



## PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

CITY OF NOVI

Regular Meeting

**March 25, 2020 7:00 PM**

Remote Meeting

45175 W. Ten Mile (248) 347-0475

### CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 PM.

### ROLL CALL

Present: Member Anthony, Member Avdoulos, Member Ferrell, Member Gronachan, Member Lynch, Member Maday (joined late), Chair Pehrson

Absent: None.

Also Present: Barbara McBeth, City Planner; Lindsay Bell, Senior Planner; Rick Meader, Landscape Architect; Kate Richardson, Staff Engineer; Thomas Schultz, City Attorney; Josh Bocks, City Traffic Consultant; Pete Hill, City Environmental Consultant

### APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Chair Pehrson requested that a motion be made to remove the first audience participation from the agenda.

Moved by Member Gronachan and seconded by Member Ferrell.

**VOICE VOTE TO APPROVE THE MARCH 25, 2020 PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA WITH REMOVAL OF THE FIRST AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION MADE BY MEMBER GRONACHAN AND SECONDED BY MEMBER FERRELL.**

**Motion to approve the March 25, 2020 Planning Commission Agenda. *Motion Carried 6-0.***

### CORRESPONDENCE

There was no correspondence.

### COMMITTEE REPORTS

There were no Committee Reports.

### CITY PLANNER REPORT

There was no City Planner Report.

### CONSENT AGENDA - REMOVALS AND APPROVALS

There was nothing on the Consent Agenda.

## **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

### **1. NOVAPLEX JZ19-37 WITH REZONING 18.733**

Public hearing at the request of BC Novaplex, LLC for Planning Commission's recommendation to City Council for a Zoning Map amendment from Office Service Technology (OST) to High-Density Multiple Family (RM-2) with a Planned Rezoning Overlay. The subject property is approximately 22 acres and is located on the west side of Haggerty Road, north of Twelve Mile Road (Section 12). The applicant is proposing to develop a 270 unit multiple-family residential development.

Planner Bell said this property is located on the west side of Haggerty Road, north of 12 Mile Road. It is currently zoned OST, Office Service Technology, and they are requesting a rezoning to RM-2, High-Density, Mid-Rise, Multiple-Family, using the Planned Rezoning Overlay Option to allow a multi-family residential development. Staff has indicated that the proposed zoning conflicts with the future land use designation which is office, research, and technology for this property and for all surrounding properties. On the east side of Haggerty Road is the City of Farmington Hills. There are significant high-quality regulated woodlands along the western boundary as well as some areas of wetlands in scattered locations on the property.

The applicant is proposing a 272-unit multi-family residential development. The development consists of two attached townhouse-style buildings toward the front of the property and eight apartment-style buildings. All units range from three to four-stories tall. The development is served by a private street network with two entrances off Haggerty Road. The PRO Concept Plan under consideration is the second revision, which was reviewed by staff and consultants and comments were provided in your packet. The first revision was reviewed by the Master Plan and Zoning Committee back in late 2019. Since that time, the applicant has reduced the number of units from 332 to 272. The percentage of 1-bedroom units was reduced from 39 percent to 36 percent and the total number of rooms was also reduced. The entire layout now appears to be outside of the regulated woodland boundary, which is on the western portion of the parcel so the impacts to the high-quality woodlands are significantly reduced. The number of deviations was also reduced. Some of those deviations that the applicant indicated are no longer needed and the response letter has not been evaluated by staff. Information was provided to address the sanitary and sewer capacity. This information shows that while the proposed development will consume about 50 percent of the total capacity of the system. In the area there will still be about 28 percent capacity remaining. The secondary access to the Infinity Medical development to the south is now provided in this plan revision.

The building cross section has been revised to eliminate the basement style design. The applicant also provided additional information in the last few days that shows the availability of residential service uses in the vicinity of the project. However, staff has not been able to complete a review of that information.

Planner Bell continued to say the subject property falls within the Novi School jurisdiction and we have confirmed that any children registered from this development would be included in their bus routes. As a community benefit the applicant has proposed to fill two off-site sidewalk gaps along Haggerty Road totaling about 600 linear feet. This would complete the sidewalk loop between Lewis Drive, Cabot Drive, 12 Mile Road, and Haggerty Road. The applicant indicated

that they would be responsible for design and construction and right-of-way acquisition is also required for these locations.

The following information has been provided by the applicant, but not yet thoroughly reviewed by staff. There was additional justification for the request to change the zoning; this was provided as an addendum to your packet on Monday. Justification for certain traffic deviations to include stop signs and marked crosswalks as a means of traffic calming. There were some new open space calculations. Some areas appear to not meet the definition of qualifying open space, but that has not been fully reviewed yet. There was a carport detail provided, which did not indicate any brick component which is required by the Façade Ordinance so that would require a Section 9 Waiver. Details of available parking supply in other multi-family communities were asked for and that has recently been provided. There's an indication that the applicant will widen a landscaping area as much as possible to add required parking lot perimeter trees, which is one of the deviations staff had noted, however, it is unclear if that widening will cause an encroachment into the wetland areas or if all the required trees would be provided to eliminate that deviation. Our Wetland Consultant has not yet received the missing information regarding the existing wetland boundaries and the required mitigation in order to determine whether the requirements of the Wetland Ordinance would be met. Considering the need to review these additional informative items provided and the significant issue of proper identification of the wetlands impacts, staff recommends that this item be postponed for consideration to a later date.

Tonight the Planning Commission is asked to hold the Public Hearing as advertised and to discuss the proposal. Tonight's meeting would be a good opportunity for the public to provide their comments and the Planning Commission members to ask questions and discuss the project. That way the applicant can take that feedback into consideration as they move forward. Representing the project are David Landry, Mark Highlen, and Zach Weiss and they can tell you more about their proposal.

Chair Pehrson said if the applicant wishes to address the Planning Commission at this time please do so now.

