

**REGULAR MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NOVI  
MONDAY, AUGUST 9, 2021 AT 7:00 P.M.**

**Mayor Gatt called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.**

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**ROLL CALL:** Mayor Gatt, Mayor Pro Tem Staudt, Council Members Casey, Crawford, Fischer, Maday, Mutch

**ALSO PRESENT:** Peter Auger, City Manager  
Victor Cardenas, Assistant City Manager  
Tom Schultz, City Attorney

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA:**

Mayor Gatt added "GFL" to Mayor and Council Issues.

Member Fischer added "School Zones and Speed Signs" to Mayor and Council Issues.

**CM 21-08-108 Moved by Fischer, seconded by Casey; CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**To approve the Agenda as amended.**

**Roll call vote on CM 21-08-108**                      **Yeas: Staudt, Casey, Crawford, Fischer,  
Maday, Mutch, Gatt**  
**Nays: None**

**PUBLIC HEARINGS: None**

**PRESENTATIONS: None**

**MANAGER/STAFF REPORT: None**

**ATTORNEY REPORT: None**

**AUDIENCE COMMENTS: None**

**CONSENT AGENDA REMOVALS AND APPROVALS:**

Member Mutch removed Consent Agenda Item D for further discussion.

**CM 21-08-109 Moved by Fischer, seconded by Casey; CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**To approve the Consent Agenda as amended.**

- A. Approve Minutes of:  
1. July 26, 2021 - Regular Meeting

- B. Approval to accept the residential street as part of Chamberlin Crossings and adoption of Act 51 New Street Resolution accepting Chamberlin Court as public, adding 0.26 miles of roadway to the City's public street system.
- C. Approval of Release in Full provided by Travelers Insurance in connection with the claim against it's insured, Asphalt Specialists, Inc., in the amount of \$14,585.87.
- D. Approval to proceed with the Cranbrooke Road Sidewalk project.  
**REMOVED/LATER APPROVED.**
- E. Approval of the final payment to Metro Controls Inc. for the installation of digital HVAC controls at the Civic Center in the amount of \$13,011.50, plus interest earned on retainage.
- F. Approval of the final payment to D&S Contractors for the Dispatch Renovation in the amount of \$18,132.02, plus interest earned on retainage.
- G. Approval of claims and warrants – Warrant 1089
- H. Enter Executive Session immediately following the regular meeting of August 9, 2021 In the Council Annex for the purpose of discussing privileged correspondence from legal counsel.

**Roll call vote on CM 21-08-109**

**Yeas: Casey, Crawford, Fischer, Maday, Mutch, Gatt, Staudt**  
**Nays: None**

**MATTERS FOR COUNCIL ACTION**

- 1. **Consideration of approval to award the construction contract to Bidigare Contractors, Inc., the low bidder, for the Ten Mile Road Water Main and Sidewalk project, in the amount of \$519,872, and amend the budget.**

**CM 21-08-110 Moved by Staudt, seconded by Casey; CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**Approval to award the construction contract to Bidigare Contractors, Inc., the low bidder, for the Ten Mile Road Water Main and Sidewalk project, in the amount of \$519,872, and amend the budget.**

**Roll call vote on CM 21-08-110**

**Yeas: Crawford, Fischer, Maday, Mutch, Gatt, Staudt, Casey**  
**Nays: None**

- 2. **Consideration of Introduction of Ordinance No. 18.297, an Ordinance to amend the City of Novi Code of Ordinances, Ordinance 14-271, the City of Novi Zoning**

**Ordinance, as amended, at Article 2, Definitions, in order to revise the definition of Planned Rezoning Overlay (PRO) Conditions, and at Article 7.0, "Administration, Appeals, and Enforcement," Section 7.13, Amendments to Ordinance, subsection 2, Planned Rezoning Overlay (PRO), in order to comprehensively revise the requirements of the Ordinance with respect to intent, eligibility, approval, procedure, effect of approval, amendment, expiration and extension, and effective date. FIRST READING.**

