



PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES

CITY OF NOVI

Regular Meeting

December 9th, 2020 7:00 PM

Remote Meeting

(248) 347-0475

In accordance with Open Meetings Act, MCL 15.261, ET SEQ., as amended, this meeting was held remotely.

CALL TO ORDER

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

ROLL CALL

Present: Member Avdoulos, Member Becker, Member Lynch, Member Maday, Chair Pehrson

Absent: Member Dismondy, Member Ferrell

Staff: Barbara McBeth, City Planner; Lindsay Bell, Senior Planner; Christian Carroll, Planner; Madeleine Kopko, Planning Assistant; Rick Meader, Landscape Architect; Kate Richardson, Staff Engineer; Elizabeth Saarela, City Attorney

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Pehrson led the meeting attendees in the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Moved by Member Avdoulos and seconded by Member Maday.

VOICE VOTE TO APPROVE THE DECEMBER 9, 2020 PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA MOVED BY MEMBER AVDOULOS AND SECONDED BY MEMBER MADAY.

Motion to approve the December 9, 2020 Planning Commission Agenda. Motion carried 5-0.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

No one in the audience wished to speak.

CORRESPONDENCE

There was no correspondence.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

There were no committee reports.

CITY PLANNER REPORT

There was no City Planner report.

CONSENT AGENDA - REMOVALS AND APPROVALS

There was nothing on the Consent Agenda.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. VALENCIA ESTATES SOUTH LOT 55, PWD20-0011, WOODLAND USE PERMIT REQUEST

Public hearing at the request of M/I Homes for consideration of a request for a Woodland Use Permit at 47541 Villa Terrace Court. This property is also known as Lot 55, Valencia Estates South Subdivision, which is located south of Ten Mile Road, west of Beck Road in Section 29 of the City. The applicant is proposing to remove eleven (11) regulated woodland trees in order to provide additional useable outdoor space on the site.

Planner Carroll said before you there is a proposed Woodland Use Permit requested by M/I Homes. The proposal is to remove eleven regulated woodland trees from Lot 55 in Valencia Estates South and it's to provide additional useable outdoor space on the site. On the screen, you can see where the site is located. It's close to Ten Mile Road. The proposed removals are in the back-left portion of the property. It is zoned R-3, One-Family Residential, and the future land use is single family.

The City's Environmental Consultant reviewed the request and prepared a letter that was dated November 23, 2020. The review letter confirms that the applicant is proposing to remove eleven trees from a section of the city regulated woodland and they range in size from ten to twenty-seven inches DBH, diameter at breast height. They're located outside the approved building area for the subdivision and therefore require a Woodland Use Permit. The City Forester did go to the site and determine that none of the trees were deemed unsafe therefore all the credits would be required which is twenty-two. One other thing to note is that the proposed removals have no impact to the PRO Agreement or the previously approved revised Woodland Permit which was approved back in 2018 other than what is proposed for removal on Lot 55. Within the Environmental Consultant review there is some additional information regarding the overall status of the woodland permit, but it does not have any impact on the removals proposed for this lot. There is a recorded Conservation Easement that abuts the back portion of the property, but these removals are not located within that. Staff suggests that the Planning Commission approve the Woodland Use Permit and a suggested motion is provided in the memo. Representatives from M/I Homes and Seiber Keast Engineering are present on the call to answer any questions.

Scottie Celestini, Area Construction Manager at M/I Homes, said I appreciate the Planning Commission's time in addressing this matter. This is a very important obstacle that were trying to pursue for our customer. They're very excited about the home and are looking forward to their closing date in January. Let us know if there's anything we can do to keep things moving.

Chair Pehrson said this is a public hearing if anyone in the audience wishes to address the Planning Commission on this matter you may do so now. Seeing no one in the audience wished to speak, Chair Pehrson asked for the written correspondence.

Planning Assistant Kopko said there was one letter received from Dennis Kochanowski representing

M/I Homes in support of the project. Chair Pehrson closed the public hearing.

