



PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

CITY OF NOVI

Regular Meeting

August 22, 2018 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 Anthony, Member Avdoulos, Member Greco, Member Lynch, Member Maday, Chair Pehrson

Absent: None

Also Present: Barbara McBeth, City Planner; Sri Komaragiri, Planner; Darcy Rechten, Staff Engineer; Rick Meader, Landscape Architect; Thomas Schultz, City Attorney; Beth Saarela, City Attorney; Peter Hill, Environmental Consultant; Maureen Peters, Traffic Consultant; Doug Necci, Façade Consultant

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Moved by Member Lynch and seconded by Member Avdoulos.

VOICE VOTE TO APPROVE THE AUGUST 22, 2018 AGENDA MOTION MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER AVDOULOS.

Motion to approve the August 22, 2018 Planning Commission Agenda. Motion carried 6-0.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

Pamela Gerald, P.O. Box 155 Southfield MI 48037-0155, said I usually give my telephone number – it's 248-346-0439. I just wanted to say that I am in support of the Adell Center project, which is number two on your agenda for the rezoning. And the reason why I am in support of it is that I think that the development is basically what I am going to call a visionary development. It appears as if Mr. Adell or Orville Properties have obviously come out, canvassed the area, thought about the growth and all of the new development that is happening in the City of Novi. I think it's going to be unique for those people that are so high tech that they would purchase a car with a coin, stick the coin in the machine and the car comes down. I don't know if I would do that, but for those people that are adventurous like that, that would be something nice.

I only have two concerns, and not really bad concerns. I just want to know what the restaurants would be like and if we could give a suggestion; back in the day, we had

restaurants in southeastern Michigan like the Excalibur owned by Pat Archer, you had The Lark owned by Patrick Lark, you had The Bijou in the City of Southfield. So I'm just hoping that the choice of restaurants would be for upscale restaurants, different than what we are already saturated with in a lot of the surrounding cities. I just think that it's a beautiful development. You can never have too many hotels around the already established Expo Center that is currently there.

Ms. Gerald said it seems like he's covered all the bases with your Engineering Department, with your Landscape Department, the wetlands, the woodlands, the traffic. I didn't have an opportunity to read the traffic study so I'm going to be curious to see if you think that will be a problem. But I'm just totally in support of it and hopefully he'll go around to some of the other cities in the Southeastern Michigan district and do some of the same type of development. But I'm definitely in support of it. Thank you.

Michel Duchesneau, 1191 South Lake Drive, said I too would like to speak about the Adell proposal. The proposed zoning change from Expo Center to something else is appropriate. The addition of two hotels would probably work in this location, although one of them exceeds our height requirement, as do three other buildings which is unusual for a site to have so many tall buildings. Two restaurants could survive if the traffic backups along Novi Road don't become an issue. A Bob Evans, a Big Boy, The Melting Pot, did not survive in this location, so hopefully we fare better this time. But the additional restaurant choices are always welcome in Novi.

My main concern with the development is the added traffic to Novi Road. The applicant is eager to build and has requested a waiver to completing a traffic study while Novi is doing an area wide study. In recent years, we have not seen a more traffic-intense development than this one. It is very close to the freeway exits and entrances and may cause similar backups to when our mall first opened. The supporting roads were not available and it is possible the ring road won't be completed for ten years, and then Novi will be blamed as it was when Sandstone was being built. The City has recently approved hundreds of apartments at Novi Road and Flint Street. Emerson Park on Novi Road near Ten Mile Road will add significant traffic. Woodbridge at Novi Road and Nine Mile, more traffic. The Suburban Showplace Expansion on Grand River will funnel quite a bit of additional traffic onto Novi Road. And then we have Manchester with its hundreds of apartments on Novi Road and Thirteen Mile, which is nearing completion and will soon be available. And Bolingbrooke on Novi Road and Twelve and a half Mile.

Mr. Duchesneau we also have Pavilion Shore Village, which will soon be before you. So just want to make sure the developer is aware of the situation and the environment he is entering into as he goes forward. The only entrance or exit from the development is Novi Road, and I think that should be a concern. Villa D'Este set the bar very, very high as far as developing something under a PRO. I don't see the benefits that even Villa D'Este offered under their PRO, so I would like to just say that everyone consider, it is going to be a good development, but I think it's being pushed a little bit too quickly and everybody has to understand the implications.

Dorothy Duchesneau, 125 Henning, said 30-second refresher course. Pavilion Shore Village: a designated eight acre area near the shore of Walled Lake that was specifically targeted by the City in the 2016 City Master Plan. It is located at and south of the intersections of Old Novi Road, Thirteen Mile and South Lake Drive. Lakeview PRO: the southern portion of

Pavilion Shore Village that was resubmitted by Robertson Brothers developers to the Planning Commission earlier this month, and whose blueprints are currently under review. Our understanding is that the new proposal is 21 single family detached homes on smaller lots per the PRO guidelines. The three-story attached townhomes are now gone. Now it's time to look into the details and the benefits to the residents and neighbors.

