



PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Draft

CITY OF NOVI

Regular Meeting

January 25, 2012 | 7 PM

Council Chambers | Novi Civic Center | 45175 W. Ten Mile
(248) 347-0475

CALL TO ORDER

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

ROLL CALL

Present: Member Baratta, Member Greco, Member Gutman, Member Lynch, Chair Pehrson, Member Prince (7:10)

Absent: Member Anthony (excused)

Also Present: Barbara McBeth, Deputy Director of Community Development; Tom Schultz, City Attorney; Kristen Kapelanski, Planner; David Beschke, Landscape Architect; Ben Croy, Engineer; Doug Necci, Façade Consultant; Rod Arroyo, Traffic Consultant

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Moved by Member Gutman, seconded by Member Baratta:

VOICE VOTE ON THE AGENDA APPROVAL MOTION MADE BY MEMBER GUTMAN AND SECONDED BY MEMBER BARATTA:

Motion to approve the January 25, 2012 Planning Commission agenda. Motion carried 5-0.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

No one from the audience wished to speak.

CORRESPONDENCE

There was no correspondence.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

There were no Committee Reports.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPUTY DIRECTOR REPORT

Deputy Director McBeth stated that at their most recent meeting, the City Council considered a matter that the Planning Commission had recently reviewed – the Retail Service Overlay Text Amendment. Following quite a bit of discussion, the City Council approved it for the first reading. Staff may be making some modifications to the text amendment before it goes back to the City Council for a second reading.

CONSENT AGENDA - REMOVALS AND APPROVAL

There were no consent agenda items.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION

1. HYATT PLACE AT SUBURBAN COLLECTION SHOWPLACE SP 11-44

Consideration of the request of Cunningham Limp for a recommendation to City Council for Preliminary Site Plan and Stormwater Management Plan approval. The subject property is located north of Grand River Avenue and west of Taft Road at the existing Suburban Collection Showplace site, in Section 16 of the City. The property totals 48.23 acres and the applicant is proposing a 6-story, 128 room hotel.

Planner Kapelanski stated that the site is located at the existing Suburban Collection showplace property on the north side of Grand River Avenue. The applicant is proposing to construct a six story, one-hundred twenty-eight room hotel attached to the east side of the existing conference and banquet facility. The site of the hotel is completely surrounded by the existing exposition and conference and banquet facility and the associated parking for these facilities.

The zoning of the property is EXO, Exposition Overlay District. Zoning in the surrounding area is OST and I-1. The property is master planned for office, research and development and technology uses. There are regulated wetlands on the property but the area of construction for the hotel does not impact any of these existing wetlands.

Planner Kapelanski stated that the applicant is proposing to construct the hotel on the east side of the existing conference and banquet facility in an area currently used for parking for the existing facilities. Construction of the hotel and the associated changes to the parking area immediately surrounding the new building footprint would result in a net loss of 221 parking spaces.

The planning review does not recommend approval of the Preliminary Site Plan, mainly due to the insufficient parking provided on the site. The applicant has several options to address this deficiency, be it through a shared parking study, landbanked parking or a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Planner Kapelanski noted the applicant has indicated parking data from recent events has been gathered and will be analyzed shortly. However, staff cannot recommend approval unless the applicant can demonstrate adequate parking has been provided for all existing and proposed uses on the site. In addition, covenants and restrictions, required as part of the original approval of the Rock Financial Showplace were also never finalized. The applicant should submit that document for review by staff and approval by the City Council. There are additional more minor items that can be addressed on a final site plan.

The traffic review also does not recommend approval mostly due to a traffic circulation safety concern along the southeast corner of the hotel. The parking island should be modified as indicated in the traffic review letter so that patrons cannot back into a main circulation aisle. There were also several more items noted in the traffic review that may be addressed on the final site plan. Rod Arroyo is here this evening to address any traffic questions.

Planner Kapelanski noted the landscape review does not recommend approval. The applicant has not provided enough information for staff to complete a thorough review of the plans or identify what landscape waivers would be required. It appears a waiver would be required for deficient parking lot landscaping. The parking island the traffic review recommends expanding could count towards this landscape requirement. If any additional landscape waivers are identified on future submittals, the applicant would be required to return to the Planning Commission and City Council for consideration.