Member Avdoulos said based on what Christian presented and the fact that the proposed removals have no impacts to the previously approved Woodland Use Permit, it doesn't have impact on the recorded Planned Rezoning Overlay, and that the removals are not recorded within a Conservation Easement, I have no issues and would like to make a motion.

Motion made by Member Avdoulos and seconded by Member Maday.

In the matter of Valencia Estates South Lot 55 PWD20-0011 motion to approve Woodland Use Permit, PWD20-0011, for the removal of eleven regulated woodland trees within an area mapped as City Regulated Woodland on Lot 55 of the Valencia Estates South Subdivision for the reasons that the applicant wishes to use the space for recreation, decking, and a play area for the family. The approval is subject to payment for the Woodland Replacement Credits into the City's Tree Fund, and any other conditions as listed in the Environmental Consultant's review letter.

Member Lynch said you know how I feel about the City Tree Fund and it sounds like the applicant is willing to replace the trees on site, so I do agree with approving this, but I don't agree with just paying into the tree fund. I think the trees should remain on site. It looks like the applicant is willing to do it. Instead of writing a check, my opinion is that I'm willing to approve this if the trees can be replanted on site somewhere.

Member Becker said I went and looked at the site and some of the trees are really close to the back of the house. The packet said the intent for the removals was so it wasn't endangering the house and I would want to remove them too. I agree with it, whether he can plant them or put them in the tree fund. I think we should approve his request.

Member Maday said given the fact that it's not impacting the previous agreement and it's not impacting the easement, I'm okay with it. As to whether or not were requiring them to plant the trees back on the site I would prefer that, but I would not be willing to say no because of that.

Chair Pehrson said I'm in support of the motion as is.

ROLL CALL VOTE TO APPROVE REQUESTED WOODLAND PERMIT FOR VALENCIA ESTATES SOUTH LOT 55 PWD20-0011 MADE BY MEMBER AVDOULOS AND SECONDED BY MEMBER MADAY.

In the matter of Valencia Estates South Lot 55 PWD20-0011 motion to approve Woodland Use Permit, PWD20-0011, for the removal of eleven regulated woodland trees within an area mapped as City Regulated Woodland on Lot 55 of the Valencia Estates South Subdivision for the reasons that the applicant wishes to use the space for recreation, decking, and a play area for the family. The approval is subject to payment for the Woodland Replacement Credits into the City's Tree Fund, and any other conditions as listed in the Environmental Consultant's review letter. *Motion carried 5-0.*

MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION

1. THE BOND JSP 18-10

Consideration at the request of Bond at Novi LLC for JSP 18-10 for recommendation to the City Council for approval or denial of the revised Preliminary Site Plan and Storm Water Management Plan. The subject property is zoned TC-1 (Town Center One) and is approximately 7.74 acres. It is located west side of the recently renamed Bond Street in the

south west corner of Grand River Avenue and Novi Road in Section 22. The applicant previously received approval of the proposal of a mixed-use development with two four-story multi-family residential buildings with a total of 260 apartments and a single-story commercial building (5,578 SF). The current submittal makes revisions that will require modifications of some of the previously approved waivers.

Planner Bell said the subject property is located behind City Center Plaza between Flint Street, recently renamed Bond Street, and the railroad, West of Novi Road. The property is zoned Town Center-1 surrounded by the same on all sides except with Light Industrial on the south side across the railroad tracks. The Future Land Use map indicates similar uses for the subject property and surrounding parcels.

The subject property is approximately 7.74 acres and is located on the southwest side of the renamed Bond Street (formerly Flint Street). The applicant has proposed to redevelop the former Fendt Transit Mix Concrete Plant into a mixed-use development with two four-story multi-family residential buildings with 260-units and a single-story commercial building. The site improvements include a two-level parking structure on the railroad side, surface parking, site amenities such as a swimming pool, landscaped courtyards, and related landscape improvements. The Planning Commission recommended approval of the project in June of 2018, and City Council granted approval in July of 2018 with a development agreement to address the timing of construction activities.

