



# PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

CITY OF NOVI

Regular Meeting

**June 26, 2019 7:00 PM**

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

## CALL TO ORDER

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

## ROLL CALL

**Present:** Member Avdoulos, Member Greco, Member Hornung, Member Lynch, Member Maday, Chair Pehrson

**Absent:** Member Anthony

**Also Present:** Barbara McBeth, City Planner; Sri Komaragiri, Planner; Lindsay Bell, Planner; Rick Meader, Landscape Architect; Kate Richardson, Staff Engineer; Beth Saarela, City Attorney

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Pehrson led the meeting attendees in the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance.

## APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Moved by Member Avdoulos and seconded by Member Lynch.

## VOICE VOTE TO APPROVE THE JUNE 26, 2019 AGENDA MOTION MADE BY MEMBER AVDOULOS AND SECONDED BY MEMBER LYNCH.

**Motion to approve the June 26, 2019 Planning Commission Agenda. Motion carried 6-0.**

## AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

Michel Duchesneau, 1191 South Lake Drive, said I just want to let you know that there's a proposal coming to you shortly called Scenic Pines. It will probably be here in a few weeks. I live in the Lakewood subdivision, and this subdivision is over 90 years old, when it was first platted. And at that time, they didn't take care or weren't concerned about stormwater drainage and any future impacts. The proposal that you'll be seeing has a street that basically drains onto the subject property that will be Scenic Pines and there's no drainage at all. And the proposal we've seen will have that going into people's backyards. And I'll just leave it at that, other than to say I see that the City Ordinances does have a section that talks about unreasonable burden on surrounding properties. I know the drainage from a Right-of-Way is not something you normally look at, but I'd like to give you a heads up. Thank you.

Robert Varteresian, 45800 Grand River Avenue, said my question is that I understand that the board is looking to change the zoning along Grand River west of Novi Road, and I

wondered what you might be able to tell me about that change.

Chair Pehrson said this is not a question and answer, but if you want to contact Ms. McBeth sometime during the week, she'll be able to fill you in on everything.

Mr. Varteresian said ok, thank you.

## **CORRESPONDENCE**

There was no correspondence.

## **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

There were no Committee Reports.

## **CITY PLANNER REPORT**

City Planner McBeth said good evening. I wanted to report that the City Council approved the First Amendment to the previously approved Planned Rezoning Overlay plan and agreement for the Adell Center PRO. This amendment was primarily for the modification to the approved layout for Unit 6 and 7, change to common landscape areas, building signage, and location of accessory units.

## **CONSENT AGENDA**

There were no items on the consent agenda.

## **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

### **1. MUNRO'S PRESERVE JSP19-09**

Public hearing at the request of Taft 11 Group LLC for Preliminary Site Plan With Open Space Preservation Option, Site Condominium, Wetland Permit, Woodland Permit and Stormwater Management Plan Approval. The Subject Property is located in Section 22, South of Eleven Mile Road and East of Taft Road and is Zoned R-4 (One Family Residential). The applicant is proposing to construct 17 single-family residential unit development (Site Condominium) utilizing the Open Space Preservation Option, with 2 additional single family parcels off of Danya's Way.

Planner Bell said the subject property is located in Section 22 south of Eleven Mile Road, on the east side of Taft Road. The two existing parcels total 13.73 acres. They are zoned R-4, One Family Residential, as are the properties to the east, north, and south. West of the property across Taft is zoned RA, Residential Acreage, and is developed with a Novi Schools complex. The Future Land Use map indicates Single-Family for this property and surrounding properties. To the west is designated as Educational Facility. There are extensive woodland and wetland areas present on the site, which I will talk about later in my presentation.

The applicant is proposing to divide the two parcels into four new parcels. One 2.19-acre parcel would be retained by the current owner of the farmhouse near Taft Road, that's the area outlined in pink on the screen. This is shown as Parcel A and was subtracted out of the density calculations for the remainder of the site. Parcels C (0.42 acres) and D (2.88 acres), which are shown outlined in blue, would be accessed off an extension of Danya's

Way. A T-turnaround design was required for emergency vehicle access and maneuvering. In order to create these two parcels, the applicant will need to request a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals due to the fact that the public road frontage will not span the full width of the lot. Staff is supportive of this request because the proposed road design provides adequate access to the parcels and minimized impacts on the wetland area to the north.

Planner Bell said on the remaining 8.12-acre parcel B, shown in green, the applicant proposes to develop a site condominium utilizing the Open Space Preservation Option provided in Section 3.30 of the Zoning Ordinance. This option allows an applicant to develop the same number of units on a property in a smaller area of the site, with the intent of encouraging the long-term preservation of natural features and open space. The site plan meets the general eligibility requirements outlined in the Ordinance. The applicant has provided the required parallel plan showing 19 units could be developed on the site under conventional R-4 standards.

The development would have a cul-de-sac drive off of Taft Road serving 17 single-family units. The applicant is requesting a reduction of minimum site area from 10,000 square feet to 8,000 square feet per lot, and a minimum lot width from 80 feet to 70 feet, a minimum side yard setback from 25 feet on two sides to 20 feet on two sides. The Ordinance allows the Planning Commission to approve these reductions with a minimum 20% of the site preserved. The applicant has proposed 29% of Parcel B as protected open space in this case. The applicant has proposed a large central wetland area and much of the surrounding buffer would be protected within a Conservation Easement. That area is shown in the heavy dashed line in this image. Three smaller open space areas would be maintained as landscaped park-like spaces with restrictions within the Master Deed.

A Planning Commission waiver is requested for the use of the 'eyebrow' in the road design where one is not warranted by site conditions. An administrative variance is also requested for not providing a stub street at 1,300 foot intervals along the property line due to presence of wetland and woodland areas.

Stormwater would be collected by a storm sewer collection system and discharged to a detention basin and a small rain garden on the property.

The tree survey provided indicated 331 regulated woodland trees on the site. The proposed plan would remove 75 percent of those, or 249 trees, with 25 percent to be preserved. 436 woodland replacement credits are required to accommodate the impacts. The applicant proposes to plant 71 credits on the site, with the remaining to be paid into the Tree Fund.

The wetland delineation identified 4 wetland areas on the site. Two small wetland areas on the west side of the site, as well as a small portion of Wetland A would be permanently impacted, for a total of 0.32 acres. The permanent impact to the wetland buffer areas is 0.34 acres. The impacts fall below the City's threshold for mitigation. The applicant is asked to consider demarcation of the wetland buffers on-site for those areas behind Lot 10, and Parcels C and D, and also for the rest of the conservation area. For the portions of the buffer that extend onto sites, we would recommend they put physical means such as boulders or decorative fencing along those buffer boundaries to make clear that the areas are protected and should not be mowed or treated chemically.

