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CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: I'd like to call to order the January 11, 2011 regular meeting of the Planning Commission.

Sri, Happy New Year, can you call the roll, please.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Here.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Here.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GICAPETTI: Here.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Here.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Here.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Zuchlewski?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We will
call him, absent, excused. He might be a little tardy.

With that, we will stand for the Pledge of Allegiance. We will let the new kid lead us, Member Avdoulos.

MR. AVDOULOS: Sure.

(Pledge recited.)

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: With that, we will look for a motion to approve or amend the agenda.

MR. GRECO: Motion to approve.

MR. ANTHONY: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Motion and a second, any other comments? All those in favor?

THE BOARD: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have an agenda.

We do have three audience participations or public hearings. We do have an audience participation.

At this time, if there is anyone in the audience that wishes to address
the Planning Commission at this time, for something other than those three hearings, please step forward.

Seeing no one, we will close the first audience participation.

Any correspondence?

MR. GRECO: There is some correspondence, but it is related to the public hearings.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Any committee reports? City planner report.

Ms. McBeth, Happy New Year.

MS. MCBETH: Same to you.

A couple of things to report this evening. First I would like to welcome John Avdoulos back to the Planning Commission. John was appointed in December to fill the remainder of Dave Baratta's terms as a commission member.

And as you may remember, John had previously served on the Planning Commission from 2002 through 2008. We look forward to working with him.
MR. AVDOULOS: Thank you, Barb.

Good to be back.

MS. MCBETH: And another introduce we have is Darcy Rechtien. She is a staff engineer. She stepped in to replace Jeremy Miller who resigned to take a position with the Road Commission for Oakland County.

So Darcy has a degree in engineering from the University of Colorado, Boulder. She has worked as an engineer for seven years for two different private engineering firms in Texas, before moving to Seattle to work for another four years as a project manager. Darcy has also worked for the City of Novi for about a year with our engineering division. We are looking forward to working with her.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Very nice.

Welcome aboard, Darcy.

MS. MCBETH: Then at the City Council this past Monday, City Council approved two first readings of ordinance amendments that were also recently removed by
the Planning Commission.

The ordinance to amend to permit drive-thru restaurants in Town Center District was approved for a first reading, and the ordinance amendment to modify the TC and TC1 Town Center Districts to better accommodate mixed used and residential developments in the industry.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.
Welcome Darcy, welcome, John. Good to have you back.

We come to our first public hearing, Item No. 1, Suburban Collection Showplace expansion, JSP16-12. It's a public hearing at the request of T-bon, LLC for Planning Commission's recommendation to City Council for approval of preliminary site plan, wetland permit, storm water management plan.

The request is for the expansion of the building and parking lot within the OST, planned office service technology district. And in the OST planned
office service technology district with an
EXO, exposition overlay district.

The subject property is
located in Section 16 north of Grand River
Avenue and west of Taft Road.

The applicant is proposing to
expand the existing Showplace exposition
facility by adding 172,315 square foot
building addition, with associated parking
lot and other site improvements.

The current revised plan
proposes changes to the previously approved
building elevations adding more parking
spaces and corresponding site improvements.

Sri.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Thank you. I
hope you all had a wonderful holiday season
and Happy New Year.

As you may recall at the July
27 meeting, in 2016, Planning Commission
recommended approval to the City Council for
building and parking expansion to the
existing Suburban Collection building.
The City Council approved the preliminary site plan on August 8, and the plan to receive final approval on October 20th. At that time, the plan required a special land use as the off street parking was proposed on a separate parcel. Since then both parcels are combined, which now eliminates the requirement for special land use.

The subject parcel is located in Section 16, north of Grand River Avenue and west of Taft Road.

The request is for an expansion of the building and parking lot for the land within the subject property. It has split zoning boundary line with OST, planned office service technology district on the west and OST with EXO overlay on the east.

The subject parcel is surrounded by OST zoning to the west, I1 to the east and south and abuts I96 right-of-way on the north.
The future land use map indicates office research and development, for subject parcel and surrounding properties, except industrial research and technology on the south. There are few regulated woodlands and wetlands on the property. None of them are being impacted with the current proposal.

