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CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Call to order the regular meeting of the Novi Planning Commission for February 22, 2017.

Barb, can you call the roll.

MS. MCBETH: Member Anthony?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Absent, excused.

MS. MCBETH: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Present.

MS. MCBETH: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Here.

MS. MCBETH: Member Greco?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Absent, excused.

MS. MCBETH: Member Lynch?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Absent, excused.

MS. MCBETH: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Here.
MS. MCBETH: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Here.

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

(Pledge recited.)

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

MR. GIACOPETTI: Motion to approve.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a motion and a second, all those in favor, say aye.

THE BOARD: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Any opposed? We have an agenda.

Open our first audience participation. I see two participants that are going to speak at some point in time. So open and close the first audience participation.
I don't believe we have any correspondence.

Any committee reports?

City planner report, Ms. McBeth.

MS. MCBETH: Good evening.

Nothing to report this evening.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Awesome.

Bring us to our first public hearing, Item No. 1 is the 2017-2023 Capital Improvement Program. Ms. McBeth. Our assistant, City Manager Victor Cardenas is here along with Carl Johnson, our finance director, to give a presentation and to answer any questions.

MR. CARDENAS: Good evening.

Thanks for having me. This is the I think the sixth or seventh time I have made the pilgrimage to the hallowed halls of the Planning Commission to give this presentation to talk about our annual Capital Improvement Plan.

This year it's been a little different, just because of the passage of the
Capital Improvement Fund. So that fund was supported very generously by our voters and that has taking care -- it's going to probably equate to about $35 to $40 million for ten years.

So it's going to go to a lot of projects around the city, specifically some big projects that we have identified here later in our presentation.

But because of that passage of that new mileage on the CIP committee, which is made up of Mr. Giacopetti, Mayor Pro Tem Stout, Council Member Wroble and Council Member Much and Commissioner Zuchlewski, kind of subbed in for Commissioner Lynch, so we appreciate that.

We have been meeting for quite sometime to talk about those -- that new fund and what projects are supported in that. We will really appreciate their efforts in helping us frame and construct what we have here for the CIP that's before you tonight.
So as you can see, we have 174 projects, $173 million of city funds, and we have $4 million of leverage funds. Those are usually from grants, usually tied to road projects, they have got other state or federal funds for.

As you can see, the majority of that is coming out of the CIP fund. The larger projects that we have on tap are coming out of the CIP funds, large building renovations or new buildings that we are proposing. And you can see the road funds are followed up by the water, sewer funds. We got big water sewer projects that are coming that are much needed as well.

So let's talk about these actual projects that are -- this is the second year we have in digital CIP, for everyone sitting at home, and everybody here, CIP.cityofnovi.org. So that is an IP, revolutionary tool that we have developed. We are actually presenting on that at a conference in beautiful Tulsa, Oklahoma in
April. So it's an innovative idea that we are presenting, at a government invasion conference. So those are the icons that denote what year the comes out of the CIP.

We are still making some final alterations to the website to make it more user friendly, so looking at improving upon that in the years to come.

So again, getting to these projects. One thing we have talked about for several years now, since I have been here, is the northwest quadrant, Ring Road, which is the northwest corner of Grand River and Novi Road. So this is something that's going to alleviate some of that traffic and that is -- that piles up during rush hour, especially making a left-hand turn heading north on Novi Road, and getting some additional exits for a company Comau, which is over on the west side of that.

So this is the current design, you can see by the -- this is where the old Big Boy used to be, now the Blaze and
Qdoba, so that stretch is already completed, so we are looking around $5 million for this project, we are using some moneys from a special assessment fund that will look to get reimbursed for this project through a new capital or (unintelligible) improvement authority that we will be bringing forth to City Council at a later date. So this has been in the works for a long time. We have set aside the -- council set aside about $600,000 about four or five years ago for this as well. So we have -- this has been completely designed so we are really looking forward to getting this taken care of finally.

Next up is our public services garage, our facility. And this facility was constructed for Novi about, you know, 30 years ago, of about maybe 10,000 people.