MKSK: the consultant firm hired by the Planning Commission with the City Council's approval, to host a neighborhood and resident workshop as to what Pavilion Shore Village should become. Pavilion Shore Park: the place where MKSK is going to hold the neighborhood workshop tomorrow between 6:00 and 7:30 at the park shelter where the restroom building is located. The Pavilion Shore Village concept involves the intersection where three 25 mile per hour roads meet at the south end of Walled Lake. There is nothing more than a stop sign in each direction. It involves existing businesses, possible new businesses, existing homes of long-time residents, and the construction of new homes for new residents on what are smaller lots than normally allowed by ordinance. It involves land that had an old Mobile Gas Station on it during the years of the amusement park. It involves most of the Southern Shore of Pavilion Shore Park and it will involve the people who use the Park for day use and who park in the parking lots at both ends, east and west. It involves traffic flow, it involves multiple pedestrian crosswalks. It needs to be done right to preserve the character of the lakeshore community.

Ms. Duchesneau said last week I went to and asked the members of the Parks and Rec Commission to attend the MKSK workshop on the 23rd. Not all of them realized that something was going to happen to that area and that it might affect the use of Pavilion Shore Park. Tonight I'm asking that all of you, the members of the Planning Commission, also attend this workshop. Even though Robertson Brothers is not on your agenda tonight or maybe not even at your next meeting, it will be very soon. This meeting tomorrow will likely be the best heads up on this area you will ever get. Hope to see you there.

Rachel Sines, 2219 Austin, said my speech would be more effective if the overhead was working but luckily for you, that means it's shorter. First, I want to thank you all for listening to the residents that are going to be affected by Pavilion Shore Village and for being patient with us; I know we've been here quite often. As you know, there's been another proposal submitted and my neighbors and I are very happy to see that the three-story buildings are gone. But there are still some issues, hopefully they're minor.

First I want to address that these parcels are not contiguous and should not be treated as such. They are three separate parcels called A, B, and C; my particular interest lies in Parcel A because this one backs up to my backyard and is comprised of 1.3 acres. If you do the math, only nine homes should be permitted under 7.3 units per acre, but the proposal from Robertson Brothers has eleven homes on this lot. The developers have been given a gift with a promised rezoning from 3.3 to 7.3, and please do not let them take advantage of this gift. In fact, in doing a lot of research, where House 11 sits, the City has an easement – a reserved easement on that property that's not buildable. You'll see this in the summary from June 25 on page 83 of the design and layout concerns.

Also on that, in the summary is the suggested reducing the number of units on the west side, which is Parcel A, to have some wider lot frontage so that will allow some more flexibility of layout, consider alternate layouts, and reduce the amount of pavement that is needed for single-family residential driveways, and additional landscaping provided

between existing homes and proposed homes to provide additional screening – none of which have been done with this latest proposal.

Ms. Sines said from the proposal and from when you're looking at the plans, this does look like a big area but it's not. I urge all of you to come and take a look and see for yourself how close these houses really are to us. There's two garages and two driveways that are pointing directly into my windows, simply changing the orientation of the garages as they did with Parcel C would help but better yet would be the use of what they call Richmond houses. They're one-story, one and a half story houses and attached garages. When I purchased my home, I knew what I was getting and that's a one-story house behind me. I know a lot of people say I can't argue privacy but if I can just put up a fence, I have two windows facing me currently, I think I do not hear or see any of the people coming or going from those houses. One and one and a half story houses would be ideal for Parcel A since these homes back up to existing residents, and would also solve the problem for Novi of not enough senior housing as noted in the Master Plan. That's it. Thank you.

Rod Schlessman, 100 Pleasant Cove Drive, said I'll be really brief. Basically I'm here to support Rachel and Dorothy in their comments. One thing I noted in the Robertson Brothers development, and there's been a lot comments on this, was the density for the size. I don't see where there's really a hardship for them developing using the existing zoning, which I believe is the 3.3 per acre. I'd like to keep with the current zoning and on the small lots, there's very little green space for each lot. And as Dorothy mentioned, tomorrow night there is a Pavilion Shores meeting and it would be a great time to come and do two things at once – look at the Pavilion Shores development project as well as the Robertson proposal.

CORRESPONDENCE

There was no correspondence.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

There were no Committee Reports.

CITY PLANNER REPORT

City Planner McBeth said as was mentioned in the Audience Participation, which we appreciate, I did want to remind the audience that there is a public workshop tomorrow evening from 6 to 7:30 at the Pavilion Shore Park to take a look at that area and hear some comments from the neighbors. If anybody would like to come, it's a drop-in workshop, you wouldn't need to stay for the whole time, but you would be welcome to attend. And if you can't attend, we will provide a summary for you, too, as the project moves along. Residents who cannot attend but did get sent a copy of the flyer that we sent to about 250 homes are welcome to provide feedback by the back of that flyer and by email to me. Thank you.

Member Lynch said if all of us show up, would that constitute a quorum with the Open Meetings Act?