Member Mutch asked City Attorney Schultz a couple of questions regarding the amendment process for this. He said that is on page nine, subsection 12 right before letter C. He said one of the issues that we have had come up recently with the Maples but has also come up with some other previous developments in the City. He stated they have these kind of binding, long term development plan approval plans in place is this question of who has the authority once it is moved past the stage where the initial developer gets approval from the City and they go through the development process. He said we enter a phase where it is the long-term life of these developments where now we are dealing with not just one developer, but in some cases, hundreds of property owners. He asked who has the authority to then come in after the fact and request changes in one property owner among 100 request to change that affects everybody without getting their approval. He asked for clarification on that point as it applies to the PRO. He guessed specifically the section about who can request an amendment after the fact. City Attorney Schultz said it was a good questions, in light of some of the conversations that have been going out as far as the City has been concerned over the last, however many years we have represented the City, whether it is for the old PDS, or the RUD's or even the PRO's, if you own a property in that kind of a Planned Unit Development, because these are really all planned united developments under the Zoning Enabling Act. He said you are able, as far as we have applied the ordinance to come in and ask for an amendment. He said if you have a large development where you are only a piece of a larger sort of planned project if you have relationships established in your private documents that set up that development through the developer. He stated those are private restrictions, private arrangements that need to be enforced among property owners, but from the City's perspective, the way we have approached these is really all we know is what is in the ordinance and what is in the agreement that we have, and we will apply those. He said we had the Maple's issue come up, which is sort of on hold right now, so we have not had a formal response to the neighbors who are adjacent to the commercial piece. He said more recently we had the Manchester project, which was obviously part of a very big PUD, the Sandstone PUD and that argument, when Manchester came in and converted the commercial undeveloped piece at Novi Road, rather than 13 Mile, to multifamily residential, there is kind of this lightly argued position from an adjacent property owner in the circuit court, when we went to have the amendment to the consent judgment entered, that everybody in the PUD needed to consent to this. He said the position we took on behalf of the City was, we have got a property owner with property rights we think we should process. He stated that ultimately, the circuit judge agreed with that position. He said nobody at that point tried to make an argument from a master deed, overall master deed. He said that may become an issue in one of the ones that you are looking at in

the future, but we can for second reading, if that is what Council would like, sort of layout that in writing, and maybe address it in the ordinance, because basically what the Zoning Enabling Act says is we are allowed to create our own process, if you think that is an issue, then we can talk about it and do something a little different. He stated the only thing we have done in the draft in front of you today is try and take words that we have put in the last couple of PRO Agreements to try and keep things off the City Council Agenda if they are truly minor amendments. He said that is now built in there. He explained that if they are minor amendments, we do not have to go through the entire process, the Planning Commission can make some changes, but he guessed we could talk about what it is that you want the answer to be as a Council. Member Mutch thought it was problematic to have a process that requires everybody's agreement to enter the agreement. He said we do not process of PRO or an RUD, or any of these other agreements with multiple property owners, without their consent to that everybody must sign off on that we do not allow you to pull somebody in and essentially buying their property in a way or affect their property in a way. He said it seemed logical to him that an amendment process would follow the same process that if you are going to make some substantial change, he was not talking about some change in parking standards but something substantial use change. He stated as a city's perspective, everybody should be on board with that they have a situation where somebody could unilaterally and he knew they could not do it without the City's approval, but to even open that door. He personally thought that was problematic. He said he would rather have a process that people buying into that there is an agreement in place, they understand what the agreement says, and everybody follows that. He thought that is most residents' expectations, when you buy into a condo development, or you buy into a subdivision, you have a homeowner's association and deeds and restrictions, if there is a change request that there is a whole process. He knew it depended on the association and how many folks need to sign off, but people understood that. He thought it created problems for the City and he thought it creates problems for the residents to leave that door open for somebody to unilaterally come in and request a change like that. He said that was his thought on that issue.