After further due diligence and value engineering, the applicant is currently proposing reducing the building footprint by about 28,000 square feet from the previously approved square footage. A total of 136 additional on-site parking is proposed on EXO side. No other site changes are being proposed to the west of the proposed building expansion.

With the current plan, the building projection from the approved plan shown in the red rectangle is now replaced with additional parking spaces. The proposed southern facade footprint in the current plan now aligns with the existing building. The
drop-off area to the east indicated in blue
is now replaced with additional parking
spaces. The amount of outside patio area in
the southwest corner of the proposed addition
indicated in green, has been reduced considerably.

Staff has identified a deviation for building setback in the review letters, however, after further research into the requirement and the definition, staff now believes that the deviation is not applicable to the current revisions.

All previously approved Zoning Board of Appeal variances are still valid. Planning recommends approval with further comments to be addressed at final.

The current revised plan is not proposing any changes to the previous approved storm water management plan. Engineering recommends approval with no further comments.

Landscape was not recommending approval due to a sharp drop in
the quantity of building foundation landscaping provided. It is less than what was approved in terms of linear feet of coverage and area provided. However, the applicant has been working with our landscape architect in devising the landscape plan to mitigate the extent of deviations requested.

Landscape now supports the deviation requested and recommends approval.

Along with the previous approval, the applicant has provided a major event traffic plan in lieu of required traffic study. Traffic is recommending approval with the request to provide an update to the METP study prior to the final stamping set submittal along with additional comments to be addressed.

It is still recommended to revisit the right turn taper lane in future in two years or if determined by the city as listed in the motion sheet.

A majority of the changes that are proposed with the current revision
include changes to the building elevations. The addition is less than 100 percent of the area of existing building, therefore, a continuation of existing materials would be permitted. In this case, existing building previously received a Section 9 waiver for the underage of brick and overage of concrete panels. So the Section Nine waiver would be required only for the overage of combined types of flat metal panels on the south facade.

The applicant has presented renderings that indicate the proposed facade materials and facade consultant believes that the materials and color will harmonize well with the existing building. Facade recommends approval. Our facade consultant, Doug Necci, is here if you have any other questions for him, so is the applicant's architect, Scott Bowers. We have the updated materials tonight for your review.

The Planning Commission is asked tonight to make recommendation to the
City Council to approve the preliminary site plan with Section 9 facade waiver and storm water management plan and to reaffirm some of the previously approved non-minor wetland permit and the ZBA variances as listed in the motion sheet.

The applicant, Blair Bowman, is also here tonight, if you have any questions for him.

As always, staff is always happy to answer any questions you may have for us. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Applicant wish to address the Planning Commission at this time?


I just will tell you, that a great job was done in the recitation of the differences in the plan here. I just wanted to briefly indicate the reasons for the change.
I think it can be best shown again, I don't know if this is possible to -- the projection of the building into the parking area, and valid reasons from an internal operation keeping everything on a single level, there was some concern internally as far as a dual functioning, pre-functioning area, but that was thought to be relatively overcomeable.

But a few of my operation folks came through and came forward and said, do you realize you're really taking our primary circulation lane that goes on and through into the west new expanded areas, and basically cutting it off.

And so we took the opportunity to look at what we could do from a redesign standpoint.

We had a mezzanine area proposed internally that was going to be largely for storage, initially and potentially for future expansion. We are now looking to accelerate the plans to utilize
that second story space. And in a phased and programmed manner we are going to look to include what would be a second story overlook ballroom and meeting space on the second story.

It gives us the ability, too, with the new facade, to then create more of a physical wow factor presence with the glass in the center and ultimately escalators and things of that nature in the pre-function space leading to the second story space.

So it does provide a considerable amount of resources that we have to put into programming and putting forth that space to that use and time, but we think that it's a much better use of the overall site from a circulation standpoint.

I will say that we did have some challenges as far as just functionally having foundation areas to plant, and so we worked with the consultant and we're happy to address some vertical plantings that he was looking for, some height and some variations
and some expansion of some of the beds, and we were able to accomplish that.

And realistically, it saves and preserves about 140 of the most primary parking spaces, too. So a number of positive factors and we think ultimately, it will be from an operational standpoint, a very positive thing. And the customers that we interviewed about it were very positive about it ultimately.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Very good.