City Attorney Schultz said we can talk about that at the end of the meeting.

CONSENT AGENDA

There were no items on the consent agenda.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

There were no public hearings.

MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION

1. BERKSHIRE E-SUPPLY JSP 17-72

Consideration at the request of Berkshire E-Supply for revised Preliminary Site Plan approval. The subject property is approximately 57.12 acres and is located at the southeast corner of M-5 and Fourteen Mile Road (Section 1). The applicant has received Preliminary Site Plan approval for a two-story headquarters office building (18,380 SF) and a single story Fulfillment Center and warehouse with mezzanines (193,230 SF) with associated site improvements. The applicant is currently requesting approval to eliminate the public walking trail previously proposed in the southerly part of the site, and is requesting a Section 9 waiver for changes to the building façade.

Planner Komaragiri said on February 28, the Planning Commission approved the Preliminary Site Plan with land bank parking, Wetland Permit, Woodland Permit, and Stormwater Management Plan for the Berkshire eSupply project, which is located near the southeast corner of Fourteen Mile and M-5. The applicant has recently submitted the Final Site Plan for staff's administrative review.

Staff has identified the two following changes to the approved Preliminary Site Plan that would require your reconsideration. The previously approved site plan included public walking trails, and a private walking trail through the woodlands along the southern boundary. They are not required per the code, but the walking trails were considered to be a positive improvement to the plan and a good amenity for the employees in the new buildings and for the public on the proposed public walking trails north of Cabot Drive. Based on the Commission's discussion at the February 28 meeting, staff understands that the trails played a part in the approval of the Preliminary Site Plan, although not technically required by the Ordinance. The applicant is currently proposing to remove those trails due to conflict with regulated woodland trees. Kevin McDevitt, the engineer who is working on the project, is here tonight and he can explain a little more into detail.

Planner Komaragiri said revisions are proposed to façade materials that would require additional deviations than what was previously approved. The terracotta tile from the original design, which was considered as brick with respect to the façade ordinance, has been changed to orange-colored flat metal panels. The applicant has provided a façade board, which is in front of the podium. The façade consultant has reviewed the request and is in support of the proposed changes, subject to Planning Commission's review of the Section 9 Waiver. The Planning Commission is asked tonight to consider the two changes proposed and approve or deny the revised Preliminary Site Plan. Thank you.

Kevin McDevitt, the civil engineer in charge of the site development project, said the employee walking path that was shown on the Landscape Plan, if you go back to the exhibit – it wasn't identified on any of the other site plans in the set because it was originally meant just to be kind of a concept being tossed around amongst our team. The

part south of the drain was never meant to go on to the site plan application.

The issue that we have is that in order to install that pathway, there would be a lot of impacts to both regulated woodlands and wetlands to do that, which obviously is not beneficial. The employee walking path on the north side of the drain has a lot of the same issues involved. The vast majority of that trail was through existing regulated woodland canopy, which during the site plan review phase was found out that we would have to keep that outside of the canopy, which essentially eliminates the vast majority of that trail system, so we just decided to take it off of the plan altogether. There are sidewalks available around the site if the employees wish to walk, which will also be connected in to the Right-of-Way sidewalk both up on Fourteen Mile.

Member Lynch said so the real issue here is that if you put the pathway in, you kill the trees?

Mr. McDevitt said well we would impact the trees, I don't know if they would actually be killed or not but yes it definitely could damage some of the regulated trees.

Member Lynch said ok, now what type of path were you proposing?

Mr. McDevitt said originally it was meant to be a woodchip pathway, which we would essentially grind up a bunch of the other trees that are being removed, lay it down on probably an aggregate base in order to make it stable, and that could essentially damage the root systems of the remaining trees that we are trying to get access to.

Member Lynch said do we have anybody here from DEQ or our consultants? Have you reviewed this with the woodland experts and the DEQ experts?

Planner Komaragiri said we have Pete Hill, our ECT wetland and woodland consultant here if you have any questions for him.

Member Lynch said if you could come up – I could see putting a concrete path and how that could present a problem. You're familiar with this?

Environmental Consultant Hill said my recollection is that on the plans that we have reviewed, there wasn't a detail on the proposed plans. It was my understanding that the employee walking trail on the north side was to be woodchip pathway. I'm not sure about the material under, if there's rock. So we didn't review any details on the plan, nor did we review specific tree numbers that either had to be reviewed or that the path would go through the critical root zone or the dripline of the trees. So I actually can't stand here and tell you how damaging that would be. My thought is that it could be done without being too damaging, but I don't have the details.

Member Lynch said I understand. If it's going to be a woodchip path, my personal feeling is that I don't see where that's going to cause a problem to any of the wetlands or woodlands. And it seems like you're confirming that, I know you haven't gone out on the site and looked at it. The other path, the one further to the south – the public walking path, that has to be concrete I would imagine since it is a public path.

Environmental Consultant Hill said that was my understanding that it would be more ADA

compliant. It would be a little more engineered.

