



MASTER PLANNING & ZONING
City of Novi Planning Commission
January 6, 2010
Novi Civic Center – Conference Room A
45175 W. Ten Mile, Novi, MI 48375
248) 347-0475

CALL TO ORDER

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

ROLL CALL

Present: Members Victor Cassis, Michael Meyer, Michael Lynch, Michael Lynch

Staff Support: Mark Spencer, Planner, Barbara McBeth, Deputy Director Community Development, Kristen Kolb, City Attorney

APPROVAL OF AGENDA AS AMENDED

Moved by Member Lynch, seconded by Member Cassis – **Motion passed 3-0**

VOICE VOTE ON AMENDED AGENDA APPROVAL MOTION MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER CASSIS

Audience Participation and Correspondence

Daniel DeFemer [MediLodge] is in the audience. Planner Spencer stated that we have that item on the agenda and asked Mr. DeFemer if he would like to discuss at that time. Mr. DeFemer stated that would be fine.

Staff Report

None

Matters for Discussion

Item 1

Master Plan for Land Use Review

- a) Recommended Master Plan Amendments Review and discuss Planning Staff recommendations and possibly approve with or without modifications, for inclusion in Master Plan Review and proposed Master Plan Amendments to be forwarded to the full Planning Commission.

Eleven Mile and Beck Roads Study Area

Planner Spencer stated the first component is Future Land Use designations. Staff is proposing to add suburban low rise from the previous discussion you will recall staff presented a definition for suburban low rise as designated “Suburban low rise uses including attached single family residential, multiple family residential, institutional and office uses when developed under a set of use and design guidelines to keep the residential character of the area and minimize the effect that the transitional uses would have on nearby single family residential properties.”

Planner Spencer presented staff’s proposed Goals, Objectives & Implementation Strategies recommendations to go along with this under the Land Use Category.

The first goal would be to “Provide for planned development areas that provide a transition between high intensity office industrial commercial use and one family residential uses.”

Objective would be to “Provide for form based low rise suburban development options to promote the development of key areas in the city from the key areas that can provide a transition from higher intensity office and retail uses to one family residential developments that include access, design and

use standards that promote a residential character to the streetscape and provide increased economic value.”

Implementation Strategy “To create a planned suburban low rise form based zoning district that permits attached single family and low density multiple family residential, community service, human care, civic educational, public recreation and office facilities.” This new use district will provide a transition from higher intensity commercial office industrial areas to one family residential uses, specifically located where the natural environment provides defined borders to provide separation from one family residential areas. Detached one family residential uses would not be permitted in the district, the district would be designed to reduce traffic, environmental and visual impacts for providing higher intensity use and detached one family districts, while maintaining a residential character.”

Planner Spencer stated the Eleven Mile and Beck Roads land use designation goals, objectives and implementation strategies supporting reasons are to increase potential for developing because of a expanded basket of potential uses, which was discussed previously and committee was in agreement. Office, institutional, attached single family and multiple family residential uses to generate more tax revenue than the development of land with detached single family residential. Low rise office, attached single family & multiple family residential uses can act as a transitional use area between high intensity office industrial commercial uses and single family residential uses. Form based standards that prohibit retail or commercial looking uses could foster the maintenance of a residential character.

Planner Spencer [pointing on map] indicated that the committee have discussed previously the 5 sub-study areas. Sub-Study Area 1 is currently single family residential staff’s proposal is to change that designation to suburban low rise.

Sub-Study Area 2 - no change, keep as public park and open space.

Sub-Study Area 3 - utility area no change [gray area on map by ITC corridor]. Office to office commercial recommendation was to expand the office into three sets of office uses, Community Office, Office Commercial & Office Research Development & Technology. Mr. Spencer stated that the recommendation is consistent with the zoning of the properties. The Providence property is currently zoned OSC [office, service commercial] this proposed designation would be consistent. Mr. Lynch asked Mr. Spencer about the hatch mark area, which Mr. Spencer said is the area is proposed to go from single family residential to suburban low rise which includes the Bosco property.

Sub-Study Area 4 - will continue to be single family with no change.

Sub-Study Area 5 - educational facilities no change.

Planner Spencer stated the supporting reasons for these recommendations: Keeping the public park educational facility and utility use designations on the property so designated on the current Future Land Use Map is appropriate due to current ownership and current use of these properties and the compatibility of these properties with the neighboring properties.

