Concept Plan and any resulting PRO Agreement, provides assurance to the Planning Commission and the City Council of the manner in which the property will be developed, and offers benefits that would not be likely be offered under standard development options.

Planner Bell said although staff recommends approval of the Concept Plan to move forward, we still have unanswered questions about certain details of the plan, which will need to be worked out before Final Site Plan approval. These include: how the necessary screening on the west side of Old Novi Road can be accomplished given the need for utility easements; a full delineation of the wetland area on the rear side of Lots 20 and 21, as well as a pre- and post-construction analysis to ensure the existing and planned homes that are adjacent to the wetland area are not negatively impacted in a severe storm event; related to that are concerns with the Stormwater Management Plan details, which Darcy can further address, especially if the Commissioners have questions. Further detailed analysis would need to be reviewed to determine whether the stormwater plan will work adequately; driveways are supposed to observe a three foot setback from the property line, which does not appear to be the case on many of the proposed lots. The applicant has not requested this as a deviation, however it has been added to the motion sheet.

Tonight the Planning Commission is asked to hold the scheduled public hearing and make a recommendation for approval or denial to the City Council.

The applicant, Tim Loughrin, is here from Robertson Brothers to tell you more about their proposal. Staff and the City's consultants are also here to answer any questions you may have. Thank you.

Tim Loughrin, the Land Acquisition Manager for Robertson Brothers Homes, said thank you for being here tonight. I'm a fellow Planning Commissioner so I know that you don't get thanked too often, so thank you. I'll try to be as brief as possible, I'd much rather answer your questions.

Mr. Loughrin provided the history of Robertson Brothers. It's a family-owned company, professionally run organization that's been in business for about 70 years. We've actually pulled the second most permits in Oakland County to date this year. We've won HBA awards both for builder and developer of the year in the past couple of years. We have not done too much in Novi, you may have known that we did the Charneth Fen development – that was a failed condominium project that we came in and we finished it up nicely with townhomes at Twelve and a Half Mile just west of Novi Road.

I don't really want to belabor the fact, but we have worked very diligently with staff and the surrounding property owners and we're excited to bring a quality development that everybody will be proud of. The site, as Lindsay had mentioned, is just over three acres on both sides of Old Novi Road just south of Thirteen Mile. 21 single family lots, just under the 7 dwelling units per acre, I think it's 7.3 in the Master Plan, so we're under that Master Plan density designation. Homes will be ranging between 2,100 and 2,900 square feet. We are proposing a Planned Residential Option, and specifically the proposed project is unique in that it represents an opportunity to improve an area that has been identified by the City as a potential redevelopment area, as well as a site – the fact that the western parcels are only 100 feet in depth – which really requires a creative approach to development, given the nature of single family lots rather than townhomes or stacked apartments. We will be constructing a pond in large to accommodate the historic stormwater flows from the City's roadway, and an established HOA will be maintaining all of the common open space areas.

The Pavilion Shore plan identifies a need for housing in the redevelopment area specifically as cottage court style homes, which we are proposing that style. We believe the proposed use will provide for single transition from existing residential to commercial that are envisioned in the area plan to be located closer to the park and the lake. We feel this is appropriate land use, this is clearly demonstrated and conveyed from several meetings with surrounding property owners, as well as the Master Planning and Zoning Committee which was a couple of months ago.

Mr. Loughrin said we have addressed all Staff comments. We did follow up, as Lindsay had mentioned, we do realize and recognize that there will be further follow-up if we do get passed tonight as we go toward Final Site Plan. We feel the site plan as proposed will be in the best interest of the City, as it addresses most of the concerns of the neighboring properties while still meeting the intent of the Pavilion Shore Village overlay and the Master Plan provisions. Further, the plan will clean up several dilapidated buildings and stabilize home prices in an improving neighborhood.

So, in closing, there are several public benefits to the project, such as development of an otherwise undevelopable property under current zoning regulations; development of a unique site configuration with significant development challenges; meeting the intent of the City's Pavilion Shore Village planning area; meeting the maximum density requirements of the City's Masters Plan; inclusion of ADA accessible sidewalks to provide for neighborhood access to the Pavilion Shore Park; public parking spaces along Old Novi Road for overflow park parking; landscape and amenity improvements to an oversized Right-of-Way; new housing options for residents that are currently underserved; the elimination of several non-conforming buildings and uses that are in disrepair; storm detention in an area that currently has no structured storm system and a combination of road water stormwater flow; and quality architecture and design that will provide a catalyst for retail amenities in the Pavilion Shore Village area. So with that, again I want to be brief, I'm happy to answer any questions, as I'm sure they'll be many.

Chair Pehrson asked if there was anyone in the audience that wished to address the Planning Commission regarding this project.

Rachel Sines, 2219 Austin Drive, said my house just happens to back up to this development. And first, I want to thank you all for listening to us over the past year. I know

you're just as tired of hearing from us as we are of being up here. Everything we've been saying and doing has led to this moment right now.

First, I want to mention that my frustration and displeasure about the situation lies with the City of Novi and not necessarily Robertson Brothers. Back in July of 2017, the City approved changes to the Master Plan which increased the density of our area from 3.3 units per acre to 7.3 without informing or including the residents. However, Robertson Brothers was informed and involved in that process and you can see from this letter, they were asking for approval of the Master Plan. Obviously, they were playing a game that we didn't know we were involved in, and they played it well. And unfortunately for us, we were told about the game too late. As a community, we gathered signatures from over 70% of the residents living within 100 feet of Pavilion Shore Village and presented our petition against the City to the City Council. Yet, here we are today.

The City has recently held a workshop asking residents for their vision of Pavilion Shore Village. Overwhelmingly, the vision of the community was the country cottage concept that would blend in and enhance existing neighborhoods. The same Master Plan that granted the increased density also mentioned preserving the feel of the area. Robertson Brothers originally submitted plans that had over 70 three-story units on just a little over three acres of land. With the outrage of the community, the City and Robertson listened, so we have the plan submitted tonight of 21 single-family homes. While this is much better, there are still some issues. The largest one for me is that on the west side of Parcel A is 1.3 acres, and under the 7.3 units per acre, only nine homes should be permitted. Yes, 21 homes is the correct number for each parcel if it's treated as individual, which they are. They are separated by streets and not contiguous. It is less expensive to build an above-water detention pond than the underground water system originally discussed. My neighbors and I shouldn't have to take on the burden of extra houses because it's less expensive for the developer. The City of Novi has even stated that the houses per acre in this area is five. At 7.3 units, this is already a significant increase but Robertson Brothers is suggesting 8.5 homes per acre on the west side.

I truly want to support this project and I want Robertson Brothers to do it, but it needs to be done correctly. The amount of deviations would be greatly reduced if nine houses were built instead of eleven. Put the other two houses back on Parcel C, so there will still be 21 homes. Here are some of the things that I would like to see happen. I would like to see attached, front-entry garages. This would be possible if the appropriate number of nine houses were permitted. At the very least, I would like front-entry garages at least six feet from the property line.

Ms. Sines said and most importantly, I would like to see one or one-and-a-half story houses on the west side. This would satisfy a number of issues listed in the Master Plan, such on page 8 and 10 for the aging population and young professionals, both seeking smaller homes and smaller lots; pages 40, 55, and 114, the preservation of existing neighborhoods and the way of life; and what the residents want to see as part of the results from the Pavilion Shore workshop. I would even be willing to compromise the number of homes if one or one-and-a-half stories would be ensured. This would be less invasive to the homes impacted by this development. I know that some of the neighbors support this plan and for that, I am happy. We have come a long way from 70 plus units. But as someone this directly affects because it is literally happening in my backyard, I cannot and do not support the plan as it is now.

Gary Zack, 359 South Lake Drive, said I'd like to echo several comments that the previous speaker just made from a little bit different angle. I think when you drive down Old Novi Road, this is going to be primarily what you see is what's on the west side. And it has a little bit of a look of a barracks, with a bunch of homes that are all very similar, although nice. But I'd like to see a little bit more changing it up and as the previous speaker mentioned, if the density were reduced over there then perhaps you could do that. Maybe some single story, I like the idea of single story. Most of the homes in the Shawood area, a lot of them are single story. But the one thing that is there is there's a lot of variety, so you've got some that are tall, some that aren't so tall, some that are wider lots, some that aren't so wider lots – it's not this regimented, where everything looks like a cookie cutter.

I also believe that we should look at the density separately in the separate segments, and consider that this side is getting a little overbuilt. The other concerns I have are the stormwater management, just to make sure. We've got two lakes right there, we've had issues recently from the development going on down the street, which is not Robertson, with sediment getting into the lake and a lot of issues there. So we have to be cognizant that we have the proper control of the runoff from all the lawns and the fertilizer and all this from this area.

My last point I'd like to make is not with Robertson, it's really with the City. I don't understand why we have a system where we have to go to a density that's twice what even the Master Plan is and then reduce it with a PRO, rather than coming up from R-4 and increasing the density. It's just a little unnerving as a citizen. And I hope that the way this is written, is that this PRO and this rezoning only applies to these properties that Robertson has, not anything else in this Pavilion Shores Village area. And if something were to happen to this development and Robertson can't complete it, this is all undone so that somebody doesn't come in and build a five-story apartment building, which is what the RM-2 zoning is really there for. Now I understand the PRO and I don't know all the details of how that works, but I would rather see R-4 with an exception to say there can be more density, because then you may not miss something that you might miss like a 65-foot tall building. Thank you very much.

Michael Davis, 2345 Austin Drive, said I but up to lot number 1 there, the one that is sitting on the angle. My grade at the back of that house and to where that proposed garage sits is 12.6 foot above grade. They're above me, twelve feet above me. And they're going to cut into that hill, they're going to have to make that livable or buildable, and my fear is flooding. You're going to flood me out. Oh no, Mr. Davis, we won't, we're engineering. Yeah well the house beside me, on the north side of me, the City allowed that to be built and they built into that hill, and it flooded me. And the City required the homeowner to put a trench down through there and he failed to do that and I flooded again. So they put a drain on Old Novi Road that drains across the street into the creek.

We're going to fight water, and I can't do it. I'm a disabled vet, 100 percent disabled vet and you're going to force me to sell. I built that home in 1999, I've been in Novi for a long time. We followed every building code that they had and my home had to be similar dissimilar. You guys held my feet to the fire on that, and look now what you're building – the barracks as the one man alluded to. And it's no doubt they're going to build, and we know that in Novi. But that Twelve and a Half Mile, that building, the water just ran down Old Novi Road and just flooded into the radiator shop, and right in into the attorney's

office there. And it's going to happen to me, beyond a doubt. And so you're going to force me either to sell at a reduced price, move – where am I going to move to? Where am I going to go at my age and 100 percent disabled? What am I going to do?

So I ask that you guys really take a look at the elevation and the water, the water runoff, and my god I can't get down Old Novi Road to get to CVS Pharmacy to get a prescription filled anymore. The traffic is just horrendous. And this really needs to be thought out about the traffic pattern. And Robertson Brothers has indicated that on-street parking on Old Novi Road, have you people been down Old Novi Road? You can't on-street park, there's no way in the world. A fire truck will never get down through there. If my home starts on fire and I need an ambulance to come and resuscitate me from a heart attack, they'll never get down through there. So I just ask that you guys really take a look at this configuration. Thank you.

Michel Duchesneau, 1191 South Lake Drive, said I've submitted a letter to the Planning Commission as well as to the builder and I would like to have that as part of the record for this meeting minutes. Not to go and read it to you tonight, but I support the concept plan with one recommendation. You just heard a gentleman talk about the drainage, and my recommendation pertains to the drainage. Basically, there's many advantages to this development, it does minimize the traffic compared to other alternatives and that has been our concern, my personal concern.