So the biggest need for this facility is to house all the city's vehicular assets. So we already can house under a roof
all of our one ton single axle, tandem axle 
trucks that are the plow trucks, but all of 
those pickup trucks and other vehicles that 
are out in the elements year-round, so we are 
trying to get some kind of structure that 
will be able to house all those under those a 
roof or two, that will shield them from the 
elements.

And also some other 
improvements to that facility to help improve 
and add efficiencies to the plowing efforts, 
also in terms of -- a lot of it is geared 
towards maintaining the vehicles that we have 
and prolonging the life of them.

That's still in design right 
now. We are thinking to be between five and 
seven million dollars, and there is going to 
be an additional roadway that is going to be 
probably one way in, one way out and adding 
additional parking for the firearm training 
center up there. And making an additional 
parking lot as well.

So a lot of improvements to
that facility, looking forward to that coming in the rest of the year, hopefully with a more hammered out plan soon.

Another big one, I spoke to you -- spoke to the Commission last year regarding the Lakeshore Park, and they're completely redoing Lakeshore Park, adding a facility up there to house elections and be a precinct up there and a reservational facility for homeowners associations or small events up there, mainly to house our programming that occurs in lakeshore.

Right now the building was currently housed for lakeshore summer camp is probably from the '60s, and it need to be replaced.

So in addition to that new building up there to serve the residents on the north side, also pave the parking lot, add some new play structures, some new rentable shelters, so we are looking around $5 million for this project as well. Again, this will be out of the CIP fund.
Again, I have a little notation there, it's not the current concept it's very fluid and right now City Council and city administration is in the process of fine tuning this as well.

The building might be on the south end of the park, might be on the north, might be a little bit in the middle, all is up for debate right now. But we really want to make sure we optimize this park for the residents on the north side and residents for the city to enjoy.

Another thing we have been talking about for a long time and we are nearing the completion of is the ITC corridor pathway. So this is taking it from ITC park all the way up to Providence Park Hospital. So we have completed the trail, that is almost linked to ITC park. We need to build a trailhead there. But there is a trail going from there up to just south of Nine Mile. So we now need to do the rest of this -- this is the project here for $2.6
million that will complete that stretch from just south of Nine Mile all the way up to fire station four.

We originally planned to be at fire station four, but we have acquired some property just east of that, used to be an oil company, which has a cell tower, I believe you have seen that before you in the past, so we are looking for a trailhead for that cell tower facility as well, south of Ten Mile just east of Wixom Road.

So once we get this done, we are to going have to full pathway going all the way up to Providence Park. So it's already a small segment that goes south of Nine Mile, all the way over to ITC is being used considerably. A lot of people access that off Deer Run on the south side of town.

Finally, something that a lot of our buildings already have, is a generator for facilities here in the city, and this is just slightly before Meadowbrook Commons. We originally planned this a couple years ago to
have a generator there, been using a generator to repurpose a generator that is currently servicing other parts of the city. That didn't work out so much, so we did the first -- whole new dedicated generator for Meadowbrook Commons to make sure that kind of -- in the case of an outage over there, we can have a generator that pops everything back on and keeps the necessary utilities at Meadowbrook Commons going until power is restored to that area of the town.

So with that, a lot of stuff, lot of projects we have on the horizon. This is just what's going to be for '17/18, a lot of more projects looking out to 2023, so we welcome any questions the Commission might have.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Very good. Thank you, sir, appreciate it. This is a public hearing. And seeing there is no one in the audience, take a stab with that, close the public hearing, turn it over to the Planning
Commission for their consideration.

Who would like to start.

Anyone?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Only question I have is the trailhead, what's the width of that? Do we have a standard width for the trailhead?

MR. CARDENAS: A width. In terms of what trailhead are you referring to, the north side one off Ten Mile, or what we are going to do on the south side?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: South side.

MR. CARDENAS: South side, we haven't had a lot of discussion about that. I think it's going to be integrated into the ITC park itself. So we haven't had many conversations about that because it's going to be ITC park as that kind of theater -- the parking. Up in the north side it's going to be the -- I mean, I don't have the specific dimensions, but there is currently a carved out piece of property there, clearing in that wooded area, that, you know, maybe three to
four car lengths across that will service
that trailhead to the north.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Very good.

Beautiful job.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Victor, I
have noticed in some of the future years,
there is a lot of road improvements where
there is moneys that the city has dedicated,
but then there is -- we are waiting on other
moneys. Where do those typically come from?