MR. BOWMAN: I will also address that we did submit today, our consultants did get the modeling completed on the updated major event traffic plan and that was submitted to Maureen.

So I would happy to address any other questions you might have.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: As we do, we will call upon you then.

This is a public hearing. If there is anyone in the audience that wishes to address the Planning Commission at this
time, please step forward.

Seeing no one, I think we have correspondence?

    MR. GRECO: We do. We have correspondence from Robert Fresard, 46085 Grand River Avenue, Novi, Michigan, 48374, supports the Suburban Collection Showplace expansion.

    CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Very good.

    With that, we will close the public hearing on this matter, turn it over to the Planning Commission for their consideration.

    Anyone like to start? Member Greco?

    MR. GRECO: I have a question for Rick. With respect to the motion sheet we have in front of us, a lot of it is reaffirmation of what we already did, but in Section B of the motion sheets, Section B II and III, are those fine as is with respect to what accommodations, modifications and agreements have been reached between the
applicant and the city with respect to the additional plantings and stuff?

MR. MEADER: Yeah, those variances still are applied, but they did improve the height of the plantings and also as Blair pointed out, they are maintaining the landscape islands in the parking lot in front of it, so in fact, while it's a decrease from what it was before, it's still going to have an attractive look from the parking lot and the road.

MR. GRECO: But if we make the motion as is set forth in the motion sheet, that should satisfy what you need to make sure that they are getting done what they need to get done?

MR. MEADER: Yes.

MR. GRECO: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Anyone else? Member Avdoulos.

MR. AVDOULOS: Thank you. I had a quick question for the applicant.

This might have been
discussed in previous presentations, but
we're indicating digital signage on the
facade, and then the one that we are showing
right now has it one side and then another
image has it on the other side.

Is that going to be on both
or is that just options?

MR. BOWMAN: Well, we did fully
understand that as it currently is
established that the site plan and these
renderings don't establish anything as it
relates to signage.

We know that we have to come
forth with regard to -- and we had some very
reasonable reception, frankly, at a Zoning
Board before from the standpoint of an
overall package of signage. We indicated at
that point in time that we would be actually,
if the expansion were to be moved, we come
back with a comprehensive package. These are
just examples of where we could go. We know
that we have to provide information and
obtain permits and approvals for them.
MR. AVDOULOS: Yes, I appreciate the applicants when they're always looking to work with the city and the landscape issue was, I think, the trickiest one. I think looking at what was presented previously and this current design that pushes the building back is a little bit, you know, more streamlined and fitting in better with what's there, and then allows the better circulation. So, you know, as always, that's much appreciated.

MR. BOWMAN: Thank you.

MR. AVDOULOS: That's all.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Member Giacopetti.

MR. GIACOPETTI: My question concerns the memorandum from the traffic ADCOM, concerning the traffic review study, then in the motion sheet. Is it really necessary for these additional -- these additional studies to be requested as contrasted to the original motion?
MS. KOMARAGIRI: They're revised and a study was requested when the original site plan was approved.

They have set a timeline of two months after the final site plan was approved to give the applicant a little bit more time while the construction is under way.

So that did fall into place, but since they're making a change we now know everything is falling into place. So that was a requirement since 2016, when the first plan --

MR. GIACOPETTI: Okay. I wasn't sure if it was --

MS. KOMARAGIRI: That's because a new plan, required -- based on this, this is just a reminder, we need to pick it up, we need to wrap it up.

MR. BOWMAN: That has been submitted today and it was a work in progress. There was some actual modeling that was done that actually would address
from a very much a traffic speed perspective, establishment of the parameters for the MDEP. So I think it was very worthwhile in the time frame that they had to work with that, I believe, is going to be in a condition that you're going to be very happy with.

MR. GIACOPETTI: The other question I had for you, Blair, is that in the memo, there was some recommendations, and one was concerning traffic flow, which it sounds like the modifications to the footprint will improve.

MR. BOWMAN: Immensely, yes.

MR. GIACOPETTI: The other recommendation or suggestion was concerning traffic counting techniques. Would those be added to the final site plan or have those been considered?

MS. KOMARAGIRI: I think one of the items on the memo is that they have to address all the comments in the staff and consultant review letters. So if it is a comment as part of the letter, they will
address it at the time of the final site plan.