And then the second item was the three-story townhouses, those are gone. That was our second biggest concern. The appearance of a townhouse would not fit in this neighborhood. This proposal does remove poorly maintained rental houses and rental buildings. It brings City water to areas that are on wells. And it does have the potential to improve the water, runoff and drainage. And since this is a Concept Plan, not a Preliminary Site Plan, I want you to consider that. If you look at the drainage plan that they have, basically for the west side of the property, going through the back half of five through eleven, water drains to the west towards the houses and the backyards on Austin, and then it goes north to divert to the retention pond. One of the variances requested by the developer is to make that five foot rear yard setback for the accessory buildings – the garages – as opposed to six that our Ordinance requires. My recommendation is that we hold them to six. However, I'm in support if that means moving all the houses east towards Old Novi Road and giving them a six foot setback to the property line as opposed to seven. I support that. It will help, especially since their drainage is a swale behind the houses, behind the garages. This is basically a swale. People tend to push snow down the driveways to the backyards toward the property line, at least that's what I would do. And I know there's an HOA that has to be incorporated as far as the maintenance of that swale in the agreement, the PRO agreement that the City has to present with them. There's also a short list of other items that might support not giving them the six foot variance.

I recognize this is a lengthy plan, the developer has met with the residents in a manner that I would hope that other developers do. They were very proactive, seeking to meet our recommendations and expectations. I'm good with 21 houses, I don't have issue with that. I may have some other recommendations, but this is a lengthy process and this is a Concept Plan, not a Preliminary Site Plan. The letter that I have that I've asked to include in the minutes basically says my one remaining area of recommendations is drainage, which you just heard the gentleman who spoke before me has an exceptionally bad condition. He is at the bottom of a hill and the houses on this side drain down the hill, he



lives out in this area. This plan proposes drainage to go down the hill to a retention pond in the corner to get back to the retention pond, so those areas need to be looked at very carefully when this thing gets to Preliminary Site Plan. So basically that's the main thing that I have, and just so you know these are not off the cuff comments and particularly my letter talks about how I have looked at the reviews of the drawings many times, I've looked at the narratives, the physical site, the Master Plan, the tax records, the Novi Zoning Ordinances, the similar developments that Robertson Brothers have done in other locations, as well as presented. So I hope that you can consider my recommendation, but I do support the Concept Plan to move forward.

Letter from Michel Duchesneau, 119 South Lake Drive, to the Planning Commission:

Attn: Novi Planning Commission

Re: JSP18-0016 Lakeview Concept Plan Review – Public Hearing

I support the Lakeview concept plan with one recommendation, per the following:

As you know, many residents have expressed interest in having input on what is developed in Pavilion Shore Village. In my opinion, the major concerns on the development direction are addressed with the concept plan.

The concept plan:

1. Minimizes the traffic increase to the hundreds of people living on South Lake, East Lake, Thirteen Mile, Wainwright, and Old Novi roads. These are all residential areas with a strong preference for single family detached homes.
2. Does not add townhomes, apartments, or commercial businesses to a traditional residential community.
3. Supports the three existing businesses with badly needed additional parking.
4. Removes poorly maintained rental houses and vacant buildings.
5. Brings city water to an area on wells.
6. Has the potential to reduce water runoff and standing water for adjacent homeowners.

Thus, I support the concept plan with one recommendation based on reviews of the drawings, narratives, physical site, master plan, tax records, Novi zoning ordinances, similar developments by Robertson Brothers, and resident input.

Novi has very stringent zoning ordinances when it comes to building setbacks. Specifically, accessory buildings (garages and sheds) require a minimum six feet setback to the property line in an R-4 district (4.19.1.G). The concept plan reduces this to five feet. I support the setback reduction for structures within the boundaries of the development. I recommend maintaining the six feet rear yard setback for the new garages to the western property line (lots 1 thru 11). Novi property owners expect a minimum ten feet side yard setback to a new house in an R-4 district and a minimum six feet setback to any garage or shed.

I also propose reducing the minimum front yard setback for the houses on lots 1 to 11 from seven feet to six feet to make up for the reduced rear yard. All houses, garages and drives can move one foot closer to Old Novi Road to compensation. Please consider this.

Maintaining the six feet minimum rear yard setback for the garages has other mutual benefits. The drainage plan has the water from the northern half of lot 5 all the way to lot 11 flowing west towards the rear yard property line and then north to a storm drain via a swale. The extra foot will allow this to be a more viable plan with fewer maintenance issues for the swale and fewer complaints from adjacent property owners.

The extra foot will allow vehicles to more easily use the driveway 'T' to turn around when side entry garages are built.

There are few places to stack snow on site and people with side entry garages will push

the snow to the end of the driveway. It will sit there until the "great thaw" occurs. Hopefully the drainage design carries it north.

High voltage power lines and fiber optic cables run over the western property line of lots 6 to 11 and there may be easements or other restrictions.

Surveyors for these 1920's subdivisions made lots of mistakes and the current property line can vary significantly based on who does the surveying.

People have over the years built sheds, garages, and houses on or beyond the property lines. The Novi Land Records Map shows multiple potential conflicts for the subject property perimeter and existing accessory buildings.

Thank you,

Michel Duchesneau

Dorothy Duchesneau, 125 Henning, said Robertson has to be given credit for being up front and meeting with the residents back in February with their intention to develop and even to let the residents see what was being proposed at that time. I give them a lot of credit for revising the first plan and even finally dropping the three-story townhomes options. Meeting with all the residents early on, with or without someone from Planning, should be a requirement for the developers in the future. It could save time, money, and effort from being wasted and this may involve making some changes in how certain plans go through the development process.

I, too, support the Concept Plan, but I have a couple little minor beefs and tweaks. I totally disagree with the side entry garages on the west side of Old Novi Road. They make absolutely no sense from a security standpoint – you're in the house, how do you know when the garage door is open? How do you know what is happening in your garage? As was said earlier, where is somebody going to push snow? Right to the end of that driveway. I understand the object is to be able to turn around the car and head nose out, but if you look at other plans and other options that Robertson has in other communities, you drive straight into the garage. No headlights for the person behind you. You have a big backyard. Yes, you can make your T-return and come back out so that you have your nose facing out. I don't know why many of Robertson's developments are nose-in garages and this one ended up being side entry. But Old Novi Road is 25 miles per hour.

My second comment is with regards to the sidewalk. According to the plans, it looks like the sidewalk is going to be totally relocated from where that sidewalk currently is along Old Novi Road. There's nothing wrong with it as close to the road as that sidewalk is now. It does not have to be set that much farther west. Give these people some front yards, move the houses a little farther east if you have to. But where the sidewalk is now is perfectly fine for a 25 mile per hour road. It doesn't need to be 30 feet away from the road. Those are my comments, thank you.

Todd Keene, 2300 Austin Drive, I've lived here for about 25 years. I also appreciate Robertson Brothers, they seem like they're doing a pretty good job and are definitely getting better with the residents. My thing is that I still think it's too dense. I think if they removed houses 15 and 16 from the east side and spread those out, and then 10 and 11 on the west side and spread that out, I think that would definitely improve things. I don't understand, as we read over the agenda for tonight, I was looking at a lot of stuff and I still don't understand the RM-2 high density. I don't understand why we can't just keep it R-4 and do variances to try to accommodate some of the stuff that's going on here.

In my neighborhood – I live in Shawood Heights subdivision – I’m just throwing a number out there but it’s probably pretty close, somewhere between 70 and 80 percent of the homes in that area are on double lots. And this doesn’t really fit in with our community and keeping with that style of neighborhood. So I think, like I said, if we took off 10 and 11 or persuaded Robertson Brothers to do that, and 15 and 16 and spread things out, and tried to make it less like a cookie-cutter situation. But we’re moving in the right direction. I’m proud of them and I’d like to support them to build something. I just hope they can get with our needs.

Jerilynn Meldrum, 2027 Austin Drive, said if you look at the illustration, I’m adjacent to 11 and flooding is my major concern. The field behind my house is elevated higher than my house and on the downslope of the hill, flooding and stormwater is a really big concern of ours. In my opinion, it’s still a little bit too dense. If you look at the houses that are backing up the development, there’s like three houses for six or seven houses. We do have nice yards, nice kind of like laid back country feel, which is why everyone really wanted the country style court buildings. The majority of our homes are one level ranches, and they’re modest. So for them to stack three houses for each one of our modest homes really just gives you some perspective of how tight these will be.

I agree with the people before me in saying that these driveways and the garages – I’m right on the property line so that’s going to be like headlights right into my living room making that turn. And if they are pushing the snow back, it will add to the runoff that I’m already going to have to face. So thank you, Robertson Brothers, actually, for scaling it back from that first rude awakening at 57 condominiums being proposed. This is a nice concept, but it’s still too dense. And it still has a long of things to factor for us existing people who have a great community, and to put this cookie cutter, high density housing into our little neat sprawling neighborhood doesn’t conform. So thank you for hearing us.

Chair Pehrson asked if there was anyone else that wished to address the Planning Commission at this time. When no one else responded, he said I think we have some other correspondence.

Member Lynch said yes we do, and everything will be put into the public record. We’ve got letters from Michel Duchesneau, 1191 South Lake Drive, and Dorothy Duchesneau; we’ve got an objection from Kelly Butherford, 125 Austin; an objection from Greg Baber, 115 Linhart Street; objection from Patricia Keene, 2300 Austin Drive; objection from Todd Keene, 2300 Austin Drive; objection from Brian Damron, 129 Wainwright Street, and another from the same person; an objection from Jane Vaiciunas, 2214 Austin Drive; an objection from Daniel Kevin Toma and Kayla Melinda Toma, 2154 Austin Drive; an objection from Susan Cova, 111 Austin Drive; an objection from Michael Davis, 2345 Austin Drive; an objection from Terry Davis, 2345 Austin Drive. And a support from Mark Robbins, 2230 Old Novi Road; a support from Mark Robbins, 2293 Austin Drive; and two more from the same person.

Chair Pehrson closed the public hearing and turned it over to the Planning Commission for their consideration.

Member Lynch said just briefly, I did drive out to the site and I spent some time out there. One thing that I was concerned about was right now, the drainage seems to be a prevalent issue. I think that on the east side, that section on the east side, will help

because especially the person who lives next to Lot 21, it looks like everything drains down in there and it's all asphalt, so I think this may help. But it's unclear to me on the west side of Old Novi Road, and I guess for the developer – how are we going to handle the stormwater? Let me finish for a second because I looked at it and it looks like, we don't have lawns there and it's not absorbing although this may absorb some. Is the plan to slope towards Old Novi for Lots 1-11 or is there some sort of drainage strategy behind that development that it's not going to make a made condition? Because right now, it does look bad. I was out there when it was raining and I did see flooding, but it wasn't raining all that hard. But I can see how the water, especially down Austin Drive, kind of flows and then from Old Novi Road it looks like there already is an issue. My question is, is there some kind of strategy that you guys have that you're going to mitigate some of that drainage issue that we're currently having?

Mr. Loughrin said through the Chair, so I'm looking at the grading plan right now and it's similar to what the gentleman had mentioned before about the northern lots through the back going towards the north. So we have the same proposal to have a storm drain on the west side where the property line is in structured storm pipe that would then go to a drainage structure, so a catch basin if you will, and then that would bring everything out to a catch basin right along Old Novi Road. Right now, there is nothing. So it's a combination of two things, so we will be grading what you see today – obviously we're going to need to grade and tabletop in some respects. So we will control the drainage that way. And then again everything will go down to basically the bottom corner and then out to the east to a pipe.

Member Lynch said so what you're doing, and it doesn't exist now, is putting in a drain pipe?

Mr. Loughrin said that's correct.

Member Lynch said that's going to collect the water runoff, granted you're adding some asphalt or concrete, and you have the rooftops too. It's probably a wash on drainage, what's there now to what you're going to put in there. So you're going to guide it to a drain pipe, ok.

