

REGULAR MEETING - PLANNING COMMISSION

CITY OF NOVI

January 11, 2017

Proceedings taken in the matter of the PLANNING COMMISSION, at City of Novi, 45175 West Ten Mile Road, Novi, Michigan, on Wednesday, January 11, 2017

BOARD MEMBERS

Mark Pehrson, Chairperson

Tony Anthony

David Greco

Robert Giacometti

John Avdoulos

ALSO PRESENT: Barbara McBeth, City Planner

Rick Meader, Landscape Architect, Sri Komaragiri, Planner,

Thomas Schultz, City Attorney, Darcy Rechtien, Staff Engineer

Certified Shorthand Reporter: Jennifer L. Wall

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

Novi, Michigan.

Wednesday, January 11, 2017

7:00 p.m.

** ** *

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: I'd like to call to order the January 11, 2011 regular meeting of the Planning Commission.

Sri, Happy New Year, can you call the roll, please.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Here.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Here.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Here.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Here.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Here.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Zuchlewski?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We will

1 call him, absent, excused. He might be a
2 little tardy.

3 With that, we will stand for
4 the Pledge of Allegiance. We will let the
5 new kid lead us, Member Avdoulos.

6 MR. AVDOULOS: Sure.

7 (Pledge recited.)

8 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: With that,
9 we will look for a motion to approve or amend
10 the agenda.

11 MR. GRECO: Motion to approve.

12 MR. ANTHONY: Second.

13 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Motion and
14 a second, any other comments? All those in
15 favor?

16 THE BOARD: Aye.

17 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have an
18 agenda.

19 We do have three audience
20 participations or public hearings. We do
21 have an audience participation.

22 At this time, if there is
23 anyone in the audience that wishes to address

1 the Planning Commission at this time, for
2 something other than those three hearings,
3 please step forward.

4 Seeing no one, we will close
5 the first audience participation.

6 Any correspondence?

7 MR. GRECO: There is some
8 correspondence, but it is related to the
9 public hearings.

10 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Any
11 committee reports? City planner report.

12 Ms. McBeth, Happy New Year.

13 MS. MCBETH: Same to you.

14 A couple of things to report
15 this evening. First I would like to welcome
16 John Avdoulos back to the Planning
17 Commission. John was appointed in December
18 to fill the remainder of Dave Baratta's terms
19 as a commission member.

20 And as you may remember, John
21 had previously served on the Planning
22 Commission from 2002 through 2008. We look
23 forward to working with him.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

MR. AVDOULOS: Thank you, Barb.
Good to be back.

MS. MCBETH: And another
introduce we have is Darcy Rechtien. She is
a staff engineer. She stepped in to replace
Jeremy Miller who resigned to take a position
with the Road Commission for Oakland County.

So Darcy has a degree in
engineering from the University of Colorado,
Boulder. She has worked as an engineer for
seven years for two different private
engineering firms in Texas, before moving to
Seattle to work for another four years as a
project manager. Darcy has also worked for
the City of Novi for about a year with our
engineering division. We are looking forward
to working with her.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Very nice.
Welcome aboard, Darcy.

MS. MCBETH: Then at the City
Council this past Monday, City Council
approved two first readings of ordinance
amendments that were also recently removed by

1 the Planning Commission.

2 The ordinance to amend to
3 permit drive-thru restaurants in Town Center
4 District was approved for a first reading,
5 and the ordinance amendment to modify the TC
6 and TC1 Town Center Districts to better
7 accommodate mixed used and residential
8 developments in the industry.

9 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.
10 Welcome Darcy, welcome, John. Good to have
11 you back.

12 We come to our first public
13 hearing, Item No. 1, Suburban Collection
14 Showplace expansion, JSP16-12. It's a public
15 hearing at the request of T-bon, LLC for
16 Planning Commission's recommendation to City
17 Council for approval of preliminary site
18 plan, wetland permit, storm water management
19 plan.

20 The request is for the
21 expansion of the building and parking lot
22 within the OST, planned office service
23 technology district. And in the OST planned

1 office service technology district with an
2 EXO, exposition overlay district.

3 The subject property is
4 located in Section 16 north of Grand River
5 Avenue and west of Taft Road.

6 The applicant is proposing to
7 expand the existing Showplace exposition
8 facility by adding 172,315 square foot
9 building addition, with associated parking
10 lot and other site improvements.

11 The current revised plan
12 proposes changes to the previously approved
13 building elevations adding more parking
14 spaces and corresponding site improvements.

15 Sri.

16 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Thank you. I
17 hope you all had a wonderful holiday season
18 and Happy New Year.

19 As you may recall at the July
20 27 meeting, in 2016, Planning Commission
21 recommended approval to the City Council for
22 building and parking expansion to the
23 existing Suburban Collection building.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

The City Council approved the preliminary site plan on August 8, and the plan to receive final approval on October 20th.