MR. CARDENAS: They come from
federal funds that are allocated through
local county, fiduciary groups. And there is
a committee that gets together every year and
doles out those funds to a certain part of
Oakland County. So we have been generous.
We have been lucky to have some of those
funds allocated. But as -- I think that they
met about a few weeks ago. We weren't --
some of the ones that we proposed, that we
have on tap, did not receive enough votes.
So we will try again next year.

But with that said, sometimes
the ones that do receive votes, they get funding from the feds, but then come time to construct that municipality that received the support may not have their matching, so then they might come to us and say hey, do you have the funds to support this and we might be able to pull together and make that happen.

So, as of right now, what we have in the outline of the plan that has federal funds has been supported by previous -- what's the group called?

MS. JOHNSON: I am trying to remember.

MR. CARDENAS: They have received funding previously, but in the future we are still going to keep on trying, to get --

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Pretty much a --

MR. CARDENAS: Tri-County funds, that's what it is.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Very good. I echo Ted's comments as well. The website
and the way that it's laid out is just beautiful. For anybody that isn't a financial wizard to actually know where the money goes for the city, house means, it's just a wonderful display. I really applaud the effort.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Couple of questions, Victor. The Beck Road widening project, which is pushed out to 2021 fiscal year. And I assume that that is on the list of projects that are submitted to the tri-county panel.

In the event that there was money available, I mean, that is a much, much larger project than a couple extra dollars lying around.

I mean, would there be a benefit to having it moved forward on the CIP? Does the committee take that into consideration when they allocate funds as to when it is scheduled on your plan?

MR. CARDENAS: I mean, I believe that the plan is kind of predicated on what
the committee supports.

So if we have that support,
then they would obviously have that sooner in
the plan for your consideration. That
widening project is going to be very
significant. The road construction is going
to be enough -- is going to be significant
enough, but the (unintelligible) acquisition
is even more. We would want to do that in
partnership with our colleagues to the south.
And we are looking at more federal funds and
consultation with our Congressional
representatives and seeing how we can make
that work. Not only just for Novi, but down
to the south, Wayne County. We want that
continuous four lane road all the way from
M14 up to Beck. To acquire all that rights
of way and the road construction in
collaboration with multi jurisdictional
support, is going to be -- it's significant.

So once we get that support
and line all that up, yeah, we can go
forward, but it's pretty aspirational right
now.

There is a lot of due diligence being accrued right now, in discussions taking place not only here, but with our colleagues in Washington.

MR. GIACOPETTI: The other question is concerning the Ring Road project. That project -- starting that project is contingent on the special assessment being passed, is that -- do I understand that correctly?

MR. CARDENAS: We have special assessment dollars currently right now that are -- that have been set aside for several years by City Council for a special project like this. So the dollars are available now. The reimbursement would be what would be set up from the (unintelligible) improvement authority at a later date.

I think we have got a little bit of a chicken and the egg situation. Once we get the authority set up, then I think we can pull the trigger on this project.
MR. GIACOPETTI: This could be moved if that's not approved, or it doesn't come to fruition?

MR. CARDENAS: Correct. Or like in years past, we might fund it in this fiscal year, but maybe start working on it in future fiscal years and roll the money over, just because it's -- how large it is.

It might not be able to get it done in one year, especially with the bidding, how the weather is.

MR. GIACOPETTI: The estimate on the maintenance facility. You expect to have that shored up before the budget -- CIP approved?

MR. CARDENAS: Definitely, definitely.

MR. GIACOPETTI: So I want to echo the other members, comments that the staff did a fantastic job. I think council members Wroble and Stout deserve a lot of credit as well. It was very productive meetings, a lot of hard work went into this
plan. So I fully support it.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: John?

MR. AVDOULOS: I have seen the plans from way back when, and seeing how this was put together, I think it's very user friendly.

There is a lot of -- kind of interesting, there is a lot of things that I have seen that are still here and I know how the process works and how things move up to the top and back and froth.

It is a great tool to be able to use -- I was looking at it the other day with my wife, and she found it very easy to navigate, and then, you know, zero in on the areas of your particular interest.