Member Lynch said that one I do agree that that is going to cause a problem. The woodchip path, I don't know that that north woodchip path is going to cause any detrimental impact on wetlands or woodlands in my opinion, it sounds like that's being confirmed by you. But the other one, I do understand and I do agree that if they go in there and start digging stuff up and laying concrete and putting stuff in, I understand and I totally support that. I'm not so much in support of removing the woodchip path, I still think the woodchip path in my opinion would still be able to go in and not cause a problem. I do agree with the applicant on the concrete one.

Environmental Consultant Hill said we did have some general comments in our letter, I believe, that asked that the alignment of the trail be laid out such that it would minimize the impact. One of the issues, I don't think the tree survey is completed for that whole area where the trail is because it's outside of the limits of disturbance of the actual grading for the project. So like I said before, we didn't have any assessment of tree numbers impact or gone underneath or anything like that.

Member Lynch said I understand. What we're being asked for tonight is two deviations – one is the façade and the other one is getting rid of the trails. I've convinced myself, with your help, on the woodchip path. I guess that's all I wanted to know on the woodchip path and I'll get to the façade next. Thank you, Pete.

City Attorney Schultz said before we get too far and maybe to follow up on Member Lynch's description of this as a deviation – just to be clear, so when this was approved, it was approved as a regular old Preliminary Site Plan by you previously. So it's not a discretionary decision, there's no Special Land Use, there's no rezoning, no PRO. So if that path had never been shown, it would have been an approvable site plan that you would have approved. So what they are here before you to do is really to amend the site plan to take out something that isn't required, so the plan in front of you still meets the Ordinance requirements and I guess I just wanted to make sure everybody is on board with that for the path.

Member Lynch said my misunderstanding. So I guess it's up to the discretion of the developer.

City Attorney Schultz said and the façade is different. The façade is your regular discretionary façade waiver.

Member Lynch said okay. And I guess Mr. Necci would be the next one that we should ask for his opinion on the façade, just so we have it on the record. I know we have so many different new materials. What are your thoughts and recommendation on it? Have you worked with the developer on the façade and are you happy with the proposal? Does it meet the intent of the Ordinance?

Façade consultant Necci said I think it does. We went around a couple of different iterations; they agreed to increase the amount of brick on the fulfillment center, bringing it within two percent of the Ordinance. So we're recommending a waiver for that minor deviation, I think they're at 26 percent instead of the required 30 percent. They raised the brick up to ten feet to get to that point, there's really no point in making it ten feet eight

inches for the sake of two percent. With respect to the overage of metal panels, I hadn't seen the façade board but as you can see on the board in front of you, it's kind of a special type of metal panel with a textured finish and a fairly unique color. The original design had terracotta panels, which they've changed to these metal panels but the color is almost identical to the terracotta and the texture is, as well. So we thought that met the intent of the Ordinance, and therefore we're recommending the waiver on that item as well. Both buildings will go together well and they're very nicely designed buildings.

Member Greco said looking at this like our counsel pointed out, I think it looks like they're taking away something but they actually put in something that was nice and wasn't necessary but ultimately upon review looks like something that might be a little bit more trouble than they anticipated. So with that, I'd like to make a motion.

Motion made by Member Greco and seconded by Member Avdoulos.

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

In the matter of Berkshire E-Supply JSP17-72, motion to approve the Revised Preliminary Site Plan with a Section 9 waiver, based on and subject to the following:

- a. The site plan is subject to the approved motion from February 28, 2018 meeting with the following additions:
 1. A Section 9 waiver for the following as listed in the Façade review letter, which is hereby granted;
 - i. Overage of Limestone on the Headquarters Building (50% maximum allowed, 80% proposed on the west, 63% proposed on the east, and 70% proposed on the north facade);
 - ii. Underage of Brick on the Headquarters Building (30% minimum required, 0% proposed on all facades);
 - iii. Overage of Orange Flat Metal Panels on the Fulfillment Center (50% maximum allowed, 45% proposed on the west and 1% proposed on the north and south facades);
 - iv. Overage of Silver Flat Metal Panels on the Fulfillment Center (50% maximum allowed, 16% proposed on the west facade, 55% proposed on the east facade, 73% proposed on the north façade and 49% proposed on the south facade);
 - v. Underage of Brick on the Fulfillment Center (30% minimum required, 25% proposed on the north facade);
 2. Removal of the public and private trails proposed on the Preliminary Site Plan for the south part of the site, based on the applicant's request as noted in staff's prepared memo.