Mr. Loughrin said and just to follow up on that, we don't just build the houses and walk away. So we don't want to have drainage issues any more than anyone else. We come and fix them anyway, so it's in our best interest to make sure we don't have any issues for homeowners, nor our neighbors. We fix that, as well. We stand by our product, we have a good reputation and we're not going to create a situation where it's just going to be a continual headache for us or homeowners.

Member Lynch said I did look at the drainage plan, my purpose was to have that on the record. Also, if you guys walk away, my understanding – to the counsel – is that once this PRO agreement is signed if this gets approved, if for some reason the developer decides they don't want to do it anymore, is it true that it all goes back to the way that it was? In other words, one of the gentleman came up and said they're worried about changing the zoning with the PRO agreement and what happens if Robertson for some reason decides to walk away? Does that nullify the PRO Agreement or does the Agreement stay with that property in perpetuity?

City Attorney Schultz said so the PRO, I believe, it's two years without development then it would expire or terminate of its own accord. But just to clarify, this is a PRO approval for this development only. So whether it expires or the parties walk away from it, nobody can come in and say they're going to just amend this agreement to do something more intense. It's just for this project, and if this project isn't built, then they have to move on to a different plan and a different approval process.

Member Lynch said ok. And I only spent about 25 minutes out there because I didn't want somebody shooting at me because I'm looking in the houses, but I was looking at the diversity of housing and I was trying to picture in my mind – if we were to leave it as General Business, does that make sense? And my opinion is no, it doesn't make sense. And I don't see how a business would survive.

And then the second question is, looking at the neighborhood, will this fit into the character of the neighborhood? And I guess my opinion is, I think it will based on the diversity of housing in various other neighborhoods where they have anything from townhomes to million dollar homes. I think this will be a good addition, in my opinion, to this neighborhood. I wasn't out on Old Novi Road that much, but I didn't see a lot of traffic. Maybe I was there at the wrong time, but Old Novi Road looks like a nice residential area. My opinion, I've seen this in other places, is by putting residential there instead of commercial, it will calm the road and calm the traffic. I think that Thirteen Mile might be a traffic issue, but this isn't going to change that.

But overall, I like this idea better than what I've heard of the other plans. This is the first time I've had a chance to actually look at this plan and I know there are some issues that need to be ironed out, but I do see that fitting into the character of that neighborhood. I do think that based on my assessment of the engineering drawings, I think that the water problem should improve if it's built to those prints. The drain pipe goes in, I think it might not resolve all of the water problems because there's a lot of other reasons for the water problems, but I think that for the most part this will fit into that particular area. And I appreciate you working with the homeowners, it becomes very personal. It's difficult for everyone, it's difficult for the homeowners, certainly difficult for you, and I appreciate you spending the time and doing that. Based on where we were to where we are now, I think this is a pretty good plan.

Member Avdoulos said I'd like to echo the previous comments about having all of the residents involved and keeping us informed for this long, it's been a long time. When we were first hearing of this at audience participation, we had no clue what anybody was talking about. And then slowly the story became a little bit more evident and so we actually spoke to a lot of the residents and kept encouraging them to participate and keep us informed and have their voices be heard. And low and behold, here we are, this is real now. And the developer has done a great job in taking the time to meet with the residents and try to iron out as many of the concerns as possible.

Member Lynch had touched base on a few of the concerns I had, one with the flooding. And I would even be in favor of some of the adjustments that were recommended by Mr. Duchesneau about if there's some additional setbacks that can be bargained with in order to maybe alleviate some flooding concerns or drainage concerns, especially around that Lot 1. I think that would be something that we like to see, anything that would not create a hardship for the neighbors is something that I think would be really important.

The other question that was brought up and keeps being brought up is the cookie cutter façade. I saw elevations that were presented, different types of variations. If I could have our consultant, Doug, come up and maybe walk through what you've seen. It was mentioned by one of the residents, the similar dissimilar. And Novi really does take a look at that, although you can only do so much. I think some of these are taking the same plan but being a little bit more unique. But if you could walk through what you've been seeing and how the applicant has been responding to your comments, that would be helpful.

Façade Consultant Necci said the applicant submitted I think nine models with a total of 36 different front elevations, and the City Similar Dissimilar Ordinance prohibits cookie-cutter type architecture. It actually requires that adjacent homes have a different front façade, it even goes so far as requiring rear façades that are visible from the main road be dissimilar as well, although that doesn't apply to this project. So essentially, adjacent homes and the second house, so two on the left and two on the right, have to be different facades. In addition, any ones across the street have to be different. So the theory is that if you're standing in any one spot, all the homes within plain sight have to have differing façade. And that's a review that's done on every single house in Novi.

So we looked at the elevations that they had provided, those have been in the package for quite some time now. I don't know if they're all still in the package but with 36 elevations, they can meet the Similar Dissimilar Ordinance readily. There shouldn't be any issue with it whatsoever. There's always a tendency for a few models to be more popular, so that happens, but we watch over that pretty well.

Member Avdoulos said I appreciate it. The concerns with the detached garages or the garages in the rear – when I look at it, if you put a garage up front of a house and then you have a house, it actually makes the house look bigger. I think the way the houses are set and designed as in the image keeps them a little bit more downscale to sort of work with the rest of the area, being a little bit more contextual with the site and giving it more of a neighborhood character along Novi Road and the area to the east. So personally, I don't have an issue. I do understand the concern, especially the residents along the west side of Old Novi Road 1-11, where lights may be shining into their homes. That one, if Robertson Brothers could take a look at maybe offsetting the garages instead of side entry to maybe have them straight in similar to 12-16 where you can drive right in. If you could take a look at possibly doing that, although I know at the same time that it affects drainage and grading.

Mr. Loughrin said if I can answer, really the only reason why it's different than any of the other ones that we've done is really just because we figured Old Novi Road functions more as a collector street than residential, we were just concerned that there might be concern from the City's standpoint of having cars back onto that. That's the only reason – by putting it on the side orientation, you're able to back out and then go out front. So that was the sole reason. For us, frankly, it really doesn't matter too much. We will get bigger backyards, which is great. And it would reduce any kind of impacts to our neighbors. So we're okay if that's the decision, to go front-in. It's really just if there's any concern with backing out onto Old Novi, that was our only reason of doing that.

Member Avdoulos said okay, and maybe take that into consideration and walk it through with the City to see what the balance is.

Mr. Loughrin said we're also fine with the six foot rear setback, particularly if we could go six feet in the front just to justify that and make sure we have enough space. We would be okay with that.

Member Avdoulos said my concern is to have enough room to allow the grading to do what it needs to do, so if we have to sacrifice a little bit on the setbacks I have no issue with that. I think right now, that answers some my questions. I appreciate it.

Member Maday said you guys pretty much covered what I was going to ask but I just wanted to restate that with the side entry garages, I know it doesn't seem like a big deal in the grand scheme of things to a lot of us, but those few houses that are affected, it's a huge deal going in and out as many times as somebody might every day. So if you could work with the City, that would be great. I just wanted to extend my appreciation and "thank you's" to the citizens of the community, as well as to the developer. You guys showed your voice and did what makes our country and the City great, and your voices were heard. I think this is going to be a great development for this area. It gets rid of some unsightly buildings and it may very well be able to bring some businesses that you local residents have been hoping for. It might draw some people that want to come in there. So I am encouraged by what I see, when I think about where we were before to where we are now and just seeing you guys happy and the developer happy and the City happy – it's a huge accomplishment. I'm just really happy with everything that has been done.

Member Greco said I just have a question for the Staff. Does the Staff have a position or has considered any issue regarding the positioning of the garages? Because that is an issue, and I know that we do have in the requirements a screening fence or landscaping should be provided along the rear lot lines of the properties on the west side of Old Novi Road, which I assume is to address that. But the headlights issue is definitely an issue, just in my experience being a lawyer dealing with other communities and with commercial and residential issues. It becomes kind of maddening for some of the individuals that are trying to watch a movie on Netflix and they keep getting lit up. So does the City have a position on that? We heard from the applicant about why they addressed it.

Planner Bell said our Traffic Consultant wasn't able to be here tonight, but I don't recall that being a major issue that they were concerned with.

Member Greco said okay, thank you. With regard to a screening fence or landscaping, what's the position of the applicant with regards to that?

Mr. Loughrin said we've already agreed to that. That was a follow up with Staff as far as the western perimeter and putting up a fence of some sort. And we're open to that, yes.

Member Greco said and that, of course, is something that needs to be kept up once it is put in, right?

Mr. Loughrin said yes.

Member Greco said thank you.

Chair Pehrson said Lindsay and Darcy, if we give up a little bit on the front yard setback and move things a little bit further to the east, is there concern for the current position shown on the rendering of the sidewalk relative to Novi Road if we move that closer?

Staff Engineer Rechten said I don't think there's any concern with it being closer to the roadway. The existing sidewalk is closer. I'm not sure exactly how it was placed where it's shown there, but I don't see any concern.

Chair Pehrson said I don't see any dimensions on it, I'm just assuming that if we go further to the east with the setback we still have the option to move the sidewalk a little bit forward and still maintain safety. Okay, great. I agree that I am in support of the proposal as it stands right now. I think we've come a long way from what we did want and what has been now worked out. I think this will be a great change to that area for the positive. I'll look for someone to make a motion.

Member Greco said I can make a motion, and I think with regard to the motion sheet concerning what we're approving today, some of the issues regarding the screening and the positioning of the garages, and the sidewalk, we can deal with at the time of site plan. So with that, I will make a motion.

Motion made by Member Greco and seconded by Member Avdoulos.

**ROLL CALL VOTE TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF REZONING MOTION MADE BY MEMBER GRECO AND SECONDED BY MEMBER AVDOULOS.**

**In the matter of Lakeview JSP18-16 with rezoning 18.723, motion to recommend approval to the City Council to rezone the subject property from R-4 (One Family Residential) and B-3 (General Business) to RM-2 (High-Density, Mid-Rise Multiple Family) with a Planned Rezoning Overlay Concept Plan, based on the following:**

1. The recommendation shall include the following ordinance deviations and additional information requested by staff for consideration by the City Council:
  - a. Planning Deviations for Single-Family (R-4 standards):
    - i. Reduction of minimum lot area by 5,000 square feet (10,000 sf required, 5,000 sf provided);
    - ii. Reduction of minimum lot frontage by 32 feet (80 ft required, 48 ft provided);
    - iii. Reduction of the minimum required building front setback by 23 feet (Required 30 feet, provided 7 feet);
    - iv. Reduction of the minimum required building principal side setback by 5 feet (Required 10 feet, provided 5 feet);
    - v. Reduction of the minimum required building side total setback by 10 feet (Required 25 feet, provided 15 feet);
    - vi. Reduction of the minimum required building rear setback by 15 feet (Required 35 feet, provided 20 feet);
    - vii. Reduction of the exterior side yard required building setback by 20 feet (Required 30 feet, provided 10 feet);
    - viii. Reduction of the side and rear yard setback for accessory buildings (Section 4.19.1.G) by 1 foot (Required 6 feet, providing 5 feet);
    - ix. Exceeding the maximum lot coverage percentage by 20% (25% allowed, 45% provided);



- b. Engineering DCS deviation for the width of storm sewer easements (10 feet requested);
- c. Engineering DCS deviation for the driveways less than 3 feet from the property line;
- d. Traffic deviation for driveway width of 10 feet (16 feet standard) which is within the acceptable range and may be granted administratively;
- e. Landscape deviation for no screening berm provided between the B-3 commercial district and the residential properties to the south on both sides of Old Novi Road (6-8 feet tall landscaped berm required) with alternative screening with fence/wall and/or landscaping to be provided;
- f. Landscape deviation for street trees located in front yards of single family homes on Wainright and Linhart, rather than within the right-of-way due to the presence of utilities;
- g. Landscape deviation for subcanopy trees used as street trees due to the presence of overhead power lines on Old Novi Road;
- h. Landscape deviation for fewer subcanopy trees substituted for canopy street trees than required, due to the number of driveways and the 10 foot spacing requirement from driveways;
- i. Landscape deviation for landscaping and decorative fence proposed within the right-of-way due to the width of Old Novi Road right-of-way;
- j. Façade waiver under Section 5.15.9 for underage of brick and overage of horizontal siding on certain elevations;
- k. Subdivision Ordinance deviation for site condominium unit boundaries extending into wetland area for lots 20 and 21; and
- l. Planning deviations for lots 50-22-10-231-019 and 50-22-10-231-008 (remainder of lots fronting on Austin maintaining R-4 zoning designation) as follows:
  - i. 21 foot rear setback where 35 foot is required;
  - ii. Lot area of 6,500 square feet where 10,000 sf is required;
  - iii. Lot coverage of 30% where 25% is permitted.