David Landry, attorney for the applicant, said I appreciate the opportunity to address the Planning Commission this evening. I think it's important to understand the history of this particular piece of property and how it is that we got to where we are today. Beztak purchased this property in the late 1990s. They attempted to develop it with the zoning of OST, Office Service Technology. So this is not a developer that just bought a piece of property and coming before you saying "please rezone it." We've been working with this property for twenty years. In fact, twenty years ago, Beztak went through this same process. They didn't just put a for-sale sign up and say "somebody please buy this for OST." They went through the process and a Preliminary Site Plan was approved as an OST project. No one would buy it. They marketed it after they got preliminary site plan approval. The parcel is unique in that it's narrow, it has limited frontal visibility on Haggerty Road and the topography of the property gets lower at Haggerty, so that's where the stormwater has to be. So they went back to the City in 2017 and talked about mixed-use. They talked to the planning department and I think the department would have preferred that we come up with some unique, all residential project. So in 2018 we started working with administration for a possible rezoning to RM-2 with a PRO. We have been working on this for two years. We had a Pre-Application Meeting and we got comments, we submitted again and got comments, we went to the Master Plan and Zoning Committee and we got more comments and then we submitted our most recent submittal. The comments we heard were that the project was too dense. We then reduced density. They told

us to stay out of the woodlands. We've heard that numerous times and we stayed out of the woodlands. We were told to present some unique architecture, we think we have that. At the Master Plan and Zoning Committee they asked about the schools, we contacted the Novi School District and they will provide a bus stop. There's no increase in traffic. We made a secondary access. We've added the screening. We've also looked into the sanitary capacity. We heard initially that we should hire a planner, so we did. So here we are now, after two years, and I think as the Planning Commission looks at this and as I look at it, there are two aspects to this: what I call the conceptual aspect which is, "what about the use? Can the use work here?" and the second is the technical, dimensional site plan aspect.

Let's talk about the conceptual aspect. It's residential. Somebody might say this is an island of residential surrounded by OST. It really isn't, and it's only an island of residential surrounded by OST if you ignore all the residential across street and along Haggerty between 12 Mile Road and 13 Mile Road. This is the border line of Novi, but there's a ton of residential there and also I think you have to keep in mind that the OST land owners in Novi asked us for walkable, bike-able residences. Their people want a place to live that they can walk and bike to work so we've been working with the Planning Department, were here before the Planning Commission and planning as you all well know remains flexible because things change and sometimes a plan just can't accommodate everything. I would call your attention to Novi's own experience. Fifteen years ago, Providence Hospital came in here and once that happened, the entire zoning of the northwest quadrant of the city had to be reconsidered and many rezonings were made to accommodate medical support uses that were not in the Master Plan, but that's what planning is all about, it's flexible. One thing I know that you're all aware of is once a big business comes into Novi and invests millions of dollars, we need to make sure that we have the planning in place so that they remain successful. Here, Haggerty Corporate Park, the major OST developers in the City of Novi, one of their major tenants, Harman wrote to you and said our tenants want a place they can walk and bike to work. Haggerty Corporate Park said our prospective tenants want a place they can walk and bike to work and the City has been flexible, they rezoned so Starbucks could be in this area because that's what the tenants wanted. So I believe we have a piece of property we've spent twenty years trying to develop, I think this is a minor revision to meet a confirmed need. As planners, some of the recent motions are horizontal mixed developments so instead of a mixed-use all-in-one parcel you can place them on different parcels next to each other in a horizontally mixed-use. To my knowledge, there has been no objection to the OST surrounding uses to this. That's interesting because usually the objections come from the residents who say we don't want nonresidential next to us. Well this is the flip side to that where the OST people say we want residential next to them. So I think the use can work in this situation and I don't think it's an island of residential.

From the technical standpoint, there are a number of deviations, but looking at your reports most of these are supported by staff. There's only a few of them that are not. Many of them can be dealt with at the site plan stage and we've given explanations for many of these deviations. I think technically we can deal with deviations and work with the city to work those out during the site plan review. From the standpoint of public benefit, our aim is to integrate this project with the OST that's why a lot of the setbacks are OST-type setbacks., We were trying to come up with a public benefit that integrates the residential use with the surrounding OST that's why we proposed walkable and bike-able to make sure there are paths to do that. By the way, filling in those two gaps is going to cost us in the neighborhood of around \$80,000. The Master Plan, while it might call for OST, it also talks about providing a wide range of housing, housing in proximity to other places. You can look at the zoning map, there are other areas where residential is behind commercial-just look at Twelve Oaks, there's RM-1 adjacent to OST. If you look at Beck Road, there's RM-1 next to I-1. So there have been areas of the City where this has

been done, successfully. We are anxious to bring closure to this project. Project Manager Mark Highlen and Manager of Development and Acquisition Zach Weiss are here. I would turn it over to them at this time or take any questions from the Planning Commission.

Mark Highlen, Project Manager, said I want to reiterate that the context of the development is very important. We really did look at the site and tried to design it to fit in. We wanted the site to be a multi-family site that complements and fits in to the surrounding OST districts. We are asking you to allow an RM-2 use within an OST District using OST-like development standards. You can see by the layout, we didn't follow the standard apartment layout with the large winding road with the two-hundred foot radius's, what we tried to do was more of a linear approach. We did designate the center loop as a primary road, kept it 28-feet wide, that's the road that's adjacent to all the 4-story portions of the buildings as well as the remainder of the site. The exterior road is the 24-foot wide, that's the secondary road where all the parking lots are off of for the upper side of the development. You can see that it's more of a linear design, it fits well with the site, and it doesn't look out of context with the neighboring developments. Some of the items in the layout we had adjusted. We went with longer buildings, but we did step the stairs and step the floor grades so it wouldn't appear overly long, but they are in effect no longer than any of the OST developments in the Haggerty Road Corporate Park as well as some of the buildings around us. We really did try to make this fit in, that was our big goal. We want this to look like it belongs in the area.

As far as utilities, we designed our storm sewer to drain to the front. It's a steep site, we had to put our detention basin in front and push the development back off the road so there's going to be a fairly decent setback there. We are storing for the 100-year all around the site. We ran our sanitary from our site, this is the last undeveloped site on the line for this sanitary sewer so when they say there is 25 percent remaining, the only thing left undeveloped besides our site is the narrow residential property next to the medical building with the yellow house on it to our south. So the sanitary sewer will still have capacity and be plenty for that site. We gave that information to the engineering department and they have agreed. The water main was brought up to through the site and stubbed it to the north property line where the engineering department requested it.

Mark Highlen continued to say with the woodlands and wetlands, we started this residential plan originally back in 2017 and we were trying to max out the development. So we went back in to try to leave approximately 100 feet of trees along the rear property line. Staff was very dutiful in telling us "not even close," so we started working our way back out and what we ended up with two years later is that we are out of the tree lines with our paving, we have left room in the back to expand the existing wetland. We are mitigating a lot of wetland, but we aren't mitigating the full amount. We respectfully disagree with the wetland consultant. Wetlands didn't exist in many cases twenty years ago or they were significantly smaller. The wetlands really do not present much of a habitat. There's no volume due to stormwater, they don't recharge aquifers in most cases. There are tire ruts and old test holes that were left slightly sunken. There's a couple there that we have to fill in when we tie into our shared entrance with the medical building to our south. That was built in to the edge of the wetland so we have no choice but to fill that in to get into the site. So we are asking that the City look more favorably into requiring a little less mitigation because what we're replacing really isn't significant in the way that the wetland ordinance describes what exactly a wetland is. Next Zach would like to say a few words as well.