MR. GIACOPETTI: That's all my questions. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: I would just like to thank Blair for coming forward and making the changes and always -- we like to see applicants work with the city to take little items off, make littler items even smaller in front of us. So I appreciate you working with that and finding compromise. This is a great addition to the city, so I am in favor.

MR. BOWMAN: I do want to say for the record again, we were very anxious to, and I will say even needed to accomplish some of the site work and things of that nature and have the prior approved plan, and the staff and the consultants and everybody worked with us tremendously.

We were able to get in an enormous amount and accomplish things and will allow us to really move forward after
this next stage of approvals. We really appreciate that.

MR. ANTHONY: I just wanted to reaffirm what the rest of the Planning Commission has said.

Thank you for working with staff, the Center, I'm glad to see it growing. It's one of the most important businesses in our city, because of it being a destination, it also helps all other retail businesses with the traffic you're able to draw.

And I am prepared to make a motion.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Very good, sir.

MR. ANTHONY: In the matter of Suburban Collection Showplace, expansion JSP16-12, motion to recommend approval to the City Council for the preliminary site plan with expo overlay, based on and subject to City Council approval of the following waivers proposed.
A, reaffirming no change
needed for the following waivers approved by
City Council on August 8, 2016, as listed
through items Roman numeral I through XI, is
that acceptable?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Most
excellent.

MR. ANTHONY: B, the following
waivers and conditions would require updated
approvals as listed through Roman numeral I
through V.

And C, reaffirming no change
needed for the following waivers approved by
Zoning Board of Appeals on August 9, 2016, as
listed in Roman numeral I through IV. D, the
findings of compliance with ordinance
standards in the staff and consultant review
letters, and the conditions and items listed
in those letters being addressed on the final
site plan.

This motion is made because
the plan is otherwise in compliance with
Article 3, Article 4 and Article 5 of the
zoning ordinance and all other applicable
provisions of the ordinance.

MR. GRECO: Second.

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

Any other comments? Sri, can
you call the roll, please.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member
Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes
five to zero.

MR. ANTHONY: In the matter of
Suburban Collection Showplace expansion
JSP16-12, affirming no change needed for the non-minor wetland permit, previously approved by City Council on August 8, 2016, based on and subject to the following.

A, the findings in compliance with the ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters, and the conditions and items listed in those letters being addressed on the final site plan.

This motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Chapter 12, Article 5 of the Code of Ordinances, and all other applicable provisions of the ordinance.

MR. GRECO: Second.

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

Any other comments?

Sri, please.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes five to zero.

MR. ANTHONY: In the matter of Suburban Collection Showplace, Expansion JSP16-12, motion to recommend approval to the City Council for the storm water management plan, based on and subject to, A, reaffirming no change needed for the following waivers approved by M.D.O.T., approval of the storm water detention basin discharge to I-96 right-of-way.

B, the findings of compliance with ordinance standards in the consultant review letters and items listed in those letters being addressed on the final site
This motion is made because it is otherwise in compliance with Chapter 11 of the Code of Ordinances, and all other applicable provisions of the ordinance.

MR. GRECO: Second.

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

Any other comments?

Seeing none, Sri, please.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes
five to zero.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: All set.

Next on the agenda is Text Amendment 17-188, it's a public hearing for the consideration to amend Chapter 28 signs of the City of Novi Code Amendment 17-188, to update clear finding, provide new substantive regulations, concerning placement of sign within and throughout the city.

Barb?

MS. MCBETH: So as we mentioned in December, over the last several months last year, City Council's ordinance review committee has undertaken a review of the entire sign code in order to review the standards for updates based on recent court activities, and to allow the ordinance to be more business and user friendly.

Among some of the changes recommended are the following. Different additional regulations regarding billboards along I-96 and M5. The changes to the sign review process, which will be part of the
site plan review process. The changes to the
size, number and placement regulations
throughout the ordinance to allow additional
signage for certain uses and to clarify and
declutter the ordinance where possible, and
revise variance standards.

Although the sign ordinance
is separate from the zoning ordinance, the
sign ordinance provides regulations by zoning
districts, as in the past, the Planning
Commission has asked to take the opportunity
to review the proposed amendments, hold the
public hearing and make recommendations to
the City Council of the proposed changes.