2. If the City Council approves the rezoning, the Planning Commission recommends the following conditions be requirements of the Planned Rezoning Overlay Agreement:

- a. A homeowner's association shall be established as part of the development and the City shall review the Master Deed and Bylaws prior to recordation. A separate maintenance agreement to be assigned to the homeowner's association is proposed to meet the intent of this provision.
- b. The use of the property will be for single family homes meeting the standards spelled out in the development agreement.
- c. The maximum number of single family units shall be 21.
- d. The maximum density of the development shall be 6.67 DUA.
- e. Use easement extending 15 feet into the Old Novi Road ROW for the parcels along the west side of the road. The use easement would be used as front yard space for the homes, including landscaping features and decorative fences to be maintained by the home owners association established in a Master Deed.
- f. The small wetland area on the northeast corner of the site shall be minimally impacted only as permitted by MDEQ and City Wetland Permit, and the applicant has indicated that the Master Deed for Lakeview will provide for a conservation easement for these two properties such that the wetlands will not be disturbed.

- g. Screening fences and/or landscaping shall be provided along the rear lot lines of the properties on the west side of Old Novi Road.
- h. On both sides of Old Novi Road, in lieu of the required berm separating the residential uses from the non-residential uses to the north, the applicant shall provide alternate screening in the form of a fence or wall and/or landscaping to be approved by the City's landscape architect. Consideration shall be given to limiting noise and visual impacts for the residents, as well as impacts to wetlands and buffer areas.
- i. The two lots north of Wainwright, east of Old Novi Road, shall have front entry garages due to the presence of the wetland in the rear yards that shall be preserved. The remaining 19 lots shall be constructed with detached or rear attached garages.
- j. The applicant shall provide 10 on-street parking spaces along the east side of Old Novi Road, as recommended by the Master Plan.
- k. The city shall abandon the 50 feet of the utility easement within the previously vacated Erma Street, but shall require a 20 foot water main easement.
- l. Applicant complying with the conditions listed in the staff and consultant review letters.

This motion is made because:

1. The proposed plan meets several objectives of the Master Plan, as noted in the review letter, including:
  - a. *The Pavilion Shore Village area is identified in the Master Plan for redevelopment with a vision for a cohesive mixed use village that complements the surrounding neighborhood. (Bringing additional residents and investment into the area could drive development interest in the other areas of Pavilion Shore Village, and the community has strongly expressed single family uses are preferred on these parcels).*
  - b. *Provide and maintain adequate transportation facilities for the City's needs. Address vehicular and non-motorized transportation facilities (Pedestrian improvements are proposed along Old Novi Road including building a segment of planned sidewalk on the east side of the road, which includes a bench seating area with landscaping).*
  - c. *Provide residential developments that support healthy lifestyles. Ensure the provision of neighborhood open space within residential developments. (The homes are set in a walkable context with sidewalks leading to the nearby parks.)*
  - d. *Provide a wide range of quality housing options. Attract new residents to the City by providing a full range of quality housing opportunities that meet the housing needs of all demographic groups including but not limited to singles, couples, first time home buyers, families and the elderly. (The homes include characteristics of the "missing middle" housing option with medium density, well-designed units with smaller footprints that will appeal to many types of demographic groups.)*
2. The proposed detention pond provides improved management of storm water in an area not currently detained.
3. The redevelopment of this site provides an update to the visual aesthetic in a unique area of the City with underutilized parcels.
4. The redevelopment of the subject parcels will remove non-conforming structures from the Right-of-Way.

5. The proposed single family homes are consistent with the surrounding residential neighborhoods.
6. The topography and parcel configuration are such that single family home development under the existing zoning would not be possible without similar variances for lot depth, lot area, lot coverage and setbacks.
7. The density proposed is within the density recommended in the Master Plan.
8. Submittal of a Concept Plan and any resulting PRO Agreement, provides assurance to the Planning Commission and the City Council of the manner in which the property will be developed, and offers benefits that would not be likely to be offered under standard development options.

*Motion carried 5-0.*

## **2. FOUNTAIN VIEW AKA STONERIDGE WEST II JSP18-30**

Public hearing at the request of Acquire Realty Holdings for approval of Preliminary Site Plan, Phasing Plan, Wetland Permit, and Storm Water Management Plan. The subject property is located in Section 10 of the City of Novi north of Twelve Mile Road and west of Novi Road. The applicant is proposing to construct three medical and professional office buildings totaling 40,240 square feet with associated site improvements.

Planner Bell said as you mentioned, the subject property is in Section 10 on the north side of Twelve Mile Road, west of Novi Road. The parcel is 4.45 acres. It is zoned OS-1, Office Service, with properties to the east and west also zoned OS-1. The property to the north is zoned R-1, Single Family, and to the south is Twelve Mile Crossing at Fountain Walk, zoned RC, Regional Commercial. The Future Land Use map indicates Community Office for this property and those to the east and west. Single family uses are planned to the north, and Regional Commercial to the south.

There is a small wetland on the northern portion of the site, although it is not indicated on the City's Wetland Map.

The applicant is proposing three new medical and professional office buildings to be built in succession. Two of the buildings would be one story with 10,060 square feet each, and one would be two story with 20,120 square feet, for a total of 40,240 square feet.

The site would be accessed by a driveway off of Twelve Mile with a secondary access near the back of the lot to the existing Stoneridge Office complex to the east. A waiver is needed for same-side driveway spacing due to site constraints. The applicant has proposed sufficient vehicle and bicycle parking. Traffic recommends approval of the Preliminary Site Plan.

Stormwater would be collected by a single collection system and detained in a stormwater basin on the site before being discharged to existing storm sewer. Engineering recommends approval with additional details required in a Final Site Plan submittal.

Planner Bell said buildings A and C would require a Section 9 Façade waiver to allow an overage of Burnished CMU on all façades, an underage of brick on the rear, left and right façades, and an overage of Standing Seam Metal on the rear left and right façades. Our Façade consultant supports these deviations because the buildings exhibit well-balanced

composition and overall the buildings are consistent with the intent and purpose of the Façade Ordinance.

Two Landscape waivers are also requested, as listed in your motion sheet, which are both supported by Staff.

The project site contains a wetland and 25-foot setback that are regulated by the City of Novi. Impacts to these features will require a Wetland Minor Use Permit and an Authorization to Encroach the 25-foot Natural Features Setback. Remaining wetland areas would be preserved.

Fire has identified an issue with a driveway in front of Building A being longer than 150 feet without providing an area to turn around. This will need to be addressed by the applicant in the next submittal.

All reviewers are recommending conditional approval with additional comments to be addressed in Final Site Plan.

Planner Bell said the Planning Commission is asked tonight to approve or deny the Preliminary Site Plan, Phasing Plan, Wetland Permit, and the Stormwater Management Plan. Representing the project tonight are the owner, Joe Schimizzi, and his team to answer any questions you may have.

Ron Jona, the architect and planner on the project, said as was mentioned, Joe Schimizzi, the developer, is here and Mark Collins from Nowak and Fraus engineers are here. I think it's pertinent to say that Joe Schimizzi had bought the original Stoneridge, which is just to the east of this, years ago and turned that from a partially completed project into a very successful office medical park. He had purchased this property some time ago and we've been planning for the last 24 months. We resolved the ingress-egress issue, which was something that kind of delayed it, and then continued to work with Lindsay Bell and your Planning department engineers to create what we think is going to be a very effective site.

We are looking at office medical uses and other than the presentation she had, the only thing I can say is that the one driveway issue in front of Building A, there's various solutions to that. If the driveway gets shortened, we're going to potentially lose three to five cars. If we lose three to five cars, our options are to find them on site, and there are a couple spots that we could add them. We could change our ratio from medical to office; right now, we're 80-20 but if we went to approximately 76-24, we'd make the parking and having lost those cars.

The third solution and the one that is most attractive to us is to possibly work with Level One Bank and connect that drive. They have an overage of parking and we've had some talks with them earlier on, being that we are going to be neighbors. We believe, and I think the City believes from any other project I've worked on, that if we can connect Level One to us on the front drive, we're keeping traffic off Twelve Mile and having patrons potentially just share the two companies. That works for us because that would actually add a car. And we use that 80-20 split – that's not just arbitrary, that's about exactly what we have in the current Stoneridge so that's the ratio we're expecting.

Other than that, we're prepared to answer any questions. Hope this meets with your approval and we'd like to hopefully break ground in the spring.

Chair Pehrson asked if there was anyone in the audience that wished to address the Planning Commission regarding this project. Seeing no one, he said I don't believe we have any correspondence.

Member Lynch said no correspondence.

Chair Pehrson closed the public hearing and turned it over to the Planning Commission for their discussion.

Member Avdoulos said I don't see too many issues with the project. I see approval recommended going down the row. There is the concern with the driveway, and I'm always in favor of connecting properties if we can, as I am in favor of connecting subdivisions if we can, to just as you said – minimize traffic on the road and that also gives people the opportunity to not go on Twelve Mile but they can go on the road next to Level One. So I think that is good.

I think the development is a good addition to the other businesses along Twelve Mile Road. I think it enhances what we already have there, bringing medical and office into that area is just doing what we like to do. And I think Novi is really becoming a destination for a lot of the health care that is being provided within the region, so I think that's positive. I have no issues.

Motion made by Member Lynch and seconded by Member Avdoulos.

**ROLL CALL VOTE TO APPROVE PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN MOTION MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER AVDOULOS.**

**In the matter of Fountain View AKA Stoneridge West II, JSP 18-30, motion to approve the Preliminary Site Plan and Phasing Plan based on and subject to the following:**

- a. **For buildings A & C, a Section 9 waiver to allow the overage of Burnished CMU on all facades (10% allowed; up to 20% proposed), an underage of Brick on the rear, left and right facades (30% required; minimum 20% proposed) and an overage of Standing Seem Metal on rear, left and right facades (25% allowed; up to 36% proposed). *These deviations are supported because the buildings exhibit well balanced composition and the proportions of materials used are consistent with and will enhance the overall design, and overall the building is consistent with the intent and purpose of the Façade Ordinance.* The Section 9 waiver is hereby granted;**
- b. **Waiver for deficiency in total foundation landscape area provided which is hereby granted *because the site will be heavily and attractively landscaped, and only the limited paved areas of the building are not landscaped as required;***
- c. **Waiver for use of a gray dogwood to screen along the northwestern half of the parking lot in place of the required 4.5-6 foot tall berm, *which is hereby granted because more of the wetland would have to be filled if the required berm was built along the entire northern frontage;***

- d. Waiver for driveway spacing of 140 feet from the driveway to the east, where 230 feet is required, *which is hereby granted because of constraints on the site and in the Twelve Mile right-of-way;*
- e. The conditions and items listed in the staff and consultant review letters being addressed on the Final Site Plan.

This motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with the Article 3, Article 4 and Article 5 of the Zoning Ordinance and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance. *Motion carried 5-0.*

**ROLL CALL VOTE TO APPROVE WETLAND PERMIT MOTION MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER AVDOULOS.**

In the matter of Fountain View AKA Stoneridge West II, JSP 18-30, motion to approve the Wetland Permit based on and subject to the findings of compliance with Ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters, and the conditions and items listed in those letters being addressed on the Final Site Plan. This motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Chapter 12, Article V of the Code of Ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance. *Motion carried 5-0.*

**ROLL CALL VOTE TO APPROVE STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN MOTION MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER AVDOULOS.**

In the matter of Fountain View AKA Stoneridge West II, JSP 18-30, motion to approve the Stormwater Management Plan based on and subject to the findings of compliance with Ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters, and the conditions and items listed in those letters being addressed on the Final Site Plan. This motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Chapter 11 of the Code of Ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance. *Motion carried 5-0.*

### **3. JAGUAR LAND ROVER JSP17-65**

Public Hearing at the request of Erhard Motor Sales, Inc. for Planning Commission's recommendation to City Council for consideration of a Special Development Option Concept Plan in the GE, Gateway East zoning district. The subject property is comprised of two parcels totaling 9.48 acres. It is located on the southwest corner of Grand River Avenue and Meadowbrook Road in section 23. The applicant is proposing to build a 58,663 square foot car sales facility for Jaguar Land Rover. The concept plan proposes 138 parking spaces and 287 parking spaces for storing cars for sale.

Planner Komaragiri said as some of you may be aware, the subject property was rezoned from Non-Center Commercial, NCC, and Office Service, OS-1, districts to Gateway East, GE, at the December 4, 2017 City Council meeting. The applicant is now proposing to use the Special Development Option available under Gateway East zoning to propose an auto car dealership.

The subject property is located at the "entry" area of the Gateway East District, since it is located on one of the four properties at the intersection of Grand River and Meadowbrook. The SDO option allows a non-residential use permitted elsewhere in the Ordinance, but not otherwise permitted in the GE District for one of these properties,

subject to City Council's approval based on Planning Commission's recommendation.

The property is now currently zoned to Gateway East and is bordered by Gateway East to the west, Multiple Family RM-2 to the south, Single Family Residential and OS-1 Office service to the east and Non-Center Commercial to the west and north across Grand River Avenue. Except for the property to the east, all other properties are currently developed or under construction. The Future Land Use map recommends residential land uses to the south and Town Center Gateway district on all other sides.

The Plan indicates one area of wetland on this site located along the southern boundary of the subject site. The current plan is not proposing any impacts to the existing wetlands on site. Regulated woodlands are located in the southwest section of the site. This map is slightly misleading – it shows wetlands in the middle of the property, but they are essentially located to the south.

The subject property is comprised of two parcels totaling 9.48 acres. The applicant is proposing to build a 58,663 square feet car sales facility for Jaguar Land Rover. The proposed facility includes sales and service area located in the southwest corner of the building and also proposes 138 parking spaces for employee and visitors, and 287 parking spaces for storing cars for sale.

At the time of consideration of the rezoning request, the Planning Commission noted that the applicant should maintain a reasonable buffer between the parking lot and the residential uses to the south. A storm water pond is proposed on the south side that also acts a buffer from the residential use on south side of Cherry Hill Road. The site has access from both Meadowbrook Road and Grand River Avenue.

As mentioned before, there are no impacts proposed to the wetlands but there are some impacts proposed within the 25 foot buffer. A total of 149 regulated trees are proposed to be removed, which accounts for up to 48 percent of trees on site. About 172 replacements trees are required, which are proposed to be planted on site at this moment. The Woodland Replacement trees are proposed around the stormwater detention basin, along the west edge of the property, near the loading zone, and within several parking lot islands. The location of the trees in the parking lot islands and perhaps near the loading zone is not consistent with the intent of the Woodland Ordinance; they are hard to be preserved in a conservation easement. The applicant agreed to relocate the trees out of the parking lot.

Traffic review recommends approval with additional comments to be addressed with the Preliminary Site Plan. A Traffic Impact Study would be required based on the trip generation for this site; however, item e. in the motion refers to two options – either to waive the requirement or defer it to the time of Preliminary Site Plan review, as the site falls under the study boundaries for the ongoing study by the City. Staff supports either of those options.

As indicated in the motion sheet, the Concept Plan requires multiple deviations. Staff is in support of all the deviations except for first two items listed in the motion sheet.

The first item refers to the Open Space requirement. 25% of the gross area of each development within the GE District shall be comprised of open space. Substantially all of

the total open space area must be designed as useable space. The plans provided, which were included in the packet, did not provide enough information to make that determination. However, since we uploaded the packets online, the applicant has been actively working with Staff to find alternate options. The revised plans show additional details for the pocket park at the northeast corner shown in the red boundary here and added a trail around the stormwater pond with possible seating around it for employees. The total space provided is now approximately 11.5%. The applicant is suggested to work with staff to find other options to provide more usable open space. However, only a part of the requirement appears to be met. They may require a deviation for not meeting the total percentage.

Façade requires deviations for underage of brick, overage of flat metal panels and overage of horizontal rib metal panels for rooftop screening, all supported by Staff. Façade boards and colored renderings are included in the packet and are available in front of the podium.

Per Section 3.11.8, street corner building should have greater massing and height. The proposed façade did not meet the intent at the time of review. However, as mentioned, the applicant has proposed some changes since then. They propose to drop the grade level at the corner of Grand River and Meadowbrook, and propose to use landscaping design to create interest at the corner instead of using building materials to create the massing. Staff is in agreement with the concept of it, but we still feel like we need to address some details prior to the approval of the SDO Concept Plan.

The applicant has submitted a Noise Impact Statement to address the possible noise concerns, due to the proximity to the residential neighborhood. The report was very well detailed and demonstrates that the noise levels will be kept under the Ordinance minimum. Site lighting is proposed to be turned on all day and night for security reasons. The applicant is suggested to consider reduced lighting for security purposes after hours due to proximity to residential uses. The Planning Commission may consider adding this as an additional condition if the suggestion seems reasonable.

All reviews are recommending approval with additional information to be addressed as noted in the review letters and tonight's presentation.

The Planning Commission is asked tonight to hold the public hearing and make a recommendation to City Council for approval of SDO Concept Plan.

The applicants and staff are here tonight to answer any questions you may have.

Mark Drane, with Rogvoy Architects, said I am the architect for the project and I am representing their group. I'm here to answer questions, it sounded like a mouthful what Sri had but they are very small, minor items. We're here to do a good job.

Chair Pehrson asked if there was anyone in the audience that wished to address the Planning Commission regarding this project. Seeing no one, he asked if there was any correspondence.

Member Lynch said there are two. Jimmie Cranford, 24693 Bloomfield Court, is concerned about the residential neighborhoods on all four sides of the development. If the



development is approved, a berm or wall is suggested at the south and east boundary to provide some separation. And another objection from Jacob Oomen, 41336 Clermont Avenue, said the construction of Jaguar Land Rover will decrease the property value of my home and homes in this area, and he objects to this construction.

Chair Pehrson closed the public hearing and turned it over to the Planning Commission for their consideration.

Member Avdoulos said I have a couple of questions. One to Sri – in the report, you had indicated that right now, you're not recommending approval because of a lot of deviations and things that need to be done. Is that where you are still landing?

Planner Komaragiri said the two major items why we are recommending that is the Open Space requirement, and the Façade and massing. But like I mentioned, the applicant has been working with us. They seem to be moving in the right direction, just a few details need to be worked out.

Member Avdoulos said and then related to Landscaping and buffer with the adjacent residential area, we had some concerns that what they have provided will provide buffering throughout all four seasons. Where are with that?

Landscape Architect Meader said in my opinion, there is sufficient buffering. Along the southern edge along Cherry Hill, there's a ditch with heavy natural – I'm not going to call it native – but natural vegetation there that's going to stay. And then in addition, they're adding two or three more layers of plantings at various heights and types through there. So I think that any view from there is going to extremely screened, I mean if you really look you might be able to see some but I don't think it's anything that's major. They're also extending the berm along the left side down to the wetland buffer and we don't want them to go further, and that's heavily planted with a lot of woodland replacement trees. So in my opinion, they have enough screening. You can always add a few more plants to it, but I'm not sure that's really necessary.

Member Avdoulos said thank you, I just wanted to make sure we had that. Those were my only questions.

Member Greco said before I make a motion, I have a question. On the motion sheet, 1b. Would the Planning Commission prefer that, as we discussed the architectural standards, that the applicant work with the Façade consultant?

Chair Pehrson said I think that's best, in my opinion.

Member Greco said and 1e. the traffic deviation to waive the requirement for the Traffic Impact Study or defer it to the time of Preliminary Site Plan review – are there comments on that?

Member Maday said can we just defer it to the time of Preliminary Site Plan?

Member Avdoulos said I'm okay with that.

Chair Pehrson said that's fine.

Member Greco said okay. With that, I'd like to make a motion.

Motion made by Member Greco and seconded by Member Lynch.

**ROLL CALL VOTE TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF SDO CONCEPT PLAN MOTION MADE BY MEMBER GRECO AND SECONDED BY MEMBER LYNCH.**

1. The recommendation shall include the following ordinance deviations:
  - a. The applicant shall work with staff to provide acceptable amount of Open Space as defined in Section 3.11.7 GE District required conditions, prior to City Council's consideration of SDO Concept Plan;
  - b. The applicant shall work with City's Façade consultant to provide alternate design elements to meet the intent of Section 3.11.8;
  - c. Planning deviation from Section 3.11.8 for absence of required sidewalk along Cherry Hill Road due to existing wetlands;
  - d. Deviations from Section 5.15. Exterior Building Wall Façade Materials for the following:
    - i. Underage of brick (30% minimum required, 25% on north façade and 28% on east façade proposed);
    - ii. Overage of flat metal panels (50% maximum allowed, 58% on north façade and 56% on east façade proposed);
    - iii. Overage of horizontal rib metal panels for roof top screening (0% allowed, 17% on north, 16% on east, 12% on south and 18% on west proposed);
  - e. Defer the Traffic Impact Study to the time of Preliminary Site Plan review, as the site falls under the study boundaries for the ongoing Comprehensive Traffic study by the City;
  - f. Traffic deviation for variance from Design and Construction Standards Section 11-216(d) for not meeting the minimum distance required for same-side commercial driveways along Grand River Avenue;
  - g. Landscape deviation from Section. 5.5.3.E.i.c for lack of street trees along Grand River Road frontage due to lack of space (8 trees required);
  - h. Landscape deviation from Section. 5.5.3.E.i.c for lack of street trees along Cherry Hill Road frontage due to lack of space (8 trees required);
  - i. Landscape deviation from Section 5.5.3.B.ii and iii for not providing greenbelt berm or plantings in area of wetland in order to preserve wetland along Cheery Hill Road frontage;
  - j. Landscape deviation from Section 5.5.3.B.ii and iii for not providing greenbelt berm or plantings between Cherry Hill and the parking lot area not behind the wetland;
2. The Applicant shall comply with the conditions and items listed in the staff and consultant review letters as a requirement noted in the Special Development Option Agreement.