Zach Weiss said I wanted to address two things and those things represent the exhibits that Lindsay has shown. The first exhibit, exhibit A, correcting some of the misunderstandings with the

review letter, trying to clear up some of the more technical things and provide some additional color. Four things on this exhibit I wanted to address and then following that I want to run through a quick summary of the connectivity of the neighborhood because I know that was a comment on previous reviews.

Starting with exhibit A, the four things I wanted to clear up would be clarification of open space, the explanation differences of wetlands, calculation of room counts, and then the clearing up a deviation for the amount of parking and drive aisles within the side setback. So the first one, addressing the amount of open space, we provided a quick exhibit showing that we would absolutely meet the required amount of 54,000 square feet. The exhibit to clarify how much useable open space is proposed, taking from the common walkways and the land areas and including the pool deck. In doing that we know that that includes 2.46 acres of open space so that's over 110,000 square feet, more than double the required 54,000 square feet, so we believe that should be no issue in meeting that requirement. I don't think that's a deviation technically, but it clears up that aspect of the review.

The second item addresses the differences in wetlands. It was noted in the review that EGLE identifies 1.58 acres of wetlands. We say that actually the same boundaries, were not even arguing different boundaries, but that they total 1.45 acres. The difference we were told by the engineer has to do with the technology issue: exporting the file from CAD to another format mistakenly added small amounts of wetland, but the boundary that EGLE provided we agreed to, so there's really no issue in the total amount of wetland, it's just the technology issue that led to different numerical amounts. Hopefully that clears up that issue that's it's actually 1.45 acres instead of 1.58 acres.

The third point has to do with how I approached looking at the blended site area between 3-story and 4-story buildings. The deviation that was noted, even though it is supported by staff, I wanted to provide a little bit more color. There is a mix of 3-story and 4-story buildings on the site, however, only 80 units on the site are contained in 3-story buildings and only 192 are in 4-story buildings. So if you prorate the site area based on that its 29 percent of the site basically in terms of density, is 3-story buildings and 71 percent are 4-story buildings so if your prorate the site that way and divide the 29 percent by 2,000 and the 71 percent by 700 which are the different factors for RM-1 and RM-2 you end up with having an excess of over 988 rooms. That's what the table shows in the exhibit. We are only proposing 742 rooms so that leaves an excess of 246 rooms so when you think about it yes, it is a mix of 3 and 4-story , but if you prorate the density in that way it leaves a lot of remaining rooms.

The fourth thing is the deviation about side and rear yards. That was actually addressed in a previous review, it just got carried over mistakenly onto this review so that's actually been satisfied. There's only a 21.8 percent of the side and rear yards that have parking, loading, and drive aisles and 1.4 acres out of a total 175 setback is 6.41 so only a little under 22 Percent. That's all for exhibit A.

Zach Weiss continued to say for exhibit B, I just wanted to touch on the overall connectivity with neighborhood services. It was addressed at the prior meeting that it seems like it's an island of residential in a sea of office, but when you really look at the neighborhood there's a lot of services in the area mostly within 2 miles of the property. If you go up and down Haggerty Road, just a bit north there is Costco, Target, Home Depot, PetSmart, Michaels, and Staples and if you go west toward M-5 you get to the Twelve Oaks area which is roughly within 2 miles. We also have the shops along West Oaks Drive, which includes Nordstrom Rack, DSW, and Marshalls. As far as groceries go there is a Meijer and there are two Kroger's also within 2 miles.

The Meijer is a bit longer, but both Kroger's are actually within 2 miles. As far as entertainment goes there's the United Artist Commerce Theater, there's restaurants like Steven Lellis On The Green, there's service restaurants like Panera, there's multiple Starbucks, Tropical Smoothie Café, Ruby Tuesday, there's a variety of different types of restaurants and types of entertainments and that's within two miles of property.

As far as employment goes there's a variety of employment, it's probably one of the better areas to be located in terms of employment proximity. There's Nissan, there's Bosch, the Henry Ford Medical Center, Dana, Harman, Paychex, Magna, and Mercedes Benz. One of the other items that was addressed was proximity to schools and childcare. We noted that the zone for Orchard Hills, which is a little over 3 miles away but there are other areas of the City that are zoned for elementary schools that are 3.5 to 4 miles away. One of those areas is 13 Mile and Old Novi Road that I believe serves Parkview Elementary. That's actually farther away than it is to Orchard Hills. There are also other types of schooling and childcare in the area. There are a couple daycare centers, there's a Montessori, there's a preschool, KinderCare and a Childtime. There's also recreation, religious facilities in the area, fitness centers, and parks. So all in all there's a really good mix surrounding this property within 2-3 miles so we feel it's actually quite connected to the things that matter to the residents and the things that are kind of required to build a good community. That's really it for exhibit B and I will open it up to questions.

Chair Pehrson said thank you, if there's anyone on the Zoom meeting that wishes to address the Planning Commission, this is a public hearing and I will open it up to the public at this time.

Dorothy Duchesneau, 125 Henning, said I just have a couple comments. This project has seen a lot of work by the developer and by the City., Put it anywhere else in the city and I would say it would be a welcome addition, but the Master Plan and Future Land Use Plan calls for this area between M-5 and Haggerty Road and between I-696 all the way north to 14 Mile Road to be OST. That's what everyone else has been able to work with to bring projects to the city so OST should remain. This is not nearly a location that should have its zoning changed by going to residential renters instead of other office and business uses. The proposed claimed benefits, I think, are miniscule under the PRO. Also, the future families will be segregated from their schools by two major roadways: M-5 and I-696 on the west and south sides. There's no easy access to parks or to the rest of the city in which they live without the use of a car. You should find the schools, the parks, and the access lanes for families to engage with the rest of the Novi Community. I've lived in that area and you spend your money and time driving north to Commerce Township, and into West Bloomfield, and east into Farmington Hills. Living off of Haggerty Road, I didn't connect with Novi in any way, shape, or form. I think changing the zoning by way of a PRO will make this a solitary mini-neighborhood. When you consider Novi as one of the best places to live you consider the community of Novi, not the cities that are around Novi, at least that's how I would think of it. The residential that's on the east side of Haggerty is Farmington Hills, that's a totally different school system and totally different community and has no connection whatsoever to what's on the west side of Haggerty.

Chair Pehrson closed the audience participation seeing no one else wished to speak and asked for the correspondence.