Member Mutch said he had another question as it regarded page 11, where it talked about these minor changes, and he said it talked about parking related landscaping and sod related requirements. He stated that one that was recently before Council was the Lakeview Development. He asked if that would fall under that in terms of the kind of changes that they were requesting. City Attorney Schultz thought the Lakeview PRO used some specific language. Member Mutch said he did not need an answer, he was just asking that questions, because it may not even affect that decision. He just wanted to understand with these changes in language that you are suggesting kind of what is the scope of that. He said his last question as on that page at the very top where it talks about putting in place, essentially kind of like a perpetual deed restriction on a property in terms of somebody could get PRO approval and essentially becomes shall not expire, shall not the land and be a deed restriction, what is the thought on that. City Attorney Schultz said with Sakura, where the City and the developer have specifically agreed that it will be a deed restriction run with the land and not expire after a certain period through non pay, lack of building by the developer. He said in most situations, you do not care, you are the City, somebody is coming in to develop property and if they develop it great,

and they comply with the ordinance, great. If not, you know two years pass, then they must come back in and look for a different approval. You know, you are selling the property to Sakura here, and you have put in the agreement that this is the development you get, this just sort of confirms that we can put that in the agreement. Member Mutch said this specifically deals with an expiration period. He was concerned that we could create a zombie development, where somebody goes through the process does get approval rights, or deed restriction, restructure, and does not act on it. He said then years down the road, suddenly it revives, except there is nobody sitting up here who really knows who, what, went into all this, why was that put in place? He thought that is the value of having these expiration periods, and making folks come back to City Council because it keeps everybody on the same page. He raised that issue because this has happened in other communities, again, with PUD, where Canton Township was one community that came to mind, because it has come up there, the Township Board back in the 1970's appeared to approve some commercial PUD's at some busy intersection and never got built, nothing happened, the whole area around it gets built up and then it pops up 20 years later with a development that now no longer actually really fits the area that it is going to be proposed. He said that is the nature of his concern. He said he did not want to get something on the books that just never goes away. City Attorney Schultz said we wrote it as something the City would have to agree to. He stated he would expect that in 99% of the cases neither party would want that, because the developer can come in and ask for an extension, for another couple of years. He said in situations like the one where you happen to be the seller, this was really kind of a let's make this clear that this is permitted under the ordinance. Member Mutch said it is more granting authority, right. He said that was his comment in terms of what he felt like was the substance of things. He said, generally, we have talked about several times, he thought the flow of this in terms of the process to coming to City Council before it is formally reviewed by the Planning Commission, he thought is necessary. He said until we are actually going through that process and see how that will function and how that works. He thought even that that change will make a difference, because he thought that is what is currently missing from the processes. He believed a lot of things happen before it ever comes to City Council to approve it, creating a lot of expectations on behalf of the developer and then causing problems for them if the City Council chooses not to sign off what they feel like they have gone through the process and then gotten their approval for. He said he liked the language that was incorporated that makes that clear. He said people do not always read the information the way they should, but he thought it makes it clear that the first phase is very much review, feedback, not an approval, that does not happen until round two, it might make the process a little bit longer. He said considering how some of these PRO's have gone, it will probably make the process shorter, because the City Council having input earlier into the process may address problems that have come up along the way with some of these different PRO Agreement. He believed this would make it an easier process for the developers, and better for the residents to have more opportunity to have some input into the process and he thought that would make things better. He said we will have to see how it goes, but he could support the first reading and said he would make a motion.

**CM 21-08-111**

**Moved by Mutch, seconded by Staudt; CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**Motion to introduce Ordinance No. 18.297, an Ordinance to amend the City of Novi Code of Ordinances, Ordinance 14-271, the City of Novi Zoning Ordinance, as amended, at Article 2, Definitions, in order to revise the definition of Planned Rezoning Overlay (PRO) Conditions, and at Article 7.0, "Administration, Appeals, and Enforcement," Section 7.13, Amendments to Ordinance, subsection 2, Planned Rezoning Overlay (PRO), in order to comprehensively revise the requirements of the Ordinance with respect to intent, eligibility, approval, procedure, effect of approval, amendment, expiration and extension, and effective date. FIRST READING**