At that time, the plan required a special land use as the off street parking was proposed on a separate parcel. Since then both parcels are combined, which now eliminates the requirement for special land use.

The subject parcel is located in Section 16, north of Grand River Avenue and west of Taft Road.

The request is for an expansion of the building and parking lot for the land within the subject property. It has split zoning boundary line with OST, planned office service technology district on the west and OST with EXO overlay on the east.

The subject parcel is surrounded by OST zoning to the west, I1 to the east and south and abuts I96 right-of-way on the north.

1 The future land use map
2 indicates office research and development,
3 for subject parcel and surrounding
4 properties, except industrial research and
5 technology on the south. There are few
6 regulated woodlands and wetlands on the
7 property. None of them are being impacted
8 with the current proposal.

9 After further due diligence
10 and value engineering, the applicant is
11 currently proposing reducing the building
12 footprint by about 28,000 square feet from
13 the previously approved square footage. A
14 total of 136 additional on-site parking is
15 proposed on EXO side. No other site changes
16 are being proposed to the west of the
17 proposed building expansion.

18 With the current plan, the
19 building projection from the approved plan
20 shown in the red rectangle is now replaced
21 with additional parking spaces. The proposed
22 southern facade footprint in the current plan
23 now aligns with the existing building. The

1 drop-off area to the east indicated in blue
2 is now replaced with additional parking
3 spaces. The amount of outside patio area in
4 the southwest corner of the proposed addition
5 indicated in green, has been reduced
6 considerably.

7 Staff has identified a
8 deviation for building setback in the review
9 letters, however, after further research into
10 the requirement and the definition, staff now
11 believes that the deviation is not applicable
12 to the current revisions.

13 All previously approved
14 Zoning Board of Appeal variances are still
15 valid. Planning recommends approval with
16 further comments to be addressed at final.

17 The current revised plan is
18 not proposing any changes to the previous
19 approved storm water management plan.
20 Engineering recommends approval with no
21 further comments.

22 Landscape was not
23 recommending approval due to a sharp drop in

1 the quantity of building foundation
2 landscaping provided. It is less than what
3 was approved in terms of linear feet of
4 coverage and area provided. However, the
5 applicant has been working with our landscape
6 architect in devising the landscape plan to
7 mitigate the extent of deviations requested.

8 Landscape now supports the
9 deviation requested and recommends approval.

10 Along with the previous
11 approval, the applicant has provided a major
12 event traffic plan in lieu of required
13 traffic study. Traffic is recommending
14 approval with the request to provide an
15 update to the METP study prior to the final
16 stamping set submittal along with additional
17 comments to be addressed.

18 It is still recommended to
19 revisit the right turn taper lane in future
20 in two years or if determined by the city as
21 listed in the motion sheet.

22 A majority of the changes
23 that are proposed with the current revision

1 include changes to the building elevations.
2 The addition is less than 100 percent of the
3 area of existing building, therefore, a
4 continuation of existing materials would be
5 permitted. In this case, existing building
6 previously received a Section 9 waiver for
7 the underage of brick and overage of concrete
8 panels. So the Section Nine waiver would be
9 required only for the overage of combined
10 types of flat metal panels on the south
11 facade.

12 The applicant has presented
13 renderings that indicate the proposed facade
14 materials and facade consultant believes that
15 the materials and color will harmonize well
16 with the existing building. Facade
17 recommends approval. Our facade consultant,
18 Doug Necci, is here if you have any other
19 questions for him, so is the applicant's
20 architect, Scott Bowers. We have the updated
21 materials tonight for your review.

22 The Planning Commission is
23 asked tonight to make recommendation to the

1 City Council to approve the preliminary site
2 plan with Section 9 facade waiver and storm
3 water management plan and to reaffirm some of
4 the previously approved non-minor wetland
5 permit and the ZBA variances as listed in the
6 motion sheet.

7 The applicant, Blair Bowman,
8 is also here tonight, if you have any
9 questions for him.

10 As always, staff is always
11 happy to answer any questions you may have
12 for us. Thank you.

13 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Applicant
14 wish to address the Planning Commission at
15 this time?

16 MR. BOWMAN: Good evening. Blair
17 Bowman, representing T-bon, LLC 46100 Grand
18 River.

19 I just will tell you, that a
20 great job was done in the recitation of the
21 differences in the plan here. I just wanted
22 to briefly indicate the reasons for the
23 change.

1 I think it can be best shown
2 again, I don't know if this is possible to --
3 the projection of the building into the
4 parking area, and valid reasons from an
5 internal operation keeping everything on a
6 single level, there was some concern
7 internally as far as a dual functioning,
8 pre-functioning area, but that was thought to
9 be relatively overcomeable.

