



PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

CITY OF NOVI

Regular Meeting

October 9, 2013 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 Giacometti, Member Greco, Chair Pehrson, Member Zuchlewski

Absent: Member Lynch

Also Present: Barbara McBeth, Deputy Director of Community Development; Kristen Kapelanski, Planner; Sara Roediger, Planner; Gary Dovre, City Attorney; Dave Beschke, Landscape Architect; Adam Wayne, Staff Engineer, Doug Necci, Façade Consultant.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Moved by Member Greco, seconded by Member Anthony:

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

Motion to approve the October 9, 2013 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

Deputy Director McBeth introduced Sara Roediger, the new staff planner with the Plan Review Center. She started in September. She has a bachelor's degree in sociology from the University of Detroit Mercy and she has a master's degree in planning from Wayne State University. She's worked for the last four years with West Bloomfield and prior to that she worked with a private planning consulting firm. She's also on the Planning Commission in the City of Ferndale where she currently serves as chair. Secondly at the City Council Meeting on September 16th, the Council approved the text amendment that related to rental vehicles in the Light Industrial District. There were a couple of modifications.

CONSENT AGENDA - REMOVALS AND APPROVAL

There were no items on the Consent Agenda.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. CHARNETH FEN, JSP13-51

Public Hearing at the request of Robertson Charneth Fen LLC for Planning Commission's recommendation to the City Council of a Revised Preliminary Site Plan with a PD-1 Option and Revised Special Land Use Permit approval. The subject property is 4.66 acres in Section 10 of the City of Novi and located on the south side of 12 ½ Mile Road, west of Novi Road in the RM-1, Low Density,

Low-Rise Multiple-Family District. The applicant is proposing an altered footprint and slightly altered layout for the site along with revised elevations and floor plans.

Planner Kapelanski said the applicant is proposing to alter the previously approved site plan and unit style for Charneth Fen, an attached condominium development. One building along with the site infrastructure of the previously approved plan was constructed and a new developer has bought the rights to develop the remaining units. To the north of the property is Bolingbroke Estates, to the south and east is Society Hill (an unfinished development) and to the west is Carlton Forest. The subject property is currently zoned RM-1, Low Density, Low-Rise Multiple-Family Residential with RM-1 zoning to the east, west and south and R-1 zoning to the north. The future land use map indicates Planned Development Option 1 uses for the site and properties to the south, east and west with single family uses planned to the north. There are both woodlands and wetlands on the site but no additional impacts to those features are planned.

As previously noted, the infrastructure for this site, along with one building, is already in place and natural features impacts have been permitted and completed. The new developer of the site wishes to finish the construction with a different unit footprint and unit style. This site was approved using the PD-1, Planned Development Option. There are several factors outlined in the planning review letter for both the Planning Commission and City Council to consider in their recommendation and approval of the proposed changes. Additionally, any developments utilizing the PD options are required to seek Special Land Use Permit approval in addition to site plan approval and the Planning Commission is asked to make a recommendation on the Special Land Use Permit as well. The planning review recommends approval noting several ordinance deviations have been requested for the deficient front yard building and parking setbacks, the proposed building orientation and to allow driveways to abut residential units. All of these are supported by staff. The landscape review recommends approval noting a waiver would be needed for the lack of street trees. Staff does not support this waiver. The façade review recommends approval noting a Section 9 façade waiver is required for the underage of brick and is supported contingent on the applicant providing a sample board demonstrating harmonious color selections. The engineering, traffic and fire reviews all recommend approval noting items to be addressed on the next submittal.

Jim Clark of Robinson Brothers, said he had supplied a letter to the Planning Division in response to the staff comments. We don't have any issue with making all the recommended changes. The one discrepancy from my engineers standpoint is he advised that the reason the buildings are not setback 75 feet from the future right-of-way is because you're not allowed to ask for a setback for a future right-of-way; you can only ask for a setback for an existing right-of-way. We can move the building on the west side of the property closer to the existing structure and meet the 75-foot setback from the future right-of-way. It is a natural beauty road and it seems unlikely that the 75 feet would come into play as a half right-of-way.