Member Lynch said we have a few correspondence letters. The first one is from Leszek Urban, 39094 Plumbrook Farmington Hills, is opposed because of concerns with public safety, infrastructure costs, and is worried about pollution. The next one is from Victoria Cross, 39140 Plumbrook Farmington Hills, she is concerned about traffic, noise on Haggerty Road, and property values. The next two are from Matthew Sosin who is in favor and listed a bunch of

benefits. The final one is from E. Brooke Matthews from Harman and is in favor and mentioned the project being walkable and bike-able as a big benefit.

Chair Pehrson closed the public hearing for this matter and turned it over to the Planning Commission for consideration.

Member Anthony said first just in defense of the city and staff on what has been a little bit of a longer process than it would others. Some of the examples that were given of this are that this contrast in zoning and rezoning has been done elsewhere in the city, but that hasn't been done necessarily without problems. Member Anthony showed a map of the city and said in this highlighted area, which the applicant's attorney had mentioned, that's where we have a contrast in zoning. We end up focusing on those and end up having to give those areas extra attention and how do we deal with that because it becomes more difficult. So this situation is similar to that. Though, we can look at the schools and actually there's an elementary school in Novi that's maybe a mile and half away. Maybe looking within Novi it's an island of residential, but being up against Farmington Hills is where the thought is that it's not an island, but that it's a transitional zone. I can see that, and staff has been working with the applicant in order to find something to work with so that we don't have problems in the future. For instance, are we setting a precedent for more of these drastic zoning changes that have caused us problems or greater challenges in the future? I commend our staff for working with you. I also thank you for working with us, reducing the number of units, for pulling a development out of the wetland and out of the protected woodland, of recognizing that we do have a non-motorized transportation plan which also has a connection that goes through that green area so I do thank you for that. It's a difficult site and you're asking us to rezone against Future Land Use Plan and the Master Plan and really that along with the Ordinance is really all we have to hold development in the city to a cohesive set of standards that are workable and sustainable. We have to be careful on how we move through this so that's why you're feeling this frustration. I see you're working with us and I thank you for that, but our staff is really trying to take a difficult situation and trying not to have problems in the future. I do think you have made a lot of improvements with what you have done since our last meeting and it's going in the right direction.

As we have spoken earlier, we do want to reduce the number of deviations that we see and the question is to one of the comments you had made earlier: can these be handled in the next phase? I believe I'm hearing from our staff they need a little bit more information. For instance, one example there was the question or the discussion about land banked areas within the parking and does that mean that the parking lot area gets bigger and encroaches into the woodland and the wetland area. So again, I side with our staff there because of their cautious approach of preventing problems for us in the future. There was another question on the calculation of the size of the wetlands, of course, CAD does that calculation if that is simply an error in transmission from one file to the next - I'm sure that can be resolved with staff as well. I understand the frustration of that the Novi Ordinance on wetlands is stricter than what the state says. Wetlands at the state level may be considered low-quality, but we still are preserving and we are preserving that for a reason. You'll see that it really does add to our city. So with that I wanted turn my discussion or questions to Lindsay. Lindsay, when I look at all these deviations that are there, are these types of deviations that can be worked out in the next step of planning or are we making an exception here for this property that we wouldn't or haven't done on other properties?

Senior Planner Bell said I do think that we've come a lot closer to reducing and justifying certain deviations. However, certain items that were presented in the applicant's response letter we

haven't got a chance to actually review yet. We are also just hearing tonight that they're going to request a deviation from providing the full amount of wetland mitigation, which was the first I've heard of that. That will certainly need further review.

Member Anthony said for me, on the wetland, I would need to see a new updated map so that I can visualize what we are losing from what we have now.

Planner Bell said right, some may think we can evaluate just based on text, but ones like that I think we need to see on a plan for what would happen and what those areas look like and how much mitigation would be missing. There was also a landscape deviation where they were saying they would provide as much as possible but without knowing whether we can simply eliminate that deviation and they would meet it in the future or do they need a certain or lesser amount of deviation, that's something we can't really know at this point.

Member Anthony said the other piece was the argument on the prorating of that to arrive on the number of allowable units. Two things: I had trouble following that so the second part of that is I'm concerned if we applied that, once we fully understand the logic behind it, could that then be used on other sites where we feel we have unit challenges? I want to avoid setting a precedent for the future there.

Planner Bell said I haven't been able to go into that exhibit at all to really be able to understand it myself.

Member Anthony said I have gone from not wanting residential here at all, because of it not fitting with our plan, to looking at it saying now we're down the path that we can make this work. I don't agree that there are close-by amenities. To me, within two miles is still too far, I think within a mile would be better. I can see the connection with Farmington Hills. I do believe we need to have connections with our neighboring communities. I can see this being an extension of the residential there, though it is a bit of a leap. So through this path I've moved to we can get multi-family residential to work, but I'm not where I won't rely on the expertise of our staff because they don't feel that they have enough information right now. I need to feel comfortable with the proration argument, what the final wetland and woodland protection map would look like, and the sanitary and sewer connections. Though it looks like we have resolved the issue with the sanitary sewer, I still at some point want to hear from the city engineer. We should look at the length of that line and what other vacant lots Novi has in that area that would also have potential future developments connected to it. When you look at a larger map, not knowing exactly the run of that sewer line I'm not sure what vacant lots could also connect to it. So were much closer than we were the first time I've looked at this and I do believe we will find success here, but I'm not there now.

Member Gronachan said I'm on Master Plan and Zoning Committee as well and I first have to thank my fellow Commission Member Anthony because he speaks so eloquently and he takes the words right out of my mouth. So I want to say I support everything that he said, but I do want to add something else. I concur that when I sat down and read this for the very first time I said "no way, absolutely not. This is crazy," but when the petitioner came and explained in that first meeting, just as Mr. Landry explained, it was a long process. It's been twenty years of waiting to do something with this property. I think that that needs to be remembered or we need to be reminded of this long process. We do want growth in Novi. We don't want to give-in willy-nilly and I think our staff is doing an excellent job, but I also think that the petitioner has gone above and beyond doing their homework and I want to thank them for that. We can't echo those words enough. I want them to be encouraged because I do see light at the end of

the tunnel. I echo the comments of Member Anthony. I, too, feel that we need to support what the staff feels that they need in order to do justice to this project. I think this is an out-of-the-box project and I would support it further down the road, but I can't be there yet. I'm excited to see it coming. I'm glad that all three petitioners said what they said tonight and it opened my eyes even more and it shows their level of commitment. I cannot support voting on it this evening, I would like to see the rest of these deviations addressed and I would like to have the staff comfortable with the things that they need to review so that they can come back to us because after all we need to count on them. They are our experts.

Chair Pehrson said for the record Member Maday has joined for the meeting.