10 But a few of my operation
11 folks came through and came forward and said,
12 do you realize you're really taking our
13 primary circulation lane that goes on and
14 through into the west new expanded areas, and
15 basically cutting it off.

16 And so we took the
17 opportunity to look at what we could do from
18 a redesign standpoint.

19 We had a mezzanine area
20 proposed internally that was going to be
21 largely for storage, initially and
22 potentially for future expansion. We are now
23 looking to accelerate the plans to utilize

1 that second story space. And in a phased and
2 programmed manner we are going to look to
3 include what would be a second story overlook
4 ballroom and meeting space on the second
5 story.

6 It gives us the ability, too,
7 with the new facade, to then create more of a
8 physical wow factor presence with the glass
9 in the center and ultimately escalators and
10 things of that nature in the pre-function
11 space leading to the second story space.

12 So it does provide a
13 considerable amount of resources that we have
14 to put into programming and putting forth
15 that space to that use and time, but we think
16 that it's a much better use of the overall
17 site from a circulation standpoint.

18 I will say that we did have
19 some challenges as far as just functionally
20 having foundation areas to plant, and so we
21 worked with the consultant and we're happy to
22 address some vertical plantings that he was
23 looking for, some height and some variations

1 and some expansion of some of the beds, and
2 we were able to accomplish that.

3 And realistically, it saves
4 and preserves about 140 of the most primary
5 parking spaces, too. So a number of positive
6 factors and we think ultimately, it will be
7 from an operational standpoint, a very
8 positive thing. And the customers that we
9 interviewed about it were very positive about
10 it ultimately.

11 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Very good.

12 MR. BOWMAN: I will also address
13 that we did submit today, our consultants did
14 get the modeling completed on the updated
15 major event traffic plan and that was
16 submitted to Maureen.

17 So I would happy to address
18 any other questions you might have.

19 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: As we do,
20 we will call upon you then.

21 This is a public hearing. If
22 there is anyone in the audience that wishes
23 to address the Planning Commission at this

1 time, please step forward.

2 Seeing no one, I think we
3 have correspondence?

4 MR. GRECO: We do. We have
5 correspondence from Robert Fresard, 46085
6 Grand River Avenue, Novi, Michigan, 48374,
7 supports the Suburban Collection Showplace
8 expansion.

9 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Very good.

10 With that, we will close the
11 public hearing on this matter, turn it over
12 to the Planning Commission for their
13 consideration.

14 Anyone like to start? Member
15 Greco?

16 MR. GRECO: I have a question for
17 Rick. With respect to the motion sheet we
18 have in front of us, a lot of it is
19 reaffirmation of what we already did, but in
20 Section B of the motion sheets, Section B II
21 and III, are those fine as is with respect to
22 what accommodations, modifications and
23 agreements have been reached between the

1 applicant and the city with respect to the
2 additional plantings and stuff?

3 MR. MEADER: Yeah, those
4 variances still are applied, but they did
5 improve the height of the plantings and also
6 as Blair pointed out, they are maintaining
7 the landscape islands in the parking lot in
8 front of it, so in fact, while it's a
9 decrease from what it was before, it's still
10 going to have an attractive look from the
11 parking lot and the road.

12 MR. GRECO: But if we make the
13 motion as is set forth in the motion sheet,
14 that should satisfy what you need to make
15 sure that they are getting done what they
16 need to get done?

17 MR. MEADER: Yes.

18 MR. GRECO: Thank you.

19 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Anyone
20 else? Member Avdoulos.

21 MR. AVDOULOS: Thank you. I had
22 a quick question for the applicant.

23 This might have been

1 discussed in previous presentations, but
2 we're indicating digital signage on the
3 facade, and then the one that we are showing
4 right now has it one side and then another
5 image has it on the other side.

6 Is that going to be on both
7 or is that just options?

8 MR. BOWMAN: Well, we did fully
9 understand that as it currently is
10 established that the site plan and these
11 renderings don't establish anything as it
12 relates to signage.

13 We know that we have to come
14 forth with regard to -- and we had some very
15 reasonable reception, frankly, at a Zoning
16 Board before from the standpoint of an
17 overall package of signage. We indicated at
18 that point in time that we would be actually,
19 if the expansion were to be moved, we come
20 back with a comprehensive package. These are
21 just examples of where we could go. We know
22 that we have to provide information and
23 obtain permits and approvals for them.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes, I appreciate the applicants when they're always looking to work with the city and the landscape issue was, I think, the trickiest one.

I think looking at what was presented previously and this current design that pushes the building back is a little bit, you know, more streamlined and fitting in better with what's there, and then allows the better circulation. So, you know, as always, that's much appreciated.

MR. BOWMAN: Thank you.

MR. AVDOULOS: That's all.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Member Giacometti.