The revised ordinance as
recommended by the ordinance review
committee, and with additional minor
modifications from the city attorney's
office, has been included in the packet.

The Planning Commission
considered setting a public hearing for the
sign ordinance amendments at a meeting in
December, and determined that the public
hearing would be scheduled for tonight's meeting.

Tonight the Planning Commission is asked to hold the scheduled public hearing for the proposed amendments and to make a recommendation to the City Council for further review.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you. This is a public hearing. If there is anyone in the audience that wishes to address the Planning Commission on this particular item, please step forward.

Seeing no one, close the audience participation. We have correspondence?

MR. GRECO: We do have some correspondence. This is a letter from Matthew Sosin, president of Northern Equities Group. In the letter from Mr. Sosin, they support the changes to the ordinance that would allow their tenants more signage in the OST district, because they believe it will foster economic development through increased
visibility and recognition, and also in certain cases help with safety, and finding their destination easier.

However, Mr. Sosin also strenuously objects to any amendment allowing ground pole signs in the City of Novi, especially in the OST district.

He indicates that having such signs is not what one would expect to see in a city of the caliber and standards upon which Novi has built its reputation and asks that we please reconsider including ground pole signs in the city.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you. With that, we will close the public hearing, audience participation at this time. Turn it over to the Planning Commission. Who would like to start? Member Anthony.

MR. ANTHONY: Question for staff. So, our public comment that was sent in by writing makes a really good point about ground pole signs. I didn't see an allowance. Is there an allowance for ground
pole signs?

MS. MCBETH: There is.

MR. ANTHONY: Which section is that?

MR. SCHULTZ: Page 32 of the draft that you have. Really what I think what Mr. Sosin was talking about is the off-premises advertisement signs. So billboards basically.

MR. ANTHONY: In this, you could help me since I missed this part, how does the -- our staff envision that those pole signs would look as far as height and size and what types of businesses would --

MR. SCHULTZ: So, basically, the proposed amendment allows one ground pole sign, basically one billboard off premises advertising sign between Fourteen Mile and Twelve Mile. Doesn't specifically say what it's going to look like, if you look at the chart, there is a size, can be up to 672 square feet, no higher than 30 feet.

MR. ANTHONY: So we have limited
the area where that can be.

MR. SCHULTZ: Correct. So it would be the east side of M5 between Twelve and Fourteen.

MR. ANTHONY: All right. Very good. I was envisioning the classic gas station sign, lollipop sign, the 76 gas station signs. I am really, really glad to see that wasn't what was thought of.

Also glad to see that we are updating our sign ordinance and I have always liked how Novi has kept a high end on our signs.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Sir, any other comments?

MR. GIACOPETTI: I have a follow-up. In terms of this ground pole sign, Section 28-8, which you just addressed. So ground pole signs, these billboards would only be permitted in I2 along 96, is that -- am I reading this right? It says, permitted in the I2 district, but only where the report is immediately abutting --
1/11/2017

MR. SCHULTZ: Off premises advertisement -- billboards, yes. That's where they are permitted now.

MR. GIACOPETTI: There is no change to that per se, just clarifying?

MR. SCHULTZ: Right. In a separate section of the ordinance, we are adding a taller sign in the EXO district, but not as an off-premise billboard.

MR. GIACOPETTI: That is also along 96?

MR. SCHULTZ: Also along 96.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Thanks. That was just a clarification.

MR. SCHULTZ: This is probably one of the -- the ordinance review committee talked about as much as anything, this billboard question, so there -- I mean, we're actually already having questions from billboard companies about this, so there may be between now and when it actually gets to City Council, there may need to be some minor tweaks, but it's in generally the concept
that probably isn't going to change between now and the first City Council meeting, some of the words might.

MR. GIACOPETTI: I guess this is more of a -- I guess we will wait close -- I have some more comments. I'll wait until we close the public hearing. This is more maybe a comment for the group.

Do billboards really -- if you are driving by on the highway, does it really reflect the community? I mean, is it really a reflection of Novi if you're driving by at 80 miles an hour and -- I am -- just a philosophical question for the group.

MR. ANTHONY: If we are looking at personal opinion, I wouldn't think so on 96. I think M5 is another question because it's integration, residential and retail, but we are covered by M5, we're not having that.