Member Avdoulos said I think both Planning Commissioners spoke about what I had on my list. Again, I'm on the Master Plan and Zoning Committee too. Conceptually, I don't think it's a bad fit. As Member Anthony indicated, we can have this looking as a transitional zone. It is a project that is kind of out-of-the-box, but we do have residential across the street. That, to me, is what made me feel more comfortable and the work and everything that has gone into this project and I echo what the two previous Planning Commissioners indicated that the work has been done to get us to this point. We've had the same issue with Sakura. That came in and we worked with them, it was postponed, they came back and I am actually pleased with the final product that we were able to approve and move forward with. Again, I get nervous when the staff is not fully comfortable and there are a lot of deviations here that are supported. There's a few that are not, or as Lindsay had indicated, in some of the applicant's responses, the answers may have seemed a little more open-ended where they needed to have some closure. I'm very uncomfortable in making a recommendation to the City Council if there's still a lot of open ended issues so what I would like to do is make a motion.

Motion made by member Avdoulos and seconded by member Anthony.

**In the matter of Novaplex, JZ19-37, with Zoning Map Amendment 18.733, motion to postpone making a recommendation to the City Council to rezone the subject property from Office Service Technology (OST) to High-Density Multiple Family (RM-2) with a Planned Rezoning Overlay Concept Plan. This motion is made for the following reasons:**

- 1. To allow the applicant time to provide a revised submittal which reflects the changes described in their response letters dated 3-9-2020 and 3-16-2020;**
- 2. To allow the applicant time to develop a list of conditions to be imposed on the development in line with the PRO Concept Plan proposed;**
- 3. To allow the applicant time to address the comments in the wetland and traffic review letters;**
- 4. To allow staff time to review the additional information provided by the applicant in their response letter dated 3-16-2020, such as wetland mitigation, traffic calming measures, and carport details;**
- 5. To allow staff to review the revisions to the plans to identify any additional deviations and conditions that would be needed in the PRO Agreement, and evaluate any new information provided;**
- 6. To allow the applicant to work with staff to reduce the number of deviations requested;**
- 7. To allow additional time for the applicant to submit additional evidence/information in support of the public benefits to be achieved through this development and to justify the proposed ordinance deviations and the intent of the section 7.13.2.D.ii that the proposed PRO rezoning would be in the public interest and the benefits to public of the proposed PRO rezoning would clearly outweigh the detriments.**

**8. The applicant shall have the opportunity to clarify through a modified submittal if any PRO conditions are being offered under the PRO provisions of the Zoning Ordinance.**

Member Ferrell said I echo what the other Commissioners have said. One thing I was concerned about was the sewer and that was brought up by Member Anthony. I think just waiting until we get some more definitive answers to make a decision is where I stand as well.

Member Maday said I echo everything everyone has said. The one thing I do want to do and I think everybody said it is that we just want to dot our I's and cross our T's before we make a decision on a property that is out of the box. Some of our residents in Novi are going to be concerned about this development and I want to make sure what we do, we do it completely appropriately and to the best of our ability and I don't think we are all there at this point.

Member Lynch said this brings me back to when I first got appointed to the Planning Commission. Some of the things they told me in the interview had to do with OST. My understanding at the time was that OST is great for the city. Even though with my background I kind of saw where the demographics and the technology was headed. I don't think that this is going to be our first OST project that is going to need re-use. My greatest concern with this whole thing is whatever we do were not going to set precedent for other OST projects. That's just my personal opinion based on how I see technology and the work place moving. OST properties, which were once big office buildings, I think, there's not as much demand as there was in the past. I think we're going to be doing more of this as we move into the future. I have no issue with residential, but my biggest concern is whatever we do with this project we have to be prepared to apply to do for every other project across the city.

The other thing, when I was interviewed for the Planning Commission, I remember the interviewer telling me to do your best and do what you think is right, but you don't have to be right all the time, but be consistent. So whatever we do on this project is going to be a template, I believe, for what we do on other OST rezoning's and I just want to be cautious. One thing that kind of jumped out at me was the calculation of open space and I sent an email, hopefully it will be shared with the applicant, I don't know if we've ever done that before where we've considered balconies and portions of a unit or building as part of the open space. If we're going to do that that's fine, if the Planning Commission agrees I want us to think about it. I want the planners to work with the developer. I do appreciate the struggle that they've been through and in my opinion you know I've made this statement before as far as OST properties so I hear what all the commissioners are saying I hear what the applicant is saying. My recommendation to the Commission and to the Planning Department is that whatever we decide we need to be prepared to apply it across a number of OST properties. As long as what we agree on this particular project and were willing to apply it everywhere else, I have no problem with that.

Chair Pehrson said having sat in on the Master Plan and Zoning Committee for this particular session when this was brought in front of us, we have come very far; we're close to finalizing this. I'm in support of this change in zoning It is a good fit for area. I don't discount the fact that I don't see a border between us and Farmington Hills, there is residential across the street. This is equipped for businesses that want to have employees living nearby. I think we can work out these details but I do also commend everyone's comments at this point in time. I am in support of postponing this so I hope we take this back and have another chance to review.

**ROLL CALL VOTE TO POSTPONE MAKING A RECOMMENDATION TO CITY COUNCIL FOR JZ19-37 NOVAPLEX TO REZONE THE SUBJECT PROPERTY FROM OFFICE SERVICE TECHNOLOGY TO HIGH-**

**DENSITY MULTIPLE-FAMILY WITH A PLANNED OVERLAY CONCEPT PLAN MADE BY MEMBER AVDOULOS AND SECONDED BY MEMBER ANTHONY.**

In the matter of Novaplex, JZ19-37, with Zoning Map Amendment 18.733, motion to postpone making a recommendation to the City Council to rezone the subject property from Office Service Technology (OST) to High-Density Multiple Family (RM-2) with a Planned Rezoning Overlay Concept Plan. This motion is made for the following reasons:

1. To allow the applicant time to provide a revised submittal which reflects the changes described in their response letters dated 3-9-2020 and 3-16-2020;
  2. To allow the applicant time to develop a list of conditions to be imposed on the development in line with the PRO Concept Plan proposed;
  3. To allow the applicant time to address the comments in the wetland and traffic review letters;
  4. To allow staff time to review the additional information provided by the applicant in their response letter dated 3-16-2020, such as wetland mitigation, traffic calming measures, and carport details;
  5. To allow staff to review the revisions to the plans to identify any additional deviations and conditions that would be needed in the PRO Agreement, and evaluate any new information provided;
  6. To allow the applicant to work with staff to reduce the number of deviations requested;
  7. To allow additional time for the applicant to submit additional evidence/information in support of the public benefits to be achieved through this development and to justify the proposed ordinance deviations and the intent of the section 7.13.2.D.ii that the proposed PRO rezoning would be in the public interest and the benefits to public of the proposed PRO rezoning would clearly outweigh the detriments.
  8. The applicant shall have the opportunity to clarify through a modified submittal if any PRO conditions are being offered under the PRO provisions of the Zoning Ordinance.
- Motion carried 7-0.*

**2. MORGAN PLACE JZ19-17 WITH REZONING 18.731**

Public hearing at the request of Trowbridge Companies for Planning Commission's recommendation to City Council for a Zoning Map amendment from Freeway Service (FS) to General Business (B-3) with a Planned Rezoning Overlay, as well as Preliminary Site Plan consideration. The subject property is approximately 0.48 acres and is located on the east side of Haggerty Road, north of Eight Mile Road (Section 36). The applicant is proposing to develop an approximately 2,420 square foot single story building.

