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CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Call to order the January 25th, regular meeting of the Planning Commission.

Kirsten, call the roll.

MS. MELLEM: Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Here.

MS. MELLEM: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Here.

MS. MELLEM: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Here.

MS. MELLEM: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Here.

MS. MELLEM: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Here.

MS. MELLEM: Member Zuchlewski?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Here.

With that, if we could rise for the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Pledge recited.)
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

With that, we will look for a motion to approve the agenda or any modifications thereof.

MR. GRECO: Motion to approve.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a motion and a second. Any other comments?

All those in favor.

THE BOARD: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Any opposed?

Have a motion.

Presentations? Any?

Audience participation?

We do have one public hearing tonight.

If anyone in the audience wishes to address the Planning Commission on something other than that public hearing, please step forward at this point.

Seeing none, we will close the first audience participation.
I don't believe we have any correspondence?

MR. GRECO: No correspondence.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Any committee reports? I don't believe so.

City Planner, Ms. McBeth.

MS. MCBETH: Good evening.

Just a couple things that happened at Monday night's Council meetings.

Council did consider two development plan requests, that was also recently considered by the Planning Commission.

First Council approved the revised preliminary site plan for the expansion of the Suburban Collection Showplace, and associated parking lot and other site improvements.

Council also granted a tentative approval of the requested Hadley's Towing for the Zoning Map Amendment and the Concept Plan for a vehicle towing business.

That's for property located on the south side
of Grand River between Beck and Wixom Road.

Once that PRO is drafted and approved by Council, the preliminary site plan will return to the Planning Commission for their consideration.

Council also approved the second reading for two text amendments. The Planning Commission recently recommended the Text Amendment to allow drive-thru restaurants in the Town Center district and the amendments intended to accommodate the use for residential developments in that Main Street area. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, Barb, appreciate that.

We come to our first and only public hearing.

It's the Learning Experience, JSP16-19. It's a public hearing at the request of Lockard Development, Inc. on behalf of the Learning Experience for special land use, preliminary site plan, storm water management plan.
The subject property is located in Section 14 on 2.2 acres in the City of Novi and is located on the northeast corner of Eleven Mile and Town Center Drive in the OSC, office service commercial zoning district.

The applicant is proposing a 10,000 square foot day-care facility for 150 children and 24 employees with associated site improvements.

Kirsten.

MS. MELLEM: Good evening. The applicant is proposing to construct a single story day-care building consisting of 10,000 square feet, outdoor recreation area and associated site improvements.

The project is 2.2 acres located on the northeast corner of Town Center Drive and Eleven Mile Road in Section 14. To the north is the new Homewood Suites hotel, to the west is Town Center, to the east is Courtyard Marriott hotel and to the south is vacant property.
The subject property is currently zoned OSC, office service commercial and surrounded on the northeast and southeast by OSC as well.

To the west and southwest is zoned TC, Town Center.

The future land use map indicates office commercial for the subject property and the properties to the north and the east. To the west is TC commercial and to the south is TC gateway.

The site does not contain any wetlands or woodlands.

The applicant is proposing a day-care facility for approximately 150 children in a 10,000 square foot building. They are providing 7,227 square feet of outdoor recreation spaces, which is deficient by about 15,273 square feet and is the only ZBA variance the applicant is seeking.

The applicant is providing 44 parking spaces and internal sidewalk connections to Town Center Drive and Eleven.
Mile Road.

There is an existing sidewalk along Town Center Drive and an existing pathway along Eleven Mile Road.

Traffic has noted that the entrance island is below the required 15-foot radius and fire has noted that the south end of the parking lot does not meet fire department standards to insure that large trucks and emergency vehicles can maneuver throughout the site.

The applicant has responded they will adjust the radii to meet the minimum requirement on the final site plan submittal.

The applicant is also requesting a traffic waiver for same side, opposite side driveway facing to permit less distance between entrances along the private drive to the north. It should also be noted that the ingress, egress issue has also been resolved.

The landscape plan shows the
applicant is providing a landscape berm along Town Center Drive and Eleven Mile Road as required by ordinance.

There are a couple of landscape waivers the applicant is requesting which is supported by staff.

The first one is to permit fewer parking lot perimeter canopy trees than required, 18 are required, three provided. And second is to permit less building foundation landscaping and to allow foundation landscaping to be located away from the building foundation and away from the play area due to conflicts with the children.

The facade elevations show that the applicant is requesting a Section 9 facade waiver of the overage of asphalt shields on all sides. The required minimum is 25 percent and the applicant is providing between 40 and 42 percent.

This is supported by staff because it is consistent with overall design
of the building and is in context with the 
existing single story office building located 
to the east.