Can we move this to this year, and well, that's up to a group of people, not individuals.

I do live by the ITC trail, by Garfield, that goes to ITC park. We use that, you know, constantly. So it's a great asset to the city, and also the walkability
that the city is looking to do. I think it's fantastic and it's pulling a lot of people out, and I see people, you know, really taking to heart, you know, what the city is providing.

The one interesting thing that I saw and came up in discussion, was the roundabout at Taft and Nine Mile. I am all for roundabouts. But, you know, once all that gets developed, I think, you know, we'll put the priorities, you know, in the correct order.

But I again, I think it's a nice tool and appreciate the effort.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Barb? Motion from us?

MS. MCBETH: Yes, we do. Motion for adoption, if you are so inclined.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Chair Pehrson, I failed to mention Council Member Much and the hard work he put into this as well. Because I know he reads the minutes of our meetings.

MR. CARDENAS: I'm sure he will
appreciate that.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: He's the one.

MR. GIACOPETTI: With that, I would like to make a motion to adopt the 2017-2023 Capital Improvement Program.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a motion by Member Giacopetti, second by Member Zuchlewski. Any other comments?

Barb, can you call the roll.

MS. MCBETH: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. MCBETH: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. MCBETH: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. MCBETH: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. MCBETH: Motion passes four to zero.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

Appreciate it.
Next on the agenda is the landscape order, Text Amendment 18.23. It's a public hearing in consideration of Section 5.5 of the Zoning Ordinance and it's accompanying Landscape Design Manual. The changes are proposed to make the ordinance requirements more achievable and realistic given the restraints of most sites to promote the visibility of buildings and the health of planted materials through the less crowding of plantings, to promote the health of non-built open areas by additions of certain invasive species to the list of species not allowed, to clean up the inconsistencies in the ordinance, from the intent of the ordinance, and to bring the ordinance into agreement with the other recently amended ordinances.

MR. MEADER: Thank you very much for your time. I just wanted to do a brief introduction of we are proposing with these changes.

As I mentioned in the
introduction, a lot of it is related to
basically trying to avoid the requirement for
a lot of variances and things, especially
these changes are on the commercial and
industrial sector. Actually very little
changes related to anything residential.

As an example, what I am
trying to get at is behind you, I don't know
if it shows up on computers. So this is --
if we totally enforce -- this is for
commercial district -- we totally enforce the
rules that are in place now, this is what we
would have, trees on top of trees, and trees
forced into situations where they really
can't survive very well because they are so
crowded on top of each other.

So what happens is, I could
either -- when I am reviewing plans, either
choose to make them do this, which is pretty
ridiculous or basically they have to get
waivers or basically kind of say this is good
enough based on having enough trees.

So kind of like they have the
situation where we have been fully -- beat
the ordinance fully, but it doesn't create
something like this.

So the changes that I am
proposing, for example, commercial, that's
105 trees, by the way, the changes still have
significant landscaping, but the most
different changes are less required for
interior landscaping, less required in front
of buildings, so it's better visibility for
buildings that has been requested by business
people, by the fire marshal, and by
landscaping architects who want to have a
chance to be creative rather than just
cramming trees in to meet an ordinance.

So this -- it still creates
the screening required for parking to keep --
because not -- it lets people see the
building, it lets the fire people see the
address on the building, that kind of thing.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We
appreciate that.

MR. MEADER: Kevin thought that
would be a good thing, too.

So it's a total of 64 trees.

You're down 31 trees, it's still quite heavily landscaped. So that's one example.

Here is another. This is kind of a new thing I am proposing. This is for situations for commercial where you have parking between the building and the road.

So if we did full parking requirements, it would still be blocking the building. So it's about 50 percent of the requirements with a berm still required to block the headlights, but people can see the building better. It's kind of a different thing. We don't really have any kind of situation like in the ordinance right now.

And then this is a third example, this is for the industrial subdivision. We currently require one canopy tree for every 30 linear feet plus three sub canopy for every 40 feet, which basically is a small tree, like a flowering crab apple, so we require three for every 40 feet, which is
pretty packed in. That's kind of what it looks like there.