With the current revised plan, the applicant is proposing to modify the previously approved façade material percentages, revise the western parking lot layout and access point, and make adjustments to the landscaping and screening walls. The parking lot changes are due to a portion of the Bond Street not being constructed at this time, so the access point has been moved to the west, which will provide access to Grand River through the City-owned parcel. City Council will need to agree to an easement to allow this access until the planned extension of Bond Street is completed. The revised site plan does not indicate significant changes to the building footprint or the site layout. The site plan is subject to all previous approved conditions and deviations.

Planner Bell continued to say the façade review notes that in general the buildings exhibit interesting massing and the creative use of materials and colors. The proposed revisions to the Section 9 Waiver for the materials are minor in nature and that the overall appearance of the building would not be significantly improved by strict application of the percentage listed in the Ordinance. The applicant has provided a façade board.

One of the previously approved landscape waivers also requires revision. The number of multifamily units on the ground floor increased in a previous submittal, which increases the number of multifamily trees required. However, the building footprint has not increased, and the applicant has placed as many trees as can fit on the property. Therefore, the revised waiver is supported by staff.

All reviews are recommending approval. The development is over 5 acres and is located in the TC-1 district. This would require City Council approval based on your recommendation.

The Planning Commission is asked to consider the proposed changes to the architectural materials and landscaping and is asked to make a recommendation to City Council to either approve or deny revised waivers. The applicants Albert Ludwig, Michael Horowitz, and John Woods are here with their design team if you have any questions for them.

Albert Ludwig, Applicant, said we are making very few changes to the plan as Lindsay mentioned. It got modified over the course of the last year and a half due to available materials and some additional market studies. It looks the same, feels the same, and has the same number of units. It has the same appearance from the road. With all these minor changes, which are not that many, it's

really going to be unnoticeable and I believe all your consultants agreed with it. We're just looking to move it forward to we can start building this thing in the spring.

Member Maday said I'm okay with the changes. The landscape worried me, but then I realized they just went from 49 to 57 units, but the building didn't change so I'm okay with that. I trust the façade consultant as far as what he says in terms of creativity and the use of it. Obviously, I'm okay with using city land to access the building on the north side given that they don't have any other option, so I'm in support of this.

Member Lynch said these are minor changes. The Section 9 Waiver is not a big deal. I agree with Member Maday about the footprint, it hasn't changed. I think the biggest obstacle is negotiating the agreement with the City, but I have no issue with these revisions.

Member Becker said this may have already been decided because you have been working on this since 2018, but when I went out and took a look at the site today the only thing I thought of was that there's 260 units and all you have servicing it to get to Grand River Avenue and Novi Road is Bond Street, which seems like it's going to be a heck of a bottleneck in the morning and evening rush hour time for a small road getting on to two major roads that are going to have the best traffic light flow. I'm not questioning what you've done, that was the first thing I thought of. For the little I know in the one-month I've been here everything was fine on what is being questioned to be approved.

Member Avdoulos said I think we went through this the last time this was brought forward, Member Becker. They had a traffic study done and made it available to us and it looked like everything was working out. We also had some of those concerns addressed. Who knows now with the way things are we may not have as much traffic with people working remotely and with flexible schedules coming in the future. It may change, but I feel confident about the project. I'm excited about it and would like to see it get started as the applicants do also. The changes are very minor, it hasn't really affected the project that much and our Façade Consultant indicated that he was okay with the materials being presented.

Chair Pehrson said I support the changes and I agree with everyone that they're minor. I look forward to this becoming reality.

Motion made by Member Avdoulos and seconded by Member Maday.

ROLL CALL VOTE TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO CITY COUNCIL FOR JSP18-10 THE BOND REVISED PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN APPROVAL MADE BY MEMBER AVDOULOS AND SECONDED BY MEMBER MADAY.