Mr. Clark did meet with the Society Hill representatives and reached out with an email to the neighborhood associations to the west but didn't meet with them nor the neighbors to the north. None of them were opposed to the development and they would like to see something finished. It's in a terrible state of disrepair at this point in time. We've prefunded the association and we would propose to make the new units part of the existing association. They haven't been filing association reports or financials because they were just five units, but we'd bring the whole thing back into compliance. From a pricing standpoint, the units will approximate what all the existing owners paid. Most of the owners bought from the bottom of the bottom. So although those units are substantially larger, we would not be depreciating their property values with these new units which we hope to price in the low to mid \$200,000 range. We'd like to not do street trees. We'd like an allowance to not do the street trees where we have the front entry garages which is one of the requested changes. If we need to meet all the street trees, it's heavily landscaped as it is, we'll put more landscaping in there. With a small association, it's a

big obligation for a lot of landscaping and it's a well screened site. And the last thing I'll say is the building orientation as it was approved, sets the front of buildings to the back of buildings. Because the existing road pattern is already there, we're hoping to use the existing road pattern and create that landscaped courtyard, garden area between the buildings which would provide a visual landscaped greenbelt for the people in the existing residence as opposed to putting another building on a 45 degree angle and it would substantially increase the amount of roads and impervious surface and would end up costing us more.

There was no correspondence and no one from the audience wished to speak. Chair Pehrson closed the public hearing.

Member Greco said with respect to the waiver for the street trees that there are looking for, that's one of the things that I had concerns about since the staff has concerns. As far as what he was indicating as far as the landscape and using the roads and the frontage of the garages. Does that make sense or should they be including the required trees?

Landscape Architect Beschke said what he stated is absolutely true. There's a lot of landscape on this site. There's a nice brick wall feature up at the front and it's heavily landscaped. The only reference that I was making was to the ring road. It's a short frontage and there's two drives in there. Once you get site distance corners in there, we're only talking about a couple of trees. So you may choose to waive it. They've got a lot of landscape or we would work with them to get another couple trees in.

Member Baratta asked if the applicant would object to that.

Mr. Clark said no, not at all.

Moved by Member Baratta and seconded by Member Greco:

ROLL CALL VOTE ON THE REVISED SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT APPROVAL MOTION MADE BY MEMBER BARATTA AND SECONDED BY MEMBER GRECO:

In the matter of Charneth Fen, JSP13-51, motion to recommend approval to the City Council of the Revised Special Land Use Permit based on the following findings:

Relative to other feasible uses of the site:

- **The proposed use will not cause any detrimental impact on existing thoroughfares as indicated in the traffic review letter;**
- **Subject to satisfying the requirements in the Engineering Review, the proposed use will not cause any detrimental impact on the capabilities of public services and facilities because the plan adequately addresses and provides for water and sanitary sewer service and management of stormwater volumes;**
- **The proposed use is compatible with the natural features and characteristics of the land as no new impacts to natural features are proposed;**
- **The proposed use is compatible with adjacent uses of the land as indicated in the staff and consultant review letters;**
- **The proposed use is consistent with the goals, objectives and recommendations of the City's Master Plan for Land Use;**
- **The proposed use will promote the uses of land in a socially and economically desirable manner;**
and
- **The proposed use is listed among the provisions of uses requiring special land use review as set forth in the various zoning districts of this Ordinance, and is in harmony with the purposes and conforms to the applicable site design regulations of the Zoning district in which it is located.**

This motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Article 6, Article 24 and Article

25 of the Zoning Ordinance and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance. *Motion carried 6-0.*

Moved by Member Baratta and seconded by Member Greco:

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

In the matter of Charneth Fen, JSP13-51, motion to recommend approval to the City Council of the Revised Preliminary Site Plan with a PD-1 Option and Section 9 façade waiver based on and subject to the following:

- a. City Council finding that the standards of Section 2404.4.A of the Zoning Ordinance are adequately addressed, as identified in the planning review letter;
- b. City Council approval of ordinance deviation for the deficient front yard building setback (75 feet required, 64 feet provided);
- c. City Council approval of ordinance deviation for the deficient front yard parking setback (75 feet required, 65 feet provided);
- d. City Council approval of ordinance deviation for the proposed building orientation (45° required, 180° provided);
- e. City Council approval of ordinance deviation to allow driveways to abut residential units;
- f. City Council Section 9 façade waiver for the underage of brick in the front and rear facades as:
 1. The request is for a comparatively small deviation in the percentage of Brick from the minimum amount required by the Façade Chart which is not significant when taken within the overall context of the design
 2. The proposed facade represents an enhancement in the overall composition and aesthetic quality as compared to the existing structures; and
 3. The request is generally in keeping with the intent and purpose of Section 2520;
- g. Applicant providing a material sample board that demonstrates that the proposed colors will be harmonious with the existing building;
- h. 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 Revised Final Site Plan; and
- i. The applicant working with the City's Landscape Architect to provide up to 3 required street trees along 12 ½ Mile Road.

This motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Article 6, Article 24 and Article 25 of the Zoning Ordinance and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance. *Motion carried 6-0.*

MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION

1. SUNDANCE GRILL & CONTINA (fka Ole Ole), JSP12-73

Consideration of the request of Theodore Andris for Preliminary Site Plan and Section 9 Façade Waiver. The subject property is located in Section 2 at 1103 East Lake Drive in the B-3, General Business District. The applicant has altered the building colors and is now seeking a waiver for non-compliance with the Façade Ordinance.

Planner Kapelanski said the applicant has altered the building colors of the existing Sundance Grille and Cantina (formerly known as Ole Ole) at the southeast corner of Fourteen Mile Road and East Lake Drive. The property is directly bordered by vacant land but in the general vicinity of single and multiple-family residences. The property is zoned B-3, General Business with B-3 zoning immediately adjacent as well. The applicant has repainted the building and the City has found the new paint color in violation of Section 2520.2 of the Zoning Ordinance which requires that colors be harmonious with other colors used on the building as well as adjacent buildings and states that the use of intense colors to increase the visual presence of a building for the purpose of advertising is inconsistent with the Ordinance. The applicant has made several improvements with respect to the violation regarding the dumpster and guardrails and

these are noted in the façade review letter. However, the building remains in violation of the façade ordinance. There is an extensive façade review letter provided in the packet detailing the violation and suggesting remedies. The City's façade consultant, Doug Necci, is here to address any questions or concerns.

Ted Andris, owner, said the building colors previously were yellow, red, and green. He recently purchased the property and also owns the surrounding property. The existing building colors were not appropriate. The most appropriate color seemed to be blue to match the sky and water nearby. Given the previous colors of the building, it didn't seem like a blue color would be anything worse than what was there. We haven't received a single complaint from anyone except the City. The City informed us that we are in violation. Mr. Andris did meet with Façade Consultant Necci and agree that there would be no problem with removing some of the color with the guardrail and dumpster area. As for the mansard roof, we agreed upon a color which would be Battleship Gray and I had indicated that I would like some time to change that. I really didn't think it was offensive, but since it was requested, I would have no trouble changing it. In the meantime, we've been working up plans and we have submitted them to the City now showing an expansion of the parking lot and the addition of a patio and landscaping. We also are requesting to expand the front of the building which will require a new mansard roof surrounding the upper part of the building. At this time I would request if an agreement could be reached that as soon as I get approval from the City on the plans we're submitting, I will change the colors of the building features as discussed with Façade Consultant Necci.

Member Greco said looking at the presentation I think the Planning Commission here has a job to do with respect to the ordinances that are in place and enforceable in the City. Our job is to look at what fits within and what fits outside of it. There are two things that I learned today. Number one I learned what the building looked like before. And the second thing I learned is that it looks like your plans are to expand the building and it sounds like you're interested in changing the color of the building consistent with what our façade consultant and the City wants. I'm not sure an agreement could be reached because I believe there's an enforcement action going on so I don't think this board has authority to do anything with respect to that. Is your plan eventually to expand and change the color of the building?

Mr. Andris said yes, battleship gray as discussed with Façade Consultant Necci.

Member Greco said do we have any history regarding this building and how it started off as bright yellow and red.

Planner Kapelanski said it does pre-date the present staff. I don't know if Façade Consultant Necci has any information on that but it certainly does pre-date me.

Member Greco said my only comment to the Planning Commission is we have our obligations under the ordinance and I have a feeling I'm going to vote the same way that I thought when I reviewed the packet before I heard Mr. Andris. But it sounds like at some point later on there may be a deal struck with the applicant. In my opinion, it is in violation of the ordinance but I'm hopeful and it sounds like there might be some sort of agreement in the future to make this work for everybody.

Member Giacometti said there's no way that the existing structure was ever in compliance with the ordinance. It was far brighter than what's been done recently. Would it have been grandfathered in?

Planner Kapelanski said it could have been. I think we'd have to research that to see how that approval was granted if there ever even was one. We would certainly have to look into how the previous colors were dealt with.

