



PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

CITY OF NOVI

Regular Meeting

DECEMBER 10, 2014 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 or about 7:00 PM.

ROLL CALL

Present: Member Baratta, Member Giacobetti, Member Greco, Member Lynch, Chair Pehrson, Member Zuchlewski

Absent: Member Anthony (excused)

Also Present: Barbara McBeth, Community Development Deputy Director; Kristen Kapelanski, Planner; Sri Komaragiri, Planner; Jeremy Miller, Staff Engineer; Tom Schultz, City Attorney

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Moved by Member Greco and seconded by Member Baratta:

VOICE VOTE ON THE AGENDA APPROVAL MOTION MADE BY MEMBER GRECO AND SECONDED BY MEMBER BARATTA:

Motion to approve the December 10, 2014 Planning Commission Agenda. *Motion carried 6-0.*

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

No one in the audience wished to speak.

CORRESPONDENCE

There was no Correspondence.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

There were no Committee Reports.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPUTY DIRECTOR REPORT

Community Development Deputy Director McBeth said I just wanted to report a couple of items that might be of interest to the Planning Commission as they have recently been presented at the City Council meeting. The first reading of the Clearzoning zoning ordinance reformatting was approved and will be continuing for a second reading. Also the City Council approved the rezoning request with planned rezoning overlay for Toll Brothers for the property that's east of Novi Road and South of Ten Mile Road. So we'll expect that the attorney's office will be working with the applicant on developing a Planned Rezoning Overlay Agreement and the preliminary site plan will return to the Planning Commission.

CONSENT AGENDA - REMOVALS AND APPROVAL

There were no Consent Agenda items.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. ZONING ORDINANCE TEXT AMENDMENT 18.273

Public hearing for the Planning Commission's recommendation to City Council for an ordinance to amend Ordinance No. 97-18 as amended, the City of Novi Zoning Ordinance at Article 4, R-1 through R-4 One-Family Residential Districts, Section 402, Principal Uses Permitted Subject to Special Conditions in order to allow additional height for places of worship.

Planner Kapelanski said the City has received a proposed text amendment to allow for additional building height of up to 65 feet for places of worship. Staff is generally in support of the proposed amendment with some minor revisions to the conditions noted in the suggested text which the applicant has agreed to. The Planning Commission set the public hearing for the proposed amendment on October 22, 2014. The Planning Commission is asked to hold the public hearing and make a recommendation to the City Council regarding the proposed amendment.

Gary Jonna, representing Brightmoore Christian Church, said in a moment I'll ask our architect to make a very brief presentation but I just wanted to note for the record that at the recommendation of staff we did speak to our neighbors, both Fox Run and Lenox Park, and we communicated with them that if they had not known that we were requesting a public hearing on this matter that we wanted to make them fully aware of it. So we made contact with them and they were both very supportive of our petition. So with that, I would like Brian Cane from Progressive AE to make a brief architectural presentation.

Brian Cane said I think the last time we were here we put together some ideas of sections and understanding of large places of worship. The early trend in designing places of worship was that larger places of worship would have balconies and catwalks because it's theatrical in nature. Catwalks allow you to go up and adjust lights and adjust speakers and it starts to give you a certain sectional quality. One of the things that we've been doing in practice is that when you get into the range of about 1800 to 2500 in seats, instead of going with the balcony we've been doing what we call the lower bowl and stadium style seating. So what that does is help us with the height and the idea of intimacy. The reason you have the lower stadium style is that the depth from stage platform to the back of seating, we're trying to minimize that. So here's a couple things that that does. It helps us with the idea of section and intimacy but what it also requires is that you're entering at a midlevel so when you come in you're at the center point so when you turn around behind would be stadium seats and in front of you would be those lower soft rake, as they call it, and a stage.

So the reason that I'm bringing that up as part of a section is because the buildings are pushed into the ground but they're pushed into the ground to the level of the platform. So when you start looking at long spans, you're starting to get a building that has a structural footprint of about 10 to 15 feet in height, you have catwalks and the idea of elevated seating. Our experience has been that when communities allow worship within certain areas they have a zoning ordinance that supports the further you bring the building from the setback the more height you can establish. I guess in a nutshell that's really the thesis behind it and the package

that you have there is really for information of what contributes to the height of a building of this nature.