MR. GIACOPETTI: My question concerns the memorandum from the traffic ADCOM, concerning the traffic review study, then in the motion sheet.

Is it really necessary for these additional -- these additional studies to be requested as contrasted to the original motion?

1 MS. KOMARAGIRI: They're revised
2 and a study was requested when the original
3 site plan was approved.

4 They have set a timeline of
5 two months after the final site plan was
6 approved to give the applicant a little bit
7 more time while the construction is under
8 way.

9 So that did fall into place,
10 but since they're making a change we now know
11 everything is falling into place. So that
12 was a requirement since 2016, when the first
13 plan --

14 MR. GIACOPETTI: Okay. I wasn't
15 sure if it was --

16 MS. KOMARAGIRI: That's because a
17 new plan, required -- based on this, this is
18 just a reminder, we need to pick it up, we
19 need to wrap it up.

20 MR. BOWMAN: That has been
21 submitted today and it was a work in
22 progress. There was some actual modeling
23 that was done that actually would address

1 from a very much a traffic speed perspective,
2 establishment of the parameters for the MDEP.
3 So I think it was very worthwhile in the time
4 frame that they had to work with that, I
5 believe, is going to be in a condition that
6 you're going to be very happy with.

7 MR. GIACOPETTI: The other
8 question I had for you, Blair, is that in the
9 memo, there was some recommendations, and one
10 was concerning traffic flow, which it sounds
11 like the modifications to the footprint will
12 improve.

13 MR. BOWMAN: Immensely, yes.

14 MR. GIACOPETTI: The other
15 recommendation or suggestion was concerning
16 traffic counting techniques. Would those be
17 added to the final site plan or have those
18 been considered?

19 MS. KOMARAGIRI: I think one of
20 the items on the memo is that they have to
21 address all the comments in the staff and
22 consultant review letters. So if it is a
23 comment as part of the letter, they will

1 address it at the time of the final site
2 plan.

3 MR. GIACOPETTI: That's all my
4 questions. Thank you.

5 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: I would
6 just like to thank Blair for coming forward
7 and making the changes and always -- we like
8 to see applicants work with the city to take
9 little items off, make littler items even
10 smaller in front of us. So I appreciate you
11 working with that and finding compromise.
12 This is a great addition to the city, so I am
13 in favor.

14 MR. BOWMAN: I do want to say for
15 the record again, we were very anxious to,
16 and I will say even needed to accomplish some
17 of the site work and things of that nature
18 and have the prior approved plan, and the
19 staff and the consultants and everybody
20 worked with us tremendously.

21 We were able to get in an
22 enormous amount and accomplish things and
23 will allow us to really move forward after

1 this next stage of approvals. We really
2 appreciate that.

3 MR. ANTHONY: I just wanted to
4 reaffirm what the rest of the Planning
5 Commission has said.

6 Thank you for working with
7 staff, the Center, I'm glad to see it
8 growing. It's one of the most important
9 businesses in our city, because of it being a
10 destination, it also helps all other retail
11 businesses with the traffic you're able to
12 draw.

13 And I am prepared to make a
14 motion.

15 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Very good,
16 sir.

17 MR. ANTHONY: In the matter of
18 Suburban Collection Showplace, expansion
19 JSP16-12, motion to recommend approval to the
20 City Council for the preliminary site plan
21 with expo overlay, based on and subject to
22 City Council approval of the following
23 waivers proposed.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

A, reaffirming no change needed for the following waivers approved by City Council on August 8, 2016, as listed through items Roman numeral I through XI, is that acceptable?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Most excellent.

MR. ANTHONY: B, the following waivers and conditions would require updated approvals as listed through Roman numeral I through V.

And C, reaffirming no change needed for the following waivers approved by Zoning Board of Appeals on August 9, 2016, as listed in Roman numeral I through IV. D, 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

1 zoning ordinance and all other applicable
2 provisions of the ordinance.

3 MR. GRECO: Second.

4 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a
5 motion by Member Anthony, second by Member
6 Greco.

7 Any other comments? Sri, can
8 you call the roll, please.

9 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?

10 MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

11 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member
12 Giacopetti?

13 MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

14 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

15 MR. GRECO: Yes.

16 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

17 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

18 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Anthony?

19 MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

20 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes
21 five to zero.

22 MR. ANTHONY: In the matter of
23 Suburban Collection Showplace expansion

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

JSP16-12, affirming no change needed for the non-minor wetland permit, previously approved by City Council on August 8, 2016, based on and subject to the following.

A, the findings in compliance with the 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 5 of the Code of Ordinances, and all other applicable provisions of the ordinance.

MR. GRECO: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a motion by Member Anthony, second by Member Greco.

Any other comments?

Sri, please.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes
five to zero.