Planner Bell said the subject property is located on the east side of Haggerty Road, north of 8 Mile Road on a triangular-shaped parcel. This project has historically been called Triangle Place, but recently the applicant requested a name change which has been approved, which is Morgan Place. If there is any confusion on the references in the packets, that is why. This parcel is currently zoned Freeway Service (FS) with the same zoning on the south and Office Service Commercial (OSC) to the west. The site borders Farmington Hills on the east which is developed with commercial uses including a hotel, car wash, and some restaurant uses. The future land use designation is for community commercial. There are no existing natural features on the site. This property was previously rezoned with a Planned Rezoning Overlay from FS to B-3, General Business, in 2007. Several extensions of that PRO Agreement that were granted by City Council over the years, but the most recent extension expired in 2016 and therefore the property reverted back to the FS Zoning District.

The applicant is back with a similar request now with a very similar layout of a single story

building of approximately 2,420 square feet. The applicant would restrict the uses of the building in the proposed conditions of the PRO Agreement to those allowed within the B-3 District, which are less intensive and would not be big traffic generators or require much parking since the site is so small. The list of deviations are largely related to the size and shape of the parcel and the presence of the several utility easements both underground and overhead lines. The applicant has provided further justification and clarification for certain deviations that were requested by staff in their response letter.

As a community benefit, the applicant has offered to install an approximately 180 linear feet of sidewalk in front of the detention basin immediately to the south. So they would fill the gap that is there now as well as the sidewalk that they are required to provide. The applicant also offers to plant native shrubs along the right-of-way in front of the detention pond to the south of the subject site and on the opposite side of Haggerty Road. The applicant offers a pedestrian connection and landscape seating feature located in front of the building providing an addition pedestrian amenity in the area. You may have noticed the only review not recommending approval was for the rezoning traffic impact study, which was originally reviewed in May of last year. As of today, the requested update to that document has been provided so our consultant will be able to review that prior to the PRO Agreement being presented to City Council. That was included as a condition in your draft motion.

Tonight the Planning Commission is asked to have the public hearing and make a recommendation to City Council. If the recommendation is for approval, the Planning Commission is also asked to consider a conditional approval of the Preliminary Site Plan and Stormwater Management Plan. Staff as well as our traffic consultant are available to answer any questions you may have and Brian from Powell Engineering is here to tell you more about their proposal and answer any questions.

Brian Biskner, Powell Engineering, said first I wanted to thank the City of Novi for holding this meeting in the crazy times that were in. We very much appreciate being able to keep the ball rolling on this project. Lindsay went over the project very well. I don't know how long you have all been on the board but you may have seen this 3-4 years ago as its most recent submittal and we'd just like to highlight a couple of things that are different between this one and that one.

We removed the loading zone that had once been there and approved mainly because as we strengthened our list of uses that will not be able to go into this building, we can't have any retail uses that would make use of anything like that. So we were very happy to pull that out of there as it didn't make very much sense. We have added a small circular sidewalk area with landscaping in the front to beautify the front as part of strengthening our public benefit and then we added a sidewalk connection from the north side of the building to the sidewalk that we'll put in front of the property as well. That's about it, it's a very difficult piece to develop obviously due to all the easements and utilities on there and we're happy to be where we are right now and I look forward to any questions you may have.

Chair Pehrson opened the public hearing for public comments and seeing no one wished to speak asked for the correspondence in which there was none. Chair Pehrson closed the public hearing and turned it over to the Planning Commission for consideration.

Member Anthony said overall, I like this project. It's a really difficult site to work with anytime you have a 3-sided property, so I have no objection to it. I mainly just have a curiosity on some of the information from the City and that is at the very end. We have a conditional approval from

the Fire Marshal and the issue was the Hazardous Chemical Survey. I'm assuming that is part of the community to have a right to know if you disclose using hazardous materials to the City Fire Department so this question is to the developer: what are the Hazardous Chemicals that you are anticipating in this use?

Brian Biskner said we are not anticipating any hazardous materials on-site and I'm not sure why that's there, but we will obviously take care of that. Powell Engineering has been involved with this property in the early 2000's as part of a possible residential submittal at one point and there were no issues back then and nothing came up with the previous engineer that I'm aware of. I'm not sure why that was flagged there. I don't anticipate any, but we will comply fully.

Member Anthony said so you don't expect anything beyond regular office use?

Brian Biskner said correct. For this zoning classification, obviously there are uses by right and uses by special land use, out of those uses we have picked a list of 23 uses that we feel along with your staff obviously that are inappropriate to put here, so we've spent a lot of time on trying to figure out what's the best way to develop the property in regards to uses so anything high density and obviously generating a lot of parking we tried to pull out.

Member Anthony said okay I can support this.

Member Avdoulos said I was on the Planning Commission in 2007, when I saw this come in and thought obviously that this was a difficult site and looking to see that piece of property be developed in an appropriate manor and it's been worked out with the city so I have no issue with it at all. I think all the deviations that are noted here are basically all supported by the staff. There are some that are conditional and I think there was one that was landscape related, but I think that was addressed in the motion sheet. Rick, do you recall the lack of a greenbelt because of the hedge alternative?

Rick Meader said because of the zoning they are proposing a hedge instead of a berm. There really is no room for any significant berm anyway. It's perfectly fine with all their waivers they are going to need.

Member Avdoulos said okay with that I'm going to make a motion.

Motion made by Member Avdoulos and seconded by Member Gronachan.