Mr. Jonna said also in your package you also saw some comparables from both Southfield and Troy. Just note that our church was located in Southfield until we moved to Novi and Southfield allows 55 feet and they don't really set a acreage size. So in this case I think it's important to note that we've narrowed this petitioner proposed amendment to be on a size of 30 acres or more. And really what that's about is a demographic trend. Novi has been growing dynamically over the years, as you know. So as the population grows then you have places of worship that you can establish that can support major campus developments. So thus population is driving it. In a community of 10,000-15,000, you may not see churches like this but since Novi is 55,000-65,000 in population you can see the necessity of this structure. Another point to note, during the calculations it would require any front, rear or side yard setback to be a minimum of 135 feet from any property line. Southfield and Troy generally allow one foot of additional height for one foot of additional setback. In this, we've increased that by 50% indicating that it would be one and a half feet for every additional 1 foot of setback. So in summary, if churches are going to be an allowed use in an R-1 to an R-4 district that you need to provide a modern ordinance to recognize that larger campuses of worship sanctuaries of 2,000 seats or more cannot be accommodated under the current zoning ordinance. So I'm happy to answer any questions and Brian is available as well.

Chair Pehrson opened the public hearing. No one wished to speak and there was no correspondence and Chair Pehrson closed the public hearing.

Member Giacometti said first I have a question for Mr. Cane. I appreciate you explaining the design philosophy; it was really interesting. I guess when I looked at these plans, I thought this concept could be achieved if you built down, meaning you walked into the church and instead of going up, that the structure was below ground and then you'd have plenty of space for the catwalks and lighting which seems to really put you over the edge in terms of exceeding the height. Now was that ever a consideration?

Mr. Cane said I alluded to that and I'll tell you the design difficulties and hardships that it puts on communities that we're working with. So what would happen with that is its two points of access that would become very difficult. Barrier free access would be very difficult because having a lower bowl and an upper bowl when you come into the middle the slope from the part where you come in to the stage that's a barrier free slope so from that point down to the stage, everybody could have access. If you would start from the back and try to go to the front, you wouldn't be able to maintain that barrier free access. The idea of how high the stage would have to get from the view point in the back, you would have to maintain a stage of six to seven feet in height so the individuals in the back would be able to have a good view point. The other thing that works really well about having the stage or the platform at the level by not submerging it is having vehicular access. Part of what happens is it's a performance based environment and that's going on actually right now. They're putting on a wonderful Christmas performance and there's a stage set. So to be able to get product up on the stage, you would have a lengthy truck duck to get down to the level where the stage is if you would submerge that substantially into the ground. So we looked at that and we have looked at that in the past but for barrier free access it really makes it simpler doing it this way.

Member Giacometti said a key component of service at the church seems to be performance space.

Mr. Cane said that is correct. Think if this was stadium seating from that point up and we entered from the back, trying to have access down to this level would be extremely difficult. If our entrance was right at the point where the door is and then you can have your access down and turned around and had the stadium seating, it really works out planning wise that there's a lot of equality when it comes to that.

Member Giacometti said I just have some other general comments; this is mostly to share with commission members. In your overview there were a few statements made, one in terms of where places of worship are heading and the other suggestion that we need to consider modernizing the ordinance. I agree with you but I think you're going the other direction, which is large places of worship are heading in this direction where they're getting bigger and bigger. I think the commission and ultimately the City Council has to consider whether or not residential is appropriate zoning for places of worship over a certain size. I went back and I looked up some history of how places of worship came to be a permissible use in residential districts and if you go back to the 1930's when zoning ordinances started to develop, it was to promote walkability. Not everyone owned a car so they could walk to church. Modernizing the ordinances, I don't suspect as many people walk to church as they once did so that's one. Secondly, I'm concerned that the ordinance change would encourage more development of large structures in residential districts. The setback is a great suggestion in terms of no one's house or property line having something towering over it but then it also requires a larger campus. The City Master Plan is really designed to accomplish a lot of things. One of them is to provide as much residential development as we can which has an impact on our tax base as we move forward. So I think for me its two things. One, I do think it's time to modernize but I think the modernization should be to encourage large places of worship to build in zones that are more appropriate. I would love to see this project take place in a distressed area of Grand River. I mean you can go as high as you want. In a residential neighborhood I have a problem with it. Also, it's not this project, I think this project is great but I'm just concerned with the size of these buildings located in neighborhoods. Its traffic concerns, the character of the neighborhood, the amount of space the campus needs to be. Those are my concerns of why I'm inclined to recommend denial to City Council. I just don't feel like it's in keeping with the intent of ordinance in terms of permitting places of worship in residential zones. I feel like it's contrary to the intent of the master plan to maximize residential area and develop a tax base that can support the city as it builds out.