Basically I am proposing fewer sub canopy trees and a few more shrubs to kind of offset it. But this was building better, enforce the hedge requirement for blocking the headlights from the parking, but loosen up it a little bit you can see still see the building, you still do a lot of landscaping but nothing to the amount that we have there. There is 115 trees, now the requirement is 31, plus 31 shrubs. You still are seeing a lot of landscaping, but you're not seeing this overplanting that's required by ordinance.

So those are the main focuses of it, kind of loosen it up a little, still lot of screening, still block the parking, but get the buildings more visible.

Then there is some other kind of smaller changes that I encourage you to look through in the ordinance. There is a lot of changes. I can't go through them all
in one night, nor do you want me to go over them all now.

But I am happy to answer any questions you might have.

One thing I do have in there, is in the Town Center we currently require just like any other commercial situation, canopy trees and sub canopy trees. I am proposing having just one or the other. They can choose, if they want canopies or a few more sub canopies, but just one or the other.

We don't really do that now anyway. We don't really have a requirement in most of the developments. I just want to make it official.

Anyway, whatever you -- comments you have, I am glad to have them.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We will open it up to the audience. There is no one in the audience, so we will close the audience participation, turn it over the Planing Commission.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Like to make a
comment. I think in addition to saving the
developers money to put in plants, then
owners to maintain them, because of dying and
being choked out, normally they don't get
replaced. I think this is -- in the long run
this is going to be very beneficial all the
way around.

I also like the idea that the
buildings aren't hidden behind, you know,
from a security standpoint. You know,
inviting break-ins and that sort of thing. I
think people can see around the building and
it's illuminated well and it's not
overcrowded, I think this is going to help in
those cases also.

Those are my commend. You
did a lot of work on it, a lot of scratching
out, there wasn't much left. Good job.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Member
Giacopetti.

MR. GIACOPETTI: I had a couple
of questions about the process.

In the amendment, you have
 referencing that the proposed changes were
sent out to a number of local developers?

MR. MEADER: Yes, I sent it --
not to developers. I sent it to 13 different
landscape architects who do a lot of work in
the city to get their comments. I
incorporated some of them, I couldn't
incorporate all. Some wanted more trees,
some wanted less, some wanted, you know -- so
I couldn't do everything, but I did get their
comments and I can share with you what they
provided.

But I did try to use as many
as I could that I thought were in line with
what they were trying to do here.

MR. GIACOPETTI: In summarizing
the comments, did they typically want to back
out more, or -- were there any themes that
jumped out from their comments?

MR. MEADER: Well, they all like
that there was less. They all -- none of
them said they thought that this was a
mistake to reduce the number of trees. It's
something they have all been dealing with,
trying to get around the ordinance and they
all are basically tree huggers, they love
trees. They saw a need for not as many.

A couple asked if we could do
it based on parking spaces, number of spaces
in an area. I tried a couple of different
scenarios and I couldn't make one work to not
penalize one end or the other. So I just
went with the space that we currently use.

I think it makes sense anyway
because part of the problem is if we have --
like this is just parking spaces, but if we
have areas developed with big loading areas,
then if you do it by spaces, then they're
going to be undercounted, or if I jack up the
counts to compensate for them, then the ones
without loading space like this, then they
are penalized. I just figured it would be
fair to lower that area.

Some wanted no street trees,
just again, to create the visibility. I just
didn't -- there were no perimeter trees
around the parking lot. I didn't want to go there. I know that there -- I didn't try to dot the ordinance. I know that a lot of thought had been going on beforehand. I was just trying make it work. So some said less perimeter trees or no perimeter trees. Generally they didn't fault having good amount of landscaping. They just had different ways to look at it.

MR. GIACOPETTI: I guess over the past year or so that you have been working closely with us, can you think of any specific plans that we have reviewed that this would have had very significant impact or that you would -- the view would have been -- the original plan would have been in compliance as initialed proposed? Did any specific plans come -- you know, do you have in mind when you developed the --

MR. MEADER: Basically I would say 80 to 90 percent at least of the projects we've had since I have been here have -- wouldn't have been able to meet the full
ordinance as we have it now.

So that's what I was kind of just constantly getting -- seeing this. That's where I was reacting to mostly because -- just that we couldn't meet the ordinance. And so I didn't want to have a skeletal thing. I think it's nice to have a lot of trees, so there is no particular project, there is a lot of them, that they just couldn't meet the ordinance.