The Planning Commission is 
asked tonight to consider the special land 
use permit for the proposed day-care use 
taking into consideration the factors that 
shall be considered in review of any special 
land use, which is provided in the motion 
sheet.

If a favorable outcome is 
obtained in the Planning Commission it is to 
consider a preliminary site plan and storm 
water management plan including the requested 
waivers.

Representatives Paul Riordan 
from Lockard Construction and Shiloh Dahlin 
from Alpine Engineering and the staff from 
the Learning Experience are also here to 
answer any questions you may have.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

The applicant wish to address the Planning 
Commission at this time?
MR. RIORDAN: We just want to
thank you for your time tonight and we are
available to answer any questions that you
may have.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: This is a
public hearing.

If there is anyone in the
audience who wishes to address the Planning
Commission on this matter, please step
forward.

Seeing no one, we will close
the public hearing at this time and turn it
over to the Planning Commission for their
consideration.

Anyone? Member Anthony.

MR. ANTHONY: This is for the
applicant. In looking at the site plan, I
see that there is a proposed fence that's
around the play area.

What would that fence be
constructed of, are there plans now?

MS. SCHWEIKER: Good evening. My
name is Charlotte Schweiker. I am with
(unintelligible) Architects, the architect of
record for the project.

The fence that's going to
surround the playground will be a six-foot
tall privacy PVC fence and it's going to be
white.

MR. ANTHONY: You don't have any
pictures of it?

MS. SCHWEIKER: We submitted a
rendering of the building that does show the
fence. It's also detailed --

MR. ANTHONY: Very good.

The other question I have is
for the pathway that's along Eleven Mile.
That pathway right now, I guess, first, to
the City, do you guys remember, is that an
asphalt pathway right now?

MS. MELLEM: Yes.

MR. ANTHONY: So in the
construction of your development, with the
sidewalks and pathways that are there, will
they be care taken in order not to damage
those pathways?
MR. RIORDAN: We will do everything we can to make sure they don't get damaged. If they do get damaged during construction, we will make sure they get fixed.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: I have a question for the architect.

I am looking at the dimensions on the parking lot, parking spaces specifically.

And the spaces up against the sidewalk are at seven feet in depth. Then the ones in the middle are 19. I am just wondering, that's not standard by any means, isn't it normally 20 feet?

MS. SCHWEIKER: I think site engineering will address that question.

MS. DAHLIN: Good evening. My name is Shiloh Dahlin. I'm with Alpine Engineering.

It guess it was my
understanding that it's 19 and 19.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Then, what do we do with that 17-foot?

MS. DAHLIN: The 17-foot is because --

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Overlap --

MS. DAHLIN: The sidewalk is a four inch curb. Typically there is a two foot --

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Overhang?

MS. DAHLIN: Overhang.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Then that really cuts the sidewalk down to five feet then, is that correct?

MS. DAHLIN: Correct. It is a seven foot walk. So with the two foot overhang it would be a five foot walk.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: All right. And the dumpster location, is there any other place to put that dumpster? Could it go parallel with the front of the building only in the green space to the south, instead of having the traffic run all the way around it,
and enter vehicles -- you know, for that
dumpster to come in and the truck to come in
here and pick that up and be pumping the
asphalt there, it would just seem it would be
better if it was in a green belt to the
south, is there a potential for that?

Is there any reason it was
put where it is?

MS. DAHLIN: You are talking
about moving it south?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Moving it south
and anywhere along that south property on the
other side.

MS. MELLEM: If I can interject,
that requires a ZBA variance since it would
be in one of the exterior side yards. We do
prefer the location where it is. They did
have it along the east property line, but
there was some -- it would have been in the
building -- or the parking setback too close
to the property line, so the location where
it's at now works best.

If they were to put it south
of the building, they would need to go to ZBA
to get a variance for that.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Then the other
question I have is that the handicapped spots
up against the building, those widths are
eight feet?

MS. DAHLIN: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: What's the
normal required width for those spaces?

MS. DAHLIN: It's eight feet.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Because they
have got the common area in between them?

MS. MELLEM: We require I think
one van accessible for the number of spaces
that you have and two handicapped spaces, so
we just decided to make both of them van
accessible.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Then we have
a -- we have got an loading unloading space.
What's that about?

MS. MELLEM: It's a requirement
of the OSC and the day-care facilities. Many
day-cares actually just request that they get
a variance from that from ZBA, since no one
is dropping off their kids, everyone requires
them to actually physically bring their
children into the building.

So they chose to kind of put
the loading zone there, probably to
accommodate the dumpster location. I don't
know if that answers --

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: That was my next
question, was the cueing of dropping off. So
many of these facilities there is eight, ten,
12, 20 cars dropping the kids off at one
time. How is that handled here?

Are the parents actually
parking and dropping off the children?

MS. MELLEM: That was my
understanding.