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.*

2. ADELL CENTER PRO JZ 18-24 AND ZONING MAP AMENDMENT 18.724

Consideration at the request of Orville Properties, LLC for a Zoning Map Amendment 18.724 for Planning Commission's recommendation to City Council for a Planned

Rezoning Overlay Concept Plan (PRO) associated with a zoning map amendment, to rezone from Expo (EXPO) to TC (Town Center). The subject property is approximately 21.48 acres and is located at 43700 Expo Center Drive, north of Grand River Avenue and south of I-96 in Section 15. The applicant is proposing to develop the property as a multi-unit commercial development consisting of nine units accessed by a proposed private drive. The current PRO Concept plan includes a request for an Unlisted Use Determination under Section 4.87 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Planner Komaragiri said thank you for the summary of the uses for this project. As you all know, Planning Commission held a public hearing for the current request and postponed their decision for a later meeting to allow the applicant to address some items. As noted last time, the applicant reaffirms that the current unit boundaries have been mutually agreed upon and major layout changes are not possible. The current layout with the revised Concept has increased the road width to 36 feet as staff recommended with a 70-foot easement, which resulted in a reduction for Unit 1, 6, 7, and 8 site access. Internal parking lot layout for Unit 6, 7, Unit 2, and Unit 8 has changed slightly. The proposed end users are the same as presented at the earlier meeting.

We met with the applicant at their request after the last Planning Commission meeting and after we have sent the review letters for the revised concept plan to provide clarification about staff's comments. Some revisions were made with the revised concept plan and some clarifications were provided with the response letter that is included in your packet. I would like to provide a summary of changes as they relate to your last action summary.

The first item is parking. Section 5.2 of our Zoning Ordinance lists standard requirements for most of the uses and the supporting information that is required to arrive at the minimum required parking for each use. For example, number of rooms and employees are required to calculate minimum parking for a hotel. The applicant has finally provided some of the information in response to a parking memo prepared by staff. A trip generation study or a parking study is required for Carvana to establish a minimum required. Uses should be clarified for Unit 4, 6 and 7 to verify the parking proposed. Staff has agreed that as the project moves forward for consideration of a PRO agreement to recommend allowing for a 5% reduction below typical parking standards that can be considered as part of Planning Commission review of individual site plans at the time of Preliminary Site Plan review. This would allow for these unknown factors such as loading and dumpster etc., which are undetermined at this time. In other words, the applicant can either conform to the ordinance requirements at the time of Preliminary Site Plan submittal, or request no more than 5% parking allowed. If the applicant requests a further reduction than allowable 5%, he can either provide an approvable shared parking study supporting such a reduction or the applicant can request a PRO amendment at that time. Staff cannot support any other deviation requests for parking without supporting data at this time.

The revised concept plan shows a revised road width of 36 feet with a 70 feet access easement, as requested by our traffic engineer. The applicant has also agreed to revise the cross-section to include three 12 foot wide lanes. This eliminated all of the engineering deviations that were requested at the last meeting.

Planner Komaragiri said the third item is the water tower. The applicant indicated in his response letter an intention to use the water tower as a reservoir for the on-site irrigation

system for the roadway greenbelt, pocket parks and the I-96 berm and landscape areas, and possibly for individual units. The future and current use and maintenance of this Unit must be addressed in the PRO agreement, at a minimum. Staff recommends that the PRO agreement will need to address future changes to the use, if any.

The plans indicate a 7,000 future building, but information about future uses is not indicated on the revised Concept Plan. However, in the response letter, the applicant indicated a temporary use for outdoor yoga sessions and or outdoor events. He provided the exhibit which is in front of your screen. The applicant may expand on this in his presentation. The applicant should note that the future use and size for the proposed building would be limited by the parking available on this unit.

Façade is one of the other items. Façade review recommends approval for Section 9 waivers requested by Carvana and Drury. Fairfield has provided a letter indicating that they will conform to the code at the time of site plan review. Planet Fitness did not update the missing side elevations nor provided intent to conform. iFly has been in active discussion with our façade consultant and provided revised elevations; this is their Generation 9 design, which is different from what you've seen at the last meeting. A Section 9 Waiver would be required for the proposed design, which was recommended contingent upon incorporating additional Brick as required to bring the percentage of brick to approximately 30% minimum on all Facades. The applicant has provided some revised elevations in the past couple of days and has to provide up to 20%, which can be supported by our façade consultant, with a minor clarification. In the email he provided, he said brick can be raised up to 13 feet 6 inches, so we would like to say support provided either 13 feet 6 inches or 20%, whichever is greater, because we did not get a chance to review the elevations to confirm the percent that the applicant indicated.

Updated information has been provided for two Adell Center development signs and they would require deviations, which are being requested. Information about other signage was not provided. The applicant is requested to indicate how future deviations from Sign Ordinance will be addressed in the PRO agreement.

Planner Komaragiri said another item is the Open Space Plan. The review letters indicate that the open space may not meet the minimum requirement, as the calculations included wetlands. However, the applicant has clarified that they do not. The plan indicates 15 percent minimum as required. However, part of it is places in the southern area which is considered a common element. Some of the required area is also located in individual units, which is circled in red. The applicant should provide clarification as how the open space areas will be installed and maintained on those individual units. Staff also recommended some restoration efforts to existing wetlands and woodlands in the southern area, in order to make it more usable and aesthetically pleasing as recommended in our Wetlands review letter. The applicant agreed to provide the same in the response letter. Staff recommends that the information should be provided with the Preliminary site plan as part of wetland review to be approved by Planning Commission, but not as part of a Final Site Plan review, as requested by the applicant, when they come in for the site condominium and the roads and utilities part of it.