Planner Bell said all reviewers are recommending approval with additional comments to be addressed in the Final Site Plan, and the applicant indicates that they will comply with the outstanding comments in the review letters.

The Planning Commission is asked tonight to hold the public hearing and approve or deny the Preliminary Site Plan and Site Condominium, Woodland Permit, Wetland Permit, and the Stormwater Management Plan. The engineer, Dan LeClair, is here tonight representing the project. Staff is available to answer any questions you may have. Thank you.

Dan LeClair, with GreenTech Engineering, said I'm representing the applicant on this project. We started working on this project almost a year and a half ago, I believe. When we first got involved in this project, we knew that there was a pond and knew there were some wetlands on the property and obviously the first step was to have the wetlands delineated. And basically, everything that you see in the darker shaded area on this plan is the wetland areas.

So at that point, we started putting different plans together and looking at the different options with preservation in mind. Hence, the name. Before you is what we ultimately landed on as a straight zoning plan. This plan is a plan that we believe, and Staff has reviewed this with respect to the R-4 zoning, is something that could be built. The challenge with this plan is that there's a pretty extensive pond right in the middle of that darker shaded area, and it would have required about a half-acre of impact between the impact associated with extending Danya's Way into the property as well as the small wetland areas up near Taft Road. With that in mind, we started looking at the different options. How can we develop this piece of property and keep as many natural features as we can? Look at the wetlands, look at the woodlands, and that's when we started looking at the Open Space Option. And if Lindsay could go to that plan, what we did is we kind of broke this project down into smaller pieces. The two parcels in the back, C and D, those would be created essentially as parcel splits. A couple of the benefits of that are that you've got some very large parcels back there. Parcel D is just under 3 acres in size. And you can see the size of a home that would generally be placed on that parcel, you can see the outline of some of the houses both to the east and to the south and you can see how the relation of the size of the property to the houses. With that in mind, we kept those aside as parcel splits.

Basically all of the trees, all of the wetlands, with the exception of one little area by the little T-turnaround, are going to be preserved. We think there's enough room on those properties to be able to preserve everything. What we're focusing on tonight is the site condominium and that would be the Parcel B. With that parcel, that's where we turned on the rules and regulations for the Open Space Option, needing to create enough open space to follow the requirements. Minimum lot sizes because there is a reduction in exchange for the preservation, and we were able to preserve still several of the trees. We were able to handle the stormwater management, create open space, and meet essentially what we believe are all the requirements of the City's Zoning Ordinance. So with that in mind, we think that we've done a really good job on this.

Mr. LeClair said the last thing I want to point out is at the end of Danya's Way, one thing that we've learned in the process, is currently there's no means for emergency vehicles to turn around on that property. There's no turnaround there, so they essentially have to

back out back to the next street. So at the request of the Fire Department, what we're proposing is to dedicate a Right-of-Way for the extension of Danya's Way and propose the construction of a T-turnaround that meets the Fire Department requirements. The reason, as Lindsay mentioned, that we are going to the Zoning Board of Appeals, is that the Zoning Ordinance requires you when you dedicate Right-of-Way, you have to build the road for the entire Right-of-Way. So we're proposing an 80-foot long piece of Right-of-Way, but that 80-foot long Right-of-Way would extend into the wetlands. So rather than extending the road and impacting wetlands, we've asked for a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals to deviate from that requirement and allow us to build only the road that we need to satisfy the requirements to build that T-turnaround. So that road will end up being about a 44-foot roadway extension into the property. And with the Fire Department's approval, we can handle the driveways off the end of that T-turnaround and make everything work.

With that, I'd be happy to answer any questions and look forward to hearing any comments from our neighbors, as well. Thank you.

Chair Pehrson asked if there was anyone in the audience that wished to address the Planning Commission regarding this project. Seeing no one, he asked if we have any correspondence?

Member Lynch said we do. We have an objection from Frank J. Penzato, 25542 Danya's Way, worried about construction traffic and congestion. We have an objection from Ronald Cabansag, 44649 Williams Drive, saying they used to live in a site condominium and owners would rent out units to people not invested in the community. Another objection from Elissa Valentine, 45254 Jacob Drive, saying it will disrupt the natural beauty of the surrounding areas. And we have a support from Dan Valentine, who owns a couple pieces of property, with some comments about the parcels.

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

Member Lynch said I have a couple of questions and want to make sure I understand this. The parcel that's located on the northwest portion, that's never going to be developed, right? That's just part of this whole deal. The only homes you're putting in are the 17, right?

Mr. LeClair said yes, the current property owner obviously owns the entire property right now and what we would do is create a parcel split. And he intends on remaining there on that property.

Member Lynch said so there's a home there?

Mr. LeClair said yes.

Member Lynch said ok. Then let's go down here on the one the southeast corner, Parcel D I think. You're not going to build anything there, right?

Mr. LeClair said that's a home site, yes.

Member Lynch said ok, so that's a home site so it won't get built on with this. One other

thing, I heard you say you're going to put something in the Master Deed so somebody doesn't infringe on the wetland areas?

Mr. LeClair said that's correct. Currently within the condominium development that's proposed, there are no impacts to the wetlands, but there is the 25-foot wetland buffer that encroaches up onto one of the lots. What we do is we would demarcate that 25-foot buffer so it will be a deed restriction.

Member Lynch said so when you say a 25-foot buffer, that's a Michigan Department of Environmental Quality buffer or a City of Novi buffer?

Mr. LeClair said that's a City of Novi buffer.

Member Lynch said so once Unit 10, Unit 9, and Unit 11 start whacking stuff down there, who enforces that?

Mr. LeClair said it will be part of the Master Deed, so the Homeowners Association will be able to monitor that, as well as the City.

Member Lynch said is the City aware of that? Is it an Ordinance? Because you know it's going to happen.

Planner Bell said it's a conservation easement.

Member Lynch said ok, so it's a conservation easement. Who enforces the conservation easement? That's what I'm getting at.

City Attorney Saarela said if it's violated, we can enforce it either by writing a ticket or filing a lawsuit.

Member Lynch said so I know the developer, I know you're going to do this. You're going to go in there, you're going to put in the conservation easement, you're going to put the signs up that say you're not allowed to go and whack it down. As soon as you leave, the Homeowners Association comes in, Units 9, 10, and 11 are going to go in there and whack that stuff down. You've got a Master Deed enforcement, right? If that's not enforced and the Homeowners Association decides not to enforce that, who does?

Mr. LeClair said at that point, the City would be able to.

Member Lynch said does the City agree?