Mr. Spencer stated the next reason is to design properly low rise, human care, educational, attached single family and multiple family residential uses can act as a transitional use area between high intensity office industrial for commercial uses and single family residential uses. Natural built environments include wetlands, schools, parks, electrical transmission line corridors separate the study area from existing single family residential development, and provide an adequate buffer between higher intensity uses and lower intensity single family uses. Planner Spencer indicated infrastructure is basically adequate with minor manageable utility road improvements, ultimately development may require increasing the city’s sewer plant capacity. Another reason Mr. Spencer stated is suburban low rise use areas that permit office, institutional, attached single family and multiple family residential uses would generate more tax revenue than the development of land with detached single family residential. Planner Spencer indicated that placing the southwest corner of Beck and Eleven Mile Roads in the suburban low rise use area is appropriate since the parcel is a small corner parcel that would

be difficult to develop as single family. Member Cassis asked about the infrastructure in that area. Committee went on to discuss infrastructure further. Member Lynch asked Member Cassis if he is saying we do not have the infrastructure to handle the increase in density? Member Cassis answered you never know if a development comes in to the Planning Commission at that time looking at that development says we need you to do this and do that and then the lawyer says that the infrastructure is basically adequate, then why do we need to do this? Member Lynch stated that maybe we need to reword it. Planner Spencer stated we can take the statement out and use engineering comments in the review.

Kristen Kolb, City Attorney commented that the plan is just a guide it's not an ordinance or requirement. Ms. Kolb said you could put a temper limitation on it {20 years from now} if there are changes. Committee went on to discuss the infrastructure statement further. Planner Spencer stated we will take out the word minor. Committee agreed.

Member Meyer asked if our goal right now is to edit this statement or what is our purpose. Planner Spencer stated the purpose is to come to a consensus on the planning aspects including the master plan. Mr. Spencer stated that as far as editing the statement he doesn't feel it needs to be done at tonight's meeting. Ms. Kolb agreed with Mr. Spencer. Planner Spencer also said he will be presenting a final document for the Committee's approval and recommendations before going to the Planning Commission.

Planner Spencer went on to discuss the staff's proposal for Residential Density Pattern Map changes. Sub-Study Area 1 from 4.8 to 7.3 dwelling units per acre. Sub-Study Area 2 [park area] as an underlined residential density from 0.8 to 3.3. Sub-Study Area 3 maintaining the utility area at 3.3 and the balance of the area that are suburban low rise at 7.3, but with no residential density map on the areas that would be office commercial. Member Meyer is concerned with regards to the citizens in the area if it will offend the people who live in this area and thought they were moving to the rural part of Novi. Planner Spencer stated there is some potential for that, that is why we had an Open House and a survey on line for public comments. Mr. Spencer stated he would like to have two public hearings on this before it is adopted, we have to have one by state's statue, and one at the Planning Commission before it goes to City Council for distribution. There will be more opportunities for public input as this moves forward. Committee continued to discuss the density in the Sub-Study Area 3. Sub-Study Area 4 from 1.65 to 3.3. Sub-Study Area 5 proposing to change the northern half of it recommended for 3.3 underlined residential density and keeping the residential density the same on the southern part of it, which has a lot of wetlands.

Planner Spencer stated the supporting reasons for this is: Increasing density and providing for a mix of uses are the principles supported by The American Planning Association, The Smart Growth Network and The Governor's Council and Physical Fitness. Increasing residential density could increase enrollment in the Novi Schools. Increase residential density could provide additional housing opportunities to more demographic groups including seniors & young families. Increasing residential density could increase tax revenue. Increasing residential density could generate additional retail, office and industrial floor space demand.

Planner Spencer stated the last component staff would like to present tonight on this study area before asking the committee for decisions on this is the MetiLodge Concept Plan. Committee asked staff to bring to the committee submitted concept plans and developments we have seen for each of the study areas. MetiLodge is the last one that was submitted. Planner Spencer stated the general idea of the use fits into what staff proposed for suburban low rise. The major component that MediLodge doesn't have is creative access that would keep the corridor more residential.

Chairman Meyer stated the idea for us as a committee is to listen and give feedback. Planner Spencer stated that this is not a rezoning proposal at this time. He stated the committee is welcome to give comments at this time. Planner Spencer also stated for the committee's consideration for tonight's agenda is to hear what is proposed and see if that effects how your decisions would be on the recommendations for this study area.