The façade review notes Section 9 waivers are required and recommended for the overage of EIFS on the south and east facades. The applicant has submitted renderings illustrating the porte-cochere and roof element illumination as requested in the façade review letter. The large scale mock-up of the metallic finish panel has also been provided. The façade review recommends the applicant should reduce the percentage of EIFS on the west and north facades. A Section 9 waiver cannot be supported for these facades. Doug Necci is here to address any façade issues.

The engineering review and fire review both recommend approval of the plan noting items to be addressed on the Final Site Plan.

Lastly, Planner Kapelanski stated that site plans and any associated waivers in the EXO District require the approval of the City Council after a recommendation from the Planning Commission and the Planning Commission is being asked to make a recommendation on the plan this evening.

Blair Bowman came forward representing the applicant, TBON, LLC and stated that he is very excited to introduce the long-awaited lodging component of the Suburban Collection Showplace along with additional significant meeting space that will attract and fill out the entire complex as a full service convention facility.

Mr. Bowman acknowledged the staff review comments and appreciated that there were some technicalities to be addressed.

Regarding the landscaping, this is an expansion of the existing facility and the plan indicates that the proposed landscaping exceeds the ordinance requirements. Staff asked for some additional details including a landscape cost estimate. As far as any required landscape waivers, the approval of the original Rock Financial Showplace plan did receive a waiver for the lack of parking lot landscape islands. The current plan proposes moving those islands that are there, but he would not expect to have to re-open the entire site and look at landscape waivers that were previously granted. If that is the case, then that waiver should be included as part of formal application.

Mr. Bowman noted the project architects are available to answer any questions regarding the facade. This is a beautiful building but Mr. Bowman acknowledged the staff and officials need to consider things in terms of materials and percentages. Façade waivers for the overages of EIFS were granted for the previously proposed hotel in 2008. The current design is very consistent and complementary to the large-scale panelized construction of the existing showplace. EIFS was chosen for the tower because it has a smooth, very consistent finish, which is complementary to and flows right into the existing showplace. There is some variation accomplished by using different types of materials, specifically the metallic panels and different colors in conjunction with glass crown, which is required by Hyatt and illuminated in a tasteful manner to create a beacon that people will see coming from both directions.

As an alternative on the north façade, the stair tower material could be altered to a split faced block, more specifically C-brick, which creates a look very similar to real brick. Ultimately, it is not shown formally on the plan, but in an L shape off of the back of the proposed hotel, extending where the current employee parking is, will be the future location of an expansion tower, if all goes well. The tower would connect right at the stairwell.

Mr. Bowman stated that this is a big investment that will be a very high-quality, high-class, high-end facility that creates a significant amount of additional meeting space.

Mr. Bowman said, finally and most importantly, the hotel has been seamlessly integrated into the existing complex so that aisle ways and lobby ways literally flow into one another from the proposed hotel into the existing Diamond Center. Integrating the facility was a key component. The previous hotel proposal from 2008 included a second story walkway connection that was a very substantial cost. The current proposal does result in the loss of some parking spaces but it is his contention that the site will still have more than adequate parking.

Written copies of parking information collected thus far have been provided to the Planning Commission and staff. This information is actual numbers with video and photographic information showing what is happening at the site during shows and including some of the busiest shows in the spring and in the fall. Mr. Bowman then proceeded to show a series of photographs and videos demonstrating parking availability during several shows at the Suburban Collection Showplace.

Mr. Bowman explained that he does not expect the new hotel to have enough capacity to board all of the exhibitors for all shows; so surrounding hotels would still be needed to accommodate all of the visitors.

There are almost always additional parking spaces because the showplace and conference center do not overbook for any social events. There may be some rare instances where parking could be an issue but those would be few and far between. A parking study from Wilcox and Associates is being prepared.

Mr. Bowman did note that per the Urban Land Institute requirements, the showplace would only be required to have 1,783 spaces total on site and that is with the hotel, meeting space and with the convention space. Although that is a calculation based on urban areas, it is still very consistent with the trip generation, the vehicle parking and placement at the showplace.

Chair Pehrson asked if there was anyone in the audience that would like to address the Planning Commission and seeing no one asked if there was any correspondence and there was none; Chair Pehrson then turned the matter over to the Planning Commission for their consideration.

Member Greco asked the staff to address the parking deficiency issue.