This motion is made based on the following findings:

- a. The project results in a recognizable and substantial benefit to the ultimate users of the project and to the community, where such benefit would otherwise be unfeasible or unlikely to be achieved by a traditional development;
- b. In relation to a development otherwise permissible as a Principal Permitted Use under Section 3.1.16.B the proposed type and density of development does not result in an

- unreasonable increase in the use of public services, facilities and utilities, and does not place an unreasonable burden upon the subject and/or surrounding land and/or property owners and occupants and/or the natural environment;
- c. Based upon proposed uses, layout and design of the overall project, the proposed building facade treatment, the proposed landscaping treatment and the proposed signage, the Special Development Option project will result in a material enhancement to the area of the City in which it is situated;
  - d. The proposed development does not have a materially adverse impact upon the Master Plan for Land Use of the City, and is consistent with the intent and spirit of this Section;
  - e. In relation to a development otherwise permissible as a Principal Permitted Use under Section 3.1.16.B, the proposed development does not result in an unreasonable negative economic impact upon surrounding properties;
  - f. The proposed development contains at least as much usable open space as would be required in this Ordinance in relation to the most dominant use in the development (*provided the applicant makes the required revisions*);
  - g. Each particular proposed use in the development, as well as the size and location of such use, results in and contributes to a reasonable and mutually supportive mix of uses on the site, and a compatibility of uses in harmony with the surrounding area and other downtown areas of the City;
  - h. The proposed development is under single ownership and/or control such that there is a single person or entity having responsibility for completing the project in conformity with this Ordinance;
  - i. Relative to other feasible uses of the site, the proposed use will not cause any detrimental impact on existing thoroughfares in terms of overall volumes, capacity, safety, vehicular turning patterns, intersections, view obstructions, line of sight, ingress and egress, acceleration/deceleration lanes, off-street parking, off-street loading/unloading, travel times and thoroughfare level of service;
  - j. Relative to other feasible uses of the site, the proposed use will not cause any detrimental impact on the capabilities of public services and facilities, including water service, sanitary sewer service, storm water disposal and police and fire protection to service existing and planned uses in the area;
  - k. Relative to other feasible uses of the site, the proposed use is compatible with the natural features and characteristics of the land, including existing woodlands, wetlands, watercourses and wildlife habitats;
  - l. Relative to other feasible uses of the site, the proposed use is compatible with adjacent uses of land in terms of location, size, character, and impact on adjacent property or the surrounding neighborhood;
  - m. Relative to other feasible uses of the site, the proposed use is consistent with the goals, objectives and recommendations of the City's Master Plan for Land Use.
  - n. Relative to other feasible uses of the site, the proposed use will promote the use of land in a socially and economically desirable manner; and
  - o. Relative to other feasible uses of the site, the proposed use is (1) listed among the provision of uses requiring special land use review as set forth in the various zoning districts of this Ordinance, and (2) is in harmony with the purposes and conforms to the applicable site design regulations of the zoning district in which it is located.

*Motion carried 5-0.*

4. KEFORD COLLISION AND TOWING JZ18-32 with REZONING 18.725

Public hearing at the request of Keford Collision and Towing for Planning

Commission's recommendation to the City Council for rezoning from I-1 (Light Industrial) to I-2 (General Industrial) with a Planned Rezoning Overlay (PRO). The subject property is approximately 7.61 acres and is located on the south side of Grand River Avenue between Taft Road and Novi Road in section 15. The subject property contains two existing buildings which are currently unoccupied. The applicant proposes to use the larger building (23,493 square feet) for an auto body collision repair shop and related offices, along with an accessory use of car rental services.

Planner Komaragiri said thank you for the introduction. The current rezoning request was presented for the Master Planning and Zoning Committee's input on August 22. The Committee has provided favorable input with regards to the rezoning district requested. They suggested that the applicant should work with Staff to address the screening deficiency along the southern property line abutting the residential district.

The subject property is located south of Grand River Avenue and east of Taft Road. It was formerly occupied by a machine tool manufacturer, Amcorp Ltd. The property is currently zoned I-1, and bordered by I-1 on the east, west, and the north across Grand River Avenue. The property to the south is zoned R-4 Residential. The Future Land Use map recommends similar uses for the property and surrounding properties.

The site contains three areas of wetland boundaries. It contains two small areas of regulated woodlands, but no regulated healthy trees are located within the proposed limits of disturbance.

The applicant is requesting a Zoning Map amendment for the 7.61 acre property on the south side of Grand River Avenue between Taft Road and Novi Road in Section 15 from Light Industrial, I-1, to General Industrial, I-2. The subject property contains two existing buildings which are currently unoccupied and are proposed to remain. The applicant proposes to use the larger building (23,493 square feet) for an auto body collision repair shop and related offices, along with an accessory use of car rental services. The car rental service proposes to use up to a maximum of ten parking spaces in the rear. The applicant states that the potential use for the out building (5,073 square feet) would be a small tool and die shop. No particular subtenants have been identified yet. In addition to the indoor uses, the applicant proposes to use up to 160 spaces in an enclosed yard in the rear yard for storage of towed vehicles. Keford is currently located in Novi on Grand River Avenue just west of Haggerty. The current request would retain the existing business in Novi.

With the proposed PRO option, rezoning to I-2 would not create any more high intensity uses than we would typically expect with I-2.

An outdoor storage yard is typically considered a parking lot to verify for conformance with the Zoning Code. However, the use of the subject lot is not a typical parking lot. This resulted in multiple deviations for parking lot Landscaping and Traffic requirements, much as end islands. The applicant is requesting these deviations as the curb islands and landscaping within the islands would create extensive challenges to the driver's maneuverability of tow trucks and towed vehicles. An outdoor storage yard requires adequate screening on all sides from surrounding properties. The current landscape does not propose adequate screening. The applicant is requesting a couple of Landscape deviations that are not supported by Staff. A reasonable justification is not provided, as

well. Staff believes that there is an opportunity to meet the requirements and has suggested the same as an alternate in the suggested motion sheet. Our Landscape Architect Rick Meader can provide further clarification as needed.

Planner Komaragiri said for PRO applications, City Council must determine that the proposed PRO Rezoning would be in the public interest and the public benefits of the proposed PRO Rezoning would clearly outweigh the detriments. The benefits offered by the applicant in his response letter do not meet the minimum requirements. The applicant is voluntarily offering \$10,000 to the City of Novi Grand River Improvement Authority to fund the installation of sidewalks in certain "gap" areas along Grand River Avenue to improve mobility and support the Corridor Improvement Plan. The applicant drew a comparison to the Hadley's Towing project with regards to the donation offered. This could be considered a benefit; however, the applicant should note that the intensity of land uses for this project is different than that of Hadley's Towing. Hadley's was proposing just an outside storage yard, while this project proposes an auto body collision shop, car rental, and undetermined tenant space. Also, there are no sidewalk gaps along Grand River Avenue within the project's vicinity.

The applicant has provided a revised Traffic Study addressing the Traffic review comments. Traffic is now recommending approval for the study. The proposed Keford Towing and Collision land would be expected to generate fewer trips than what could be built under the existing I-1 zoning, as well as fewer trips than is allowable under I-2 zoning.

Façade is recommending approval, provided the applicant clarify that the side and rear elevations will be painted or otherwise treated in a manner that is consistent with the front facade and that the existing natural fired clay tile will not be painted. The applicant is requested to revisit the benefits that are being offered and conform to the screening from adjacent properties. All other reviews are in general agreement with the Concept.

The Planning Commission is asked tonight to hold the public hearing and make a recommendation to City Council. The applicants, Tim and Tom Herrington, are here tonight with their attorney, Mr. David Landry, and their design team to answer any questions you may have. As always, Staff will be glad to answer any questions you have for us. Thank you.

David Landry, representing Keford Collision & Towing, said the first thing I would like to address is to explain to the Planning Commission why we are here. Keford has been in the City of Novi for thirty years, we've been a business resident for over a generation. We're losing our lease. We currently are located where we've been for many years on Grand River just west of Haggerty, adjacent to a Mercedes Benz dealership. We have a great relationship with Mercedes, they received orders from Germany that they need to take our building over because they want a sprinter maintenance. Apparently now the big thing is sprinter vehicles to be able to move car parts from one state to another without having to get a trucking license, you can use sprinter vehicles. So they're working with us and giving us time – we need to move. We don't want to leave Novi. In fact, we have a contract with the City of Novi that requires us to stay here; in order for us to two for the Police Department, we have to have a location in the City of Novi. So we don't want to move, we've been here for a long time, we would like to stay here.

This particular site, we believe, is perfect for our location and it is somewhat unique. The

site is located on Grand River, it is this site right here. It is surrounded on three sides by I-1. This in the rear, although it is zoned residential, this parcel is owned by the City of Novi and is used as regional stormwater detention. So although it is zoned residential, it will never ever be used as residential. This parcel is zoned industrial, it is a regional storm detention pond. No one is ever going to go back there. The storage aspect in the back. So this is a stormwater detention, this is a stormwater detention, this really small little landlocked parcel is owned by the City. It's not going to be used residential. So the only adjacent residential is this sliver of property here in the corner. The house is up close to Taft and it's currently a rental property.

It's unique in this sense – from Grand River Avenue, you can't see the rear of this property. The only reason we need I-2, by the way, is the storage. That's the only reason we need it, to store these cars. This is what it looks like currently, you can't see anything in the rear from Grand River. It's perfect for this particular use because everything else is industrial around it, except for this little piece right here that's the residential that will never be developed as residential. The existing site has long been industrial use since the 1940's. This building has been added onto, it's an amalgamation of several phases. The current resident is Amcor, they're an industrial machinery and manufacturing assembler. We had Phase 1 done, they found a lot of petroleum products being stored inside here. So we had Phase 2 done. There was an underground storage tank, it was removed in the 90's so that's not a problem. The Phase 2 resulted in no volatiles, there's no petroleum products. There is a little higher than normal arsenic and chromium in the soil, so we've contacted the DEQ. Interestingly, when the City built these stormwater detentions, they deposited some of the soil on here and there's arsenic and chromium in the soil. The DEQ tells us as long as we do a baseline environmental and compliance report, they're fine with it. So we're going to do all of that, including this stuff.

The Master Plan has this master planned for industrial, which we only really need the one I-2 use which is outdoor storage. And also one of the objectives of the Master Plan is to retain and support the growth of existing businesses, which clearly we are. There are two buildings, one building which is the major building here, and then there is this unique little outbuilding here in the back. We don't intend to use this outbuilding for collision storage, it's there and we're told that it has enough electrical power to it to power a small city. I don't know what they used it for, but that's why we're merely saying 'yeah we could use the rental income,' maybe we could put a small tool and dye shop. That's not core to our use up here.

In the northwest corner of the building, there's a small office which we don't intend to change. It would be perfect for a car rental business. Most auto dealerships today, if you take your car to get serviced, they'll have an Enterprise kiosk and they'll offer to rent you a car. That would be perfect for our use, people that take vehicles in for collision perhaps need to rent a car. As the Staff has said, no more than ten cars. That's all we're really talking about.

So we're going to clean this building up, the façade is approved. The front parking would be totally cleaned up, it has no landscaping so we would do all of that. We would do all the landscape islands in the front up here, that would all be there.

Mr. Landry said with respect to public benefit, your Traffic consultant has reported that our use would generate less traffic than many I-1 principle permitted uses. We're retaining a

30 year business, moving it from a busier intersection at Grand River and Haggerty, to this, which is closer to the freeway. We've offered to donate 10,000 dollars to the Grand River Improvement Authority, perhaps for any use they want or to fill in sidewalks anywhere in the City. This was the same public benefit that Hadley offered you when you approved a very similar PRO for Hadley. We've been working with the staff now for almost a year, I think we started last November. And we've come a long way. We've made many changes with the Staff, we've taken their concerns to heart. We need a few Landscape waivers. It really comes down to Landscaping, okay. And I want to address those and then I'll be happy to answer any questions.