Daniel DeFemer [architect for MediLodge in audience] stated he brought with him tonight a copy of some of the documents presented for our preliminary review and then a preliminary revised set of plans based on the recommendations we got from Planning. Mr. DeFemer stated the first plan in the package is the site plan we started with and submitted for site plan review. The project is to have two entrances off of Eleven Mile Road the second entrance we have been asked to align this with the entrance for the proposed development across the street with the second plan we have align that entrance. One of the major concerns for us is the thought of connecting back to the ring road of Providence Hospital. That has a huge impact on our site we are doing a substantial amount of litigation and wetland and woodland mediation to be able to carve out about 7 1/2 acres of this 20 acre parcel to accomplish the footprint we need for the 120 facility we are proposing. To continue this drive through to connect to the ring road would be a drive that really wouldn't go through our parking lot, because that is not the level of drive you are looking for, so it would have to be another drive addition to that, that we think would have substantial impact on the wetlands and woodlands and is a financial burden that I am not interested in pursuing, if you could recommend that to be considered.

Member Cassis asked Mr. DeFemer if he is saying he's not interested in pursuing this. Mr. DeFemer stated it is better for our project to not have to go through that unless there are ways we can find participation to refine that roadway. Mr. DeFemer stated the plan is fairly simple with a number of wings with predominately private rooms, it is a facility that's intended to be a rehab facility for the most part, there will be long term care and considering a hospice component. Mr. DeFemer stated there will be 120 beds some of them private and some are doubles. As we move on with the project there were only be 100 beds because we will have only 100 licenses so the two bedroom room units right now will become suites. We were asked to develop some elevations of what we thought the building would be, it would take on a residential character it's all with masonry materials with the exception of some end units. One comment we received back from the committee was we would like to see it more residential when developed, he stated we don't have any difficulty with that comment. Mr. DeFemer stated that they have a concern about the ordinance as it was proposed and it is not the master planned portion, but the way the ordinance was to be written. In the ordinance for a 2 1/2 story right now is a maximum 35' height, the building we are proposing in some of the higher areas to the center of the pitch is proposed to be a 30' high building. He stated in the committee's review looking for a larger scale facility in this transition district we believe this building will have that kind of profile. We did this to illustrate that this is not just a typical one story. Member Cassis asked the percentage. Mr. DeFemer stated about half of it. He stated the entire facility will have a pitched roof. Mr. DeFemer stated that we were asked by traffic and fire wanted us to try to loop the back of the building and we have done that and we have revised our parking somewhat to accommodate that. It pushed us back into the wetland and woodland a little bit further, but it is a doable situation we believe to accommodate the ring road that was asked for and connect to the positions that you asked for across the street. He stated we are also going to need the help of the Planning Department to accommodate the size of this building, because of the length we have a greater length then is acceptable. Member Cassis asked about the parking. Mr. DeFemer stated we have more than adequate parking. He stated from experience that we usually need one parking space per bed to accommodate this facility for parking. He stated there will be extensive landscaping.

Member Meyer stated his thoughts on this while reading the material is the keyword "suburban low rise" so is this suburban low rise? Planner Spencer stated the architecture itself could be suburban low rise. He said one of the reasons he presented a minimum size to maximum to get more floor space per acre for these properties. Mr. Spencer stated he would have some objections to this as low rise. Committee went on to discuss further the wetlands [pond] in the area. Planner Spencer asked Mr. DeFemer if this was a detention pond facility. Mr. DeFemer stated a portion of it is detention, the center of it we need to get the volume, because we don't want to push further into the area a portion of it will be retention. The other residential characteristic Planner Spencer mentioned previously to the committee was having access to projects off an internal road system. Member Cassis stated he would like to keep it low rise to one story or 1 1/2. Member Meyer stated he can't imagine seeing a nursing home being two stories, because older people don't like going

up and down stairs. Committee went on to discuss further the MediLodge concept.

Member Lynch stated he is real familiar with MediLodge and he agrees with Mr. DeFemer about the single story especially in the wings with the older people with their walkers. Member Lynch stated the pond doesn't bother him too much because you will be putting in about 10ft. of buffer. As far as traffic you will not get a lot of traffic you probably will get very few people visiting. His one concern is the height he doesn't want this building to look out of place. Member Lynch also stated he doesn't see the need for a road to connect to Providence Hospital. Member Lynch stated overall this facility in this area makes a lot of sense, this is what he envisioned for this form based concept.

Chairman Meyer asked committee for anymore comments.