Chair Pehrson said it's part of the enforcement code that is established within the City as part of the conservation easement.

Member Lynch said ok, so there is an Ordinance in the City?

Chair Pehrson said yes, in which if anybody is violating, they could be ticketed or sued.

Member Lynch or will have to replace it. Ok. I do like this, what I'm more concerned about is that you're doing all this to keep this preservation area. The developer is going to

go away and my fear is that preservation area is going to disappear. So we're going to walk away from this happy thinking we're really doing a great thing for the City of Novi with this wonderful project with wonderful preservation area that will make the homeowners on all sides really happy.

Chair Pehrson said that's why we have the Ordinance.

Member Lynch said ok, that's all I have to say.

Member Hornung said just a question on this development, and this may be some of my inexperience. The plan that we are reviewing here is brought along with a parallel plan. My question is, are we approving both plans or only the plan that is on the board?

Planner Bell said you would be approving the Preliminary Site Plan with the Open Space Preservation Option and Site Condominium. So that's what you're approving.

Member Hornung said ok and just to kind of piggyback on what Member Lynch was saying, the only three units that seem to be really terribly impacting this wetland area are Units 9, 10, 11. Has there been any consideration to maybe shrinking their backyards down so that they just don't own that piece of property? So there isn't quite the same concern over potentially, even accidentally, violating the Ordinance.

Mr. LeClair said actually none of the lots impact the wetland. The only impact would be there's the 25-foot setback that enters upon Unit 10. I don't believe Unit 9 or 11 would be impacting that buffer area.

Member Hornung said ok, thank you very much.

Member Avdoulos said I really don't have any large issues with the development. I think looking at what it could be to where it is with this Open Space Preservation Option and I think it works well. There was the question on the eyebrow, is that there just to give a little more room? I'm looking at it and I understand where the City is coming from, I just would like to understand where the developer is coming from.

Mr. LeClair said we were looking at that as a means of giving it a little bit more character. Get rid of the straight road-type thing. Because of the shape of the property and with the current property owner wanting to keep his property, every plan that we've done on this property has had this dog-leg left on it. So we were doing something to give it a little more character.

Member Avdoulos said so just a little bit more relief, ok.

Member Maday said I think the lot size reduction makes a lot of sense since it minimizes the impacts to the wetlands as much as possible. You're preserving 19% more than you actually are required to, while could be the parallel plan, which is much more development.

Member Greco said my only comment is that I do like the development, I do like the Preservation Option and the work that's been done here. Just to comment a little bit on those lost 9, 10, and 11, just a comment to my fellow Commissioners – with the easement,

generally people aren't whacking down their backyards to knock out the natural features if there's a nice pond back there. Unless they have acreage and are trying to do logging or something, which they won't be doing here. So I'm not that concerned about it, I think those lot owners are going to be happy with the way it looks and probably will be buying the lots for that reason. So with that, I'd like to make a motion.

Motion made by Member Greco and seconded by Member Avdoulos.

Chair Pehrson said just for the record, I agree in that I think this is a great plan that's been put in front of us. I applaud the Open Space Preservation Option that the applicants are going for. I think it ties well to the surrounding areas, so I support it, as well.

**ROLL CALL VOTE TO APPROVE PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN MOTION MADE BY MEMBER GRECO AND SECONDED BY MEMBER AVDOULOS.**

**In the matter of Munro's Preserve JSP 19-09, motion to approve the Preliminary Site Plan with Open Space Preservation and the Site Condominium based on and subject to the following:**

- a. The Planning Commission has made the determination that the parallel plan is acceptable and, based on that plan, has determined the maximum number of dwelling units that would be permitted under the Open Space Preservation Option is nineteen units;
- b. The Planning Commission has made the determination that the Open Space Preservation Plan satisfies the intent of the Open Space Preservation Option;
- c. Reduction of minimum site area (10,000 square feet required, 8,000 square feet provided), minimum lot width (80 feet required, 70 feet provided) and minimum side yard setbacks (25 feet total two sides required, 20 feet provided), as the proposed site plan utilizes the Open Space Preservation option by preserving approximately 28 percent of Open Space on Site, as permitted in Section 3.30 of Zoning Ordinance;
- d. A waiver to allow the use of an "eyebrow" in the road design where one is not warranted, which is hereby granted;
- e. Administrative variance for not providing a stub street at 1300 feet intervals along property line, as listed in Sec.4.04 A.i.b of Subdivision Ordinance, due to presence of existing regulated woodlands and wetlands;
- f. Zoning Board of Appeals variance for deficiency in minimum lot frontage for parcels C & D in order to avoid wetland impacts for construction of the road;
- g. 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 Article 3, Article 4 and Article 5 of the Zoning Ordinance and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance. *Motion carried 6-0.*

**ROLL CALL VOTE TO APPROVE WETLAND PERMIT MOTION MADE BY MEMBER GRECO AND SECONDED BY MEMBER AVDOULOS.**

**In the matter of Munro's Preserve JSP 19-09, motion to approve the Wetland Permit based on and subject to the following:**



- a. The applicant should consider demarcation of wetland buffers on-site behind lot 10, and Parcels C and D, through the use of proposed easement signage and potentially other means such as boulders or decorative fencing along the setback boundaries,
- b. 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 12, Article V of the Code of Ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance. *Motion carried 6-0.*

**ROLL CALL VOTE TO APPROVE WOODLAND PERMIT MOTION MADE BY MEMBER GRECO AND SECONDED BY MEMBER AVDOULOS.**

In the matter of Munro's Preserve JSP 19-09, motion to approve the Woodland Permit based on and subject to 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 37 of the Code of Ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance. *Motion carried 6-0.*

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

In the matter of Munro's Preserve JSP 19-09, motion to approve the Stormwater Management Plan, based on and subject to 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 it otherwise in compliance with Chapter 11 of the Code of Ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance. *Motion carried 6-0.*

Chair Pehrson said if I could ask Mr. VanSickle to step forward for a moment, please. So in the 50<sup>th</sup> year of Novi, you may or may not know this gentleman but he has been a lifelong citizen of Novi and has been in the Fire Department for about 300 decades. I think he knows something about the property that's there right now. Why don't you give us a one-minute tutorial on what Munro is?

Mr. VanSickle said that was my grandfather's property, I grew up there. He inherited it from his dad in 1909 as a wedding present. It was 80 acres and it was a farm, with chickens and cows and corn and all that. And the house I live in is a Sears 1912 house, and our family has been in Novi since about 1860 or so.

Chair Pehrson said you don't look that old.

Mr. VanSickle said, maybe some days. I grew up there and there were three houses on the street when I grew up, and it was a dirt road with trees all canopied over the road. It was a good place to live and grow up in Novi back then, everybody knew everybody.