**Roll call vote on CM 21-08-111**

**Yeas: Fischer, Maday, Mutch, Gatt, Staudt,  
Casey, Crawford**

**Nays: None**

**CONSENT AGENDA REMOVALS FOR COUNCIL ACTION:**

D. Approval to proceed with the Cranbrooke Road Sidewalk project.

Member Mutch stated that everyone on Council was familiar with this item. He stated this is the Cranbrooke Road sidewalk project and most of us were able to attend the recent City meeting about that project. He said in the packet for City Administration is recommending we proceed with a sidewalk project as it was originally proposed, which is the east side of Cranbrooke Road. He went on the record saying he would prefer to see the sidewalk built on the west side. He thought there are a few real key things that speak to that. He stated it is less of an impact in terms of the number of residents that it is adjacent to, but also the distance. He said some of the residents on the east side are within 200 feet of the sidewalk. He said those on the west side are further away. He said a significant portion of that area is also not residential, it is the clubhouse open space area at Lakewood. He thought one of the things that has been compelling to him and he has dealt with a lot of sidewalk projects over the years and a lot of pushbacks from residents concerned about the impact and oftentimes, he thought they realized after the fact it is not as significant as it is. He said this is different from other projects we have seen, you know that at the meeting it was brought up the Nine Mile sidewalk, which we had a lot of residents' concerns about that was a backyard facing situation. He said that sidewalk was much further from the homes than these others proposed sidewalk in some other locations. He said the other thing is, you know, there are sidewalks that are closer than 20 feet to residents in the City. He could think of a few locations where that happens, but folks bought in knowing that was kind of the setup, the sidewalks were in place, you bought, moved into this home knowing there is a sidewalk maybe 10 or 15 feet from your house. He said this is a different situation where we are adding a sidewalk in where there never was one, and it will have an impact. He said he heard some issues raised in terms of the relative cost difference, it is a little bit longer sidewalk, so it is going to cost a little bit more, but he thought we as a city with all our projects, and one he was looking at was Lakeshore Park, trying to address the concerns that residents had, we have always been first and foremost about being a good neighbor, and trying to minimize the

impact on adjacent neighbors. We did not skimp on Lakeshore and say, you know what, it is not that big a deal, it is only a handful of people, we made the effort to address those concerns. He said we are spending what it takes to ensure that it is not a negative, so again he would say he would prefer we build the sidewalk on the west side, because he thought it had less of an impact there. He thought it served the same function that a sidewalk on the side does, which is to provide route for people to use, get them off of Cranbrooke out of the road, where they currently walk and takes them to the destination in Lakewood, which is the clubhouse, the pool, the park, and those places that those residents visit regularly.

Mayor Gatt commented that we had a meeting, we had a public information meeting, we invited all the residents of that complex to come out, it was well attended. He said not all of them came out, but it was very well attended. He stated he did not believe that anyone who attended was against the sidewalk, so the debate was the east side or west side. He said some people on the west side pointed out that if we built the sidewalk on the west side, the sidewalk would be less than five feet away from their residence. He said he did not think whatever side those choose; it is going to make everyone happy. He said one thing for certain is the sidewalk, he is there often, other people on this Council live in the sub, and so does his daughter. He said people are not walking to the clubhouse so much, they are walking for exercise, and they are walking in great numbers. We need a sidewalk there. He stated that Member Mutch said it was just a little bit more, but the way he understood the project to build on the west side was one and a half times as much. He thought one on the east side was about \$100,000 give or take and the one on the west side was at least \$150,000 or a little bit more, so that is a substantial difference in monies, taxpayer monies. He said people on the west side say that their sidewalk will be much closer to their bedrooms, their front doors, the end units. He thought there are seven courts there and there is at least seven residences at all times because they are on each side. He said there are at least 14 residences that will have a sidewalk closer to their house, so again, he did not think we are going to be able to please everybody. He said it is a goodwill gesture by the City to put in that sidewalk and he thought for prudence part for the money reason we should stay on the east side.

Mayor Pro Tem Staudt thought the money was not a big enough issue in his mind to really be too concerned. He believed the biggest issue he had is the issue of the great number of people who are going to use this density of the users in on the east side, and a lot of seniors live in that area. He thought it is far more convenient for them to access the sidewalk on the east side than to cross the road and go to the left side to the west side. He brought up another issue that he had with their parks and green space on the west side of the road that now we are going to put a sidewalk in. He said he drives by that area frequently because he lives down the street, he did not see a compelling argument to change what we agreed on. He stated that when he was in the meeting with five other council members, he did not hear a compelling argument by anybody to put it on the west side of the road. He said he would make a motion to move forward with the current item that was in the Consent Agenda.