Planner Spencer wanted to make another suggestion to Mr. DeFemer about access [pointing on map] when you look at the size of this parcel as a whole, if a road connection is not provided to these properties the likelihood of having some kind of road system to these parcels start to diminish. Planner Spencer indicated that if these properties get rezoned to this district each one of these parcels they would want their own driveway system. Mr. Spencer also stated that there are some conservation easements so some ways to get behind these buildings connectively could make sense to keep the residential character.

Member Meyers stated that Member Lynch's point is well taken he stated this is Eleven Mile not Eight Mile Road to get to Providence Hospital it's not that far. Member Meyer said if the north part of this development is possibly going to be another development he wouldn't want to put a road through it and ruin the possibility for someone who would be providing more taxes for the city. Mr. DeFemer stated it is not the intention of this owner to develop the north portion. He also stated if a conservation easement would ease the committee's mind in that way they would consider it.

Planner Spencer asked the committee for a motion on the Eleven Mile and Beck Roads Study area.

Future Land Use definitions, Future Land Use Map and Residential Density Patterns map.

Member Lynch made a motion - The Master Plan and Zoning Committee recommends Including the following Planning Staff recommendations in the Master Plan Review and in the proposed Master Plan Amendments to be forwarded to the Planning Commission.

"Suburban Low-Rise" land use definition as presented;
Future Land Use map changes for the Eleven Mile and Beck Road Study Area as presented;
Residential Density Patterns map changes for the Eleven Mile and Beck Road Study Area as presented.

Motion seconded by Member Cassis: **motion passed 3-0**

Goals, Objectives and Implementation Strategies

Member Lynch made a motion - The Master Plan and Zoning Committee recommends including the Planning Staff's recommended **goals, objectives and implementation strategies supporting the proposed "Suburban Low-Rise" land use** as presented in the Master Plan Review and in the proposed Master Plan Amendments to be forwarded to the full Planning Commission.

Motion seconded by Member Cassis: **motion passed 3-0**

Town Center – Future Land Use Map

Planner Spencer stated that the city has received a rezoning petition to rezone property that is owned by the Town Center. Planner Spencer stated he has prepared a review on a recommended Future Land Use Map change. Mr. Spencer stated [pointing on map] that this piece of property he is recommending that this piece of property, because it is fully developed with the parking facility that supports the Town Center Development itself is logical to master plan that for Town Center commercial uses.

Item 2

Town Center Rezoning

Review and comment on rezoning petition to rezone two parcels adjacent to Town Center Drive from OSC to TC.

Planner Spencer asked for any comments or provide feedback to the applicant before making any decisions. Mr. Spencer stated staff is not making the same recommendation for that little sliver [pointing on map] in this case staff is recommending that the rezoning should still take place and could make sense, because on our future land use map it has a statement that “plans intended to show generalized land uses not intended to indicate precise size, shape or dimension on the map reflects future land use recommendations does not necessarily imply the short range zoning is appropriate.” Planner Spencer stated that currently it is Town Center Gateway, which has a different intent than Town Center itself it’s similar, but different. We can discuss with the applicant if they have any proposals or ideas of what they are going to use it for.

Committee went on to discuss further the rezoning of those two parcels adjacent to Town Center Drive.

Matt Quinn [in audience] stated he is here on behalf of the Town Center Investors. He stated that we concur with the Future Land Use map recommendation to make the parking lot in Town Center a master plan also, because it goes along with the rezoning request that is coming in. Mr. Quinn stated they are asking for a rezoning to make everything Town Center [pointing on map to the parcels he is talking about]. Mr. Spencer stated the parcel on the north half is zoned OSC and the southern parcel [opposite side] is OS-1. Mr. Quinn also stated they just want to unify the zoning for what the client owns and what it represents.

Member Cassis asked Mr. Quinn about 2.2 acres and what he thinks could fit in there. Mr. Quinn stated right now it is parking, but it could possibly have a 5, 000 sq. ft retail building of some type. Planner Spencer asked Mr. Quinn what the Town Center is envisioning doing with the 1 acre piece on the east side of Town Center south of Eleven Mile Road. Mr. Quinn answered nothing is planned. Committee went on to discuss further that 1 acre parcel.

Future Land Use Map

Member Lynch made a motion for The Master Plan and Zoning Committee recommends including the Planning Staff’s recommended **Future Land Use map** changes as presented for the parcel located at the southeast corner of Crescent Boulevard and Town Center Drive in the Master Plan Review and in the proposed Master Plan Amendments to be forwarded to the full Planning Commission. Seconded by Member Cassis – **motion passed 3-0**

Planner Spencer asked the applicants if there is anymore additional feedback they would like from the committee on this rezoning. Mr. Quinn stated the review letter pretty much says it all, the reasons for the rezoning request is to make everything Town Center. Planner Spencer stated no motion is required for the Town Center rezoning.