In the matter of The Bond JSP18-10, motion to recommend approval to City Council the Revised Preliminary Site Plan based on and subject to the following:

- 1. The previously approved waivers and Development Agreement granted by City Council and the approved variances granted by the Zoning Board of Appeals;**
- 2. The applicant will need to obtain an easement agreement with the City to grant access through the City's parcel from the vehicle entrance at the northwestern portion of the property to Grand River Avenue, including any access improvements that may be required.**
- 3. A revised section 9 waiver for the following deviations as the overall appearance of the building would not be significantly improved by strict application of the percentage listed in the Ordinance:**
 - a. not providing the minimum required brick (30% minimum required) on the east (17% proposed), north (24-28% proposed) and south (18% proposed) facades for Building 1 and 2;**

- b. exceeding the maximum allowed percentage of EIFS (25% maximum allowed) on all facades (proposed: East-54%, North-38-56%, South- 61% and West- 77%) for Building 1 and 2;
 - c. not providing the minimum required brick and stone (50% minimum required) for TC-1 district on all façades (proposed: East-26%, North-32%, South- 30% and West-23%) for Building 1 and 2;
 - d. the previously approved Section 9 waivers for the commercial building and parking garage remain unchanged
As the interesting massing and creative use of materials is not compromised by the proposed revisions as recommended by the City's façade consultant, and the proposed QCO Rusted Steel is similar to the previously approved Woodgrain metal material, which is hereby granted;
4. Revision of the landscape waiver from Sec 5.5.3.F.ii.b(1) for a deficiency in the number of total number multifamily unit trees provided (171 required, 129 provided) as the number of ground floor units has increased but the building footprint has not changed and the site is otherwise well-landscaped;
 5. The findings of compliance with Ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters and the conditions and the 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 5-0.

Motion made by member Avdoulos and seconded by Member Maday.

ROLL CALL VOTE TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO CITY COUNCIL FOR JSP18-10 THE BOND REVISED STORM WATER MANAGEMENT PLAN MADE BY MEMBER AVDOULOS AND SECONDED BY MEMBER MADAY.

In the matter of The Bond JSP18-10, motion to recommend approval to the City Council of the Revised 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.*

2. INTRODUCTION TO TEXT AMENDMENT – RESIDENTIAL USE IN THE PD-2 OPTION

Set public hearing for Text Amendment 18.295 to update Section 3.31, Planned Development Options, to allow stand-alone multiple family residential use in the PD-2, Planned Development Option for eligible properties in the RC Regional Center District, as indicated in the City of Novi Master Plan for Land Use.

Planner Bell said even before the coronavirus hit earlier this year, shopping malls in the United States were facing troubling times. On a national scale, demand for retail space has experienced a sharp decline as customers increasingly shop at on-line retailers or spend more at discount stores. The trend of big-name national retail chains filing for bankruptcy has been growing faster over time. In 2018 there were seventeen retail bankruptcies, followed by twenty-three in 2019. According to Forbes, thirty-two national retailers have filed to date in 2020, and they predict that 2021 could be another big year of closures. Last fall, it was estimated that as many as 300 enclosed U.S. malls are likely to close in the next half decade. All this upheaval in retail has led communities across the nation to begin to reimagine their malls and what is permitted in and around them.

Taking that into account, City administration and staff began discussions in 2019 to brainstorm how to address and counter-act the downward trends in retail demand and give new life to those areas that have a high concentration of retail uses, primarily the Regional Center (RC) and Town Center (TC) Districts. In late 2019 and early 2020 staff met with four of the property owners/managers of the largest retail centers and exchanged some thoughts on how the retail uses could be supported into the future. Our aim ultimately is to be proactive in planning for the future of the RC district, and make changes that will help modernize, maintain and enhance the strength of this regional destination and other nearby shopping centers.

One idea that was discussed and is now being presented is to allow stand-alone, high-density multiple family (MF) uses in the RC District. Currently only some areas on the periphery of the RC district allow residential use, but only as a component of a mixed-use development. The issue developers have encountered with the mixed-use requirement is there is already a massive amount of retail space available in close proximity, namely the Twelve Oaks Mall and West Oaks shopping center. Adding additional retail space is not only unnecessary, in some cases deed restrictions on the land prohibit establishments that would compete with mall tenants, which significantly narrows the type of retail options. Staff has also heard from many developers over the years that it is difficult to finance mixed-use buildings as the sources and requirements for the loans can be vastly different.