**In the matter of Morgan Place, JZ19-17, with Zoning Map Amendment 18.731, motion to recommend approval to City Council to rezone the subject property from Freeway Service (FS) to General Business (B-3) with a Planned Rezoning Overlay Concept Plan.**

**Part 1: The recommendation includes the following ordinance deviations for consideration by the City Council:**

- 1. Landscape deviation from section 5.5.3.C.(3) Chart footnote for lack of three perimeter parking lot trees, because underground utility easements occupy 90 linear feet of parking lot perimeter.**
- 2. Landscape deviation from section 5.5.3.B.ii and iii for underage of greenbelt plantings by two large evergreen or canopy trees and three subcanopy trees, because the trees cannot be planted in 90 linear foot wide gas pipeline easements.**
- 3. Landscape deviation from section 5.5.3.B.ii and iii for lack of berm along Haggerty Road, due to the unusual shape of the site.**

4. Planning deviation from section 5.3.13 for not meeting the minimum distance requirement between the parking from the street ROW. A minimum of 25 feet is required, varied widths from 16 feet to 20 feet proposed, because less traffic is expected in and out the site.
5. A section 9 waiver for overage of Asphalt shingles on the west and east facades (25% maximum allowed, 48% on West and 46% on east proposed), because the proposed elevations meet the intent of the façade ordinance.
6. Planning deviation from section 3.1.12.D for not meeting the minimum required rear yard building setback (minimum of 20 feet is required, four feet is proposed), as the proposed building location is limited by the existing gas line easement on the site.
7. Planning deviation from section 3.1.12.D for not meeting the minimum required front yard parking setback (minimum of 20 feet is required, ten feet is proposed), due to the unusual shape of the lot.
8. Planning deviation from section 5.4.2 for lack of required loading zone, because the proposed conditions include restricting the uses permitted on the site to those that would not require a loading zone.
9. Planning deviation from section 4.19.2.F for allowing the dumpster in the interior side yard in lieu of required rear yard, as the applicant has committed to comply with trash pick-up services so as not to interfere with site operations or traffic along Haggerty Road.

Part 2: If the City Council approves the rezoning, the Planning Commission recommends the following conditions be made part of the PRO Agreement:

1. The applicant offers installation of sidewalk in front of the detention basin, immediately south of the subject site, to connect with right-of-way sidewalk improvements for this development (approximately 180 linear feet).
2. The applicant offers the planting of native shrubs along the right-of-way in front of the detention ponds to the south of the subject site and on the opposite side of Haggerty Road (5 native shrubs);
3. Applicant offers a pedestrian connection and landscaped seating feature is located in front of the building, providing an additional pedestrian amenity to the area.
4. The following uses are not permitted on the property, unless otherwise approved by the City of Novi with a finding that adequate parking is available:
  - a. Retail business and retail business service uses;
  - b. Off-street parking lots;
  - c. Restaurants having the character of a drive in or having a drive-through window;
  - d. Theaters, assembly halls, concert halls, museums or similar places of assembly;
  - e. Business schools and colleges or private schools operated for profit;
  - f. Day Care Centers and Adult Day Care Centers;
  - g. Private clubs, fraternal organizations, and lodge halls;
  - h. Hotels and motels;
  - i. Mortuary establishments;
  - j. Auto wash;
  - k. Bus passenger stations;
  - l. New and used car salesroom, showroom, or office;
  - m. Tattoo parlors;
  - n. Outdoor space for sale of new or used automobiles, campers, recreation vehicles, mobile homes, or rental of trailers or automobiles;
  - o. Businesses in the character of a drive-in or open front store;
  - p. Plant materials nursery for the retail sale of plant materials and sales of lawn furniture, playground equipment and garden supplies;
  - q. Public or private indoor recreational facilities;

- r. Mini-lube or quick oil change establishments;
  - s. Gasoline service station and automobile repair; and
  - t. Microbrewery or brew-pub.
5. The applicant shall provide an updated Rezoning Traffic Impact Study as requested in the AECOM review letter dated May 17, 2019.

Part 3: This motion is made because the proposed the General Business (B-3) zoning district is a reasonable alternative to the Master Plan for Land Use, and because:

1. The proposed rezoning will remove the potential for many of the high-traffic uses allowed in the FS, Freeway Service District while permitting those office uses that are more appropriate for the site;
2. The requested PRO overlay and deviations requested will allow flexibility with meeting the dimensional challenges of this site;
3. The project is consistent with the Master Plan goal to retain and support the growth of existing businesses and attract new businesses to the City of Novi.
4. There is no negative impact expected on public utilities as compared with the current development potential as stated in the Engineering memo.

Member Maday said I appreciate the fact that somebody is interested in this unusual piece of property. It's going to generate some revenue for the City and you've been working so nicely with the city and I appreciate that.

**ROLL CALL VOTE TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO CITY COUNCIL TO REZONE THE SUBJECT PROPERTY FROM FREEWAY SERVICE TO GENERAL BUSINESS WITH A PRO CONCEPT PLAN MADE BY MEMBER AVDOULOS AND SECONDED BY MEMBER GRONACHAN.**

In the matter of Morgan Place, JZ19-17, with Zoning Map Amendment 18.731, motion to recommend approval to City Council to rezone the subject property from Freeway Service (FS) to General Business (B-3) with a Planned Rezoning Overlay Concept Plan.

Part 1: The recommendation includes the following ordinance deviations for consideration by the City Council:

1. Landscape deviation from section 5.5.3.C.(3) Chart footnote for lack of three perimeter parking lot trees, because underground utility easements occupy 90 linear feet of parking lot perimeter.
2. Landscape deviation from section 5.5.3.B.ii and iii for underage of greenbelt plantings by two large evergreen or canopy trees and three subcanopy trees, because the trees cannot be planted in 90 linear foot wide gas pipeline easements.
3. Landscape deviation from section 5.5.3.B.ii and iii for lack of berm along Haggerty Road, due to the unusual shape of the site.
4. Planning deviation from section 5.3.13 for not meeting the minimum distance requirement between the parking from the street ROW. A minimum of 25 feet is required, varied widths from 16 feet to 20 feet proposed, because less traffic is expected in and out the site.
5. A section 9 waiver for overage of Asphalt shingles on the west and east facades (25% maximum allowed, 48% on West and 46% on east proposed), because the proposed elevations meet the intent of the façade ordinance.
6. Planning deviation from section 3.1.12.D for not meeting the minimum required rear yard building setback (minimum of 20 feet is required, four feet is proposed), as the proposed building location is limited by the existing gas line easement on the site.
7. Planning deviation from section 3.1.12.D for not meeting the minimum required front

yard parking setback (minimum of 20 feet is required, ten feet is proposed), due to the unusual shape of the lot.

8. Planning deviation from section 5.4.2 for lack of required loading zone, because the proposed conditions include restricting the uses permitted on the site to those that would not require a loading zone.
9. Planning deviation from section 4.19.2.F for allowing the dumpster in the interior side yard in lieu of required rear yard, as the applicant has committed to comply with trash pick-up services so as not to interfere with site operations or traffic along Haggerty Road.