Member Lynch said I think I've been through this before and if you go back through history it's exactly right. The church is in a residential area, based on what I could find, so that people could walk to them. But now the law is a permissible use for a place of worship is a residential area. So we can't go back and disallow them to be in residential areas because I absolutely agree with you. When they first started, churches in residential areas were small and the people within less than a mile would walk to that church. I do agree with Commissioner Giacometti that I don't feel that megachurches should be in a residential area. However, the law is that it is an allowed use. So theoretically, I'm not in favor of megachurches in a residential area, however I will support what the proposal is by staff mainly because we're bound by the law and this is the best of what we can do in accordance with the ordinance to minimize the impact in a residential area.

City Attorney Schultz said churches are a permitted use in a residential district under the zoning ordinance and have been for a long time, but not necessarily to be confused with federal law pertaining to religious land uses. I'm not sure if that's what you're referring to but we allow churches in residential areas but at this point they're limited in size. So you aren't obligated to allow the change that's being proposed just because it's a church.

Member Lynch said well that is my concern.

City Attorney Schultz said just because it's a church doesn't mean that you have to enact a legislative ordinance to raise the height on it. Anybody can seek a variance. The height of a building is really specific to the district.

Member Lynch said I thought I'd be breaking the law; I certainly don't want to do that. In that case, I don't want to see them getting any bigger.

Mr. Cane said regardless of the height conversation, I want to address the history of churches in residential areas. I think what is quite wonderful about campuses is that they are a community asset and a part of town square. There is a public realm that was outside the building and that public realm was a place for the community to come together and it was typically open space or a park. When I say public realm, that's what I mean by it is a park. I wouldn't be nervous of, as you put it, megachurches or large campuses because those large campuses are really quite wonderful assets to the community because what they allow for is open space for the community to use and that becomes one of those intersections between the church place and community place that they can come together and use. It can be part of your park system. So I think those are some things to think about when you think about a large campus and the history of a church being a place that was walkable. Of course our society has changed; we're car centric and the larger they get, you can't walk 2,000 people to a certain destination but I think what they are are great community assets when it comes to open space. So that was the piece that I wanted to add.

Member Lynch said that's a good credible argument; I do agree. I guess I probably haven't done as much detailed research on this particular text ordinance. It has to be a certain size, 30 acres, which is quite substantial. I guess I'll listen to the rest of my commissioners. It's a dilemma. I do like the idea; I just don't think it's appropriate. I mean I think that's where we're headed, to these larger congregations and the issue is should it be in residential or another type.

Mr. Cane said look at it as a community asset. It does have public space for the community to use.

Member Baratta asked Planner Kapelanski if there are three places in Novi where we can have this size of facility. Is that a fair reading of this proposal?

Planner Kapelanski said yes that's what the map in the packet indicates.

Member Baratta said so we've limited it to only three places.

Planner Kapelanski said two really. One of the parcels is 27 acres so if they were to acquire some additional land then that would be eligible as well.

Member Baratta said so on the west of this proposed facility you've got a multi-store apartment complex. Is it four or five stories?

Planner Kapelanski said I believe they do have some buildings that are five stories.

Member Baratta said so we've got five stories on the west. You've got Thirteen Mile Road, which is a good east-west connector, south of it. Then you've got the M-5 connector to the east of it. So really what we've got is a highway visible site here. This isn't a typical residential

neighborhood where you would see that small place of worship. You've got a proposed five to six foot high building. How far is the closest point of that building to the M-5 connector? Is it four or five hundred feet?

Mr. Cane said probably over 1,000 feet.