Planner Kapelanski stated that Mr. Bowman made quite a detailed presentation on what is actually going on at the site. While the videos and photos are helpful to visually demonstrate what is going on, staff needs to see the data and the study completed before the Planning Division would be comfortable in saying that there is enough parking on site.

Member Greco asked if staff was aware of any parking issues right now.

Planner Kapelanski answered staff was not aware of any issues.

Member Lynch asked Mr. Arroyo, the City's traffic consultant, if the only traffic issue he saw was the main issue of someone backing out into a main circulation aisle.

Mr. Arroyo answered the circulation issue that was highlighted is the main concern even though there are several places within the parking lot where there were minor instances where the parking lot alignment is probably a little bit less than what it should be, but those issues are not as significant as this one section. The reason why this area is of more significant concern is because of the more exaggerated offset that is here. If you are a motorist that is traveling through this area, you have a lot of

potential for conflicts with both pedestrians and motorists and it is a lot to take in and there is going to be confusion regarding where the intersection is because of the unusual configuration of the pavement there. Given the close proximity to the building and all the factors that are in place here it makes sense to take some of those spaces out and to create an island that would form a more traditional intersection.

Member Lynch asked Mr. Arroyo that per the drawing, it looks like the applicant will lose 6 spaces.

Mr. Arroyo answered probably 7 spaces.

Member Lynch said that the parking study should be able to consider the loss of those 7 spaces. So by losing 7 spaces it improves the traffic flow. There was a landscape deficiency and that island could be landscaped to count towards those requirements. Member Lynch said he agreed with Mr. Arroyo and hoped that Mr. Bowman agreed that the traffic island improves the flow. If the parking can be worked out, the proposal seems reasonable.

Mr. Bowman said he spoke with Mr. Arroyo before the meeting and maintains that with the signage proposed there most likely would not be a huge conflict or concern. However, if it is a necessity those spaces could be eliminated.

Member Lynch said Mr. Bowman has stated the site is over-parked and those spaces would not be needed.

Mr. Bowman stated that he would be willing to eliminate the parking spaces to improve circulation and have that island count towards any landscape requirements.

Member Lynch addressed Landscape Architect David Beschke and said that it is his understanding that the site already received a waiver for the lack of a parking lot island every 15 spaces. Can that be reaffirmed? As far as the landscaping goes, by putting that island in, does the applicant now meet the landscape requirements?

Mr. Beschke answered the island won't break up the more than 15 contiguous spaces that are proposed, but it would reach the square footage necessary.

Member Lynch stated that the remaining landscape waiver is to allow more than 15 contiguous spaces without a landscape island.

Mr. Beschke noted he was only talking about the project site, not the entire site. The project would require 3 islands to break up the parking associated with the hotel, or a waiver could be granted.

Mr. Bowman stated the east lot, even with the addition of the hotel, is critical to the ride-and-drives. The education process for all the dealers in the nation happened at the showplace with the Volt. The space is ideal to bring a vehicle inside, take it out, test drive it and put out a track.

Member Lynch stated he had no concerns with the landscape waiver, especially if it was previously granted for the site. There was another issue about supplying necessary landscape details.

Mr. Beschke answered he had a letter from Mr. Conroy and the ten items he requested have been addressed. Mr. Beschke does not have any issues with the rest of the plan, with the hotel the site is gaining green space.

Member Lynch stated that it seems like the fundamental issue here is the parking and it appears it is all based on the Shared Parking Study that Wilcox is doing.

Member Lynch asked Mr. Necci, the City's façade consultant what his issues were.

Mr. Necci stated that the building was a very nice design, but is going to be very visible from the expressway. It really will be the most visible building in Novi to people passing by on I-96. The north and west façade which is the rear of the building is a little less consistent with the ordinance than the rest of the building, especially with respect to the percentage of brick. The applicant has the required 30% brick on all facades except that north façade. So, it's recommended that the applicant find a way architecturally to bring up that percentage of brick and that would indirectly lower the amount of EIFS on that façade. There happens to be a stair tower that is a logical place to put that. Mr. Bowman explained prior to the meeting that there is a future expansion contemplated. So, that explains partially why the north may not be treated the same as the rest of the building.

Member Lynch asked if it would be to Mr. Bowman's advantage to make that portion of the building, since it is the most visible down I-96, the most attractive portion.