Part 2: If the City Council approves the rezoning, the Planning Commission recommends the following conditions be made part of the PRO Agreement:

1. The applicant offers installation of sidewalk in front of the detention basin, immediately south of the subject site, to connect with right-of-way sidewalk improvements for this development (approximately 180 linear feet).
2. The applicant offers the planting of native shrubs along the right-of-way in front of the detention ponds to the south of the subject site and on the opposite side of Haggerty Road (5 native shrubs);
3. Applicant offers a pedestrian connection and landscaped seating feature is located in front of the building, providing an additional pedestrian amenity to the area.
4. The following uses are not permitted on the property, unless otherwise approved by the City of Novi with a finding that adequate parking is available:
  - a. Retail business and retail business service uses;
  - b. Off-street parking lots;
  - c. Restaurants having the character of a drive in or having a drive-through window;
  - d. Theaters, assembly halls, concert halls, museums or similar places of assembly;
  - e. Business schools and colleges or private schools operated for profit;
  - f. Day Care Centers and Adult Day Care Centers;
  - g. Private clubs, fraternal organizations, and lodge halls;
  - h. Hotels and motels;
  - i. Mortuary establishments;
  - j. Auto wash;
  - k. Bus passenger stations;
  - l. New and used car salesroom, showroom, or office;
  - m. Tattoo parlors;
  - n. Outdoor space for sale of new or used automobiles, campers, recreation vehicles, mobile homes, or rental of trailers or automobiles;
  - o. Businesses in the character of a drive-in or open front store;
  - p. Plant materials nursery for the retail sale of plant materials and sales of lawn furniture, playground equipment and garden supplies;
  - q. Public or private indoor recreational facilities;
  - r. Mini-lube or quick oil change establishments;
  - s. Gasoline service station and automobile repair; and
  - t. Microbrewery or brew-pub.
5. The applicant shall provide an updated Rezoning Traffic Impact Study as requested in the AECOM review letter dated May 17, 2019.

Part 3: This motion is made because the proposed the General Business (B-3) zoning district is a reasonable alternative to the Master Plan for Land Use, and because:

1. The proposed rezoning will remove the potential for many of the high-traffic uses allowed in the FS, Freeway Service District while permitting those office uses that are more appropriate for the site;

2. The requested PRO overlay and deviations requested will allow flexibility with meeting the dimensional challenges of this site;
3. The project is consistent with the Master Plan goal to retain and support the growth of existing businesses and attract new businesses to the City of Novi.
4. There is no negative impact expected on public utilities as compared with the current development potential as stated in the Engineering memo.  
*Motion carried 7-0.*

Motion made by Member Avdoulos and seconded by Member Gronachan.

**ROLL CALL VOTE TO APPROVE PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN FOR PROJECT JSP19-21 MORGAN PLACE MADE BY MEMBER AVDOULOS AND SECONDED BY MEMBER GRONACHAN.**

In the matter of Morgan Place, JSP19-21, motion to approve the Preliminary Site Plan based on and subject to the following:

1. The City Council granting final approval of the PRO Agreement and PRO Concept Plan;
2. All conditions and deviations in the final PRO Agreement and PRO Concept Plan being addressed on the Final Site Plan;
3. The findings of compliance with Ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters and the conditions and the items listed in those letters being addressed on the Final Site Plan.

This motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Article 3, Article 4, and Article 5 of the Zoning Ordinance and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance.  
*Motion carried 7-0.*

Motion made by Member Avdoulos and seconded by Member Gronachan.

**ROLL CALL VOTE TO APPROVE STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN MADE BY MEMBER AVDOULOS AND SECONDED BY MEMBER GRONACHAN.**

In the matter of Morgan Place, JSP19-21, motion to approve the Stormwater Management Plan, based on and subject to:

1. The City Council granting final approval of the PRO agreement and PRO Concept Plan;
2. The findings of compliance with Ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters and the conditions and items listed in those letters being addressed on the Final Site Plan.

This motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Chapter 11 of the Code of Ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance. *Motion carried 7-0.*

Brian Biskner said thank you very much board members, I really appreciate it. Stay safe and enjoy your time at home.

**MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION**

1. APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 26, 2020 PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES.

Motion made by Member Gronachan and seconded by Member Ferrell.

**ROLL CALL VOTE TO APPROVE THE FEBRUARY 26, 2020 PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES MADE BY MEMBER GRONACHAN AND SECONDED BY MEMBER FERRELL.**

**Motion to approve the February 26, 2020 Planning Commission Minutes. *Motion carried 7-0.***

#### **SUPPLEMENTAL ISSUES**

There were no supplemental issues.

#### **AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION**

No one in the audience wished to speak and Chair Pehrson closed the second audience participation.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

Moved to adjourn made by Member Lynch and seconded by Member Gronachan.

#### **Motion to adjourn the March 25, 2020 Planning Commission meeting.**

Member Gronachan said before we adjourn I just wanted to say thank you to the City for all the extra work they did over the last two weeks. I know the world has been upside down and I just wanted to thank everybody for their diligence and keeping us informed and letting us do this so well.

Member Avdoulos said I would like to thank the city and I wondering if the City Attorney is seeing this in a lot of other municipalities. This is a global issue that is hitting every person so it's not just one sector. Anything we can do to help move things along and make sure we don't stop progress but are also able to keep safe, I'm all for that. This is my second week at home and it does get frustrating, but my team meets basically every morning and I just make sure everyone is okay and that they have the technology and supplies that they need and just make sure that we get them what they need to work. We also encourage people to connect with each other so it's more physical distancing then social distancing. I think socially we need to keep connected, but I really appreciate what the city has done. Like I said I don't know if any other City has done this yet, but I think it's a great way to conduct a business and not stall anybody.

Thomas Schultz, City Attorney, said you're one of the early users of this opportunity that the order from Monday gave communities. Your staff and IT folks and everybody up and down the board has done a great job putting it all in place in really short order.

Chair Pehrson said I do appreciate you all being able to do this and thanks to Rob and the team for putting this together it just shows how forward-thinking Novi is as a community.

Attorney Schultz said there's a lot of stuff you didn't get to see as well. Sheryl and her group putting out all the public notices and what we need to do all of this.

#### **VOICE VOTE ON THE MOTION TO ADJOURN MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER GRONACHAN.**

#### **Motion to adjourn the March 25, 2020 Planning Commission meeting. *Motion carried 7-0.***

The meeting adjourned at 8:26 PM.