MR. GIACOPETTI: M5 has a more natural -- by design, a more natural looking look and feel.

MR. GRECO: Response to your
question, I don't think so.

MR. GIACOPETTI: It kind of jumped out as maybe being too restrictive, but just my comments for the record.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

Anyone else? Member Greco.

MR. GRECO: Based upon our review, discussion and consideration of this, I would like to make a motion to recommend approval of the amended ordinance to the City Council for approval and adoption.

MR. ANTHONY: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: I have a motion by Member Greco, second by Member Anthony. Any other comments? Sri?

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?
MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes five to zero.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

Third item on the agenda is the Cell Tower Amendment, it's 18.280. It's a public hearing for Text Amendment 18.280 to consider amending the City of Novi zoning ordinance in order to modify section 4.86, uses not otherwise included within a specific use district, and Section 2.2, definitions to recognize and provide for the implementation of the state and federal legislation regarding wireless communication equipment and facilities.

Ms. McBeth.

MS. MCBETH: Mr. Chair, Section 4.86 of zoning ordinance provides for placement of various communication antennas, cell towers and related equipment. Our city attorney's office has reviewed recent changes
in the state law related to the wireless communications equipment and provided suggested modifications to the zoning ordinance to insure that the standards in the new law are recognized and provided in the city's zoning ordinance.

Much of the existing ordinance text is being re-formatted and refined, as you can see in the strike-through version of the ordinance that's included in the packet.

This matter was considered by the Planning Commission in December to set a public hearing for tonight's meeting.

The Planning Commission is asked to hold a public hearing and make a recommendation to City Council for approval of the ordinance language.

One more note is that you may recall is that this ordinance was also presented to the Planning Commission in 2012, City Council in 2013, was adopted, but in error was not included in the new formatting
of the clear zoning ordinance. We are taking that through the process. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: This is a public hearing. If there is anyone in the audience who wishes to address the Planning Commission on this particular topic, please step forward.

No one in the audience. Any correspondence?

MR. GRECO: There is no correspondence.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We will close the public hearing, turn it over to the Planning Commission for their consideration. Ancillary building, all the stuff that goes along with the tower, is there -- I might have missed it, are there specifications that we provide or suggest for the building, material, size, shape, screen, things that might be a little bit more noticeable than a stick in the ground?

MS. MCBETH: Yes. The ordinance
provides some provisions for what we call the compound around the base of the tower that so many of them have for a fence and screening around the perimeter. There is also a standard, if they choose to build a building there, to house the equipment, that it needs to meet certain standards.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: With that, there is -- would then -- I have not seen it yet, but I don't know what the future would be, but if there is air conditioning, refrigeration standard, our noise standard would couple along with that to carry forward?

MS. MCBETH: Yes, it would.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Very good, appreciate that.

Any other comments? Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: I would like to make a motion. I would like to make a motion to recommend approval to the City Council to amend the Zoning Ordinance Section 4.86 as
presented to the Planning Commission for approval to City Council.

MR. ANTHONY: Second.

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

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes five to zero.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Very good.

Next on the agenda is matters for consideration, approval of the November 16, 2016 Planning Commission minutes.
Any changes, modifications?

MR. GIACOPETTI: I have a modification. On the list of board members in attendance, Anthony Giacopetti passed away a number of years ago. However, I'm not sure where we go from here. I just noticed it.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Can review and make the corrections to it. Any other changes?

MR. GRECO: Motion to approve with the change.

MR. ANTHONY: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a motion by Member Greco, second by Member Anthony. Sri, can you call the roll, please?

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacopetti?
MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes five to zero.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Next is the Planning Commission's committee request to fill vacancies.

MS. MCBETH: So the Planning Commission elected its officers in a meeting in September 2016. Assignments to the various committees were also made at that meeting.

Since that time Member Baratta resigned from his position, our new member John Avdoulos was appointed to the Commission, and we have three committees that Member Baratta had been assigned to, that should be reassigned to somebody in case these committees need to meet in the next few months.

That is the walkable Novi Committee, the Master Plan and Zoning
Committee and the Rules Committee.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: So what we were hoping for, maybe be able to sneak this one under the radar and Member Avdoulos would go, okay, I will go for that. You have any strong desires to take on Member Baratta's roles there?