Member Giacometti said that neighborhood is somewhat unique to Novi in the sense that it is older and

the colors and designs of the buildings there are different. It seemed like if this façade was appropriate anywhere, it would be in this neighborhood. To me it is in harmony with the neighborhood. I think it's a unique place in town where it doesn't have the same feel as other places in Novi. I guess I was surprised to read this. I understand it. I don't know if this building would be appropriate anywhere in terms of the way the façade is but I guess I was surprised to read the recommendation in the packet. I'm glad the applicant brought that picture because I drove by there this past weekend and I was struck by it only because I didn't recognize that it was so much different

Member Anthony said the improvements that you're looking at doing in the near future, can you describe those improvements?

Mr. Andris said right now the building is indented at the southwest portion and we want to bring out so that it's flush with the rest of the building.

Member Anthony said so in what you're considering in the future is going to be a modification in the façade. When do you see yourself doing that work?

Mr. Andris said as soon as possible. I've been trying to do it since the day I bought it but this is my first experience in dealing with engineers and architects. The plans have been very delayed. We have submitted the plans.

Member Anthony said do you know with the additional work that you're going to do, you'll probably trigger some additional façade requirements as you go through the upgrade with the Novi façade ordinance. I think it's clear that this building was built before many of those ordinances went in. So I guess my question would be, are you aware of the ordinance requirements that you'll be facing when doing the renovations and are you working to comply with those?

Mr. Andris said my architect, engineer and landscape architect have to deal with that more effectively. I'm more sensitive to it now for sure also because of this experience.

Member Anthony said I feel your frustration. Even though the neighborhood right now may be somewhat old fashioned, there is a trend and considerable improvements that are occurring throughout the neighborhood.

Mr. Andris said I would ask if you feel you could, to grant the waiver and then I will put on the record that I will come back at the time that I get the approval.

Member Anthony said my difficulty though with that waiver is that without knowing that the proposal is in compliance with the City ordinance, I don't have enough on the other side to know that I can waive it.

Chair Pehrson said we can't debate the future of what might come in and out of the City. We're dealing currently with this particular issue.

Mr. Andris said well I would just reiterate my position then that since the previous color was permitted and the new color is an improvement a waiver should be granted.

Member Baratta said if this waiver were denied, what would be the time frame for review of the new plan?

Planner Kapelanski said we currently have a site plan in for review of this site. It was just submitted so staff and consultants really haven't had time to go through it in detail and see if it meets the current ordinance provisions. We operate on a 15 business day review time, so we will have comments for them

in about three weeks or so. But those comments could be that it doesn't meet the ordinance requirements and a revised submittal is required. So it's hard to say without having gone over the plan in detail.

Member Baratta said in the event that what was submitted is in compliance, is that something that can be considered within the enforcement procedures he's going through?

Chair Pehrson said that has nothing to do with the case that is in front of us right now.

Attorney Dovre said it is outlined in the staff report that the Planning Commission has three decision options: approved, denied and conditional approval. Having listened to Mr. Andris, and with your permission I might ask him a couple more questions, you may have the framework and ground work here to do a conditional approval that he could agree to. That is something you could do and it wouldn't be dependent on or contingent on his plans for further development. Mr. Andris have you had an opportunity to review Façade Consultant Necci's review letter? I'm looking at the last page and it says "we repeat our suggestion that the amount of dark blue color be reduced. This could be accomplished, for example, by repainting the cedar shingles located on the mansard roof areas of the north, west and east facades a color that is consistent with that material, for example, weather grey or a color matching the adjacent asphalt shingles. Likewise, other areas of dark blue such as the wood fence enclosure on the north façade and door panels should be repainted a harmonious, less intense color. This approach was generally discussed during the meeting on March 8th." Is that an acceptable conditional approval to you?

Mr. Andris said yes. I remember that conversation and I think he pointed specifically to the color and I think that would be acceptable.

Mr. Dovre said because the staff has, based on that recommendation made by Façade Consultant Necci, provided the Planning Commission with a possible conditional approval motion which would approve the waiver on the condition that the use of the amount of dark blue be reduced by repainting the cedar shingles located on the mansard roof to a color consistent with the material such as weather grey or a color consistent with the asphalt shingles and repainting the wood fence enclosure and door panels to a less intense color. Is that acceptable to you?

Mr. Andris said yes but just to clarify, I would like to do the modifications once the construction of the other proposed alterations has begun.