Member Baratta said so you're a long way from M-5 and it's not on the building side of Thirteen Mile Road, it's behind it. So maybe that's another couple thousand feet. So we basically have an area there that's a long way from M-5 and Thirteen Mile. You've got a multi-story apartment complex to the west. So we're not talking about you're local neighborhood, that's number one. Initially when this proposal came up I was against it, to be honest with you, and I didn't think it should be in a residential neighborhood either. Then I got to think about it and I looked at the sight and saw precisely where it was located and I concluded that it might have been zoned residential and maybe that's not the correct zoning for it in the ordinance because it's truly not a residential area like we think it is. So I don't think I'm opposed to granting what they're looking for in this instance. The question that I have is is there any feature on or appendage to the building higher than the 65 feet? Maybe like the cross?

Mr. Cane said it has not be established yet what that height will be. We were showing that as part of a capital campaign package and the cross is a request by our client.

Mr. Jonna said let me answer that very specifically. It would be no higher than 65 feet.

Member Baratta said ok so everything is capped at that height. Ok so the way that the ordinance is written is would everything be capped including the appendages at the 65 foot mark?

Planner Kapelanski said I believe that if it's attached to the building it would be capped at 65 feet unless they were to seek some sort of variance.

Deputy Director Barb McBeth said I'm sorry if I might add also, there is a provision in the ordinance for steeples and the height of steeples can be determined by the Zoning Board of Appeals. So if a church were to come in with something taller than that that would be permitted by the ZBA.

Member Baratta said so if there was a cross that's higher, that would go to the ZBA.

Deputy Director McBeth said the cross that was shown on the drawings, we were talking to Mr. Jonna about that for some time, we're not sure if that's interpreted the same as a steeple or if that's something that would be different than that. So we appreciate the concern about it being 65 feet or less.

Member Greco said I have a couple of questions and comments. First of all, I really like the way the project looks. I think it looks excellent. The explanation that you've given for the churches and the presentation all make sense and I think it all makes sense maybe for this spot right here but I do have a couple of concerns and comments. Number one is with big campuses like this, with buildings that look like this, as appealing as it is, I really don't see it as an extension of a community area. It more so looks like a corporate park. It may look very nice with a steeple and I'm sure for Christmas it's going to look gorgeous but I don't think it really is an extension of our parks for people to you. I mean the people who worship at the church may use it but I don't really see that as a plus.

Mr. Jonna said we have athletic fields so we draw lots of different teams from all communities to our athletic fields. We have many special events throughout the year. We're going to have 10,000 people at our Christmas production from all over Novi and neighboring communities. We are very active in our community. We have car shows, things for youth, special events, and camps for underprivileged children. So there's a lot of community activity.

Member Greco said and my comments were not directed at the work that the church is doing or the outreach that it's doing, it's just that I think there's a difference between those activities and a community park. That's the only point I was making. But my biggest concern here, and we can ask our city attorney is, going through this text amendment process, this is one way for them to do this. Could they also seek a variance?

City Attorney Schultz said correct.

Member Greco said so this is an avenue that the applicant has taken to see if they can get their church in by way of this method which is changing the ordinance to just allow it. So this is the point that I'm looking at, when looking at our map at available spots that are here, I echo Member Baratta's points that he made that this looks like a good fit for this particular spot. I mean M-5 is right in front of it, you've got the apartment complex and residential to the north. It looks like a really good spot at 13 Mile and M-5. The other spots that this may be available for, don't look so good, particularly Oak Pointe Church. That is not near an M-5 type of access road. We may have plans in the future to do more with 10 Mile Road but that Oak Pointe area would not be something I'd be in favor of if we were looking at this project. So that being said, while I am certainly in favor of the project, and I'm going to withhold my opinion totally until I hear from anybody else if there are going to be any more comments, perhaps the text amendment is not the way for them to get this done. If this were the Oak Pointe at 10 Mile and Wixom Roads, I would not support it. For that reason, I'm not sure I'm going to support this and maybe direct the applicant to go apply for a variance because you're right, the spot that they're in looks good. That concludes my comments.

Member Baratta said with Mr. Greco's statements regarding Oak Pointe Church, I won't support it. I agree with your strategy, maybe this isn't the appropriate way of doing it. The project might look satisfactory but I certainly wouldn't want it expanded to Oak Pointe or Cross Pointe Meadows church.