**CM 21-08-112**

**Moved by Staudt, seconded by Gatt; CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**Approval to proceed with the Cranbrooke Road Sidewalk project.**

Member Mutch said one of the issues that was raised at the meeting was the question of screening. He said that was one thing that residents on the east side felt that if the sidewalk was going in, was if the City would be able to assist in any way with landscaping and screening to shield their units from the sidewalk? He asked Mayor Gatt if he had any specifics, because he did not want to leave this issue without that being clearly spelled out. City Manager Auger replied to his question and explained that the DPW has planned to use some of the Tree Funds, but we would meet with the individual residents, when the sidewalk is put in to see where they would want what and we would work with Rick Meader, our landscape architect, to ensure that it would be proper and grow, and give the screening that they are looking for, is in the scope of this project. He said it was rather minor, where it is important to the residents, we understand, but we want to get the project in, go meet with individual residents. He said most of you were at the meeting, the one person who actual signed one of the petitions early on saying he wanted it on the other side is on the east side and said he loved it. He said he was the closet resident to the east side sidewalk, and he was fine with it, and said he did not know if he would want a tree there. City Manager Auger said individuals might want a tree and others may not. He said we will meet with the residents and figure out what works and what we can plan out there. Member Mutch thanked him for the explanation and said he thought that we need to treat this the same way we have with our Lakeshore Park neighbors. He said we are not looking to create a wall here, but he thought where residents have concerns about screening and adjacency, he though the where the residents have a concern, we clearly have the funds in the Tree Fund available to do appropriate screening where it is requested. Thank you.

Mayor Gatt said we have a motion and support along with Administration's comments on the record that screening will be part of the project.

**Roll call vote on CM 21-08-112**

**Yeas: Maday, Mutch, Gatt, Staudt, Casey,  
Crawford, Fischer,**

**Nays: None**

**AUDIENCE COMMENT: None**

**COMMITTEE REPORTS:**

Mayor Pro Tem Staudt gave a quick update on the second Broadband Committee Report had two very good presentations and we are going to have a third meeting coming up in the next two or three weeks which will be a very small Committee meeting. He said they would like to bring that back a presentation and some potential recommendations to City Council. He wanted to give Council a heads up that it is proceeding nicely.

**MAYOR AND COUNCIL ISSUES:**



1. GFL Discussion

Mayor Gatt added GFL and said he wrote out some comments so that he did not forget anything important. He stated we are now over six weeks into our new contract with GFL garbage and refuse, yard, and waste pickup service. He said the citizen complaints continue to come in regularly at an alarming rate. He said we just got one in during this meeting. He said GFL fails to pick up garbage from one area, they fail to pick up yard waste from another area, thriving old, antiquated vehicles unlike what was promised in their contract with the City, they are dropping oil and hydraulic fluid on our streets. He said their customer service he was told is suspect at best. He said there comes a time when this City Council must look at everything happening with the microscope and say maybe we made a mistake. He said their intentions when changing from Waste Management, the GFL were unquestionably pure, and only intended to give our residents a better deal, for a longer time. He said Waste Management was asking for a tremendous percentage increase in their fees. He said they wanted to reduce the number of weeks that they would pick up yard waste, while we wanted to increase those weeks, the citizens demanded more time to put through yard waste to the curb. He said our City Council and our Administration went to work and tried to negotiate with Waste Management, but to no avail. They held steadfast to their demands. He said they went looking for a new service, GFL gave us everything we wanted at a cost savings to each resident. He said he knew it was only \$40.00 per year, per household, but multiply that by the thousands of households. He said it was real money we were saving. He stated that GFL promised they would give the same type of service to our residents were accustomed to, they would be on time every week, no misses, and no leaky trucks. Mayor Gatt said however, in just six weeks into their new service, to speak bluntly, they have failed us, the City and the residents and everybody up at this table, they have failed us. Mayor Gatt said he read in the paper that they are having a hard time getting people, and this should make us all more understanding, more tolerant, and give them more time. He said after all, there is a worldwide pandemic, but he was sorry, he did not buy any of that because the pandemic was raging when they bid for and accepted the award for the contract. It was not news to them, and it is not news to anyone. He stated if they could not meet their obligations, they should not have bid, or should have told us upfront that they are having problems exercising their duties, but they did not. He said they accepted the contract, and our residents are getting the short end of the stick. He said unless the majority of the City Council disagrees with him that evening, he was going to ask City Attorney Schultz to draft a strongly worded letter to GFL pointing out their shortcomings and fulfilling the obligations of the contract that they signed with us. He said in the letter, he would ask that you please articulate any out clauses, we expect immediate compliance with the contract. He said if that means hiring more people or subcontracting their services to some else, if that is allowed in the contract, then do it as a resident who has experienced missed garbage pickup on day one by GFL. He stated as the Mayor, who is an official spokesperson for the City and for the City Charter, he wanted our residents to know that we are behind them 100%, we hear you loud and clear. He said we want GFL to hear the same message, we are behind our residents 100% to put up or put that contract out for bids again. He said if any City Councilmember