Mr. Dovre said if that motion were made and passed, it would resolve the items on your agenda this evening. It sounds as if Mr. Andris will be back before the Planning Commission with a site plan expansion proposal which will deal with the façade ordinance as well. So you could take that up at that time. If it turns out that a tweak of what you did for the existing building is needed to make it all fit together, that could be addressed at that future meeting.

Chair Pehrson said my comment is going to go back to how it got to be red and yellow. I don't think any of us have a clue based upon where we were at that point in time whenever that was painted and whatever the ordinances were. We're at this point in time today, where we're dealing with the words of harmonious. Chair Pehrson asked Façade Consultant Necci to describe his recommendation.

Façade Consultant Necci said what's unique about this is that the red part of that building is actually cedar shingles. That's a material that you don't originally paint, but once you've painted it, you have to keep painting it. So each iteration of these colors has been really a solution to this part of the building. My opinion is that the colors that are used now are just simply an overuse of one color. The ordinance says that if you design or color a building with the intent of drawing attention to it that is a violation. I

think there is some agreement that that is the case now and it would have been the case with the red and yellow as well.

That was never flagged as a violation and I can't say why. It's equally a violation of the façade ordinance as the blue colors that are on it currently. The suggestion we've made is simply to take the color of the shingles, because part of the roof is asphalt shingles, which are a weather grey color and just use that to paint the cedar shingles. It's just a simple and logical extension of that color that caps the building. It sounds like there's general agreement that that's the direction that this thing will go. So really, I just think it's a matter of timing otherwise.

Chair Pehrson said so it's clear that the objection isn't that we hate the color blue. We're not objecting to anyone's rights to use whatever color and hue they want, we're just suggesting that it has to be harmonious with the surrounding area. So I would fully support the idea of the conditional approval as it stands in front of us now.

Façade Consultant Necci said he was able to take a photoshop image of the building and superimpose the upper view there as the darker color roof. The one below is the existing condition. That's really what we're suggesting.

Member Zuchlewski said a site plan has been submitted and is being reviewed. Have you seen anything in a proposed exterior elevation?

Façade Consultant Necci said that submittal just came in. I did page through it without thoroughly reviewing it. I did not see any architectural sheets in that submittal. It looks like a site plan for the parking lot expansion and does not include any architecture.

Member Zuchlewski said so as I understand this, is that the front of the building will be bumped out so it will be a rectangle. The round windows are going to come out and we're going to put some glass in the front and there's going to be some seating. But when we're all done we're going to end up with a black roof and a blue building, is that correct? So I guess the problem that I have with the proposal of just adding paint, is that it was brought up that the surrounding residential buildings are being upgraded. They are doing everything they can to improve this area. What I'm afraid of is that this facility, as it exists today, with those colors and an addition will be there for another 25 to 30 years. My concern is that I'm very leery of just painting the roof and sending the message that this is what we want.

Façade Consultant Necci said this review was only for colors. There are other façade issues such as the screening of rooftop equipment that will have to come into play when he proposes an addition or alteration to the building. My letter was strictly in response to the violation that the City made.

Member Zuchlewski said it's just more of an open comment to the group. We're going to be looking at this for a long time. And a coat of paint just isn't a remodel.

Member Greco said the conditional approval sounds attractive based on what we've all discussed here but there are other plans that are coming down the road that are the final plans and I feel like a conditional approval of allowing this still isn't the end of the story. I understand Mr. Andris is invested in this and got involved and really did not have knowledge about what may or may not be necessary of requirements and is learning as he goes. It seems like to me that a denial is more appropriate since we've got plans that are coming that we can consider. I think I am going to maintain my conviction that this should be denied for now, but I will tell you that Mr. Andris's presentation, not only with plans for this and the pictures of before it was blue, certainly made an impression on me of what may be appropriate or inappropriate for the neighborhood.

Chair Pehrson asked if a set of plans comes in for a remodel, will they have to comply with the current code?

Deputy Director McBeth said typically the parts of the plan that are being modified would need to comply with the code.

Chair Pehrson said with masonry, brick and all the rest.

Deputy Director McBeth said if the façade were being modified, we would certainly review that again. If there are no modifications to the façade, then we wouldn't necessary highlight those.