MR. AVDOULOS: Sure, I will go for that.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Awesome. Make it easy. We have a motion?

MR. GRECO: Motion to have Member Avdoulos take over Member Baratta's position or place on the Environmental and Walkable Novi committee, the Master Plan and Zoning Committee and Rules Committee.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a motion my Greco, second by Giacopetti. Any other comments? Quick before he says no. Sri, can you call the roll, please.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?
MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacopetti?
MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?
MR. GRECO: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes five to zero.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.
Next, any matters for consideration from anyone? Supplemental issues? This is our last audience participation.
If there is anyone in the audience that wishes to address the Planning Commission, please stop forward.
State your name, your address.
MR. LAPHAM: Charles Lapham. I have a business on Novi Road. That's L-a-p-h-a-m. I have been here before. But
apparently, I missed the parking -- the sign ordinance. And I want to address that issue at the proper time. And I'd like to know when it comes up. I was supposed to have my day in court a couple of weeks ago. And the city didn't see fit or took the time to be at the trial, and we waited until noon, the judge wouldn't hear me. So I have another date now, coming up and I'd like to be able to talk about that sign ordinance before I am arrested. Because they don't like the sign on the side of my truck and I got (unintelligible). That's more than Novi can handle. So I would like to have an opportunity to present my case before I go back to court.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Ms. McBeth, can you help us.

MR. SCHULTZ: I don't know about the prosecution in the district court, but I can say that the next place it will go from here is to the City Council for first reading. I don't know the day, but it
probably will be a meeting in February.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: So the previous items that we had, the second item on the public hearing was to address the current changes to the sign ordinance, text amendment. So, what we considered at any time if you were not aware of, the suggestion from Counselor Schultz is that what we passed tonight has to go back now to City Council for them to consider, so you would have a chance in front of City Council as well to state your case or objection to --

MR. LAPHAM: I thought City Council was going to Planning Commission that they had to address that sign ordinance, but it's back -- did I have it backwards?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes. We have addressed the changes to the amendment itself, to the sign ordinance amendment so now it has to go to City Council to be approved so that it can be codified.

There would be the chance for you to speak publicly in front of City
Council to address your specific section
or --

MR. SCHULTZ: Or as the person
did today, reduce it to writing, put it in a
letter so Council understands exactly what it
is that he would like to have done.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: The
suggestion then, if you could put your
comments on file and send it to Ms. McBeth so
we know exactly from what you're talking
about, the city can help address that, that
would be helpful.

MR. LAPHAM: I have citations
here that tell what I'm supposed to be guilty
of.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: This isn't
the forum right now where we can make any
decision based upon any citations that you
may have received, and I would suggest that
you put that in writing and hand it to
Ms. McBeth exactly what it is you're trying
to pursue relative to particular -- for the
sign ordinance.
MR. LAPHAM: If I understand, the timetable here, I am going to have to go back
to court for the second time before any
decision could be made, is that a fairly true
statement?

MR. SCHULTZ: The ordinance was
heard twice through the chair in February,
and if adopted, it would be effective
sometime after that, after publication, so
probably be in March.

MR. LAPHAM: I am due back in
court the second time January 24th.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: I would put
your comments or your particular request to
Ms. McBeth so she can address it and we can
help provide some guidance. And then I think
she can also help you understand the time
line that we are looking towards, which as to
right now, what we have passed will have to
go back in front of City Council. I don't
know what that time frame is yet. We have a
general rule, that will be in February-ish.
They will have to go through a first and
second reading of that, then at that point, it would be printed, then be part of the code that we have.

So I would suggest that you put a letter in place to Ms. McBeth at this time.

MR. LAPHAM: Also be appreciated if I could get some information so I don't have to go back to court on January 24th for the second time and I am dealing with the current sign ordinance.

Can I talk to Ms. McBeth prior to that to see who handles something like that?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes, she would be able to help you.

MR. LAPHAM: Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you sir, appreciate it.

Anyone else wish to address the Planning Commission.

Seeing no one, we close the audience participation, look for a motion to
adjourn.

MR. GRECO: Motion to adjourn.

MR. ANTHONY: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Motions and seconds. All those in favor?

THE BOARD: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you everyone.

(The meeting was adjourned at 7:45 p.m.)
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