Member Lynch said I think this is a great looking project and it's more philosophical that it's in a residential zone but when you physically go to 13 Mile where it's located, I agree with you. Either a variance or a rezoning of the parcel, which is certainly a lengthier process, would be a better idea. When you drive up and down 13 Mile Road, I think there's a lot of rezoning issues. We had a meeting just prior to this and we had a rezoning request to discuss. So I agree, I am not opposed to this project, I think it's more so the method of how we're going to do this.

Member Zuchlewski said I think after listening, initially I was in favor of the whole idea, but I think this particular site fits what you want to do. I think rather than set ourselves up for additional problems later a variance is in order. That's my comment.

Chair Pehrson said for my comments on the record, I'm in favor in the project as it stands with its zoning text amendment. Everything we try to do in a text amendment is consider the best case scenario and make allowances for the kinds of setbacks that we're trying to do to create the adequate buffer. Right now, I'm basing this solely on this particular site which, if it was residential

or light industrial, it doesn't matter to me at this point in time because it fits that particular area. Oak Pointe doesn't fit right now because it doesn't have the particular acreage that's required per this zoning text amendment. Cross Pointe Meadows could if they really wanted to. I think we've taken a look at what other communities do, which is typically what we do. We take a look at other communities to see what is valid in their ordinances and try to come up with the best of this. I respect your opinions of what happened in the 1930's, but we're not there. This is at least the 21st century. We drive to things. Churches are community points of access for a whole host of reasons like Mr. Jonna illustrated. I have no issue with this text amendment as it stands and for this particular reason, I'd be in support.

Mr. Cane said in dialogue when we were talking about the strategy of how we should go because I know you've talked about going through ZBA but why I'm giving our client a lot of kudos is that they were suggesting that the best way to go is the zoning text amendment because then it's not episodic. When we started analyzing it and looking at it, that's when we put in the documentation that we did because we think that it's logical to have this as a text amendment to accept large places of worship within your community. I also think the idea of having it as a larger site protects you from things that you're concerned about. So that's the reason we went this route.

Mr. Jonna said and the last thing I'll add is that other communities have, with sites as small as three acres, someone could go up to 65 feet if they meet the setbacks. I guess what I'm illustrating is that other communities that are in Oakland County that are of similar size or larger, have provided provisions that allow for modern places of worship. So we see this as more of a community issue. Everyone knows, my office is in Novi and 80% of my work is in Novi. I've been developing in this community for 25 years and I'm very committed to our church in this area. So I think it's incumbent upon the Planning Commission to honestly look at the ordinance and look at the population center they've become and look at what other communities are doing and allow something very practical which in this case is to allow a worship space to accommodate 2,000 or more. This height is needed. It's not for any other reason than for that assembly space for worship. In our case, we're a special use district and we're about 40 acres. Theoretically, if we could not get a zoning ordinance text amendment or were denied a variance, we basically can't grow anymore. Unless we can build and expand, we're really under a lot of pressure because our church is vibrant and attracting a lot of people and growing dynamically. So I understand that there may be other outlets to achieve this but this is really more of a 'd-day' for the Planning Commission to speak to a much longer term issue and we believe that we have presented in a compelling fashion and we've done it in a narrow basis only for large campuses.

Moved by Member Giacometti and seconded by Member Greco:

Motion to recommend denial to the City Council of Text Amendment 18.273.

Member Baratta said if the text amendment is modified to put in that there needs to be a frontage on a highway like M-5, to include a location like 10 Mile Road which is not a divided highway like M-5, would you still have your objections to text amendment?

Member Giacometti said yes I would. This is not about this project, this is about an ordinance change. This project is unique in that I think it's in a zone that maybe shouldn't be a residential zone. We would be modifying the ordinance to suite one instance. So I mean this is more about the procedure than the ordinance, not about this project. This is a great looking project and well done presentation but my recommendation is more about the method. We're not talking about this project, this project would benefit, but we're talking about the ordinance.

Member Baratta said I just have a question for you with that line of thinking. Would we then preclude any church from going in an R-1 or and R-4 if we changed this ordinance? That's one thing I want to make sure we stay away from.

Member Giacometti said no I think this really only addresses the size of the facility and this isn't size its height.

Member Baratta said it's not size, it's height. That's what we're talking about, 65 feet high.

Member Giacometti said this would just preclude places of worship from being that tall. This doesn't preclude a new house of worship being proposed for a residential zone, just at a height that is consistent with other buildings in the residential zone.