Green Novi

Goals, Objectives and Implementation Strategies

Planner Spencer stated with the request from the committee staff has put together some green language to add to our master plan.

Goal: Continue to promote and implement green building techniques, sustainable design best Management practices and energy conservation in the City of Novi.

Objective: Encourage energy efficient and environmentally sustainable development through the use of the standards established and published by the United States Green Building Council and the related standards provided by the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Registered Project Checklist.

Implementation Strategy: Review and consider regulatory incentives to encourage environmentally friendly, energy conservation, the use of green technology or (LEED) certification as part of development or redevelopment projects.

Implementation Strategy: Establish ordinance provisions to reduce the number of required parking spaces when bicycle access and bicycle racks are provided and when the applicant can demonstrate, and provide facilities for access by other alternative methods of transportation, i.e. waling or mass transit.

Implementation Strategy: Review and develop ordinance provisions to permit the Installation of renewable energy systems for residential, industrial and commercial uses.

Objective: Educate residents and developers on the benefits of green building techniques, sustainable design best management practices and energy conservation strategies.

Implementation Strategy: Develop education material to promote the most desirable Green practices the City seeks in development and redevelopment projects.

Implementation Strategy: Develop educational materials to encourage reducing waste that end up in landfills, reuse, recycling and energy conservation practices. Materials could include the benefits of such practices and highlight recycling services available, energy conservation techniques and resources for including renewable energy sources in homes and businesses.

Objective: Strive to use sustainable design best management practices and utilize LEED certification criteria to the extent such criteria and certification are financially, physically and operationally feasible, thereby ensuring that these buildings will be energy efficient and environmentally sustainable when designing or remodeling City owned buildings and facilities.

Implementation Strategy: Maintain membership in the United States Green Building Council and other organizations to have continued access to the resources and information leveraged by these organizations.

Implementation Strategy: Review and consult the LEED checklist for each City-initiated project and ensure consultants are familiar with LEED certification criteria and sustainable design.

Implementation Strategy: Consider the addition of renewable energy generators to the City's current and future buildings.

Under current goal

Protect Novi's remaining woodlands and wetlands

Objective: Protect the City's water features.

Implementation Strategy: Continue to review and update storm water management standards and ordinances to reduce the impact of development on the hydrologic environment.

Implementation Strategy: Consider ordinance changes to reduce parking requirements and reduce impervious surfaces.

Planner Spencer stated his research was derived by the resolutions of the city, which City of Novi Council has already passed. Member Cassis asked Planner Spencer if he looked at other municipalities.

Planner Spencer stated he looked at some. Planner Spencer stated his supporting reasons that the proposed goals, objectives and implementation strategies are a natural extension of existing city policies.

Member Cassis stated that we are surrounded by other cities and municipalities should we inject a statement saying where possible we cooperate with other municipalities around us to advance and promote any green practices. Planner Spencer said he could add that to the statement "To add an additional Implementation Strategy under the "Objective Encourage energy efficient and environmentally sustainable development." Work with neighboring communities to encourage energy efficient and environmentally sustainable development.

Member Cassis mentioned about the school district and do they have programs to promote green building discussions and bringing up kids to think about these kinds of objectives in the future.

Planner Spencer stated he is not aware of any programs through the school district. He did state he knew of one project that involved students that were working on a lego project that involved some green ideas.

Green Novi

Member Lynch made a motion - The Master Plan and Zoning Committee recommends including the Planning Staff's recommended **goals, objectives and implementation strategies** as amended in the Master Plan Review and in the proposed Master Plan Amendments to be forwarded to the full Planning Commission. Seconded by Member Cassis.
Motion passed 3-0

Minutes

Moved by Member Lynch, seconded by Member Cassis

VOICE VOTE ON MINUTES APPROVAL MOTION MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER CASSIS:

A motion to approve the November 19, 2009 minutes. Motion carried 3-0

ADJOURN

Moved by Member Lynch seconded by Member Cassis:

VOICE VOTE ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER CASSIS:

A motion to adjourn.

The meeting adjourned at 8:45 PM

Future Meetings

January 20, 2010
February 3, 2010
February 17, 2010

Transcribed by Bonnie S. Shrader
Customer Service Representative
February 4, 2010
Date Approved:

