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CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: I'd like to call to order the regular meeting of the Planning Commission for February 8, 2017.

Kirsten, can you call the roll.

MS. MELLEM: Member Anthony?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Absent, excused.

MS. MELLEM: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Here.

MS. MELLEM: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Here.

MS. MELLEM: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Here.

MS. MELLEM: Member Lynch?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Absent, excused.

MS. MELLEM: Chair Pehrson?

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

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Here.

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

Ms. McBeth, would you lead.

(Pledge recited.)

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you very much. Look for a motion to approve the agenda or modify.

MR. GRECO: Motion to approve.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a motion and a second. Any comments? All those in favor.

THE BOARD: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have an agenda.

Come to our first audience participation. There is one public hearing tonight.

If you wish to address the Planning Commission on any other topic at
this point in time, please step forward.

Seeing no one, we will close

the first audience participation.

And correspondence?

MR. GRECO: I do not see any correspondence.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, sir. Any committee reports? I don't believe so.

City Planner report,

Ms. McBeth.

MS. MCBETH: Thank you. I don't have anything to report this evening.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: You are awesome.

Brings us to our first item, which is the consent agenda for Novi Plaza Facade, JSP15-40, it's an approval at the request of Scott Manchanik (ph) and Associates for the revised preliminary site plan and section nine facade waiver.

The subject property is located in Section 26 south of Ten Mile Road,
and west of Meadowbrook Road in the B1 local business district.

The subject property is approximately 1.6 acres, and the applicant is proposing to remodel the existing facade in the Novi plaza shopping center along with modifications to an existing parking lot.

We have a motion?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Motion to approve the consent agenda.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a motion by Giacopetti and a --

MR. GRECO: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Second by Greco.

Any other comments?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Please.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: I would like to make a motion to postpone approval.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a motion already on the table to approve.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: I understand
that, but I am waiting for maybe somebody in
the audience that was their rep to talk, then
I was going to interject that at that time.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a
motion right now. We have to vote on it.

MR. GIACOPETTI: It's part of the
consent agenda.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: I understand,
but the drawings and elevations, nothing
matches and the site is -- it's deplorable.
I think we need to bring this up before we
approve it.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Kirsten,
can you call the roll, please.

MS. MELLEM: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: No.

MS. MELLEM: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

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

MS. MELLEM: Motion passes four to one.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Next item is a public hearing for Commerce Park, JSP17-02, a zoning map amendment 18.706.

It's a public hearing at the request of Premier Realty for Planning Commission's recommendation to City Council for rezoning of property in Section 16 located in the southwest corner of Twelve Mile Road and Taft Road, residential acreage to OST office, service technology. The subject parcel is approximately 30.64 acres.

MS. MCBETH: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Sri is absent this evening, so I get to do her report.

The subject property is 30.64 acres, vacant land located on the south side of Twelve Mile and on the west side of Taft Road in Section 16 of the city.

The subject property consists of two parcels of land. The request is to
rezone from RA, residential acreage to OST, planned office service technology. It is a simple rezoning request and does not include a planned rezoning overlay concept plan.

If the rezoning is approved by the City Council, staff expects that the applicant will submit a preliminary site plan application for review and consideration by the Planning Commission.

The subject property is currently vacant. The property to the south is used for the ITC transmission corridor and runs parallel to the I-96 freeway. The properties to the east across Taft Road are developed with single family homes. Further to the east, across the railroad tracks, the land is developed with the Somnio building. Land to the north is developed with an office building and is used for outdoor storage.

The existing zoning of the property is RA, residential acreage as is the zoning to the south and to the east across Taft Road.
The property to the north is zoned I1 light industrial, to the west the property is zoned OST, planned office service technology district.

The future land use plan recommends the following land use category for the property. Office research development and technology. The same is recommended for the properties to the south, east and west.

The requested OST zoning is consistent with the recommendations of the future land use plan. To the north across Twelve Mile Road, the future land use plan recommends industrial research development and technology land uses.

With regard to the natural features, there are woodlands and wetlands on the subject site. A survey of the natural features has been completed by the applicant, but has yet to be confirmed by the city's environmental consultant. We believe that there are about two and a half acres of
regulated wetlands on the site.

Since the request is a simple rezoning request, it does not include a planned rezoning overlay concept plan, impacts to the woodlands and wetlands will be reviewed at the time of preliminary site plan submittal.

Planning staff estimates that the development potential of the site under the current residential acreage zoning could result in the construction of about 20 single family homes, the actual number of units being more or less, depending on the proposed layout and the existing wetlands on the property.

For purposes of completing the traffic study, the applicant's consultant used an estimate of 28 homes for the existing residential acreage zoning and no more than 240,000 square feet would be possible under the proposed OST zoning.

The city's traffic engineering consultant has reviewed the submitted traffic
impact study and indicated that additional traffic that is anticipated and generated by the site under the proposed zoning classification is not expected to degrade the existing roadway network levels of service below acceptable limits.

The consultant has noted that additional trip generation estimates should be performed at the time of preliminary site plan submittal in order to determine whether a full traffic impact statement will be required once a proposal development plan has been submitted.

The city's staff engineer has reviewed the rezoning request and has no concerns regarding the sanitary sewer capacity nor the available city water capacity under the proposed zoning district.

The impacts of the rezoning land of this area to OST have been evaluated previously by the engineering department to determine viability of the proposed uses and no concerns were found.
The planning staff recommends approval of the rezoning for the following reasons.

- The rezoning is consistent with the recommended land use on the future land use plan and will be consistent with the existing zoning to the west. The rezoning provides an opportunity to develop the property in conformance with the Master Plan for Land Use recommendations, and puts a vacant parcel of land to use.

- The rezoning request fulfills three objectives in the Master Plan for Land Use, fostering a favorable business climate, showing support of development in the OST district and maintaining a competitive marketplace.

- Finally, the rezoning will not have a negative impact on the public utilities. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, Ms. McBeth.

Is the applicant here and wish
to address the Planning Commission at this time?

MS. FIELDS: My name is Stacey Fields, and I am here on behalf of Premier Realty.

We are just looking for some rezoning for the Master Plan of the OST. I am willing to take any questions you may have.

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 matter, please step forward.

Seeing no one in the audience, I don't believe we have any correspondence.

MR. GRECO: No correspondence.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Close the public hearing, turn it over to the Planning Commission for their consideration.

Who would like to start?

Member Giacopetti.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Ms. Fields, so
there is no -- there is no planned
development at this time?

MS. FIELDS: Not at this time.

MR. GIACOPETTI: This is in

anticipation of --

MS. FIELDS: In anticipation of

possibly some new development coming our way.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Premier Realty

is -- what kind of company, do you

represent -- are you representing here
	onight?

MS. FIELDS: We have land owners.

We own industrial office high tech facilities

in the area, metro Detroit, including Novi, Plymouth, Canton Township. So we are looking

at possibly -- we have held this land for

quite some time. We are looking at possibly

redeveloping this site.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Your company
doesn't do any residential?

MS. FIELDS: No, sir.

MR. GIACOPETTI: You said you are

the current land owner of this site?
MS. FIELDS: I am representing the current land owner, yes.

MR. GIACOPETTI: You are their agent?

MS. FIELDS: Correct. Not really their agent, more of a consultant.

MR. GIACOPETTI: I see. They're not here tonight?

MS. FIELDS: Actually one of the owners is here.

MR. GIACOPETTI: I mean, those are my only questions. For the Planning Commission, without a plan, I am less inclined to support the project, but eager to listen to any other questions.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, sir. Anyone else? Member Avdoulos.

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes, I drive by that site or that area quite a bit, and I think the request to rezone meets with the intent of our master plan.

I think the size of it and what could be done there is, you know,
appropriate for the type of office use that could be used there, so I have no objections.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, sir.

I too, agree that the rezoning meets the Master Plan. I think it's probably better suited than the residential lending for any particular means any way. I would be in favor of it.

Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Just a few comments. I echo Member Giacopetti's sentiments with respect to -- I prefer to see what potentially is going to be there, when we see a rezoning.

That being said, it is in compliance with our general plans for the area, and I think the area that is there, you know, with the highway backing up to it in the area, that it is in Novi, I do think that the rezoning is in compliance with what we generally want in that area, and what we are looking for and what we are hoping for.
MS. FIELDS: Part of the concerns with going to the market and marketing the plan to potential tenants or buildings for the OST zoning, knowing that was master planned is their first question is, what's the zoning, and our answer to them is, you know, the residential zoning that's there, so that gives them a little bit of a deterrent to proceed forward with our site, not knowing that the zoning is not there. So I think we run into some stumbling blocks there.

MR. GRECO: Some additional (unintelligible) at the outset.

MS. FIELDS: On the outset that they think we can't do it in the timing or something along those lines. We feel that OST zoning obviously would mean, submit any plans to Planning Commission, they would fit within that zoning.

MR. GRECO: All right. With that, I would like to make a motion.

In the matter of the request of Commerce Park JSP17-02, the zoning map
amendment 18.716, motion to recommend approval to City Council to rezone the subject property, from residential acreage to OST office service technology, for the reasons set forth in the motion sheet.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Do we have a second?

MR. AVDOULOS: Second.

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

MR. GIACOPETTI: Again, I am not opposed to the rezoning. Just in this specific location, I would prefer to have seen a concept plan for what plans go there, given the amount of protected wetland and woodland within this parcel, which is quite substantial. So I am not in support, but just my comments.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Kirsten or Ms. McBeth.

MS. MELLEM: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: No.
MS. MELLEM: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Motion passes four to one.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: All set.

Next on the agenda is matters for consideration.

Item No. 1 is 18.284 zoning ordinance Text Amendment to set a hearing for March 8, 2017 for Text Amendment 18.284 to allow outdoor display the OSC office service commercial district and to allow for above ground storage tanks in the OST planned office service technology district.

Kirsten.

MS. MELLEM: The proposed ordinance amendments addressed two previously
approved text amendments from 2014 that were inadvertently excluded from a clear zoning ordinance reformatting, and is therefore going through the process to reinstate the ordinance language.

The first one is to allow outdoor display in connection with the permitted general hospital use, making it a temporary special land use reviewed by the building official.

The second ordinance amendment is to allow outdoor placement of above ground storage tanks in OST with the same conditions as required in I1, with three modifications proposed. There are no additional changes from previously approved language as are currently proposed.

The Planning Commission is asked tonight to review the proposed amendments, and if acceptable, to set a public hearing for March 8, 2017.

At that time, the Planning Commission may make a recommendation to City
Council who will ultimately approve or deny
the amendment and may proposed alterations as
well.

Staff is available to answer
any questions you may have regarding the
proposed amendments.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: I have a question.

My question is more to our legal counsel. I
mean, once these are passed ordinances,
aren't they passed ordinances, and that's it,
and if they are inadvertently left out of
something, they still are the law of the city
or was the clear zoning -- was there a new --

MS. SAARELA: A new --

MR. GRECO: A new approval for
the clear zoning that did everything --

MS. SAARELA: Yes.

MR. GRECO: So it adopted that as
an ordinance, so that's why these were left
out and why we need to do these to add it
back in?
MS. SAARELA: That's correct.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: A non-legal question, but the amendment, does it cover billboard signages as consideration of a vehicle being parked on hospital -- being grounds as being -- something like what's going on right now, where they have vehicles I think at Varsity there, is this considered part of that, or is that something else covered in the different amendment?

MS. MCBETH: I believe that's a different amendment.

I will look at this again before it comes back for a public hearing, but I believe that's a separate amendment.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Very good.

MR. GRECO: I would like to make a motion to set both text amendments for a public hearing.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Second.

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

Any other comments?
Kirsten.

MS. MELLEM: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Motion passes five to zero.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

The second item is approval of the October 26th, 2016 Planning Commission minutes. Any changes, modifications?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Motion to approve.

MR. GRECO: Second.

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

Kirsten, please.
MS. MELLEM: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Motion passes five to zero.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Brings us to matters for discussion.

Supplemental issues?

Last audience participation.

No one in the audience, we will close the audience participation.

Look for a motion to adjourn.

MR. GRECO: Motion to adjourn.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: All those in favor.
THE BOARD: Aye.

(The meeting was adjourned at 7:17 p.m.)
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