The other thing, you know, the more trees you have -- say the thing was jammed up with required trees, there is no room for them to put woodland replacement trees on the lot. Now here -- granted there is still a lot of -- you know, there is not a lot of room for woodland replacement trees, but there is more if they choose to do that.

The way the ordinance is, if we required them it fully, there is just no room in most cases for any woodland replacement trees, aside from residential lots where they have open -- you know, open
parts, that kind of thing. Most commercial
areas, there just is no room for any kind of
woodland replacement trees to do all the
requirements. I had a hard time saying,
okay, we are going to let you not do this
ordinance in order to put woodland
replacement trees on it. I didn't see that I
could really do that. So that was some of
the issue we ran into.

MR. GIACOPETTI: My only
questions were concerning the review. This
is very extensive and not within the scope of
my expertise at all. I kill house plants.
But I do appreciate all the work.

I wish that some members
of -- some members of the -- you know, the
landscape community had come out tonight to
share some thoughts or concerns, but I
suppose, you know, they had done it through
writing.

It's so large I would -- you
know, sort of reviewed -- an independent
review, I would have appreciated for some
feedback.

MR. MEADER: I would be glad to
send you whatever comments you like to get.
I would be happy to do that.

I kind of summarized a few,
not all of them, later on.

MR. GIACOPETTI: I support it.
MR. MEADER: I wanted comments.
You know, most of them have been dealt with
Novi more than I have, more years. Thanks.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Member
Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes. I had
mentioned the last time that you were here
about the appreciation of making something
that -- when it's -- when a project is
presented to the city that the applicant
doesn't have to go through and exercise the
idea of like asking for a ton of waivers.
And this is very helpful. I think if this
was an issue, a lot of the landscape
architects would have been here. And the
fact that they were contacted to provide
their reviews and their comments, and what
they would like to see, I think that's a
great asset from the city to the profession,
because a lot of cities don't do at that.
They will ascribe to what the ordinance
should be and not allow some flexibility.

And I think what we have here
is an opportunity like you had indicated, to
allow landscape architects, you know, to work
with creativity and landscape part and parcel
with the design. And so they should, you
know, be able to work together to create a
nice project.

And I think, you know, from
what I have seen of other projects done in
other cities, you know, this landscape
ordinance is still nicely put together
because it doesn't provide landscape -- you
know, there is a lot of cities -- landscape
architects go in with their idea and, the way
landscape is taken out is through a VE
process rather than here is what we should be
doing.
So I think this is good.

It's always, you know, heading in the right direction, to eliminate a lot of the waivers. I like the fact that we added some more trees into the prohibited types, you know, could be sustainable and not have diseases and things like that.

So I think we -- you know, these things always have to get revisited anyway from what I heard. I appreciate the work that's done. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Rick, I just have one question. Section D II, subsection A.

MR. MEADER: Oh, that one.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: And it's the one that I happened to mark, there was a couple that I marked just the words, but I didn't say, but this one I did.

It's just a question of, so the comment is, in situations where the building does not allow landscaping immediately adjacent to the building,
alternate placements of required foundation landscaping may be proposed elsewhere on the property.

And I see the may, I wrote a note, should it be a shall or a should. Because you're -- I saw that a couple of times, kind of a recurring theme.

My only thought was, again, we were trying to get some flexibility. But you have gone through such an extensive rewrite, and in such situations, for this being adjacent to the building, this always comes back with I think just about every kind of applicant that walks in front of us, they will do the minimum requirement, which is fine, but I would like to see them maybe encouraged to do more.

I don't know if that may -- should be a should, or should be a different word there. But I see that as kind of there, okay, Rick, put a may in there, so I am going to get away from that and go somewhere else. Or come back with another variance or
something like that, which is what I think we are trying to get away from. Especially some of the bigger properties, where they -- that landscaping -- that you're talking about, even though it's lower, a little bit more visibility, helps everybody for the number of reasons that you articulated. I just think I would like to see the should or shall in some those of descriptors there.