MR. ANTHONY: In the matter of
Suburban Collection Showplace, Expansion
JSP16-12, motion to recommend approval to the
City Council for the storm water management
plan, based on and subject to, A, reaffirming
no change needed for the following waivers
approved by M.D.O.T., approval of the storm
water detention basin discharge to I-96
right-of-way.

B, the findings of compliance
with ordinance standards in the consultant
review letters and items listed in those
letters being addressed on the final site

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

plan.

This motion is made because it is otherwise in compliance with Chapter 11 of the Code of Ordinances, and all other applicable provisions of the ordinance.

MR. GRECO: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a motion by Member Anthony, second by Member Greco.

Any other comments?

Seeing none, Sri, please.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacobetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes

1 five to zero.

2 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: All set.

3 Next on the agenda is Text Amendment 17-188,
4 it's a public hearing for the consideration
5 to amend Chapter 28 signs of the City of Novi
6 Code Amendment 17-188, to update clear
7 finding, provide new substantive regulations,
8 concerning placement of sign within and
9 throughout the city.

10 Barb?

11 MS. MCBETH: So as we mentioned
12 in December, over the last several months
13 last year, City Council's ordinance review
14 committee has undertaken a review of the
15 entire sign code in order to review the
16 standards for updates based on recent court
17 activities, and to allow the ordinance to be
18 more business and user friendly.

19 Among some of the changes
20 recommended are the following. Different
21 additional regulations regarding billboards
22 along I-96 and M5. The changes to the sign
23 review process, which will be part of the

1 site plan review process. The changes to the
2 size, number and placement regulations
3 throughout the ordinance to allow additional
4 signage for certain uses and to clarify and
5 declutter the ordinance where possible, and
6 revise variance standards.

7 Although the sign ordinance
8 is separate from the zoning ordinance, the
9 sign ordinance provides regulations by zoning
10 districts, as in the past, the Planning
11 Commission has asked to take the opportunity
12 to review the proposed amendments, hold the
13 public hearing and make recommendations to
14 the City Council of the proposed changes.

15 The revised ordinance as
16 recommended by the ordinance review
17 committee, and with additional minor
18 modifications from the city attorney's
19 office, has been included in the packet.

20 The Planning Commission
21 considered setting a public hearing for the
22 sign ordinance amendments at a meeting in
23 December, and determined that the public

1 hearing would be scheduled for tonight's
2 meeting.

3 Tonight the Planning
4 Commission is asked to hold the scheduled
5 public hearing for the proposed amendments
6 and to make a recommendation to the City
7 Council for further review.

8 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.
9 This is a public hearing. If there is anyone
10 in the audience that wishes to address the
11 Planning Commission on this particular item,
12 please step forward.

13 Seeing no one, close the
14 audience participation. We have
15 correspondence?

16 MR. GRECO: We do have some
17 correspondence. This is a letter from
18 Matthew Sosin, president of Northern Equities
19 Group. In the letter from Mr. Sosin, they
20 support the changes to the ordinance that
21 would allow their tenants more signage in the
22 OST district, because they believe it will
23 foster economic development through increased

1 visibility and recognition, and also in
2 certain cases help with safety, and finding
3 their destination easier.

4 However, Mr. Sosin also
5 strenuously objects to any amendment allowing
6 ground pole signs in the City of Novi,
7 especially in the OST district.

8 He indicates that having such
9 signs is not what one would expect to see in
10 a city of the caliber and standards upon
11 which Novi has built its reputation and asks
12 that we please reconsider including ground
13 pole signs in the city.

14 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.
15 With that, we will close the public hearing,
16 audience participation at this time. Turn it
17 over to the Planning Commission. Who would
18 like to start? Member Anthony.

19 MR. ANTHONY: Question for staff.
20 So, our public comment that was sent in by
21 writing makes a really good point about
22 ground pole signs. I didn't see an
23 allowance. Is there an allowance for ground

1 pole signs?

2 MS. MCBETH: There is.

3 MR. ANTHONY: Which section is
4 that?

5 MR. SCHULTZ: Page 32 of the
6 draft that you have. Really what I think
7 what Mr. Sosin was talking about is the
8 off-premises advertisement signs. So
9 billboards basically.

10 MR. ANTHONY: In this, you could
11 help me since I missed this part, how does
12 the -- our staff envision that those pole
13 signs would look as far as height and size
14 and what types of businesses would --

15 MR. SCHULTZ: So, basically, the
16 proposed amendment allows one ground pole
17 sign, basically one billboard off premises
18 advertising sign between Fourteen Mile and
19 Twelve Mile. Doesn't specifically say what
20 it's going to look like, if you look at the
21 chart, there is a size, can be up to 672
22 square feet, no higher than 30 feet.

23 MR. ANTHONY: So we have limited

1 the area where that can be.