The first waiver is actually a traffic waiver for raised parking lot end islands. Those are only in the rear portion where we will be storing the towed vehicles. The obvious reason is we have large tow trucks going in and out, towing vehicles and raised end islands with landscape and with trees hinders the traffic flow. When you approved Hadley's, you waived that. It's the very same reason. The other one is Landscaping; first of all, your Ordinance provides that when industrial abuts residential, you have to have a berm. Well, there's residential technically to the south. Although, as I pointed out, it's never going to be used as residential so I think that must be in mind. We're asking for a waiver of the berm, I believe that the administration has recommended that berm. But here's what we are doing. First of all, we're putting an eight foot fence around the entire back lot where these vehicles would be stored. And on the eight foot fence, we're putting solid screening. This fence line material is 98 percent blockage of sight, you're not going to be able to see anything in this rear because it's eight feet tall.

The other thing we're doing is putting a solid row of evergreen trees – this is industrial here – all along that side. On this southwest corner, there is natural woodland here. We are adding a number of trees there, so that this one residence up here on Taft Road will not be able to see into that. One of the sheets that you have, we showed a sight line for the resident from that area showing that you would not be able to see anything from that residence because of trees and because of the natural woodlands. There is a natural berm here, I don't think the City is taking issue with that. We've added five foot berm and eight foot evergreen trees here so that this one resident, 600 and some feet, which is not adjacent to our property, but it's over here. We've taken them into consideration and put these eight feet trees on top of a five foot or seven foot berm. We've also attached a sight line for these folks that they won't be able to see any of that. So we are asking for the berm waiver next to residential. That's one of the things we're asking for.

Mr. Landry said the second thing is the parking lot interior trees, for the same reason as the raised end islands. I think the big issue for us really is this notion of parking lot perimeter trees. The City is asking us, in addition to all these trees, to put additional trees around the parking lot and they want it to be deciduous. Deciduous trees drop leaves, branches, sap, and birds drop other things. We're going to have cars parked back here. Now the use is a little unique, because some vehicles remain in this location for some time. Somebody gets picked up for a DUI, their car gets towed here. It may take them 30 days to get here, they may be in jail. They argue 'oh my gosh, look what's on the hood of my car, my car didn't have this,' and you've got sap and leaves there. Often times, somebody gets in a collision and their vehicle gets towed here. They'll be working with the insurance company for 30 days, their car sits there for 30 days. We are unlike a car dealership; I think the Staff mentioned that it is required for car dealerships. Car dealerships wipe the snow off of their cars every single time it snows, they have people out there that are moving the cars

around, they're cleaning cars. These cars go back here and sit there until somebody picks them up or somebody gets a repair. We are not like a new car dealership. People often claim their car is damaged.

The other thing, unlike Hadley's, Hadley's doesn't have a collision shop – we do. All Hadley's did was want approval for a storage lot. We repair cars, a lot of folks will come with very high end cars. We have paint booths in there, we paint cars. We paint a Mercedes Benz and bring it back here, nobody is going to want sap or leaves falling on that Mercedes Benz or that high end car. So we would really ask that you waive the perimeter cooling trees, I think. And as far as the east is concerned, this is nothing but City regional stormwater detention on this side and there's a stormwater pond up here actually installed right there.

Mr. Landry said so in conclusion, it's consistent with the Master Plan in the sense of it's industrial. Maintaining a 30 year business. We're developing in a manner that we believe is more beneficial to the City than even some I-1 uses. We're offering a \$10,000 donation, and we're asking you to consider the uniqueness of this particular use and ask that you make a recommendation to the City Council to approve this rezoning to I-2 with a very limited I-2 use of storage and also technically to have a car rental it's a Special Land Use, I think in I-1. We need that. And tool and dye, I think, is the same way. Although we don't have any tenants for either of those, so who knows when we would actually be even moving that in there. But that is our request, I would be happy to stand by to answer any questions.

Chair Pehrson asked if there was anyone in the audience that wished to address the Planning Commission regarding this project. Seeing no one, he asked if there was any correspondence.

Member Lynch said yes, we have one correspondence. A response from KJ Albers, 45283-45295 Grand River Avenue, and his primary concern is the environmental concern with having 160 towed vehicles and not knowing how long the vehicles are going to be there.

Chair Pehrson closed the public hearing and turned it over to the Planning Commission for their discussion.

Member Maday said my biggest concern is the length of time that the cars will be stored on site. What is your average for customers when they have their vehicles towed? I just don't want it to end up looking like a junkyard.

Tim Herrington with Keford Towing said it's two or three days, on average. There's a process for impounded vehicles – they're actually notified after three days that their car is here, and then after twenty days they're notified that the car would be auctioned. So after thirty days, they can be auctioned. So usually within 30 to 45 days, they would be auctioned.

Member Maday said okay. The other thing, you actually made a really valid point about the deciduous trees. Any thought as to maybe putting some evergreens to replace the deciduous?

Mr. Landry said I don't think that serves the purpose of what the City wants. But like I said



before, we are doing evergreens all along the western side. We've already put evergreens along the natural woodland that exists there, and also on the southeast side along the berm there we've installed evergreen trees.

Landscape Architect Meader said the purpose of the deciduous canopy trees along the perimeter is to help cool the asphalt that's there. I know they're saying that it's different from Hadley's, but it is very similar. It's a big parking lot and we try to cool as much as possible. Ideally, the parking lot would have internal trees, too, to do the same thing. With Hadley's you didn't require them and I could see where you wouldn't in this case, I can't support that as the Landscape Architect but I can understand for the business. But the whole purpose is to help cool and shade the asphalt for the heat island effect. And evergreen trees wouldn't do that, and the screening and fencing wouldn't do that at all. That's what this is about.

Member Lynch said let me ask you a question about cooling the asphalt – who cares? I mean, really, who cares? You can't see it, right, so if the asphalt gets all damaged, who cares. My understanding of the reason for this request, and I'm playing devil's advocate here, but the reason for the request was because they're going to have tow trucks going back and forth. And tow trucks and islands don't get along. So by making this deviation and removing the islands, why would the City even care? I see that it's in the Ordinance and I understand the Ordinance if you have a shopping center where people are coming and going, you don't want the parking lots to look bad for someplace like Kroger where people are visiting all the time. Back here, nobody can see it. You've got an eight foot wall, you've got evergreen trees surrounding it, you can't see it from Grand River, and you can't see it from the residential properties around it. Who cares? I mean, really.

Landscape Architect Meader said, the interior islands - I can understand based on the use. And if you don't care about the heat island and potentially heating the area around it more than it would be throughout the day and night, it isn't an issue. But that's the purpose of the Ordinance.

Member Lynch said ok that's my question – so you get heat island there, and on all sides you've got industrial to the right, to the left, east and west. And then you've got residential that won't be developed as kind of a park, and you've got wetland area. I'm trying to get to the intent of the Ordinance for specific applications before we approve this deviation. In my opinion, this isn't visible, it isn't heavily traveled by customers like going to a shopping center. It's going to be used for towing. I don't see a reason for not granting the deviation.

Member Maday said I forgot to mention, the building that is unoccupied?

Mr. Landry said in the sense that there is no ongoing business, but it's jam-packed with industrial equipment.

Member Maday said I guess my question for the Staff, in the future if they decide to subcontract and lease it out, I'm assuming it has to go through all the proper channels through you guys and everything else and they're going to be restricted to what they can use. Although, I would guess with the zoning you're looking for, you're going to have freedom to do a lot.

City Planner McBeth said just for clarification, you mean the other existing building on the site?

Member Maday said yes.

City Planner McBeth said yes, we would be curious what the use is proposed in that other building on site, the one with all the electrical service provided. So we would like to know what the use would be and that would play into the parking calculations, maybe the noise standards, and various other concerns.

Chair Pehrson said so would one of the recommendations or part of the PRO be that subject use has to come back and be approved, regardless of whatever it might be in the future? Instead of debating here right now, because I don't think the applicant knows what it might be, as well.

City Attorney Schultz said I think the applicant is sort of contemplating any use within the district. Could the Planning Commission limit that or could we bring it back in the PRO Agreement? Sure, we can do that.

Member Avdoulos said just to tag on to that, it can also be an accessory building? They can separate it?

Chair Pehrson said yes.

Member Avdoulos said I commend the City and Rick for being diligent on some of these landscape requirements. They're in the Ordinance and they're there to serve a purpose and for the overall scheme of things, what we try to do for landscaping and different materials we use to limit the amount of heat islands we create that if compounded, it does make a difference. But as Member Lynch had indicated, when we're looking at a specific property and what we're looking to use it for, a business that has been in the City for many years and a good business at that. And looking to help enhance that environment and clean up the building, I think the design is helping it quite a bit. So I don't see an issue, I'd like to work with the applicants to have them then work with the City Council and come back to Planning Commission, so we have time to help pull this project through and have them continue on and contribute to the City as they have been doing. We really appreciate that.

Chair Pehrson said when this came in front of the Master Planning and Zoning Committee, I think we all recognize the value of tenure in the City and we don't to lose a tenant and a resident, and a good neighbor such as Keford Collision. I believe we can work through the language, as we have identified what we are suggesting here today. I, too, recognize the intent of the Ordinance, I'm not questioning that. But every decision we make has pro's and con's associated with it, and I can live with the fact that we can withhold the perimeter trees for this particular use. I don't see that as a major objection in my mind, at this point in time.

Member Greco said I'd like to reiterate everything said already, as I agree with the vast majority of comments regarding what we should do here. I'd like to make a motion.

Motion made by Member Greco and seconded by Member Avdoulos.

City Attorney Schultz said was the intention to codify the comments that the Chair made about bringing the use of the second building back to the Planning Commission for review and approval? We can add that the motion in an appropriate place if you were. That would be added as 2d., basically indicating that you're not approving any particular use for that second building and that any additional use would come back for review and approval from the Planning Commission.

Member Greco said yes that would be the intent of my motion to incorporate that.

Member Avdoulos agreed.

**ROLL CALL VOTE TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF REZONING MOTION MADE BY MEMBER GRECO AND SECONDED BY MEMBER AVDOULOS.**

In the matter of Keford Collision and Towing JZ 18-32 with Zoning Map Amendment 18.725, motion to recommend approval to the City Council to rezone the subject property from I-1 (Light Industrial) to I-2 (General Industrial) with a Planned Rezoning Overlay (PRO).

1. The recommendation shall include the following ordinance deviations for consideration by the City Council:
  - a. Planning deviation from Section 3.1.19.D for not meeting the minimum requirements for side yard setback for Parking (20 feet minimum required, 10.7 proposed in the northwest parking lot);
  - b. Landscape deviation from Section 5.5.3.A for not meeting the minimum requirements for a 10-15 foot tall landscaped berm or not providing the minimum required screening trees between residentially zoned property and industrial. A berm approximately 7 feet in height is proposed south of the southeast corner of the storage lot, but not along the entire southern frontage, nor at the southwestern corner of the property (not including the preserved woodland);
  - c. Landscape deviation from Section 5.5.3.C.ii and iii. for lack of interior canopy trees, in the southern portion of the vehicular storage area due to conflict with truck turning patterns. Landscape deviation from Section 5.5.3.C.iv for lack of parking lot perimeter trees along 400 feet of eastern edge of property due to lack of room between drive and adjacent property;
  - d. Landscape deviation from Section 5.5.3.C.iv to allow planting of parking lot perimeter trees, more than 15 feet of the vehicular storage area;
  - e. Landscape deviation from Section 5.5.3.D for the shortage of a total of 2980 square feet (37%) of required building foundation landscaping for the two buildings;
  - f. Landscape deviation from Section 5.5.3.D for allowing less than 75 percent of each building perimeter to be landscaped;
  - g. Landscape deviation from Section 5.5.3.D for the shortage of green scape along the building frontage facing Grand River (60% required, 54% proposed);
  - h. Landscape deviation from Section 5.5.3.C.ii.i. for the lack of landscape islands every 25 spaces within the enclosed outside storage yard due to the nature of the proposed use;
  - i. Traffic deviation from Section for proposing painted end islands in lieu of raised end islands.