disagrees, he asked them to speak up that evening. He said if four or more disagree than he would be overruled. He said he will continue to fight for the residents as best he could, but if not, then City Attorney Schultz has a job. He asked that GFL have that in their hands this week if possible. He asked if any Councilmembers objected to his request.

Mayor Pro Tem Staudt agreed with Mayor Gatt 100%. He said he was the chairman of the Consultant Review Committee; we have two other members sitting up here who looked at all the contracts and after they were the low bidder, they came in at a number that we thought was extremely aggressive. He said they made many calls around to other municipalities and found that they were providing very good service to virtually all those municipalities. He stated in the past week or so he made calls to some of those places, and they are experiencing many of the same difficulties that we are. He said one of the things that completely blew his mind, was a TV report. He said a TV report can be a little bit biased at times, but they said a GFL spokesman said that they could expect until the end of the year these problems to continue. He said maybe that is fine for other municipalities, but it is not fine for Novi. He reiterated what Mayor Gatt said earlier, we need to lay our position out very clearly and the method he used is what he thought is a good way of going about this, but we cannot continue to go down this path. He said there are many things, one big issue is that he received a lot of call and a lot of text messages about the fact that they cannot get through to anybody. He said he called there early about two weeks ago, and he got right through to the guy that works for GFL and the DPW talked to him, he gave him some background on the issues, but the bottom line is, it is not acceptable for it to go through their call center, wherever the heck that place is. It is not acceptable for us to have to go online and file complaints. He stated if a resident calls, if they need to put two or three, maybe four people in our DPW Department to make sure that there is follow up, then that needs to be done, they made the commitment, this is a big dollar contract. He mentioned another issue on Saturday he was driving around, and he drove through his entire subdivision and saw a GFL truck, and it just happened to be picking up lawn waste. He said it was not earth shattering to us that perhaps a bag or two of lawn waste is sitting there for two or three days, but this is all over the City. He said it is on a specific street where every other household was taken care of what is going on, this is not an issue of lack of people, this is an issue of a lack of skilled workers to take care of this issue. He said they turn one way, but they do not go down the street the other way, he understood that they have a GPS system that tracks their trucks. He said it is not working, and our residents are tired of it. He said unless they can fix it, we are going to move on, sooner than later. He said we are not going to wait six months to see if the world gets better, this is something GFL must do now. He said he was 100% in support of the Mayor, this is just entirely unacceptable.

Member Fischer said he would be in support as well. He thought that Mayor Gatt's recommendation was a sound one. He said he was reading through the contract, there are a couple sections on liquidated damages, and it talks about our ability to fine GFL for late pickups when things are not scheduled. He thought as part of Mayor Gatt's request he would ask City Manager Auger and City Attorney Schultz to provide some information to City Council on if we have pursued those avenues, and if not, why not, when we will.

Member Mutch commented he would piggyback on that and asked that we, the City Council be provided by City Attorney Schultz what the exit strategy would be. He said the letter will touch on some of that, but it would be helpful for us to understand what the process for getting out of a contract that is for non-performance by the service providers so that we understand where we are going with this.