MS. SCHWEIKER: Yes.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Was there any
thought given to just circular traffic here
coming in from the entranceway, going across
the building, going around the dumpster and
leaving? So that we don't have two-way
travel, we can get more space for mobility on
the lot moving around?

MS. DAHLIN: I wouldn't be
opposed to doing one way traffic, but that
would kind of tie into the question or the
concern that the fire chief had in regards to
being able to get a fire truck circulated
through the parking lot.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: I would almost
come in, being able to go around, then
exit not having two-way traffic on both
sides. Just tossing it up really.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: It's really
just a radius for the trucks that we care
about.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: It wouldn't
matter one way or the other?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Unh-unh.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: It wouldn't
matter one way or the other if it was or was
not? If you could take a look at that, I
think it would make for better traffic flow
and people not having to back out because you are going to have -- you got 120, 150 children is that the number?

MS. SCHWEIKER: We actually show 162.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: We have got how many parking --

MS. SCHWEIKER: Forty-four is in the total parking count. Yes, 44.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: That's an awful lot of backing in and people going against traffic or holding up people coming in.

MS. SCHWEIKER: I think as people start to use the facility, they kind of create their own traffic pattern as to what's easier to come in --

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: I was just trying to help them out in creating a flow. It's kind of like salmon.

If that could be considered, changing the flow, so it's circular and not going against itself. Those are my only comments.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, Member Zuchlewski.

Anyone else? Member Giacopetti.

MR. GIACOPETTI: I have a question for the applicant in regards to this special land use permit requirement.

What aspect of this site, as far choosing for the development?

MR. RIORDAN: I was not part of the land selection process, but we typically go through a pretty thorough voting process of the locations that TLE selects. So as far as why we actually selected this site, I don't have that information.

MR. GIACOPETTI: The reason I ask is, this group has spent a lot of time, looking at plans for a -- to develop a unique center, the Town Center, and a walkable district, you know, a downtown environment.

And this doesn't seem to conform with I think the intent of that zone, hence why the special land use permit is
required.

And it just seems a little unusual that I think a day-care would be wedged between two hotels and Wal-mart. It just seemed like an unusual site.

I just wasn't sure what sort of business leaders was here to sort of shed some light on why this site was chosen over say other available sites.

MR. RIORDAN: I don't know the answer to that question.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, Member Giacopetti.

Anyone else?

Member Greco.

MR. GRECO: Just one question for our landscape architect, Mr. Meader.

The biggest deviation here has to do with the trees and the canopy trees.

I read your report, you're comfortable with this as far as being appropriate for the location?
MR. MEADER: Yes, they have done, as far as I am concerned, all that they can do as far as putting in enough trees without having them on top of each other.

Our ordinance requires a lot of trees and I am okay with what they have got there.

THE BOARD: Excellent. With that, I would like to make a motion.

In the matter of the Learning Experience JSP16-19, motion to approve a special land use permit based on and subject to the following items listed in A through G on the motion sheet, and this motion has been made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Article 3, Article 4 and Article 5 and Article 6 of the zoning ordinance and all other applicable provisions of the ordinance.

MR. ANTHONY: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a motion by Member Greco, second by Member Anthony.
Any other discussion?

Kirsten, can you call the roll, please.

MS. MELLEM: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: No.

MS. MELLEM: Motion passes five to one.

MR. GRECO: Next motion I'd like to make, in the matter of the Learning Experience, JSP16-19, motion to approve the preliminary site plan based on and subject to the following items listed in A through F on the motion sheet, and this motion has been
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.

MR. ANTHONY: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Motion by
Member Greco, second by Anthony.

Any other comments? Kirsten, please.

MS. MELLEM: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Motion passes six to
zero.
MR. GRECO: In the matter of the Learning Experience, JSP16-19, motion to approve the storm water management plan, based on and subject to the following: The findings of compliance 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.

MR. ANTHONY: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Motion by Member Greco, second by Member Anthony.

Any other discussion?

Kirsten.

MS. MELLEM: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.
MS. MELLEM: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Motion passes six to zero.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: All set.

Thank you.

Next on the agenda is matters for consideration, item one, Landscape Ordinance Amendment 18.283, it's to set a public hearing for Text Amendment 18.283 to consider amending the City of Novi's zoning ordinance in order to modify Section 5.5 of the zoning ordinance and accompanying landscaping design manual.

The changes are proposed to make the ordinance requirement more achievable and realistic given the restraints of most sites and to promote the visibility of buildings and the health of the planted
materials through less crowding of plantings
to promote the health of non-built open areas
by addition of certain invasive species to
the list of species not allowed, to clean up
inconsistencies in the ordinance from the
intent of the ordinance, and to bring the
ordinance into agreement with other recently
amended ordinances.

Ms. McBeth.