2. If the City Council approves the rezoning, the Planning Commission recommends the following conditions be requirements of the Planned Rezoning Overlay Agreement:
  - a. Outside storage of vehicles shall be limited to 160 parking spaces only.
  - b. Minor modifications to the approved Planned Rezoning Overlay Concept Plan (PRO) can be approved administratively, upon determination by the City Planner, that the modifications are minor, do not deviate from the general intent of the approved PRO Concept plan and result in reduced impacts on the surrounding development and existing infrastructure.
  - c. Applicant shall comply with the conditions listed in the staff and consultant review letters.
  - d. Any proposed use of the existing building on the south side of the property would return to the Planning Commission for review.

This motion is made because

- a. The rezoning request fulfills one objective of the Master Plan for Land Use by supporting the growth of existing businesses.
- b. The rezoning is a reasonable alternative as the proposed use is less intense of uses that would be typically allowed under I-2 zoning.
- c. The rezoning will have no negative impact on public utilities.
- d. According to City's Traffic Consultant's report, the proposed Keford Towing and Collision land use would be expected to generate fewer trips than what could be built under the existing I-1 zoning, as well as fewer trips than could be expected for other permitted uses under the proposed I-2 zoning.
- e. City Council's determination that the proposed PRO rezoning would be in the public interest and the benefits to public of the proposed PRO rezoning would clearly outweigh the detriments.

*Motion carried 5-0.*

## MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION

### 1. CITY OF NOVI BOSCO PARK JSP 18-42

Consideration at the request of City of Novi for Planning Commission's approval of Preliminary Site Plan and Stormwater Management Plan. The subject property is currently zoned RA, Residential Acreage and is located in Section 20, west of Beck Road and south of Eleven Mile Avenue. The applicant is proposing to build a total 13 outdoor soccer fields of varied sizes with 298 parking spaces on site. The Planning Commission is asked to consider the location, character, and extent of the improvements proposed as a City park, per state law.

Planner Komaragiri said the subject property, as you mentioned, is located at the southwest corner of Eleven Mile and Beck Road. It is currently vacant and is owned by Novi Community School District. It is currently zoned Residential Acreage, RA, and is surrounded by a variety of residential uses zoned RA, R-1, R-3, and R-4. It is bordered by one single-family house and a funeral home under construction to the east, vacant residential land to the west, and a residential subdivision to the south. Publicly owned park and outdoor recreational facilities are permitted uses under the current zoning.

There are regulated wetlands and woodlands on the property, but no impacts are being proposed to those with the current improvements. The red boundary shown is just the part

of the parcel where the improvements are being proposed.

As stated in the applicant's response letter, the City Council approved a long-term use agreement with Novi Community School District at the May 21, 2018 meeting. The agreement allows the City to make improvements and maintain the land as public park, open for use by the general public and not for private operation. No indoor recreation is permitted and no permanent structures are allowed, except for any storage or maintenance structures agreed upon by the City and the school district. The applicant is now proposing to build a total of thirteen outdoor soccer fields of varied sizes. The site access is provided from Eleven Mile Road and Beck Road. The proposed parking lot and driveway improvements are proposed to be gravel pavement, except for the handicap parking spaces.

The site plan incorporates needs of the City for programming soccer, flag football, lacrosse, and cricket, while designating and delineating space for the Novi Community School District's storage buildings, trailer parking, and senior all-night party storage pods. It also retains access to the southern part of the property, per the school district's request.

Planner Komaragiri said for those uses not specifically mentioned, the requirements for off-street parking facilities shall be in accord with a use which the Planning Commission considers is similar in type. The applicant noted that the maximum number of soccer participants utilizing the fields at any given time is estimated at a maximum of 186. The site plan submitted includes 298 parking spaces. The amount of planned parking accommodates the need for spectators, officials, and staff. Most activities will take place from 6pm to dusk on weeknights and 8am to dusk on weekends. During the summer, activities may be held during weekdays, as well. The Planning Commission is asked to make a determination whether the proposed parking is appropriate for the site.

Typically, screening is not required between two residentially zoned properties. However, soccer fields to the northwest are located within 50 feet from the adjacent residential parcel and fields to the south are within 100 feet from the adjacent residential parcel. The applicant has agreed to work with our Landscape Architect to provide additional screening or maybe raise the height of the berm, as needed. The applicant has noted that there are no plans for permanent sound systems, speakers, and/or field lighting to be installed at this time.

Due to the current agreement with the school district, the site plan proposes gravel parking consistent with the parking in our ITC Park facility. The proposed paving material and lack of curb and gutter does not conform to the code and would require variance to be approved by Council. The nature of the facility and the agreement also warrants certain landscape waivers, which are included in the motion sheet.

The applicant also requests to waive the requirement for a Traffic Impact Study. The site plan proposes a taper lane along Eleven Mile and Beck Road entrances. A left turn passing lane is proposed near the Beck Road entrance. The City's consultant reviewed a Traffic Study last year when the funeral home was being proposed. Based on the proposed mitigation, the findings presented in the funeral home Traffic Impact Study (TIS) and the distance that the Bosco Park driveways are located from the Beck Road and Eleven Mile intersection, our Traffic consultant is supporting this waiver request.

Planner Komaragiri said the City is also planning on construction of a sidewalk along the south side of Eleven Mile Road, just west of the proposed driveway. A gravel pedestrian connection to that sidewalk from the site is also proposed. All reviewers are recommending approval. Rob Petty, our Chief Information Officer is here if you have any questions about the plans and so is Staff.

Rob Petty, representing the City of Novi, said Parks Director Muck was unable to be here this evening, so I am here in his place should you have any questions. Thank you.

Chair Pehrson turned it over to the Planning Commission for their consideration.

Member Lynch said Rick, what are the best trees for sound attenuation?

Landscape Architect Meader said probably evergreens.

Member Lynch said is there an adequate amount of evergreens between the residential and the fields?

Landscape Architect Meader said there could be more between the buildings set to the south and to the west.

Member Lynch said I think I agree with that recommendation. The second thing is, lighting and sound systems. It says not at this time. If at any time, they decide to put sound systems and lighting, does it have to come back to us? I would like it to come back to us.

Planner Komaragiri said I cannot speak for the applicant, I was paraphrasing the information provided in the response letter.

Member Lynch said so they can do whatever they want, basically.

City Attorney Schultz said a reminder that the Planning Commission's role is a little different. Sometimes you get a letter from our office when we have these City projects, but this is not a site plan review, even though we've kind of called it that. It's a review under the Planning Enabling Act and the Master Plan for location, character, and extent of the development, the public improvement. So it's a general overview.

Member Lynch said so you're saying it's just to meet some Ordinance.

City Attorney Schultz said it's a review under the Master Plan, not the Zoning Ordinance. Staff has compared it to the Zoning Ordinance, but it's a Master Plan overview.

Member Lynch said on the record, I'm not comfortable with allowing any kind of sound systems, lighting systems, deficiencies in sound attenuation in a residential area.

Member Maday said if it makes you feel better, they've never installed a sound system at all at ITC and honestly, if it's being used for that purpose, I don't see it. The lighting is a different story because if they decide to use the eleven fields at night, which is pretty likely eventually, I think they might need some lights. You did say there was a sidewalk along Eleven Mile?

Planner Komaragiri said they're proposing to build to the west of driveway, that connects to the ITC future Trail.

Member Maday said ok, that's what I was going to say.

Planner Komaragiri said yes, that was the intent.

Member Maday said the last thing, how did you guys calculate parking and that it was adequate? Because I know I fight all the time trying to find parking spots at soccer fields.

Planner Komaragiri said I think the number was provided by our Parks Director based on their existing facilities and the requirements based on their experiences.

Member Maday said ok, because I do know ITC lacks parking.

Member Greco said I'd like to make a motion.

Motion made by Member Greco and seconded by Member Maday.

**ROLL CALL VOTE TO APPROVE PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN MOTION MADE BY MEMBER GRECO AND SECONDED BY MEMBER MADAY.**

In the matter of City of Novi Bosco Park, JSP 18-42, motion to approve the Preliminary Site Plan based on and subject to the following landscape waivers and subject to City Council approval of Design and Constructions standard variances:

- a. Planning Commission finding based on Section 5.2.9. that the 298 proposed parking spaces for the proposed use are sufficient, as the use is not specifically mentioned in the requirements for off-street parking facilities of the zoning code;
- b. A Landscape waiver to permit a deficiency in required greenbelt plantings along Beck Road frontage as listed in Section 5.5.3.B.ii.f (12 large trees and 19 sub canopy trees are required, 22 large evergreens are provided), which is hereby granted;
- c. A Landscape waiver to permit a deficiency in required greenbelt plantings along Eleven Mile Road frontage as listed in Section 5.5.3.B.ii.f (10 large trees and 16 sub canopy trees are required, 14 large evergreens are provided), which is hereby granted;
- d. A Landscape waiver to permit the absence of the required Right of Way trees along Beck Road (13 street trees are required, 0 are provided) as listed in Section 5.5.3.B.ii.f, which is hereby granted;
- e. A Landscape waiver to permit the absence of the required Right of Way trees along Eleven Mile Road (11 street trees are required, 0 are provided) as listed in Section 5.5.3.B.ii.f, which is hereby granted;
- f. A Landscape waiver for exceeding the maximum number of contiguous spaces within a parking bay (15 maximum allowed) as listed in Section 5.5.3.C.ii.i, which is hereby granted;
- g. A Landscape waiver to permit the absence of required vehicular use area perimeter trees as listed in Section 5.5.3.C.iii Chart footnote, which is hereby granted;
- h. A Landscape waiver to permit the absence of required parking lot interior trees as listed in Section 5.5.3.C.iii, which is hereby granted;
- i. A Landscape waiver to permit the absence of required landscaped area within the parking lot end islands and interior islands to break up long parking bays as listed in Section 5.5.3.C.iii, which is hereby granted;

- j. City Council variance from Sec. 11-239(b)(1),(2)of Novi City Code for absence of hard surface for parking lot and driveway;
- k. City Council variance from Sec. 11-239(b)(1),(2)of Novi City Code for absence of curb and gutter for parking lot and driveway;
- l. City Council variance from Sec. 11-239(b)(3) of Novi City Code for absence of pavement markings and layout including end islands;
- m. City Council approval for lack of required Traffic Impact study based on existing conditions and proposed mitigation measures near Beck Road and Eleven Mile Road entrances;
- n. The findings of compliance with Ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters, and the conditions and items listed in those letters being addressed on the Final Site Plan.

This motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Article 3, Article 4 and Article 5 of the Zoning Ordinance and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance. *Motion carried 4-1 (Lynch).*

**ROLL CALL VOTE TO APPROVE STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN MOTION MADE BY MEMBER GRECO AND SECONDED BY MEMBER AVDOULOS.**

In the matter of City of Novi Bosco Park, JSP 18-42, motion to approve the Stormwater Management Plan, based on and subject to the findings of compliance with Ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters, and the conditions and items listed in those letters being addressed on the Final Site Plan. This motion is made because it otherwise in compliance with Chapter 11 of the Code of Ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance. *Motion carried 4-1 (Lynch).*

#### **SUPPLEMENTAL ISSUES**

City Planner McBeth said because of the Planning Commission calendar for the year, we have another meeting next week. So we look forward to seeing you here again next week.

#### **AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION**

Nobody in the audience wished to speak.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

Moved by Member Lynch and seconded by Member Avdoulos.

**VOICE VOTE ON THE MOTION TO ADJOURN MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER AVDOULOS.**

**Motion to adjourn the September 26, 2018 Planning Commission meeting. *Motion carried 5-0.***

The meeting was adjourned at 9:16 PM.