2 MR. SCHULTZ: Correct. So it
3 would be the east side of M5 between Twelve
4 and Fourteen.

5 MR. ANTHONY: All right. Very
6 good. I was envisioning the classic gas
7 station sign, lollipop sign, the 76 gas
8 station signs. I am really, really glad to
9 see that wasn't what was thought of.

10 Also glad to see that we are
11 updating our sign ordinance and I have always
12 liked how Novi has kept a high end on our
13 signs.

14 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Sir, any
15 other comments?

16 MR. GIACOPETTI: I have a
17 follow-up. In terms of this ground pole
18 sign, Section 28-8, which you just addressed.
19 So ground pole signs, these billboards would
20 only be permitted in I2 along 96, is that --
21 am I reading this right? It says, permitted
22 in the I2 district, but only where the report
23 is immediately abutting --

1 MR. SCHULTZ: Off premises
2 advertisement -- billboards, yes. That's
3 where they are permitted now.

4 MR. GIACOPETTI: There is no
5 change to that per se, just clarifying?

6 MR. SCHULTZ: Right. In a
7 separate section of the ordinance, we are
8 adding a taller sign in the EXO district, but
9 not as an off-premise billboard.

10 MR. GIACOPETTI: That is also
11 along 96?

12 MR. SCHULTZ: Also along 96.

13 MR. GIACOPETTI: Thanks. That
14 was just a clarification.

15 MR. SCHULTZ: This is probably
16 one of the -- the ordinance review committee
17 talked about as much as anything, this
18 billboard question, so there -- I mean, we're
19 actually already having questions from
20 billboard companies about this, so there may
21 be between now and when it actually gets to
22 City Council, there may need to be some minor
23 tweaks, but it's in generally the concept

1 that probably isn't going to change between
2 now and the first City Council meeting, some
3 of the words might.

4 MR. GIACOPETTI: I guess this is
5 more of a -- I guess we will wait close -- I
6 have some more comments. I'll wait until we
7 close the public hearing. This is more maybe
8 a comment for the group.

9 Do billboards really -- if
10 you are driving by on the highway, does it
11 really reflect the community? I mean, is it
12 really a reflection of Novi if you're driving
13 by at 80 miles an hour and -- I am -- just a
14 philosophical question for the group.

15 MR. ANTHONY: If we are looking
16 at personal opinion, I wouldn't think so on
17 96. I think M5 is another question because
18 it's integration, residential and retail, but
19 we are covered by M5, we're not having that.

20 MR. GIACOPETTI: M5 has a more
21 natural -- by design, a more natural looking
22 look and feel.

23 MR. GRECO: Response to your

1 question, I don't think so.

2 MR. GIACOPETTI: It kind of
3 jumped out as maybe being too restrictive,
4 but just my comments for the record.

5 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.
6 Anyone else? Member Greco.

7 MR. GRECO: Based upon our
8 review, discussion and consideration of this,
9 I would like to make a motion to recommend
10 approval of the amended ordinance to the City
11 Council for approval and adoption.

12 MR. ANTHONY: Second.

13 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: I have a
14 motion by Member Greco, second by Member
15 Anthony. Any other comments? Sri?

16 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Anthony?

17 MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

18 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?

19 MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

20 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member

21 Giacopetti?

22 MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

23 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes
five to zero.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.
Third item on the agenda is the Cell Tower
Amendment, it's 18.280. It's a public
hearing for Text Amendment 18.280 to consider
amending the City of Novi zoning ordinance in
order to modify section 4.86, uses not
otherwise included within a specific use
district, and Section 2.2, definitions to
recognize and provide for the implementation
of the state and federal legislation
regarding wireless communication equipment
and facilities.

Ms. McBeth.

MS. MCBETH: Mr. Chair, Section
4.86 of zoning ordinance provides for
placement of various communication antennas,
cell towers and related equipment. Our city
attorney's office has reviewed recent changes

1 in the state law related to the wireless
2 communications equipment and provided
3 suggested modifications to the zoning
4 ordinance to insure that the standards in the
5 new law are recognized and provided in the
6 city's zoning ordinance.

7 Much of the existing
8 ordinance text is being re-formatted and
9 refined, as you can see in the strike-through
10 version of the ordinance that's included in
11 the packet.

12 This matter was considered by
13 the Planning Commission in December to set a
14 public hearing for tonight's meeting.

15 The Planning Commission is
16 asked to hold a public hearing and make a
17 recommendation to City Council for approval
18 of the ordinance language.

19 One more note is that you may
20 recall is that this ordinance was also
21 presented to the Planning Commission in 2012,
22 City Council in 2013, was adopted, but in
23 error was not included in the new formatting

1 of the clear zoning ordinance. We are taking
2 that through the process. Thank you,
3 Mr. Chair.

4 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: This is a
5 public hearing. If there is anyone in the
6 audience who wishes to address the Planning
7 Commission on this particular topic, please
8 step forward.