The other item we talked about in the action summary was the deviations that were requested. Planning Commission recommended addressing and/or reducing the number of deviations at that time. The applicant has eliminated a couple of deviations that relate with

roadway cross-section. However, the revised Concept Plan added a couple more, such as those related to loading space requirements. Typically, PRO requests include a Concept Plan that provides details about use, extent of development, and conditions and deviations. The current request also involves a Site Condominium and some unknown users, due to which the applicant is requesting to defer review of certain site plan elements until the time of Preliminary Site Plan review. Staff is unable to provide a comprehensive review at this time that we typically do due to unavailability of that information.

Staff still does not support the request for lack of loading zones for iFly, Drury, Fairfield and Unit 4 based on a few of them being hotel uses or unknown future use, and for other reasons stated in our Traffic review. A copy the response letter from Drury that was provided earlier this week addressing the request for lack of loading is provided as a hard copy in your packet tonight.

Another item talked about at the last meeting is that the applicant should have the opportunity to clarify if any PRO conditions are being offered under the PRO provisions of the Zoning Ordinance. With the response letter, the applicant has offered to add some restricted uses as a condition. Staff is in agreement with those uses. He also offered to provide the recommended Woodlands and Wetlands restoration plan in the southern area as a benefit to the public.

Planner Komaragiri said last but not least, the other item we discussed at the last meeting was to include some other elements to promote pedestrian walkability within the site. The revised concept plan included some pathways, trails and crosswalks with the current submittal. The applicant has provided some crosswalks in the area circle so there is connectivity between the northern and southern parts of the development.

The applicant indicated in his response letter that knowing that the City of Novi cannot support two exposition facilities, the applicant feels there is no viable way to develop the subject property under the current zoning. Staff does not agree with this note. We would like to clarify, in addition to the permitted Exposition facilities uses, the EXPO District also allows professional office buildings, offices and offices sales and service activities, and many other uses as listed in the ordinance. As noted, many of the uses permitted in the I-1 Light Industrial District in Section 3.1.18, except greenhouses and pet boarding facilities are also currently permitted as the property is zoned.

Suggestive motions for postponement, and recommendations for approval and denial are provided in detail addressing all items noted in the review. The motion for approval included a choice for certain items. For each of those, we tried to show which one is recommended by staff and which one is proposed by the applicant. Staff has met with the applicant yesterday at their request to go over the motion sheet. The applicant has made notes to staff recommended motion for approval. A hard copy of it is included in your packet following the usual motion sheet for your reference.

All reviews are recommending approval except for Traffic. Planning is recommending postponement due to many missing items that we would typically expect to see with a PRO request. For those items not shown on the plan, the applicant is either requesting a deviation for lack of it or to defer it to site plan review. Please note that the proposed motion for approval does, to the extent possible, attempt to address those missing items that result in staff's recommendation for postponement. Several of those are indicated as conditions to be

resolved before reaching City Council. The Planning Commission is asked tonight to consider the request for proposed Planned Rezoning Overlay and make a recommendation to City Council.

Planner Komaragiri said also, coming back in front of you, for your reconsideration is the request for unlisted use determination for Carvana on Unit 8. The applicant is proposing a use which is, in a sense, a used car dealership but does not function or appear like a used car dealership, since it does not have a display lot or sales people on-site. The Planning Commission postponed the decision at the last meeting due to its association with the current rezoning request. Staff has looked into the viability of the proposed use at other locations with Town Center district as indicated on the screen and we recommend that the use would be an appropriate use in TC district only in the location and as part of the Adell development. The motion sheet has been revised accordingly for tonight's meeting. Item B under approval motion of the unlisted use motion sheet has been replaced to reflect this time.

The applicant has given a presentation at the July 11th meeting which provided a good background on how Carvana operates. Arwa Lulu is also here tonight if you'd like her to go over the use again. With their response letter they indicated that the Carvana facility would only require 30 parking spaces and a trip generation study to support it will be provided at the time of site plan review. There will be two single car haulers, 22 feet long, proposed to be parked at south east part of the site. This is the type of information we would typically see as part of the PRO request. As you can see, the current layout does not reflect the parking zone for those single car haulers. However, the applicant is requesting to defer the request until the Preliminary Site Plan review.

As to use classifications in other communities that we discussed last time, the applicant notes that because of the unique aspect of the fulfillment center, other communities have taken a flexible approach and allowed it in a variety of commercial zones. The Planning Commission is also asked tonight to make a recommendation whether to allow or not allow Carvana as the described Unlisted Use as an appropriate use subject to Special Land Use conditions in Town Center district.

Planner Komaragiri said we have all of our staff and consultants available tonight to address any questions you may have based on our reviews. We also have the applicant Kevin Adell and his Engineers Dan LeClair and Jason Fleiss, representatives from Carvana, Drury, Planet Fitness and Fairfield if you have any questions for them. I have all of the plans and elevations loaded on the laptop if you would like to pull up any sheet to refer to, I can do that. Thank you for your time.