Generally, the uses permitted by right in the RC District include regional and community shopping centers, professional and medical offices, financial institutions, facilities for human care, personal service establishments, publicly owned & operated parks, parkways and outdoor recreational facilities, and hotels. Other uses that have been discussed and that staff is considering adding or clarifying are permitted uses within the RC District: grocery stores, community centers, daycares, parking decks, open space/plazas walking trails, outdoor entertainment and recreation, and outdoor markets or pop-up events. These could be uses permitted as of right in the RC District, or as a Special Land Use and/or Overlay District. These and other concepts would benefit from a deeper study during the Master Plan Review that is anticipated to begin after July 1, 2021.

Planner Bell continued to say as designated in the Master Plan for Land Use, certain areas on the periphery of the RC District are granted additional development flexibility known as Planned Development Options, or the PD-1 and PD-2 Options. In the Master Plan for Land Use, the area north of I-96, south of Twelve Mile Road, east of Cabaret Drive, west of and including the Twelve Oaks Mall area is designated as Regional Commercial. The PD-2 option is generally indicated for the properties north of the Twelve Oaks Mall ring road along Twelve Mile, the Chic-fil-A property, the West Oaks II development north of West Oaks Drive, and the southern area of West Oaks I north of Fountain Walk Drive, east of Donelson Drive. Outside the RC District, adjacent to the PD-2 areas are planned for Community Office, Cemetery, Educational Facility (MSU's Tollgate Farm), Office Research Development Technology, and PD-1 (Planned Development Option 1).

The PD-2 Option is "intended to encourage development of intensive major non-residential land use types and transitional mixed-use buildings with residential components land use types not otherwise permitted in the RC district." Specifically, the following are permitted: convention centers including hotels, places of assembly and accessory uses, planned commercial centers containing over 150,000 square feet of leasable area, entertainment centers such as theaters, health clubs, racquet clubs and indoor recreation centers, banquet halls, sit-down and fast-food restaurants (with conditions), office buildings for executive, administrative, professional and similar uses, retail commercial uses if on below grade floors, ground floor or ground floor mezzanine only, mixed use buildings with residential components on properties adjacent to a use or zoning district other than RC (with conditions).

Site plan applications for development projects under the PD-2 Option are reviewed by the Planning Commission for recommendation made to City Council. City Council, as part of the approval of the

Preliminary Site Plan, is authorized to grant deviations from the strict terms of the zoning ordinance, as well as attach reasonable conditions to the approval.

For the time-being, given there is interest in the short-term for development of Multiple Family uses, staff is suggesting that the Planning Commission and City Council consider adding stand-alone Multiple Family residential to the PD-2 Option. Recent discussions with Singh Development have indicated that several of the mall out-lots may be appropriate for higher density, urban-style living. If approved, Multiple Family residential would join existing residential uses around Twelve Oaks, including Walton Wood, and the Enclave condominiums, which developed under the RM-1 District about 30 years ago.

The text changes proposed would include a list of regulations for the multiple family use, including limits on density and building height. Many of the conditions reflect those that are found in the RM-2 and Town Center districts related to multiple family uses. The Planning Commission is asked to provide direction to staff on the proposed amendment and to consider setting a Public Hearing for an upcoming Planning Commission meeting. At that time, the Commission will hold the public hearing, consider the proposed text and forward a recommendation to the City Council. In the meantime, Staff plans to share the proposed text amendment with other property owners in the affected area to seek feedback.

Member Avdoulos said I appreciate we're looking at this and understanding that pre-COVID there were concerns with large retail and how that was being affected by consumer demand, one being more consumers shopping online and two, consumers looking to support smaller local businesses as much as possible so it's kind of changing the dynamic. I've been fortunate to travel to different parts of the country for different projects and it's interesting where I stay in places like Iowa, Nebraska, and even in Ohio where they have the hotels near shopping areas and hospitals near retail areas and you look around and there's a lot of residential type construction similar to what The Bond is doing here in Novi. We've got a big development that's happening in Livonia by Costco on Haggerty Road which I think is similar to the Bond, but it looks much bigger, so I think if we look at providing flexibility for developers to be able to bring forward a viable product, I don't have an issue with that.