MS. MCBETH: Thank you,
Mr. Chair.

Rick Meader has a brief
presentation to introduce the ordinance and
ask you to set the public hearing.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Good
evening, Rick.

MR. MEADER: So what you're
seeing in front of us is a proposal to change
the planting because as in with the last
project, I found in doing a lot of reviews
last year and a half, two years, that we
really have overstretched like reasonable
terms, especially in terms of parking,
The assumption was in creating them, I think that people were always going to have long islands throughout every parking lot, they would have room for extra trees, which typically most parking lots don't. Typically there is -- you know, it's smaller, they just don't have room for that kind of island.

So, these are focused primarily -- these changes are focused primarily on commercial industrial projects and affect -- with residential I haven't seen any major problems with residential, but I think it's an issue in the commercial and industrial situations.

If you look at the example, this is showing the existing that we follow them completely on the top, how many trees would be required for around the parking lot as well as screening in front of the building, in the commercial -- the proposed there is 105 trees required in that
situation.

The one below with the proposals, it's 64 trees. You can see it's still well landscaped, it still has enough to decorate the site as well as screen the parking lot from the road.

But it opens up the building a little bit more to the road and it just makes it feasible to really to support -- to enforce the rules that we have.

Now it's really hard for me to enforce the rules that we have and not have trees on top of each other.

So, you know, I like to enforce rules and rather have rules that I can enforce, then say, I know you can't, do your best. That's kind of the situation we are in right now.

So if you look through the rules, there is changes for commercial, there is changes for industrial, then there are some other rules as I mentioned.

Please take a look at it, I
will be glad to answer any question you might have. There is a lot there. I am sure you will have questions.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Very good. Turn it over to the Planning Commission for their consideration.

Member Avdoulos.

MR. AVDOULOS: Thank you. I was part of a similar process back my first tour of the Planning Commission. We were looking landscaping and we had -- I remember, brought in also -- some landscape architects came in to discuss their concerns and what benefits there would be to readjust what we have at that time.

And the projects that you're looking at, there are a lot of variances being requested and are you also -- with the information that you're presenting in consultation with some of the landscape architects that bring in the project or is this just something that you have just been noticing, you know, the last year or so?
MR. MEADER: Well, you know, I am working with the landscape architects, there is no way we can make this work a lot of times.

That was -- you know, before I did this job, I actually developed parking lot landscape plans. That's what I was familiar with, some of the issues.

So yes, I have been talking with them, but I haven't really relied on them to come up with what I have come up with.

I kind of now -- I have my own -- (unintelligible.) But I have had complaints from many landscape architects, our rules are just pretty much impossible to work with. In terms of parking lots, especially.

MS. MCBETH: I think, too, the intention is if you're going to share the draft of the landscape architects that frequently do business with the city.

MR. MEADER: Yes, there is
probably five or six that work with the
districts, send it onto them once it became
public to get their comments.

MR. AVDOULOS: I think the last
go-around that was the issue, too, we had
quite a few landscape architects that did a
lot of work in the city and they provided
their comments and feedbacks, and if we can
maintain an ordinance that will allow us to,
you know, continually enhance our sites, but
also limit the amount of variances that come
forth, then that's a win for all of us
because the one thing -- even from a
architectural standpoint, just looking at
building the projects and then there is a
variance, a variance, variance, you know,
requested all the way along, that means,
either our process is too tight or nobody is
willing to follow the rules, and they just
want to, you know, go through the process of
getting what they want.

But landscape is a good way
to do it, a lot of projects. It's a low
hanging fruit for value engineering so they can reduce costs.

   But I think if we provide something that's reasonable and can stick to it, then it will really help out, you know, what we have already got started.

   I think it's done well, you know, in the last ten years or so.

   So I think this is a good process and I appreciate your going through this and helping us streamline it.

   MR. MEADER: Thank you.

   CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Anyone else? Member Greco.

   MR. GRECO: Yes, I would like to make a motion to set the Landscape Ordinance Amendment 18.283 for a public hearing.

   MR. ANTHONY: Second.

   CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a motion by Member Greco, second by Member Anthony.

   Any other discussion?

   Kirsten, can you call the
roll.

MS. MELLEM: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Motion passes, six to zero.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Second item is the approval of the December 7, 2016 Planning Commission minutes, any modifications, changes?

Motion to approve?

MR. GRECO: Motion to approve.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Motion by
Greco and second by Giacopetti.

Any other comments?

Kirsten, please.

MS. MELLEM: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Motion passes six to zero.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

Any matters for discussion? Supplemental issues?

There is no one in the audience, close the last audience participation.
Look for a motion to adjourn.

MR. GRECO: Motion to adjourn.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, gentlemen. We are adjourned.

(The meeting was adjourned at 7:28 p.m.)
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