Member Baratta said the other comment I'd like to make then and apparently there's a lot of multiple family adjacent to this property and that's at least 60 feet high. It's five stories so it's already there.

Member Giacometti said and again that's this project. But future projects, this is the ordinance that would apply.

Member Baratta said see that's why I think a variance would work.

Member Giacometti said I'm not opposed to this project.

Member Greco said since I seconded the motion I'll respond to Member Baratta's questions. The answer is, if that were to be put into the ordinance, that type of text amendment that would further limit it and narrow it to areas where it's closer to a bigger road, that would probably change my opinion because that would narrow the sites down from three to one which is basically what we're talking about in essence. I think that if there were a change like that where it's near an M-5 road or another highway that would likely change my opinion.

Member Baratta said my point is when you have residential zoning that allows a place of worship we have a modification to that to allow for a higher elevation only with very specific instances where you have a very large piece of property. Logically it's still residential, it's still allowed in residential. We give it a little more height and we give it the setback requirements and amount of land and still have the capability of the traffic not being a problem because of the highway area. So I think there's some logical basis for modifying a residential ordinance in that regard.

Attorney Schultz said really it would be any residential property 30 acres in size. I mean it may not be worth it for a church to buy a 30 acre residential piece somewhere else in the city but theoretically we're not just talking about the places where existing churches are, it could be any assemblage of 30 acres or more.

Member Greco said really my previous comments were, and I don't think that that's a likely scenario, but the spirit of the Master Plan is to promote that these large parcels of residentially zoned districts are for the development of residential houses which supports the long term goals and long term sustainability planned for the city. I think this is a great project. I think it's in the wrong zone and I think that parcel is not properly zoned given its proximity to M-5. Maybe a variance is more appropriate. As council suggested really any parcel in the city, there's not just

three, could do this.

Member Baratta said but it still could be. The only question is can it be 65 foot high. And you could have a steeple that's 60 feet high.

Member Greco said I think a steeple is a different animal.

Deputy Director McBeth said with regard to proximity to the limited access freeways, there was a text amendment that went through a number of years ago to allow and encourage additional height for OST, Office Service Technology, properties that have certain proximities to M-5 or I-96 and a couple of projects have taken advantage of that. One of them was Harman Becker and ITC Headquarters. So I don't know if the Planning Commission is thinking along those lines, but if you're thinking certain projects within a certain proximity of the limited access freeway could have additional height given the certain circumstances. If that's something the Planning Commission would like for us to draft up and change, we can certainly take a look at that as well.

Chair Pehrson said I think that makes good sense.

ROLL CALL VOTE ON TEXT AMENDMENT 18.273 DENIAL MOTION MADE BY MEMBER GIACOPETTI AND SECONDED BY MEMBER GRECO:

Motion to recommend denial to the City Council of Text Amendment 18.273. *Motion carried 4-2.*

MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION

1. KIDNEY CENTERS OF MICHIGAN

Consideration at the request of Whitehall Real Estate Interests for approval of the Preliminary Site Plan and Stormwater Management Plan. The subject property is located in Section 17 of the City of Novi on the west side of Beck Road along Grand River Avenue in the OSC, Office Service Commercial District. The current submittal, Kidney Centers of America, includes a 7,621 square foot Dialysis area and 2,484 square foot Office space along with associated parking, loading and landscaping on a 1.89 acre site that will be under lease.

Planner Komaragiri said the applicant is proposing a development of approximately 10,000 square feet of a single story medical/office building. The subject property, Kidney Centers of America, will front on Providence Parkway, a private drive within Providence Park Hospital Campus. The Kidney Centers site would be split off from the larger parcel that currently exists and it will be leased. A wellness center and a restaurant will be part of their future development surrounding the current site. The property is surrounded by vacant land to the south and west, a storm water facility to the east and West Market Square on the opposite side of Grand River Avenue Road to the north. The subject property is zoned OSC, Office Service Commercial and is bordered by OSC on all sides. The area on the opposite side of Grand River Ave is zoned B-2, Community Business district. The Future Land Use map indicates Office Commercial use for the subject property and the surrounding properties. The area on the opposite side of Grand River is designated for Local Commercial. There are no regulated wetlands or woodlands areas on the property. The applicant is proposing a medical/office building which includes an approximately 7,600 square foot Dialysis area and 2,480 square foot Office space with associated parking and landscape improvements. This is a permitted use in the OSC district. The planning review recommends approval noting a variance from the zoning board of appeals would be required

for fronting on a private drive. The subject site currently measures 1.87 acres and would require a zoning board of appeals variance to provide parking in the front yard for a development less than 2 acres. However, the applicant has indicated in his response letter, his intent to increase the site size to meet the minimum standard. The landscape, façade and fire reviews recommend approval of the plan. The applicant has submitted the required materials sample board as requested by Facade. The traffic and engineering recommend approval of the plans with some items to be addressed during final site plan. The applicant has agreed to provide a landscape end island as suggested by Traffic in lieu of a Planning Commission waiver.

Gary Jonna, the applicant, said we're excited about this project. As many of you know, I am very familiar with the St. John Providence Campus. It's evolving and emerging as a world class health campus right here in Novi with has many centers of excellence including neuro science, heart, cancer, women's health and orthopedics. Our master plan from the onset years ago was to provide an array of services to accommodate the community. This is again a specialty for dialysis treatment, a 20 station clinic that will serve the community. There is obviously a great need for that. Also, we'll house the regional headquarters for Davita Healthcare Partners, a publicly traded company that operates over 2,100 centers in the country. So I'm here to answer any questions. We're very pleased that we can add yet another service line to what is evolving into a very special healthcare campus.

Member Greco said I've taken a look at this project. It looks like it fits in with what we want or what the future of the campus is over there. I understand that there is supposed to be some restaurants eventually going there. This is the first building that's going in. Looking at the report from our city staff and how the applicant is addressing the concerns and the variances being sought, I'm going to have no problem supporting this.

Chair Pehrson asked if this is the same organization that is currently at Beck and Ten Mile?

Mr. Jonna said yes. They're near the drug store and it's an antiquated arrangement. So they're looking to expand.

Moved by Member Greco and seconded by Member Lynch:

ROLL CALL VOTE ON THE PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN APPROVAL MOTION MADE BY MEMBER GRECO AND SECONDED BY MEMBER LYNCH:

In the matter of Kidney Centers of America, JSP 14-70, motion to approve the Preliminary Site Plan based on and subject to the following:

- a) Increase the site acreage to a minimum of 2 acres or Zoning Board of Appeals variance required from Sec 2400. (h) (1) Appendix A of the City Code to permit parking in the front yard for a development less than 2 acres in size;**
- b) Zoning Board of Appeals variance from Sec 2517, Appendix A of the City Code to permit frontage on a Private street;**
- c) Propose a raised landscape end island near the four parking spaces adjacent to the loading space as indicated in the response letter; and**
- d) 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 12, Article 24 and Article 25 of the Zoning Ordinance and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance. *Motion*

carried 6-0.

Moved by Member Greco and seconded by Member Lynch:

ROLL CALL VOTE ON THE STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN APPROVAL MOTION MADE BY MEMBER GRECO AND SECONDED BY MEMBER LYNCH:

In the matter of Kidney Centers of America, JSP 14-70, 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 6-0.*

2. APPROVAL OF THE NOVEMBER 12, 2014 PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Moved by Member Greco and seconded by Member Baratta:

VOICE VOTE ON THE NOVEMBER 12, 2014 PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES APPROVAL MOTION MADE BY MEMBER GRECO AND SECONDED BY MEMBER BARATTA:

Motion to approve the November 12, 2014 Planning Commission Minutes. *Motion carried 6-0.*

CONSENT AGENDA REMOVALS FOR COMMISSION ACTION

There were no Consent Agenda Removals.

MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION

There were no Matters for Discussion.

SUPPLEMENTAL ISSUES

There were no Supplemental Issues.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

No one in the audience wished to speak.

ADJOURNMENT

Moved by Member Lynch and seconded by Member Baratta:

VOICE VOTE ON MOTION TO ADJOURN MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER BARATTA:

Motion to adjourn the December 10, 2014 Planning Commission meeting. *Motion carried 6-0.*

The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 PM.

Transcribed by Valentina Nuculaj

December, 2014

Date Approved: January 14, 2015

Richelle Leskun, Planning Assistant
Signature on File