Chair Pehrson said so we'd like to think that we still have some of that small town heritage in our blood, so we appreciate you coming forward with this and we look forward to seeing that Sears house shine a little bit with all those other new houses around it.

Mr. VanSickle said I hate to sell it off, but at my age I can't keep it forever and I could use the money to pay some bills. I'll have neighbors all around me complaining about running a chainsaw at 10 o'clock at night, we can't have that.

Chair Pehrson said and they will, be ready Gilbert. Thank you.

## **MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION**

### **1. SQUEAKY SHINE CAR WASH JSP18-55**

Consideration at the request of Squeaky Shine LLC for Preliminary Site Plan and Storm Water Management Plan approval for site improvements to expand the existing car wash facility at 21510 Novi Road. The property is in Section 35, located on the east side of Novi Road between Eight Mile Road and Nine Mile Road is zoned B-3 (General Business). The subject property is approximately 1.56 acres.

Planner Bell said the property is north of Eight Mile Road, on the east side of Novi Road and is 1.56 acres. The zoning is B-3, General Business, as are the properties to the north and south along Novi Road. West of the property across Novi Road is zoned R-4, One-Family Residential. On the rear side of the parcel to the east and north is zoned I-1, Light Industrial, and to the south P-1, Vehicular Parking.

The Future Land Use map indicates Local Commercial for this property and those to the north and south. The rear portion of the property and the bordering land are planned for Industrial Research Development Technology. To the east are the railroad tracks, with a Single-Family neighborhood on the opposite side of the tracks. Single-Family uses are planned to the west.

There are no regulated wetland or woodland features on the site. A wetland is indicated on the City's Wetland Map over a portion of the subject area. However, the City's Environmental Consultant has inspected the site and concurred with the findings that no wetlands are present.

The applicant recently received recommended approval from the Planning Commission and approval from City Council to rezone the rear portion of the property from I-1, Light Industrial, to B-3, General Business. The existing building has operated for many years as a car wash and more recently as a demonstration facility for Belanger, a Novi-based company that designs and manufactures car wash components and systems. The facility will be repurposed as a retail car wash that would be open to the public, and no change to the building are proposed.

Planner Bell said the proposed site plan adds vacuum stations, longer vehicle stacking space, and additional parking. Stormwater would be collected and conveyed to an underground detention basin.

We have asked the applicant to relocate the proposed loading area to avoid conflicts

with emergency vehicle access, which they have agreed to do on the Final Site Plan. Three Landscape waivers are requested, all supported by Staff as they are caused by existing conditions on the site that are not being modified.

All reviews are recommending approval.

Tonight the Planning Commission is asked to approve or deny the Preliminary Site Plan and Stormwater Management Plan. Representing the project tonight are Ryan Belanger and Gregory Richard from Squeaky Shine and engineer Michael McPherson from Atwell to answer any questions you may have. Thank you.

Michael McPherson, with Atwell, said we appreciate Lindsay's thorough review and introduction of the project. Like she said, we were before you a couple of months ago for the rezoning of the site. It has been an existing car wash for 10+ years at this point, but in the last several years it's been used as a demonstration facility. They would like to now put it back into service as a car wash open to the public. So to do that, we are trying to make it more amiable for public use by providing plenty of stacking, vacuum stations for convenience, and some additional parking for employees and such.

Having said that, I believe that we have worked through all the minor items with the Staff for Landscaping and some layout items. And we are here asking for your approval tonight. We'd be happy to answer any questions you might have.

Chair Pehrson turned it over to the Planning Commission for their consideration.

Member Hornung said a question for Staff through the Chair. In the packet, it appears that the subject property has a significant amount of wetlands in the Wetland Map, yet there doesn't seem to be any referral to anything else about the wetlands. Could you bring up the Wetland Map? Are there any wetlands on the site?

Planner Bell said no. Anytime a project comes forward that potentially has wetlands, they have to actually hire an Environmental Consultant to come out and delineate the wetlands on site. They did that in the Pre-Application process and there were no wetlands found, and that was confirmed by our Environmental Consultant, ECT, that there were no wetlands on site.

Member Hornung said excellent, thank you very much.

Member Avdoulos said this project when it came before us, we thought it was pretty straightforward. It improved the current condition. When it was a retail car wash previously, there were issues with stacking but being that this piece of property is being developed so that gets pushed back, the area behind it is being utilized in an efficient way. And the fact that these waivers are related to existing conditions and Staff is behind those and supports them, I have no issues. So with that, I'd like to make a motion.

Motion made by Member Avdoulos and seconded by Member Maday.

**ROLL CALL VOTE TO APPROVE PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN MOTION MADE BY MEMBER AVDOULOS AND SECONDED BY MEMBER MADAY.**

In the matter of Squeaky Shine Car Wash, JSP18-55, motion to approve the Preliminary Site Plan based on and subject to the following:

- a. Relocating the proposed loading area to a suitable location within the rear yard, subject to Traffic consultant approval at the time of Final Site Plan approval;
- b. A waiver for lack of greenbelt width, because it is an existing condition of the site and not enhanced by this plan, which is hereby granted;
- c. A waiver for deficiency in building foundation landscaping because the existing building is not being modified and significantly more foundation landscaping has been added, which is hereby granted;
- d. A waiver for deficiency in foundation plantings along the building frontage, because all of the available frontage green area is landscaped, which is hereby granted;
- e. The findings of compliance with Ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters and the remaining 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 6-0.*

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

In the matter of Squeaky Shine Car Wash, JSP18-55, motion to approve the Stormwater Management Plan based on and subject to 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 6-0.*

## **2. FAIRFIELD INN & SUITES JSP18-66**

Consideration at the request of Novi Superior Hospitality, LLC for Planning Commission's approval of Preliminary Site Plan and Storm Water Management plan. The applicant is proposing a 5 -story hotel with 119 rooms on Unit 3 of Adell Center Development. The proposed site plan proposes associated parking and other site improvements. The subject property is part of a Planned Rezoning Overlay (PRO) development for Adell Center.

Planner Komaragiri said the subject parcel is part of the Adell Center Development, referred to as Unit 3. This is the fifth development out of the nine proposed lots that are being presented to the Planning Commission for site plan approval.

Adell Center is located on the south side of the I-96 exit ramp west of Novi Road. This unit is located south of Adell Center Drive. It is currently zoned TC, Town Center, with a Planned Rezoning Overlay, with the same on all sides except I-2, Heavy Industrial, to the west. There are a few regulated wetlands along the southern boundary of the property, but no impacts are being proposed as part of this development.

The applicant is proposing a 5-story hotel with 119 rooms. The proposed site plan also proposes associated parking and other site improvements.

The original PRO Agreement was approved by City Council at their October 22, 2018 meeting. An amendment to the PRO Agreement was recently approved on June 17, 2019. This project will be subject to conditions of the PRO Agreement and the amendment. The original approval and the amendment noted that there are certain deviations from the Ordinance requirements that can be approved by the Planning Commission. The applicant is seeking a few at this time.

The first one would be a reduction in minimum required parking. A minimum of 124 spaces are required based on the total number of rooms and employee count. 119 spaces are proposed. The reduction is less than five percent, and it can be approved by the Planning Commission based on the justification the applicant has provided if that is deemed sufficient. The applicant noted in their response letter that based on their existing hotels, they believe that the hotel residents use alternate transportation services such as Uber and Lyft, so the parking need is not as large as what is required. The applicant is here tonight and can address this item further if needed.

Planner Komaragiri said the second one is to allow a reduction of loading zone area. The applicant stated that their typical delivery trucks are 'box-size' trucks and only a regular parking space is sufficient, so he is proposing one in the northwest corner of the building.

The third item is to allow the transformer in the interior side yard in lieu of the required rear yard. It is located here due to its proximity to the electrical room.

The next item is a Section 9 Waiver for the overage of patterned siding (Nichiha Vistawood) on the west façade, as noted in the motion sheet. The applicant has provided a digital façade board earlier this week and our Façade Consultant noted that it enhances the overall composition of the building and is supported.

Finally, a Landscape waiver to allow shrubs in lieu of required perimeter parking lot trees along the western property line in this area, due to conflicts with the proposed underground stormwater detention system. This is supported by Staff.

The applicant has worked closely with Staff to address all major concerns before the plan was presented to you. All reviewers are recommending approval with some comments to be addressed with Final Site Plan.

Planner Komaragiri said the Planning Commission is asked tonight to consider the Preliminary Site Plan and Stormwater Management Plan. We have the engineer, Andy Andre, here representing the applicant and all our Staff is here to answer any questions you might have. Thank you.

Andy Andre, with Stellar Development, said I am representing the applicant on the project. I think Sri did a great job in summarizing the project at whole. This was one of the original uses that was proposed as part of the Adell PRO, so there's a level of consistency that we're seeing from the original proposal for the overall development of that area and finally carrying it through to this unit, as well. There are a couple of areas that I'd like to talk about as far as where we're asking for deviations.

One of them would be the parking reduction. Meeting the Ordinance requirements, having 1:1 plus the employees, what we typically see in the other hotels that we own and

operate is typically, even at 119 rooms you're not going to get 119 vehicles all showing up at that time, plus having room for staff. Even at 100% occupancy, you're still not occupying all of the parking spaces. So what we did as part of the response letter, some of the ownership group that is part of this project also is of the Homewood Suites that was recently opened in December, and we provided some information as far as the operation is concerned when it comes to that location, where typical occupancy right now – granted, this is from December – is 65%. But from that timeframe, from December to now, there's been 33 days of 100% occupancy. And at that point, we're still not having issues when it comes to the parking. So I think the request that we're asking for is substantiated by what's going on even within the City with other properties, as well as what we see typically. We are starting to see obviously more alternative transportation through Uber, Lyft, that type of thing. And so that parking reduction, we feel, would be beneficial to this development.

The loading zone, it's a Fairfield Inn, it's a Marriott product. There is no restaurant, there is no food service. The only thing we have is a warming area and it's kind of a breakfast-only. So there's not a lot of food prep, there's not a lot of things that are required from an operation perspective. So we typically only have deliveries twice a week, and that's a smaller box truck because your bagels, yogurt, drinks, things of that sort don't require large trucks. And we don't have large areas even within the hotel itself for storage. And so the delivery frequency is about twice a week, maybe takes about 20 minutes, and so to have a large dedicated loading space for that we feel is not really for an operational perspective. So we are asking for that consideration, as well.

And the other key one, I think, is when it comes to the landscaping. We worked pretty diligently with Staff, even to the effect that the proposal here now has 119 rooms. At one point, we had 129 rooms. We reduced the room count on the project to be more in line with the parking requirement reduction that we're asking for, as well as to be more in compliance with the Landscaping requirements and also the Fire Department's request for turning radii and such. So we actually reduced the size of the project overall.

Mr. Andre said one of the areas, getting into the landscaping, that we couldn't really comply with is part of the overall project. If you recall, there are some utilities being installed by the developer. So along our western portion of our property is one of those areas where the underground detention systems are being proposed, and we can't plant overtop of those. So one of the compromises in working with Staff was that we would incorporate trees to the extent that we could and then where we saw that the conflict started to occur, we would incorporate hedgerow. And that's what we've done there. So could we comply if the detention weren't there? Absolutely. But with that system being there, we really can't. I'd like to say that it's been a little bit of a journey – I think our pre-application meeting was back in October or November of last year. So we've worked really closely with Staff, we've taken the comments that we've received along the way and incorporated them into this plan. And we feel that we're putting together a project that we think is very viable and that we're very excited about. Novi continues to be an area of growth and a location that people want to be. And we're very excited about this project and look forward to it, and we're happy to answer any questions. Thank you.

Member Lynch said I guess I don't have a problem, what you're doing is reasonable. But it brings up another thing for Staff, and I just want you to consider this. Our Parking Ordinances were written well before we had a disrupter, meaning Uber and Lyft. And it

may not be a bad idea that we start thinking about updating those Ordinances. Obviously you can't do it with something like Kroger, but for something like hotels, with Uber and Lyft coming in, does it really make sense to require the number of parking spaces that we currently do? My personal belief is that I think if we could reduce the number of parking spaces and add more green space, it might be a win-win for everybody. I'm not an expert in this area, but I think it's probably something that Staff has access to some data from somewhere based on the new demographics with the new disruptor of ride services. Does it really make sense to have the requirements that we have right now for hotels? And maybe look at the rest of the stuff at some point.

City Planner McBeth said Mr. Chair, we can certainly take a look at that standard and see what literature out there shows with the latest trends and then report to Planning Commission.

Chair Pehrson said thank you.

Member Hornung said in taking a look at the plan, it looks really great and I noticed that there is no conference center or anything that would seem to be bringing in additional traffic other than the people who are staying overnight. So I think it looks really good. With that, I would like to make a motion.

Motion made by Member Hornung and seconded by Member Lynch.

**ROLL CALL VOTE TO APPROVE PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN MOTION MADE BY MEMBER HORNUNG AND SECONDED BY MEMBER LYNCH.**

In the matter of request of Novi Superior Hospitality, LLC, for the Fairfield Inn & Suites JSP18-66, motion to approve the Preliminary Site Plan based on and subject to the following:

1. The following items are subject to Planning Commission's approval at the time of Preliminary Site Plan approval, as noted in the PRO agreement:
  - a. *Planning deviation from standards of Sec. 5.12 for up to 5% reduction in minimum required parking (to be established by staff after reviewing the calculations provided) for each unit within the development subject to the individual users providing satisfactory justification for Planning Commission's approval of the parking reduction at the time of respective site plan approval; Planning Commission's approval to allow for reduction of minimum required parking spaces (124 spaces required, 119 spaces proposed);*
  - b. *Landscape waiver from Section 5.5.3.C.(3) Chart footnote for allowing landscape shrubs in lieu of required perimeter parking lot trees along western property line, due to conflicts with proposed underground storm water detention system, which is granted;*
  - c. *Planning deviation to allow placement of transformers in alternate locations instead of required rear yard, provided proposed locations conform to other code requirements and appropriate screening is provided at the time of Preliminary Site Plan review, subject to review and approval by the Planning Commission. This is applicable for Units 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7 and 8. Planning Commission's approval to allow transformer in an alternate location (Rear yard location required, interior side yard location proposed) due to location of the electrical room;*

- d. *The applicant shall provide supporting data to justify the proposed loading area square footages, to be reviewed and approved by Planning Commission at the time of Preliminary site plan approval; Planning Commission's approval to allow for reduction of minimum required loading area (2,060 sf required, 153 sf provided) based on the largest truck information the applicant has provided;*
  - e. A Section 9 waiver for overage of Patterned/Textured Siding (Nichiha Vistawood Cedar) (SP1) on the west façade (25 percent maximum allowed, 46 percent proposed), which is hereby granted;
2. The following deviations listed below are applicable for this site plan as noted in the approved PRO agreement:
- a. Planning deviation from section 5.12 to allow lack of required frontage on public road for Units 1 through 8. Frontage for such units shall be in the private drive as shown in the PRO Plan, which shall be built to City Standards;
  - b. Planning deviation from section 3.1.25.D to allow reduction of minimum required front parking setback of 20 ft., from the proposed access easement. A minimum of 18 feet shall be permitted;
  - c. Planning deviation from section 3.1.25.D to allow reduction of minimum required interior side parking setback of 20 feet for the following units as shared access is proposed between parking lots:  
Unit 3: minimum 15 feet along West and 5 feet along South
  - d. Planning deviation to allow placement of loading areas in alternate locations instead of required rear yard or interior side yard for double frontage lots, as listed below, provided proposed locations do not conflict with traffic circulation and appropriate screening will be provided at the time of Preliminary site plan review:  
Unit 3: interior side yard (no double frontage)
  - e. The applicant shall provide supporting data to justify the proposed loading area square footages, to be reviewed and approved by Planning Commission at the time of Preliminary site plan approval;
  - f. Planning deviation from standards of Sec. 5.12 for up to 5 percent reduction in minimum required parking (to be established by staff after reviewing the calculations provided) for each unit within the development subject to the individual users providing satisfactory justification for Planning Commission's approval of the parking reduction at the time of respective site plan approval;
  - g. Planning deviation to allow proposing the minimum required Open Space for each Unit as Common element spread within the development boundaries as shown in the Open Space Plan, provided the applicant restores the wetland/woodland on the southerly portion of the site pursuant to a plan meeting City ordinance requirements is submitted and approved at the time of Wetland permit/preliminary site plan approval, and provides the pedestrian walkway through the open space as proposed. (A minimum of 153 of total site area designed as permanently landscaped open areas and pedestrian plazas is required per section 3.27. I.F.);
  - h. Planning deviation from Section 5.7 .3.K. to allow exceeding the maximum spillover of 1 foot candle along interior side property lines provided the applicant submits a photometric plan that demonstrates that the average to minimum light level ratio is kept to the maximum allowable 4:1;
  - i. Planning deviation to allow exceeding the maximum spillover of 1 foot candle and approvable increase of the average to minimum light level ration from 4:1



within the Adell Drive pavement areas as listed in Section 5.7 .3.K. along access easements along Adell Drive, at the time of or Preliminary Site Plan review for the individual units;

- j. Planning deviation to allow placement of transformers in alternate locations instead of required rear yard, provided proposed locations conform to other code requirements and appropriate screening is provided at the time of Preliminary Site Plan review, subject to review and approval by the Planning Commission. This is applicable for Units 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7 and 8.
- k. Lighting and Photometric plans for all site plans for units within the development shall conform to the light levels indicated in the overall photometric plan and related deviations included in the PRO Agreement.

- 3. 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;
- 4. At the time of final site plan review, turning radii shall comply with the minimum fire truck turning requirements.

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 6-0.*

**ROLL CALL VOTE TO APPROVE STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN MOTION MADE BY MEMBER HORNUNG AND SECONDED BY MEMBER LYNCH.**

In the matter of request of Novi Superior Hospitality, LLC, for the Fairfield Inn & Suites JSP18-66, motion to approve the Stormwater Management Plan based on and subject to 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 it otherwise in compliance with Chapter 11 of the Code of Ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance. *Motion carried 6-0.*

**3. WASH ZONE JSP18-50**

Consideration at the request of National Car Wash Solutions for Planning Commission's approval of Preliminary Site Plan and Storm Water Management plan. The subject property is vacant land which is part of Novi Ten Shopping Center. The applicant is proposing to develop a 4,788 square foot auto wash building with related drive-through lane and 13 vacuum stations. Related changes to the existing parking lot are proposed to accommodate the drive-through for the car wash.

Planner Komaragiri said the applicant is requesting approval of Preliminary Site Plan and Stormwater Management Plan for automated car wash facility proposed at the northwest corner of Ten Mile and Meadowbrook Road. The proposed development is part of the Novi Ten Shopping Center.

The proposed development has general retail and service uses such as restaurants and car service centers in the immediate vicinity and single-family and multiple-family residential uses in the surrounding areas.

The applicant is proposing to lease the space from the shopping center. The proposed lease area is surrounded by B-3, General Business, district; however, the Multiple-Family RM-1 wraps around the northwest boundaries of the shopping center. Properties to the east are zoned RM-1, Multiple-Family Residential, and B-1, General Business. Properties to the south are zoned B-1, General Business, and R-4, Single-Family Residential.

The Future Land Use map indicates uses similar to the current zoning, except Community Office to the east. There are no regulated natural features on the property.