Dan LeClair with GreenTech Engineering said first of all, I'd really like to thank Barb and Sri for their extensive involvement with us going back and forth and answering questions with them. They've been excellent to work with and I have to say that of all the communities I work in, they've been so responsive to us that I can't stress it enough and I appreciate it. Thank you, Sri and Barb.

Just to go over a couple of the changes, and I'm going to jump through my notes a little bit because Sri covered a lot of what I was going to cover. Some of the changes that have taken place since we were before you last, including the wider road. There were several deviations with respect to widening the road and we went ahead and did that as a result of the comments from them, which has eliminated several of the comments and deviations that

Engineering had.

One of the things was the restoration and plan for the wetland area on the southern part of the property. I've been out on the property, everything to the right of the creek that's shaded on the screen before you – that area is a jungle right now. A lot of different species out there, very difficult to navigate through there; my surveyors can tell you that personally. What we're intending to do is our landscape consultant and our wetland consultant have worked with staff on restoration projects in the City of Novi, they're very familiar with what staff is looking for and Mr. Adell has agreed to go ahead and take an area that may look a little less desirable and bring it into a very nice park-like setting.

As I get further into my presentation, I'll go over that a little bit more. The introduction of some voluntary use restrictions – Mr. Adell was going to do this prior but we did include that as an additional restriction. He does not want gas stations, convenience stores, this is not the location and I think we all can agree on that, so he's just formalized that in our response. More amenities – Sri had included a couple of the items, including what is shown on the plan that's up on the screen. We're providing a little more information in the park areas, the amenity areas, as well as making sure that they are located throughout the development, including the pedestrian crosswalks. As Sri mentioned, we do want to make sure that people have the ability if they're at the hotel and want to go up to iFly that they can cross over the road in a safe location because we are expecting that this development is going to keep busy, because there's a lot of exciting uses coming in to this piece of property.

Mr. LeClair said Preliminary and Final Site Plan packets – this project is going at a very, very rapid pace. Mr. Adell is excited to get this going, he's been working on it a long time, waiting for the correct users to come in, and that's happened now. He's got almost all of the units within this development are committed to, and we're on a time frame to get it going. He would like to get that old floor and that old parking lot out of there and get it to look like Novi should. So we are on a very tight timeline on this; and as a result of this, our firm has already prepared detailed engineering plans, Preliminary and Final Site Plan, and we've submitted them to staff for the construction of the road and the utilities that are going to service these sites. We're hoping to be before you folks on September 12. We've got our reviews back from staff and we're hoping to address that and be before you. So we're excited about it and we're moving very quickly.

In addition to that, Mr. Adell's attorney is currently working on the PRO Agreement, so we're hoping that as soon as we can, Mr. Schultz is working with him as well and as soon as we get far enough along, they're going to try to get that buttoned up. So we're looking at the finish line on this and getting this done very quickly.

A couple of the things that we had talked about with staff since we had last met and we've had a lot of comments and responses even in the last week, including the parking. There are a couple units – one is almost committed, that would be the Unit 7, which is kind of straight up from the right circle right there. We have a restaurant looking at that site. And the only one that is really not committed yet is Unit 6; Mr. Adell had somebody looking at it and it just wasn't the right fit and he is waiting until he has the right fit on that unit.

Mr. LeClair said so with respect to the parking, we have – even with the motions you have before you – we have worked with staff on making sure that we have the motion set up so that we can accommodate the parking either independently on each unit or if we have to,

we'll do a shared parking study to make sure that the parking works and everybody has a place to park when they visit this development.

With respect to Carvana, staff had a couple issues with Carvana's parking and their use. If you folks would like, Carvana is here and they can come up and answer any questions. I know there was discussion about their delivery vehicles. If you would like, we can have them come up now or we can also have them come up as part of the presentation for the Unlisted Use, and that's up to you folks.

Chair Pehrson said I think we will wait until we discuss that.

Mr. LeClair said they'd be happy to. They flew in specifically for this so they'd be happy to get up and speak to their uses.

As mentioned, there was a question regarding the pocket parks and the open space and who is going to be maintaining that. Those common areas will be maintained by the association; just like a single-family subdivision or an industrial park, there is going to be an association that will be set up to handle snow plowing of the road because this is a private road, to handle the maintenance of the common areas including the large park area south of the creek. So that will be set up in the Master Deed.

The deviation list – I want to thank Sri and Barb for the opportunity, we went through and we were focusing specifically, maybe a little biased, but specifically on the approval motion and we had gone through each of those line items in the deviations and in the request, and if I might point out a couple of them. If you folks have the opportunity to look at the motion sheet under the approvals, there were a couple deviations that we were kind of spelling out as options that Sri was pointing out in her initial comments, and upon review and discussions with the end users as well as Mr. Adell, I just want to share a couple of them with you.