Mr. Necci answered that was correct. In addition, the illuminated beacon is a very nice feature that will draw a lot of attention to the building, but the rest of the façade is also important.

Member Lynch said the parking issues seem to be the major concern. It appears there is a study being done but if the Commission is considering approval, the wording in the motion concerning the parking study should be tightened up. The applicant should do the Shared Parking Study that shows there is adequate parking on site. It is to Mr. Bowman's disadvantage not to have adequate parking.

Mr. Bowman agreed and added the showplace still has arrangements in place with neighboring properties, the Town Center, etc. to park customers and/or exhibitors there and shuttle them to the site. Mr. Bowman stated that he is more than happy to commit those resources to have the study done. But 90% of the time there is a huge excess of parking and 95% of the time there is more than enough. If the expansion is built, of course, additional parking would be constructed.

Member Lynch said that he understood that and is just trying to narrow down the key things in order to make a recommendation to City Council. The applicant has stated there is no issue with doing the study, or adding the island per the recommendation of the traffic consultant, and there are no outstanding landscape issues, so it seems like everything has been addressed.

Member Baratta asked Mr. Bowman if the grass festival area would be used for overflow parking.

Mr. Bowman answered it certainly could be, but it doesn't meet requirements and has not received approval. It's currently used for marshaling and will be even more critical in the future as the showplace site has been selected and is in the final negotiation stages to host the revival of the State Fair. The festival area is constructed and designed in such a way so that it's maintainable and can be used for trailering and marshaling when big shows are moving in and other shows are moving out and, if needed, it could easily park an additional 250 to 300 cars. It would always be a last resort.

Member Baratta asked if that was a graveled and graded area.

Mr. Bowman answered it is and there is a sedimentation basin there as well.

Chair Pehrson addressed Planner Kapelanski, relative to not having the data available, but having pictures and videos and knowing that there is going to be a study performed, what is the means by which, in Member Lynch's terminology, the Commission tightens up the motion so that if that study comes back vastly different than what has been stated thus far, there is a remedy to hold the applicant to do something more than anticipated.

Planner Kapelanski answered it would be sufficient to say the applicant should address the parking deficiency with a Shared Parking Study that demonstrates there is adequate parking on site for all existing and proposed uses.

Chair Pehrson asked Mr. Bowman if that study will account for the increased amount of and size of shows that are anticipated in the future.

Mr. Bowman answered the showplace is doing the busiest of shows from a traffic standpoint now. The types of events that are expected to be added and expanded upon are more industry-specific shows like the testing and the battery show. They're big shows, but nowhere near as intense from a traffic standpoint as the women's show, motorcycle show or golf show - and those are already occurring.

Chair Pehrson asked what is the reasoning or rationale that the parking study wasn't done and provided to us at this point in time.

Mr. Bowman stated that it was discussed in the pre-submittal stages and he should have thought about that ahead of time. But he thought the video and photo evidence he provided would be enough.

Chair Pehrson asked if there were any other comments.

Through the Chair, City Attorney Schultz stated that just for point A of the motion, instead of talking about a ZBA variance, he would just be specific and say the submission of a Shared Parking Study in the form and using the methodology required under the ordinance submitted prior to submission to City Council so the planning staff can review.

Motion made by Member Lynch, seconded by Member Gutman:

In the matter of the request of Cunningham Limp for Hyatt Place at Suburban Collection Showplace SP 11-44, motion to recommend approval of the Preliminary Site Plan, subject to the following:

- a. Applicant addressing the parking deficiency with the submittal of a Shared Parking Study demonstrating adequate parking on the site for all existing and proposed uses. Shared Parking Study shall be in the form required and using the methodology required by the ordinance and shall be reviewed by staff prior to forwarding the matter to the City Council;**
- b. Applicant receiving approval from the City Council of the above-mentioned Shared Parking Study;**
- c. Applicant revising the parking lot circulation issues near the southeast corner of the proposed hotel as noted in the traffic consultant's review letter and as discussed with the applicant beginning at the pre-application meeting;**
- d. Applicant preparing and submitting the covenants and restrictions, as required by Section 1003A.11 of the Zoning Ordinance and as discussed with the applicant beginning at the pre-application meeting;**
- e. Section 9 Façade Walver for the overage of EIFS on all facades;**

- f. Applicant revising the proposed elevations on the north and west facades to reduce the percentage of EIFS and achieve a minimum of 30% brick on both facades and comply with the Façade Ordinance requirements, as discussed with the applicant beginning at the pre-application meeting;
- g. The applicant supplying a large scale mock-up of the metallic finish on insulated panels as noted in the Façade Consultants review letter;
- h. Landscape Waiver for the lack of parking lot islands every fifteen spaces; and
- i. Compliance with all the conditions and requirements listed in the staff and consultant review letters because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Article 10A, 23A, Article 24 and Article 25 and all other applicable provisions of the Zoning Ordinance.