The applicant is proposing to develop a 4,788 square foot auto wash building with related drive-thru lane. The facility also proposes 13 vacuum stations. Existing changes to the parking lot are proposed to accommodate the traffic circulation for the auto wash in the Novi Ten Shopping Center.

The drive-thru meets most of the Ordinance requirements except for two, for which the applicant is seeking Zoning Board of Appeals variance approval. One is for the reduction of minimum centerline radius, and the other is for lack of a bypass lane for the drive-thru. Both are supported by our Traffic Consultant and our Fire Marshal.

The Landscape review has identified two waivers, as noted in the motion sheet, which are supported by Staff. Three street trees are located behind the sidewalk. A waiver to not plant them at all would be supported by Staff, as there is not room for the required street trees. The eastern foundation landscaping is not located at the building. This is supported by Staff, as the landscaping is just across the sidewalk from the building.

Planner Komaragiri said as I was waiting for my turn, I was looking at the site plan and I noticed there is one item which I haven't commented on in the review letter, but it would require a Planning Commission waiver. It is for these painted islands over here in lieu of raised end islands, which is supported by our Staff. It should be noted that the existing parking lot in the Novi Ten Shopping Center is currently not conforming to the standards, so the applicant went beyond the lease boundary line to address Staff concerns to provide safe circulation. So I would like to add a waiver to the motion sheet to allow painted islands in lieu of raised end islands.

The plan proposes 13 vacuum stations north of the proposed building, over here. Each of the parking spaces was made wider to accommodate the use. A sample picture was provided as to how those vacuum poles would look via email. The lights proposed appear to be bright, however additional information is requested at the time of Final Site Plan to verify conformance. The applicant shared the image on the screen, as noted, which shows a brighter color as well. Façade review noted that the color should be more in context with the primary building. Staff is going to work with the applicant at the time of Final Site Plan to make sure those conform to the Ordinance.

A Section 9 Waiver is required for the underage of brick and the overage of EIFS and ceramic tile. The applicant has noted in the response letter that he would revise the elevations to meet the Ordinance requirements. However, we haven't seen the updated elevations so we cannot determine whether it is feasible without reviewing them. So the motion sheet includes waivers which are currently supported by Staff based on the current elevations provided.

All reviewers are recommending approval with additional comments to be addressed at the time of Final Site Plan. The Planning Commission is asked tonight to consider the Preliminary Site Plan and the Stormwater Management Plan. We have the engineer, Sue Dickinson, and Keith Burt, the applicant, here tonight if you have any questions for them. Thank you.

Sue Dickinson, with Midwestern Consulting, said I'm here with Keith Burt. I would like to just mention the raised island. Even though the ones to the very north are painted, we have included a very long raised island. Originally, we just had four raised islands where that long one is located, and then we realized with the way the drainage was coming toward our site, it was better to be able to direct the drainage by placing that long one in there. So then we needed the painted islands north of that. So that's why those islands ended up painted. So thank you very much for your complete reviews, and we'll take any questions that you may have. Thank you.

Member Avdoulos said Sri had brought this up, Sue maybe you can clarify. The painted islands, are those part of this project?

Ms. Dickinson said they are. It's part of what we would be doing.

Member Avdoulos said ok, and does that improve the parking area up to those islands? Are we resealing or doing any of the paving?

Ms. Dickinson said you can just see it in the plan that's up right now. We would be resealing everything that's at the northern edge of that raised island south.

Member Avdoulos said got it. And then everything above is going to remain existing.

Ms. Dickinson said correct.

Member Avdoulos said and those endcaps will be painted and then that's as far as we go with improvements to the parking.

Ms. Dickinson said correct.

Member Avdoulos said ok. I frequent this plaza quite a bit – that's my dry cleaner, my pet food store, ACE Hardware, Busch's, Maria's, the bank. So I love the fact that it's being supported by the neighbors, and that whole area is actually being supported by the neighbors. The facility, the whole plaza, is getting tired and that's why I asked how much improvement is going to happen. I was looking at the ins and outs of the car wash itself, and I think we're ok. I didn't see any City comment on backup. It looks like, are there two lanes going in and then feeding into one?

Mr. Burt said yes.

Member Avdoulos said and then what's the maximum capacity of cars that you could handle?

Ms. Dickinson said there is room for 25 to stack.

Member Avdoulos said good. When I first saw this, I was kind of skeptical just knowing the site and picturing it. And so I was just more interested in the flow in and out. So I have no issues with it, I'm glad that we're working with the City and trying to get the best project that we can for the existing condition. And so those are my comments, I'm supporting the project.

Member Maday said of course, you're right that that area is tired and I do like the idea of bringing something new and fresh into the area. I have one picky question and it may be answered somewhere in the packet, but when it comes to the vacuums, there was a question on the color. And it didn't match the rest of the façade. And I think, if I'm not mistaken, that it was red. Are you guys going to change that to match the building or to match the area surrounding? We just don't want them to stick out.

Mr. Burt said we'll work with the City. That's not an issue, if you want a different color.

Member Maday said it's bothersome to me when I drive by something and see something glaring at me that looks out place.

Member Hornung said one of the things that I was a little bit curious about with this location was the 2012 Ten Mile and Meadowbrook Rehabilitation area plan, which seemed to put in place an objective of the City to kind of green up that particular corner and bring in some more trees. I have no problem with the development itself, but it feels like by proposing a waiver to not have street trees, it feels like we're kind of going against what was proposed in 2012. Now, that really wasn't on my radar in 2012 so I can't speak to that particular area plan, but I was hoping to get a little bit more information on how that actually applies to this development or if it does not apply to this development.

City Planner McBeth said Mr. Chair, I think I can answer that. So that's correct, in 2012 there was direction from City Council to try to take a look at the four corners around Ten Mile and Meadowbrook Road and see if there was some way to incentivize redevelopment of these corners. And there was a beautiful plan that was prepared by our Staff and consultants that was sort of idealistic and it brought buildings to the corners and to the property lines and it was quite a bit different than what currently exists. Certain amenities could be brought into play that could spruce it up a little bit and bring more people in, even more than we have today. And I think there were some landscaping improvements that were anticipated as part of that plan, as well.

Typically, when anybody comes in to talk with us about properties around this intersection we mention this plan and the possible incentive that they might want to consider. I think in this case, the scale of the redevelopment wasn't big enough for them to really think it would be worthwhile. But certainly, the Landscape improvements that we're going to be getting – and maybe Rick can comment on this, too – would certainly be an improvement over what we have out there.

Landscape Architect Meader said yeah I think they're doing a lot of landscaping, a lot more than is in that overall mall right now. Their only comment was about the street trees, they can't put them in along the street because there's too many utility conflicts. So that's why they're not there and they don't need to put the tree behind the property line. We typically don't ask people, when they can't put a street tree where it's supposed to be, to

put the tree somewhere else, we usually just say they don't need them. So I'm very happy with the landscaping they're proposing.

Member Hornung said thank you.

Member Lynch said ok with that, I'd just like to make one comment. Thank you very much for bringing that to that property, I know that property well and I'm hoping it spurs some improvement. It's a nice piece of property, they're already redoing a new parking lot at Kroger so I still don't understand why they won't do a new parking lot there. But thank you very much, I'm hoping that your effort will help spur some improvements in that area right now. With that, I'll make a motion.

Motion made by Member Lynch and seconded by Member Maday.

**ROLL CALL VOTE TO APPROVE PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN MOTION MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER MADAY.**

In the matter of request of National Car Wash Solutions for Wash Zone JSP 18-50, motion to approve the Preliminary Site Plan based on and subject to the following:

- a. Landscape waiver from Section 5.5.3.B.ii, iii for not providing four street trees due to conflicts with existing overhead utilities, which is hereby granted;
- b. Landscape waiver from Section 5.5.3.D for providing some of the required foundation landscaping away from the building, which is hereby granted;
- c. Planning Commission waiver to allow painted islands in lieu of raised end islands at four locations as shown on the site plan, which is hereby granted;
- d. A section 9 waiver is required for the proposed East façade for the following items, which is hereby granted;
  - a. Underage of brick (30 percent minimum required, 22 percent proposed);
  - b. Overage of Ceramic tile (25 percent maximum allowed, 35 percent proposed);
  - c. Overage of EIFS (25 percent maximum allowed, 28 percent proposed);
- e. The applicant shall revise the north building elevation to conform to the Façade Ordinance requirements at the time of Final site plan approval;
- f. Subject to Zoning Board of Appeals variance from Section 5.3.11.F. for not meeting the minimum centerline radius for drive-thru lane (25 feet minimum radius required, 23 feet proposed);
- g. Subject to Zoning Board of Appeals variance from Section 5.3.11.D. for not providing the required by-pass lane;
- h. The findings of compliance with Ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters and the remaining 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 6-0.*

**ROLL CALL VOTE TO APPROVE STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN MOTION MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER MADAY.**

In the matter of request of National Car Wash Solutions for Wash Zone JSP 18-50, motion to approve the Stormwater Management Plan based on and subject to 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 6-0.*

**4. APPROVAL OF THE JUNE 12, 2019 PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**

Motion made by Member Lynch and seconded by Member Avdoulos.

**ROLL CALL VOTE TO APPROVE THE JUNE 12, 2019 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER AVDOULOS.**

**Motion to approve the June 12, 2019 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes. *Motion carried 6-0.***

**SUPPLEMENTAL ISSUES**

Chair Pehrson said before I turn over the microphone, we're going to be having two of our members leave the Planning Commission at the end of this term and I just wanted to take a moment to recognize – I don't want to say short-termer and long-termer – but Member Hornung and Member Greco for their diligence and their efforts. This is a thankless job, at which times we get spend together on Wednesday nights often being chastised, looked upon somewhat severely by those in the audience that may not understand what our roles are. We often get referred to as City Council, which is kind of fun, an elected official. But it's through the dedication of people like Member Hornung and Member Greco that this body can do what it's trying to do in making the City of Novi a better place.

I'll refer to Member Greco as the motion maker, such that I think if we held statistics and if we measured those we'd find out he is probably the overarching champion as far as making motions in the past number of years. I've sat up here for a few months and we've always seemed to gel, even though there might be differences about the way proposals come forward or the way applicants bring things forward, there's always the comradery that is shared amongst the group here that I'm going to miss with these two gentlemen leaving. And I really want to thank you for the time you've taken to give back to the City. I'll give the floor to Member Hornung.

Member Hornung said thank you, Chairman Pehrson. And I would like to just thank this wonderful group of people for just a wonderful experience here. In only nine months, I just feel that this has been a tremendous experience and I've loved working with all of you and I really appreciate the short time we did have together here. I'd also like to thank the Staff for all of their hard work. They've made this job so much more fun. Just the tireless dedication that they put forth every single week and every single day to all of the work that they do. I greatly appreciate that as a citizen of Novi, and I greatly appreciate that as a Planning Commissioner. And I'd also like to thank the Mayor for giving me a shot on this. I was fairly untested in this, but I do appreciate the opportunity to do this. This has been one of the greatest experiences of my life and I just want to thank you all for that.

Member Greco said thank you, Chairperson Pehrson. First, I want to again thank everyone. First the Staff – many of us have been together for a long time, I've been on the Planning Commission I think I confirmed with Barb for twelve years. I moved to the City of

Novi 15+ years ago and I wanted to get involved in the community, and was lucky enough to get appointed to the Planning Commission because it really is on the front line of shaping the community, dealing with the citizens, getting to know some of the people that are coming in, and looking at the shape of the City and going through all of the things that we've been through. We've got some exciting things coming up, the Adell Center that's going in there. I remember for the first several years for some of us, the Town Center was an eyesore, which is now something that we actually go to, whether to eat or to shop. And it really is making the community really look good.

And I think you're right, sometimes it's a thankless job but I think it's a job that's important that I know that everyone up here has taken seriously and we really had a good group through the years, even when we get new individuals on or individuals back, like Commissioner John. Again to the Staff, thank you so much. I'm an attorney, a municipal attorney and also an employment law attorney, and I can tell the Staff and the preparation here is incredible. It's through the roof as far as any kind of City and Staff really in the State of Michigan. And I really do feel like the City of Novi is one of the model communities in Michigan, just the way that it's laid out, what we have here with the residential and economically, where we're located, all of those things. So just thank you very much, it's been a pleasure serving with you, Mark, as a Vice Chair for all of these years. And thank you to everyone. My parents came to their first Planning Commission meeting tonight, who are now residents of Novi for the last several years moving here because their grandchildren are here. Thank you very much and thank you everyone. I'll be maybe watching you on TV. And thank you to the Mayor and Council reappointing me every term, I really appreciate their faith in me. Thank you.

#### **AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION**

Michel Duchesneau, 1191 South Lake Drive, said as a resident, I do share the comments just made about the Planning Commission. I remember one specific incident where people were complaining about everything and Mr. Greco talked about the headlights and the implications that might mean to a neighbor. We do appreciate the Planning Commission and its longevity. Thank you.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

Moved by Member Lynch and seconded by Member Avdoulos.

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

**Motion to adjourn the June 26, 2019 Planning Commission meeting. *Motion carried 6-0.***

The meeting was adjourned at 8:15 PM.