



- C. Approval to purchase two (2) 2019 Chevrolet Tahoe police package vehicles in the amount of \$71,612 from Berger Chevrolet Inc., Grand Rapids, MI through the Oakland County contract.
- D. Approval to purchase three (3) 2019 Ford Police Interceptor Utility vehicles in the amount of \$86,541 from Signature Ford, Owosso, MI through the Macomb County cooperative purchasing contract.
- E. Acceptance of a sidewalk easement for the Haggerty Corridor Corporate Park Phase 2 development project.
- F. Approval to award Sports Uniform Contract to Challenger Teamwear, for one year with the option to renew for two subsequent years with an estimated annual amount of \$45,000.
- G. Approval of Claims and Accounts – Warrant No. 1019

**CM 18-09-136 Moved by Markham, seconded by Breen; MOTION CARRIED: 5-0**

**To approve the Agenda.**

**Roll call vote on CM 18-09-136**

**Yeas: Breen, Casey, Markham, Mutch, Staudt**  
**Nays: None**  
**Absent: Gatt, Wrobel**

#### **MATTERS FOR COUNCIL ACTION**

- 1. Consideration of a contract for as-needed Supplemental Building and Trade Inspection Services and Plan Review Services with SAFEBuilt Michigan LLC for three years with option for two additional years. **REMOVED**

**AUDIENCE COMMENT: None**

**COMMITTEE REPORTS: None**

#### **MAYOR AND COUNCIL ISSUES:**

Member Markham wanted to talk about the development sequence. She said she was watching the Planning Commission meeting and she was interested in a proposal coming forward with a PRO Overlay and it passed the Planning Commission with the site plan, but Council has not seen the concept plan yet. She said she was concerned that there was a proposal coming forward and the sequence seemed rocky. She said the sequence of events for the PRO is troublesome. She said she does not want to change the process for anything in the pipeline. She said they have a situation where Council is expected by the constituents to understand what they are looking for and

the needs of community and be that oversight of developing in the way we want to be. She gave the example of a development coming through with site plan approval from the Planning Commission, she wasn't sure how it would work when it comes to Council and they want to change something. She thought a developer would get frustrated, especially if they get way down the path and then Council points something out. She thought Council was the governing body, and on rezonings that have complicated proposals, they should look at it early. She wanted them to look at the concept and make comments, then go back to Planning Commission. She wanted Council to have a spot in the process earlier for Council to review. She didn't want Council to have approval at that point, but thought it would head off Council concerns at a point in the process that has less of an impact on developers and the Planning Department. She has been very uncomfortable about proposals that come to them and then they want changes.

Member Mutch said he has made similar comments in the past. He said too often the proposals get to Council essentially done. Staff, consultants, and the Planning Commission have already had input. All those decisions have been made and the expectation is Council will just approve it as presented. He said sometimes the decisions made in the process are appropriate for them to make, but sometimes it's a policy decision in terms of density and public benefit. That is Council's responsibility. He said the way the process is currently structured with the PRO Overlay isn't serving them as a body and ultimately not serving the community well. He didn't think it served the development community well either because they go through the process thinking they've jumped through all hoops and then Council says they want a different direction. He said that adds cost and time. He said he didn't want to touch the PRO process because it was uniquely structured. He was interested in looking at a new process that would encompass rezoning requests and all developments where the developer wants approval for something that doesn't meet zoning standards or has public benefit. He would like Council to have input at the beginning. He pointed out that almost all comparable communities have a plan development option that is not tied to a rezoning. He thought instead of fixing something that doesn't work, they should look at a new plan development option that would, in some ways, accomplish the same things but would work better. He added that he doesn't like the PRO overlay process because it requires a developer to seek rezoning, and they've that it encourages them to seek higher density. He didn't think all developers were looking to get more density; some would be interested in just adjusting the zoning to deal with wetlands and woodlands. They are willing to work within the constraints of the existing site if they are given the flexibility to do so. He said having a vehicle like that would serve them better and potentially streamline the process for developers because they've heard from residents that density increases are a red flag. It was not necessarily where the lot is or the size. He said they could ask the attorney's office to return with an outline of a plan development option for them to consider; or have a joint meeting with the Planning Commission to get their input regarding what does and doesn't work. He thought maybe the first suggestion because it would move the idea along.

Member Breen agreed with the previous speakers and said it was frustrating for citizens, developers, and Council. She said projects come to them almost done and it would behoove them to come up with a process where Council has input earlier. She said she looked forward to what is brought back.

Member Casey thanked them for raising issue and would support either option. She said she was eager to have the conversation. They have had several instances where developers come in thinking they are ready to go, but Council sends them back.

Mayor Pro Tem Staudt said he was concerned about major changes because the Planning Commission serves a purpose, and if Council gets involved too early they are usurping their role. He said yes, they are the final decision makers and he didn't think any of them had any qualms about stopping a development if that's what they want to do. He said he was concerned that this was an effort to get some developments to stop prior to them getting to the Planning Commission. He said if they were going to have a process that includes Council it needs to be a formal meeting and not an open house or public hearing. He said they will look at options and come back to the topic at a future meeting.

**CONSENT AGENDA REMOVALS FOR COUNCIL ACTION: None**

**ADJOURNMENT** – There being no further business to come before Council, the meeting was adjourned at 7:18 P.M.

---

Cortney Hanson, City Clerk

---

David Staudt, Mayor Pro Tem

---

Transcribed by Deborah S. Aubry

Date approved: September 24, 2018