Member Baratta said he is sympathetic to Mr. Andris's position that he wants remodel this facility and change the front façade. I wanted to make sure that you're going to have a signification change to the front elevation of this building to meet current codes. Today you're talking about painting a building when there are other things you're going to have to do that a lot different than painting. So my suggestion to you would be to talk to your professionals as they are reviewing the code and see what you have to do to the building because this may not be as much of issue to repaint this thing as you see what you'd have to do. I think I'm going to have to be on the denial side.

Moved by Member Greco and seconded by Member Baratta:

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

In the matter of Sundance Grill & Cantina (fka Ole Ole), JSP12-73, motion to deny the Preliminary Site Plan and Section 9 façade wavier on the basis that the colors proposed to be used on the exterior walls:

- 1. Are not in the keeping with the intent and purpose of Zoning Ordinance Section 2520,**
- 2. Will not be consistent with or enhance the building design concept because the dark blue painted on the cedar shingle roof area represents an overuse of a color that is architecturally out of context with the building, and**
- 3. Fail to properly relate to the buildings and other restaurants in the surrounding area because the overuse of the light and dark blue together results in a visual intensity of the building relative to surrounding buildings which are painted in predominantly earth-toned colors.**
Motion carried 4-2. (Nay – Giacopetti, Anthony)

2. HOMEGOODS ENTRY RENOVATION, JSP13-66

Consideration of the request of Woods Construction Inc. for Preliminary Site Plan and Section 9 Façade Waiver. The subject property is located in Section 15 at 43635 West Oaks Drive in the RC, Regional Center District. The applicant is proposing to modify the entrance to the existing Homegoods store.

Planner Kapelanski said the applicant is proposing to alter the entrance to the existing Homegoods store at West Oaks Shopping Center. The property is zoned RC, Regional Center and is surrounded by RC zoning. The proposed façade modifications include the construction of a new entrance portico and painting of the existing brick on the remainder of the façade, both of which would be enhancements to the existing façade. A Section 9 waiver is required and recommended for the underage of brick and the overage of thin brick and painted CMU as the proposed alterations would represent a significant improvement to the existing façade. The façade review also notes the applicant should consider re-facing the area that was identified as to be painted. Although this would represent a further enhancement, it is our understanding it is not feasible for the applicant to make that improvement at this time. Staff would still support the requested waiver. This particular property is in the RC district which

requires the approval of the City Council after a recommendation from the Planning Commission.

John Bodery, President of Woods Construction, said this building was originally a Service Merchandise and so the prominent entrance is the entrance of the Michael's store next door. Homegoods got the exit, which is the less prominent entrance for them now. So for years they've hoped to enhance that. In fact, in 2005, we had approval to do that and shortly after the approval, the client decided to cut back on their cash expenditures and decided not to do the work. So this year they came back and asked us to bring it back onto the books. We did take back to the client the consideration of putting the brick all the way along the storefront and it was cost prohibitive at this time. So we understand why it would be nice to have that but we also understand their position that it's cost prohibitive. Actually, the adjacent structure to the east is also not the brick façade, it's the painted fluted block as well.

Member Greco asked Façade Consultant Necci if what the applicant is proposing is an improvement.

Façade Consultant Necci said yes. In fact, we recommended the waiver because it's a significant improvement. Albeit, focused only on the entrance. As stated, the Michael's store and the Gander Mountain store are still painted fluted block. All the rest, Best Buy and Old Navy have all improved with full brick facades, so we made a suggestion that they may want to consider doing that. It may have some practical difficulty, putting some brick over the top of that kind of block is problematic. It could be done but not without some cost.

Moved by Member Anthony and seconded by Member Greco:

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

In the matter of Homegoods Entry Renovation, JSP13-66, motion to recommend approval of the Preliminary Site Plan and Section 9 façade waiver to allow the underage of natural clay brick and the overage of thin brick and painted concrete masonry units (CMU) on the basis that the proposed alteration:

- 1. Represents an improvement in the existing façade that will increase the compatibility of the existing façade with adjacent buildings; and**
- 2. Is generally in keeping with the intent and purpose of Section 2520. *Motion carried 6-0.***

3. SUBURBAN INFINITY FAÇADE, JC13-99

Consideration of the request of Infiniti of Novi, Suburban Collection for Preliminary Site Plan and Section 9 façade waiver. The subject property is located in Section 24 at 24355 Haggerty Road on the west side of Haggerty Road, south of Grand River Avenue in the B-3, General Business District. The applicant is proposing to update all facades of the existing building.