Chair Pehrson thought that point f was incorrect and asked for comment from Mr. Necci.

Mr. Necci said he thought the waiver would be for the overage of EIFS on all facades and it would be contingent on him making the revision to the stair tower that was discussed. He would want to see samples of the material; but the C-brick would be in compliance. Mr. Necci explained that the color of the EIFS and the brick match each other very nicely and he would think that the C-brick would match that color and it would be a visual continuation of the brick.

Mr. Bowman then came forward and stated he would agree to that change.

Chair Pehrson stated the motion should incorporate Mr. Necci's comments.

**ROLL CALL VOTE ON MOTION RECOMMENDING APPROVAL OF HYATT PLACE PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN 11-44
MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER GUTMAN:**

In the matter of the request of Cunningham Limp for Hyatt Place at Suburban Collection Showplace SP 11-44, motion to recommend approval of the Preliminary Site Plan, subject to the following:

- a. Applicant addressing the parking deficiency with the submittal of a Shared Parking Study demonstrating adequate parking on the site for all existing and proposed uses. Shared Parking Study shall be in the form required and using the methodology required by the ordinance and shall be reviewed by staff prior to forwarding the matter to the City Council;
- b. Applicant receiving approval from the City Council of the above-mentioned Shared Parking Study;
- c. Applicant revising the parking lot circulation issues near the southeast corner of the proposed hotel as noted in the traffic consultant's review letter and as discussed with the applicant beginning at the pre-application meeting;
- d. Applicant preparing and submitting the covenants and restrictions, as required by Section 1003A.11 of the Zoning Ordinance and as discussed with the applicant beginning at the pre-application meeting;
- e. Section 9 Façade Waiver for the overage of EIFS on all facades;
- f. Applicant submitting a revised plan showing brick on the west and the north facades of the stair tower;
- g. Landscape Waiver for the lack of parking lot islands every fifteen spaces; and
- h. Compliance with all the conditions and requirements listed in the staff and consultant review letters because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Article 10A, 23A, Article 24 and Article 25 and all other applicable provisions of the Zoning Ordinance. *Motion carried 6-0.*

Motion made by Member Lynch, seconded by Member Gutman:

ROLL CALL VOTE ON MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER GUTMAN.

In the matter of the request of Cunningham Limp for Hyatt Place at Suburban Collection Showplace, SP 11-44, motion to recommend approval of the Storm Water Management Plan, subject to compliance with all the conditions and requirements listed in the staff and consultant review letters 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 6-0.*

Mr. Bowman then stated he wanted to say that in the timing, the process and the review, the Planning Division and staff have been extraordinarily helpful to myself as well as our consultants, and he just wanted to say thank you.

2. APPROVAL OF THE DECEMBER 14, 2011 PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Motion made by Member Gutman, seconded by Member Baratta:

VOICE VOTE ON MOTION TO APPROVE THE DECEMBER 14, 2011 PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES MADE BY MEMBER GUTMAN AND SECONDED BY MEMBER BARATTA.

Motion to approve the December 14, 2011 Planning Commission minutes. Motion carried 6-0.

CONSENT AGENDA REMOVALS FOR COMMISSION ACTION

There were no Consent Agenda removals.

MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION

There were no Matters for Discussion.

SUPPLEMENTAL ISSUES

There were no Supplemental Issues.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

No one from the audience wished to speak.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion made by Member Lynch, seconded by Member Gutman:

VOICE VOTE ON THE MOTION TO ADJOURN MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER GUTMAN.

Motion to adjourn the January 25, 2012 Planning Commission meeting. Motion carried 6-0.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:08 PM.

Transcribed by: Juanita Freeman, Account Clerk, January, 2012

Date Approved:

Richelle Leskun, Planning Assistant