I don't want to, again, crowd these folks into making them do things, but I think I do. Otherwise you're just going to end up with street, tree and a building, and nothing in front of the building. I like that idea of the greenery in front of the building or the landscape in front of the building, then may just kind of give them a get out jail free card.

Ms. McBeth?

MS. MCBETH: We will take a look at that before it moves on. Sometimes the attorneys take a sharper look at it before it moves onto City Council just to take a look
at those items.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Mr. Schultz look at that.

MR. MEADER: I can tell you what happened with that.

The may was in terms of positioning, not so -- because we have situations such as gas stations with a building surrounded by pavement. And we allow them to put it somewhere with the waiver by Planning Commission. So that's kind of what the may was allowing.

It wasn't they wouldn't have to do the space, but it was if there is just no place to do it -- I understand what you are saying. I can certainly change that word, that's fine. I understand what you are saying.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: It encourages the folks to understand that we want that -- you know, we strive for the kind of materials that we want on buildings to bring the level of attractiveness to the
buildings. I think the landscaping, what
you're trying to do here is a supplement to
that.

Beth can certainly --

MR. MEADER: We can work on the
rewording on that.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: That's all
I have. Thanks for doing a wonderful job,
all those cross-outs.

I guess we need a motion.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Motion to
recommend to City Council the Landscape
Ordinance Text Amendment 18.283.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Motion by
Giacopetti, second by Zuchlewski. Any other
comments? Barb can you call the roll.

MS. MCBETH: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. MCBETH: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. MCBETH: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.
MS. MCBETH: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. MCBETH: Motion passes four to zero.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thanks, Rick.

Next is the approval of the January 11, 2017 Planning Commission minutes. Any modifications, changes? Motion to approve?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Motion to approve.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Motion by Zuchlewski, second by Giacopetti. Any other comments? Barb, please.

MS. MCBETH: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. MCBETH: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. MCBETH: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

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

MS. MCBETH: Motion passes four to zero.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Matters for discussion?

MR. GIACOPETTI: I have a matter for discussion.

MS. MCBETH: Please.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Inspired by Rick's work. I think the other landscape we have seen in the last couple of years, a lot of requests for waivers in landscaping. I think the other area where you have seen a lot of requests for waivers was facade. I mean, a lot.

And I guess this is a matter for discussion and a question for Ms. McBeth is when was the last time we reviewed -- the city reviewed its ordinance and standards because a lot of -- there is a lot of requests for waivers and maybe -- I don't know.

MS. MCBETH: It has been a few
years, but the good news is that we have already asked to have a facade consultant to take a look at that. We expect they will be presenting a draft of the changes here in the next few weeks.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Recently I mean, I had seen something that had suggested the facade ordinances, broadly, which they keep the community looking good, but they also are increasing the cost of development to the point where it's not feasible to have, you know, diversity of housing options and for -- you know, all the income groups. That's why it seems to be why we are getting everything new coming to town is half a million to million dollars, you know, homes.

MR. AVDOULOS: Are the waivers based on like materials that are being proposed, or --

MR. GIACOPETTI: Typically.

MS. MCBETH: Sometimes the materials and sometimes the percentage of material doesn't exactly match what the
ordinance calls for.

MR. AVDOULOS: I know that year after year, you know, they're doing a lot of work on materials and they're getting better, you know, a lot of people are now using cement board for siding and stuff, vinyl siding, so it lasts a lot longer. It is much -- you know, much better in different types of metals and things like that.

But if it's being -- going to be reviewed, that's a good thing.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Brick (unintelligible) seems to be the most common waiver request.

MR. AVDOULOS: A lot of that is kind of interest lately, not only when a downturn in the economy came about, a lot of the brick facilities closed down. And a lot of bricklayers got out of business, so they're trying to limit the amount of materials they use for speed of construction and different things.

But I think we should take a
look at it. I am glad the city has that, too, because again there is municipalities that do not have that. They get a lot of interesting things.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Very good. Thank you. Any supplemental issues?

I am going to take a stab at the next one, audience participation adjournment, being not one run on sentence, but two categories.

Seeing no one in the audience, we will close that last audience participation. And then look for a motion to adjourn.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Motion to adjourn.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: All those in favor?

THE BOARD: Aye.

(The meeting was adjourned at 7:43 p.m.)
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