I think introducing what has been proposed would be helpful just to look at a lot of different things. That whole area by Twelve Oaks is congested. We must be cognitive of that and how traffic flows and how to get our services there. I think helping in providing some of that flexibility and getting the developers involved in discussing things would obviously be helpful and then just looking future forward making sure what we're looking at now is going to be able to sustain the test of time for a little bit longer. I just don't want to be reactionary, but I want to make sure we're providing some flexibility. Obviously, all these proposals and plans come to the Planning Department and then the Planning Commission and City Council review, similar to what we did with Sakura Novi and I thought that was a nice development for the city, so I think this is a good direction and again, involving the developers along with working with the Master Plan is going to be good for the City.

Member Becker said is it the intent to encourage or allow stand alone or multi-family buildings to be developed on the undeveloped property to the south and north sides of Twelve Oaks Mall or perhaps along the periphery's in the existing parking lot?

Planner Bell said at this point, it's all the PD-2 development areas. It's basically north of Walton Wood and then as you go across Twelve Mile Road to the west, all of that area in the hatched pattern of the map shown are all designated PD-2 eligible areas in the Master Plan as well as the conference area south of West Oaks II. Right now, those would be the properties that would be eligible if this Text Amendment would be adopted.

Member Becker said the briefing paper said there was substantial interest in the short-term development of multi-family uses as in more than just the Singh Corporation or are there others that are saying they would be interested if this were to be loosened up?

Planner Bell said right now it's just Singh. We have had interest in the past in areas that weren't necessarily in PD-2, but on the periphery. We haven't worked with them recently, but yes, there has been interest in multi-family in other locations in the City as well.

Member Becker said when you said staff was looking into other uses that might be able to be clarified in the PD-2 option, you included Community Center, which I know Novi has been looking to find a home and build something like that so is that part of the consideration for a possible site for the Community Center? If so, if you changed that wording would that allow us to go ahead and use that as a potential option?

Planner Bell said it was just on the list when we were brainstorming and of course back interest in doing Community Center was on our minds, but I don't know that anyone is seriously pursuing that right now at the mall. We were just brainstorming different uses that might bring a population there that would then utilize those other uses as well. I think that this list would just need to be studied more when we look at the bigger Master Plan option in that whole process.

Member Becker said it seemed to me if a mall is begging and dying for increased foot traffic and potential shoppers, they may appreciate high density, urban type multi-family developments there practically on-site for them to become potential shoppers instead of purchasing something online so I think this would actually do a couple of good things for us.

Member Lynch said I thought this was a plan for the whole property as if the mall were to completely go away. Is that what you were looking into or is this just the periphery of the mall property?

Planner Bell said this would be specific to the periphery where those PD-2 option properties indicated on the Master Plan right now which is sort of the surrounding area. When we met with Taubman and they assured us that they have higher occupancy rates than many of the regional malls in the area and we are a strong mall. Of course, this was pre-COVID so I don't know how things have changed.

Member Lynch said I don't know that COVID has anything to do with that. I think Amazon is the biggest threat. If you look at what's going on with the malls there was vacant space. It wasn't COVID, it didn't help the matter, I understand that. That's a short-term thing. The trend has been there. I think that if you start looking at some of the malls in the area that are starting to shut down, but Taubman I know got rid of this property, didn't they sell it to Simon?

Chair Pehrson said I don't think it went through.

Member Lynch said so actually what you're talking about in this letter for multiple proposals in the periphery area, right?

Planner Bell said that is correct. It would be specific to the PD-2 option which is allowed on specific properties.

Member Lynch said yes, we have some density and multi-family property there. I don't see any of this being an issue.