9 No one in the audience. Any
10 correspondence?

11 MR. GRECO: There is no
12 correspondence.

13 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We will
14 close the public hearing, turn it over to the
15 Planning Commission for their consideration.

16 Ancillary building, all the
17 stuff that goes along with the tower, is
18 there -- I might have missed it, are there
19 specifications that we provide or suggest for
20 the building, material, size, shape, screen,
21 things that might be a little bit more
22 noticeable than a stick in the ground?

23 MS. MCBETH: Yes. The ordinance

1 provides some provisions for what we call the
2 compound around the base of the tower that so
3 many of them have for a fence and screening
4 around the perimeter. There is also a
5 standard, if they choose to build a building
6 there, to house the equipment, that it needs
7 to meet certain standards.

8 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: With that,
9 there is -- would then -- I have not seen it
10 yet, but I don't know what the future would
11 be, but if there is air conditioning,
12 refrigeration standard, our noise standard
13 would couple along with that to carry
14 forward?

15 MS. MCBETH: Yes, it would.

16 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Very good,
17 appreciate that.

18 Any other comments? Member
19 Greco?

20 MR. GRECO: I would like to make
21 a motion. I would like to make a motion to
22 recommend approval to the City Council to
23 amend the Zoning Ordinance Section 4.86 as

1 presented to the Planning Commission for
2 approval to City Council.

3 MR. ANTHONY: Second.

4 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a
5 motion by Member Greco, second by Member
6 Anthony. Any other comments? Sri, please.

7 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?

8 MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

9 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member
10 Giacopetti?

11 MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

12 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

13 MR. GRECO: Yes.

14 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

15 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

16 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Anthony?

17 MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

18 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes
19 five to zero.

20 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Very good.
21 Next on the agenda is matters for
22 consideration, approval of the November 16,
23 2016 Planning Commission minutes.

1 Any changes, modifications?

2 MR. GIACOPETTI: I have a
3 modification. On the list of board members
4 in attendance, Anthony Giacometti passed away
5 a number of years ago. However, I'm not sure
6 where we go from here. I just noticed it.

7 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Can review
8 and make the corrections to it. Any other
9 changes?

10 MR. GRECO: Motion to approve
11 with the change.

12 MR. ANTHONY: Second.

13 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a
14 motion by Member Greco, second by Member
15 Anthony. Sri, can you call the roll, please?

16 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

17 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

18 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Anthony?

19 MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

20 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?

21 MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

22 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member
23 Giacometti?

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes
five to zero.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Next is the
Planning Commission's committee request to
fill vacancies.

MS. MCBETH: So the Planning
Commission elected its officers in a meeting
in September 2016. Assignments to the
various committees were also made at that
meeting.

Since that time Member
Baratta resigned from his position, our new
member John Avdoulos was appointed to the
Commission, and we have three committees that
Member Baratta had been assigned to, that
should be reassigned to somebody in case
these committees need to meet in the next few
months.

That is the walkable Novi
Committee, the Master Plan and Zoning

1 Committee and the Rules Committee.

2 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: So what we
3 were hoping for, maybe be able to sneak this
4 one under the radar and Member Avdoulos would
5 go, okay, I will go for that. You have any
6 strong desires to take on Member Baratta's
7 roles there?

8 MR. AVDOULOS: Sure, I will go
9 for that.

10 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Awesome.
11 Make it easy. We have a motion?

12 MR. GRECO: Motion to have Member
13 Avdoulos take over Member Baratta's position
14 or place on the Environmental and Walkable
15 Novi committee, the Master Plan and Zoning
16 Committee and Rules Committee.

17 MR. GIACOPETTI: Second.

18 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a
19 motion my Greco, second by Giacometti. Any
20 other comments? Quick before he says no.
21 Sri, can you call the roll, please.

22 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Anthony?

23 MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

1 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?

2 MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

3 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member

4 Giacopetti?

5 MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

6 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

7 MR. GRECO: Yes.

8 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

9 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

10 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes
11 five to zero.

12 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

13 Next, any matters for consideration from
14 anyone? Supplemental issues? This is our
15 last audience participation.

16 If there is anyone in the
17 audience that wishes to address the Planning
18 Commission, please stop forward.

19 State your name, your
20 address.

21 MR. LAPHAM: Charles Lapham. I
22 have a business on Novi Road. That's
23 L-a-p-h-a-m. I have been here before. But

1 apparently, I missed the parking -- the sign
2 ordinance. And I want to address that issue
3 at the proper time. And I'd like to know
4 when it comes up. I was supposed to have my
5 day in court a couple of weeks ago. And the
6 city didn't see fit or took the time to be at
7 the trial, and we waited until noon, the
8 judge wouldn't hear me. So I have another
9 date now, coming up and I'd like to be able
10 to talk about that sign ordinance before I am
11 arrested. Because they don't like the sign
12 on the side of my truck and I got
13 (unintelligible). That's more than Novi can
14 handle. So I would like to have an
15 opportunity to present my case before I go
16 back to court.