Member Casey echoed the previous speakers, and she was fully in support of this. She stated she is one of those residents who has had issues, and she has had both good and less than good interactions with GFL. She said she was pleased that we are going to be having some firm conversation with them about the level of service that we expect. She appreciated Mayor Pro Tem Staudt's comments because what she hoped that people understood is when we went through this process, there was a cost savings, we did not just say it is a cost savings. She mentioned there was a lot of investigation to understand how this vendor performed in other cities, so she was glad that he raised that point and made that as clear as he did, because there was a lot of due diligence done. It was not just saying hey, we are saving you \$40 dollars a house, that adds up, this is great, it was a good price. She said we should be getting good service for said good price. She thanked Mayor Pro Tem Staudt for reiterating the work that the Consultant Review Committee did.

Mayor Gatt closed with final comments to the residents. He reiterated that their intentions were purely pristine, they wanted to help. He said they are all residents, and you can see that they have experienced difficulties too. He said they are going to stop it, and we are going to stop it soon.

2. Install flashing beacons at Hickory Woods Elementary School.

Member Fischer stated back in March 2020, we as a Council approved the speed zone for the area of 11 Mile Road and Wixom Road for the middle school in Novi, as well as Deerfield Elementary. He stated in April of 2021, during the budget session, he had requested that we go ahead and put those signs up and include flashing beacon signs. He said we were also to investigate the use of a crossing guard there. He stated the reason for that was because the Novi Community School District went through and made some changes to the walk zones for our school system. He said there were going to be more kids walking and obviously 11 Mile Road and Wixom is very busy, and higher speeds than in Village Oaks where he grew up. He wanted to get an update from City Manager Auger on that issue and make sure we are on par. He said he was going to have that done before the school year starts given where we are in August. City Manager Auger said the solar powered flashing beacon will be going up on Wixom Road on Friday. He said we are scheduled to have crossing guards at 11 Mile Road. He stated we are in conversations with Hickory Woods Elementary, which is a different school district, and they are not going to the same model that the City of Novi schools is as far as walking to school, they are still on their same model. He said we are talking with their school system to see if they would like those same flashing beacons because they have not had any issues and they have a crosswalk coming from that one subdivision over so we will if they

would like them up there, we are prepared to put some up there as well. Member Fischer said the first issue is Novi Schools and it sounded like we are on track to do what City Council had requested. He said Hickory Woods was the other reason he wanted to add this. He understood that Walled Lake has not changed their walk zones, but that is the only school that he has been able to find in the City of Novi that goes from a 45 mile per hour speed limit down to a 30 mile per hour speed. He said we have had this conversation going for long enough that he was going to go ahead and make a motion that we install the same flashing beacon signs as soon as possible and direct City Administration to do that, hopefully before the school district starts, and pursue a partnership with Walled Lake, but absent them, joining and doing a cost share. He thought it was incumbent upon us to go ahead and install that anyway. He said it is not just about the walk zones, it is also about busses turning, it is about parents turning into the school. He said that is a motion that he made to go ahead and get that installed ASAP.

**CM 21-08-113                      Moved by Fischer, seconded by Casey; CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**To approve installation of flashing beacons at Hickory Woods Elementary School.**

Mayor Pro Tem Staudt thought it was a good idea, and he wondered how much money we are talking about, he said it was responsible to have an idea of how much money we are spending. City Manager Auger said it was about \$10,000. Member Fischer said from the memos he has seen, he believed it was \$3,000 to \$5,000, so we are talking about a minimal amount. Mayor Pro Tem Staudt asked if we had to make a budget allocation for that at some level. City Manager Auger so no, this is all administrative.

**Roll call vote on CM 21-08-113                      Yeas: Mutch, Gatt, Staudt, Casey, Crawford, Fischer, Maday,**  
**Nays: None**

Mayor Gatt said they were going to adjourn into Executive Session and that they did not intend to return to Open Session.

**ADJOURNMENT** – There being no further business to come before Council, the meeting was adjourned at 7:49 P.M.

---

Cortney Hanson, City Clerk

---

Robert J. Gatt, Mayor

---

Transcribed by Deborah S. Aubry

Date approved: August 30, 2021