Member Maday said do all the incremental tax benefits that we get from these multi-family residential units, offset the incremental services that are going to be required like traffic, schools, police and fire?

I used to think if they're paying taxes and we can afford to hire more police and fire then we can do that, I don't know if I'm being naïve and I just was curious to know your thoughts on that.

City Planner McBeth I think this is something the Planning Commission has talked about over many years and there are various studies out there that indicate that different land uses require different quantities that are more intense public services in terms of police or fire, water, sewer and utilities, or additional road improvements that may be needed, and things like that. It's hard to balance it out and say which land use would require more public services than others because they're in different categories, but I think what I was trying to say last time was that I think it's good for the planners and Planning Commission to look at the land uses as a whole. Does that land use that were talking about seem to fit in that area in this zoning district and with the special conditions that are being indicated or does it not make sense for that to be there? The taxes can get very complicated and the land use costs for the city and the schools can get very complicated in terms of decision making like this. I think it's better for the Planning Commission to look at it as a whole and not just divide it into a tax issue or not. That's my opinion, I don't know if any of the Commissioners have a different opinion on that.

Member Maday said to me it's obvious that this would be a good use for the property based on the fact that nobody wants it next to their residential subdivision. I also like what Member Becker said about adding foot traffic to the mall which could stop any potential store closings. If we are looking at it from that perspective than it makes sense to me.

Chair Pehrson said I think I would like to see this expanded a little further, not just around Twelve Oaks Mall. If you consider what's going on with Art Van, which was a large building across the street, Value City Furniture has now moved in, so we have an opening back in West Oaks. Everyone wants to be near the roadway, and everyone wants visibility. I think we need to look at this regionally around that whole area for the PD-2 option. I agree with Member Lynch that this is an Amazon issue and not a COVID issue. What I would like to understand more is the anchor store buildings at Twelve Oaks. Sears owns their portion of the store and JCPenney owns that piece of property, it's not Taubman or whoever owns the mall so if this might be a holistic approach to what happens if Sears never gets reinvented. What's the proper use to have a Sears Holdings or whoever owns a Kmart to knock that down and want to find a facility for office space or some other kind of occupancy that could co-locate?

If anyone's been down to Fairlane Mall recently, Ford is revamping some of their engineering facilities over on Rotunda Drive. They've taken over several of the larger anchor stores at Fairlane Mall and turned them into office spaces which seem like a reasonable use for a big open area. Again, with COVID and working from home who knows what that means, but I think in general my comments would be to look at this in that entire region and open up some other opportunities that might take place.

Member Avdoulos I do agree with a lot of the comments. I think the City and the Planning Department has been really good about bringing forward these potential projects. We keep going at it step by step to make sure it's the right thing so I really appreciate the ability to be flexible.

Motion made by Member Avdoulos seconded by Member Maday.

ROLL CALL VOTE TO SET A PUBLIC HEARING FOR TEXT AMENDMENT 18.295 RESIDENTIAL USE IN THE PD-2 OPTION FOR AN UPCOMING PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING TO DISCUSS AND PROPOSE A RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL MADE BY MEMBER AVDOULOS AND SECONDED BY MEMBER MADAY.

Motion to set a public hearing for Text Amendment 18.295 Residential Use in the PD-2 Option

for an upcoming Planning Commission Meeting. *Motion carried 5-0.*

3. **APPROVAL OF THE NOVEMBER 18, 2020 PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES.**

Motion made by Member Avdoulos and Member Maday.

ROLL CALL VOTE TO APPROVE THE NOVEMBER 18, 2020 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES MADE BY MEMBER AVDOULOS AND SECONDED BY MEMBER MADAY.

Motion to approve the November 18, 2020 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes. *Motion carried 5-0.*

SUPPLEMENTAL ISSUES

There were no supplemental issues.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

Seeing no one wished to speak, Chair Pehrson closed the audience participation.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn made by Member Lynch and seconded by Member Avdoulos.

Motion to adjourn the December 9th Planning Commission meeting. *Motion carried 5-0.*

The meeting was adjourned at 7:53 pm.