17 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Ms. McBeth,
18 can you help us.

19 MR. SCHULTZ: I don't know about
20 the prosecution in the district court, but I
21 can say that the next place it will go from
22 here is to the City Council for first
23 reading. I don't know the day, but it

1 probably will be a meeting in February.

2 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: So the
3 previous items that we had, the second item
4 on the public hearing was to address the
5 current changes to the sign ordinance, text
6 amendment. So, what we considered at any
7 time if you were not aware of, the suggestion
8 from Counselor Schultz is that what we passed
9 tonight has to go back now to City Council
10 for them to consider, so you would have a
11 chance in front of City Council as well to
12 state your case or objection to --

13 MR. LAPHAM: I thought City
14 Council was going to Planning Commission that
15 they had to address that sign ordinance, but
16 it's back -- did I have it backwards?

17 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes. We
18 have addressed the changes to the amendment
19 itself, to the sign ordinance amendment so
20 now it has to go to City Council to be
21 approved so that it can be codified.

22 There would be the chance for
23 you to speak publicly in front of City

1 Council to address your specific section
2 or --

3 MR. SCHULTZ: Or as the person
4 did today, reduce it to writing, put it in a
5 letter so Council understands exactly what it
6 is that he would like to have done.

7 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: The
8 suggestion then, if you could put your
9 comments on file and send it to Ms. McBeth so
10 we know exactly from what you're talking
11 about, the city can help address that, that
12 would be helpful.

13 MR. LAPHAM: I have citations
14 here that tell what I'm supposed to be guilty
15 of.

16 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: This isn't
17 the forum right now where we can make any
18 decision based upon any citations that you
19 may have received, and I would suggest that
20 you put that in writing and hand it to
21 Ms. McBeth exactly what it is you're trying
22 to pursue relative to particular -- for the
23 sign ordinance.

1 MR. LAPHAM: If I understand, the
2 timetable here, I am going to have to go back
3 to court for the second time before any
4 decision could be made, is that a fairly true
5 statement?

6 MR. SCHULTZ: The ordinance was
7 heard twice through the chair in February,
8 and if adopted, it would be effective
9 sometime after that, after publication, so
10 probably be in March.

11 MR. LAPHAM: I am due back in
12 court the second time January 24th.

13 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: I would put
14 your comments or your particular request to
15 Ms. McBeth so she can address it and we can
16 help provide some guidance. And then I think
17 she can also help you understand the time
18 line that we are looking towards, which as to
19 right now, what we have passed will have to
20 go back in front of City Council. I don't
21 know what that time frame is yet. We have a
22 general rule, that will be in February-ish.
23 They will have to go through a first and

1 second reading of that, then at that point,
2 it would be printed, then be part of the code
3 that we have.

4 So I would suggest that you
5 put a letter in place to Ms. McBeth at this
6 time.

7 MR. LAPHAM: Also be appreciated
8 if I could get some information so I don't
9 have to go back to court on January 24th for
10 the second time and I am dealing with the
11 current sign ordinance.

12 Can I talk to Ms. McBeth
13 prior to that to see who handles something
14 like that?

15 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes, she
16 would be able to help you.

17 MR. LAPHAM: Thank you very much.

18 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you
19 sir, appreciate it.

20 Anyone else wish to address
21 the Planning Commission.

22 Seeing no one, we close the
23 audience participation, look for a motion to

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

adjourn.

MR. GRECO: Motion to adjourn.

MR. ANTHONY: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Motions and seconds. All those in favor?

THE BOARD: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you everyone.

(The meeting was adjourned at 7:45 p.m.)

** ** *

1 STATE OF MICHIGAN)
 2) ss.
 3 COUNTY OF OAKLAND)

4 I, Jennifer L. Wall, Notary Public within and for the
 5 County of Oakland, State of Michigan, do hereby certify that the
 6 meeting was taken before me in the above entitled matter at the
 7 aforementioned time and place; that the meeting was
 8 stenographically recorded and afterward transcribed by computer
 9 under my personal supervision, and that the said meeting is a
 10 full, true and correct transcript.

11 I further certify that I am not connected by blood or
 12 marriage with any of the parties or their attorneys, and that I
 13 am not an employee of either of them, nor financially interested
 14 in the action.

15 IN WITNESS THEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand at the
 16 City of Walled Lake, County of Oakland, State of Michigan.

17
 18 2-14-17

19 

20 Date Jennifer L. Wall CSR-4183
 21 Oakland County, Michigan
 22 My Commission Expires 11/12/22
 23