Planner Kapelanski said the applicant is proposing to modify the facade of the existing Suburban Infiniti dealership located on the west side of Haggerty Road, south of Grand River Avenue. The property is in the B-3, General Business District and is bordered by B-3 zoning to the north and south and OS-1 zoning to the west. All facades of the building would be updated. A waiver would be required to permit an overage of CMU on all facades. Although this material is not permitted in large quantities by the façade ordinance, the applicant has chosen a representation of the material that resembles limestone, which would be a permitted material. The façade review notes staff and consultants could support the requested waiver on the condition that the applicant provided additional articulation on the north façade, clearly identified the materials on the south and west facades and provided rooftop equipment screening. The applicant has met all of these requests and the waiver is supported.

Stanly Tkacz, of Studio Design, said the program has been very arduous over a year and a half now

between the requirements of Novi and the requirements of Infiniti's image program. Based on the meeting we had with Façade Consultant Necci, he suggested we use these products so we jumped on it. We agree with the whole program as it presently stands.

Moved by Member Greco and seconded by Member Baratta:

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

In the matter of Suburban Infiniti Façade Renovations, JC13-99, motion to approve the Preliminary Site Plan and Section 9 façade waiver for the underage of brick and overage of burnished concrete masonry units (CMU) on all facades provided that:

- 1. Additional building articulation is provided on the north façade, and**
- 2. Building materials are clearly identified on the plans for the south and west building facades, and for the roof equipment screens.**

This motion is made on the on the basis that the size, texture and color of the unique type of burnished CMU that is proposed will have a visual appearance similar to that of limestone panels, which are allowed per the Façade Chart up to 50% of each building façade. With the additional features and/or materials recommended for the north façade, there will be better consistency with the front (east) façade and the view of the building from Haggerty Road. *Motion carried 6-0.*

4. INTERNATIONAL ORIENTAL RUG FAÇADE, JC13-176

Consideration of the request of International Oriental Rug for Preliminary Site Plan and Section 9 Façade Waiver. The subject property is located in Section 24 at 41360 W Ten Mile Road on the north side of Ten Mile Road, east of Meadowbrook Road in the B-1, Local Business District. The applicant is proposing to modify the front façade of an existing vacant retail building by replacing the existing asphalt shingle fascia with new metal roof siding.

Planner Roediger said the applicant is proposing to alter the front façade of an existing vacant retail building on the north side of 10 Mile, just east of Meadowbrook. The property and surrounding properties are all zoned B-1, Local Business. The property is located within the Ten Mile & Meadowbrook Commercial Rehabilitation Area Plan, but does not qualify for the incentives due to its small scope. The proposed façade modification is for the replacement of the existing asphalt shingle fascia with new metal roof siding. A Section 9 waiver is required and recommended for the overage of metal roof siding as the proposed alteration represents a significant improvement to the existing façade.

Illir Marcan, Sara-Marcan Associates, said because we're remodeling on the inside we thought we'd work on the exterior of the building also. We think that even though it doesn't comply with the ordinance, that requires the use of the material standing seam metal less than 25%, we're using around 63%. Still we think that this is a great improvement in the façade.

Chair Pehrson asked if Façade Consultant Necci agrees with the proposed plan.

Façade Consultant Necci said yes.

Moved by Member Greco and seconded by Member Giacometti:

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

In the matter of International Oriental Rug Façade Change, JC13-176, motion to approve the Preliminary Site Plan and Section 9 Façade Waiver to allow the overage of proposed metal roof siding

on the front façade on the basis that the proposed alteration:

1. Represents a significant enhancement in the building's façade that will improve compatibility with the buildings in the surrounding area, and
2. Is generally in keeping with the intent and purpose of Section 2520. *Motion carried 6-0.*

5. APPROVAL OF THE AUGUST 28, 2013 PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Moved by Member Greco and seconded by Member Baratta:

VOICE VOTE ON PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES APPROVAL MOTION MADE BY MEMBER GRECO AND SECONDED BY MEMBER BARATTA:

Motion to approve the August 28, 2013 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 to discuss.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

No one in the audience wished to speak.

ADJOURNMENT

Moved by Member Zuchlewski and seconded by Member Baratta:

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

Motion to adjourn the October 9, 2013 Planning Commission meeting. *Motion carried 6-0.*

The meeting was adjourned at 8:13 PM.

Transcribed by Valentina Nuculaj

October, 2013

Date Approved: November 13, 2013

Signature on File

Richelle Leskun, Planning Assistant