On the first page, item number 7 – it basically has the staff recommendation first in group 7a-h, and then it says "Or" as an option and then there is a second one. We feel based on where we're at with that, we actually responded that staff's recommendations would work just fine, knowing where we're at in this process and where each of the end users are. So we actually have struck out that second grouping.

Item number 12 – if you folks have color copies of the report, those are a couple "either/or's" and I would like to explain those a little bit. The loading areas, there are a few of the users, specifically the hotels as well as the iFly, throughout their processes and their operations and other sites across the country, they feel that with the loading area, to set aside a piece of real estate for a loading area and convert it from green to black just for the use of a vehicle coming in and stopping for short durations – they feel that it's a waste of valuable real estate, especially in the real estate market for this piece of property. So what we've done is we've asked for a deviation for those specific sites to eliminate the loading areas. That is the item that is shown in blue. In the event, and we want obviously to explain it to you, but in the event that this Planning Commission and City Council feel that they should have a loading area, then the items in yellow are what staff recommended. We feel comfortable with that, and this is based on the end users saying they don't really need it. But if we need to, the yellow is fine.

Mr. LeClair said and that kind of plays along with item number 14. Item number 14, if a motion

were to be made with the blue on item number 12, then item number 14 probably wouldn't apply because basically it says that if we have a loading area, item number 14 is asking that we reduce the size of it from the Ordinance requirements. So if one were to choose to prepare a motion for number 12 in yellow, then we would definitely want to be asking for number 14. And again, 14 has two options; either way, we feel comfortable with either one.

With respect to the façades on Item number 16, iFly is probably the big one because iFly corporate-wise is going through a new generation. This is probably, I suspect, going to be the first building of the new look of iFly, so it's not going to look anything like any of the other buildings across the country. They're still preparing their plans, so this will be most likely Unit 1 for this version that they're preparing. It's really neat, a lot of colors, swirls. I think it's a really neat building. So with that in mind, they simply did not have the time to meet our schedule to be able to get their new building in for review from staff. So what they have asked for is they've sent us the item I blue that you have before you tonight; they are also comfortable with what is shown in yellow and that basically is that they would present their updated plans to staff for review before City Council, or as part of the site plan.

Same thing with Planet Fitness – their preliminary plans that we presented to staff was basically the façade of another site that was located in Kentucky that is currently existing. They agree that they're going to comply with the Ordinance requirements, so we struck out the items that are shown in red.

Mr. LeClair said last but not least is Item number 17; we feel that we can comply with either one with respect to signage. We do know that a couple of the end users have submitted sign applications to staff and to the building department for their reviews, but there are a couple of questions that they had and want to work further. We'd prefer the blue but we will accept the yellow, we think either one of them will work. Again, this is all kind of coming from staff. And when we look back, with this PRO process, the best time to ask for deviations we felt for every one of these end users, is part of this overall site plan approval. We're showing you all of the cards right up front, as opposed to getting a PRO and then bother staff and having to keep coming back to Planning Commission for each PRO amendment or deviation. A lot of these deviations that were asked don't really pertain to the site and this part of the process, but we are asking for these on behalf of the end users. With that, Mr. Adell would like to talk a little bit so I'll introduce him again.

Kevin Adell said thank you again for taking the time to meet with us, and I also want to thank Sri and Barb and Tom Schultz. Working with them, they were great. We had a lot of dialogue back and forth and they were excellent to work with, so I appreciate that and like Dan said, I recommend what staff has recommended.

The most important thing would be to get approval of the zoning change, so if I can get the zoning change I humbly ask that you approve the zoning change. As far as any deviations with the users, I expect them to follow the Ordinances of Novi's requirements – bricks, signage. I've got all of the users pretty much signed up except one lot and I decided to hold off on what I'm looking at – Void, it's a virtual reality. It's owned by Disney and is another entertainment user. Given with the internet, Amazon, we need more entertainment than retail and brick and mortar.

And then the green space area – Providence St. John's, I worked on an agreement that will hopefully sponsor it and we will have some yoga classes and green space area, I would

provide concerts like every Thursday with the DSO. As far as the snow removal and grass, I would fund that the first couple years to get it going. I'm still going to have a unit there with the water tower so my thought was to fund the first couple years and then when everyone feels comfortable with it, they can take it over. And the green space area is the same thing, as well. I would fund the yoga instructions and also the DSO, as well. And so I want Thursdays when people come out there and feel free to walk around, see the entertainment sites.

Mr. Adell said so it's important to move quickly on this, the users aren't going to be there for a long time. I've locked up purchase agreements. These are all big corporations that invested a lot of money, a million dollars an acre, as well as twenty million dollars for each building. So like the Drury, I would guess, is a twenty million dollar building; and so they are not going to leave when the economy gets bad. They're going to be here, they've got skin in the game. It's different than a Twelve Oaks, where you build a building and the tenant leaves when the economy is bad or their business goes bad. They're not leaving. I humbly request that you approve the zoning for me, and if there's any deviations the users can work with Planning and staff. And I also want to thank Tom Schultz, as well, for working with our attorney. I thought the staff was great. Are there any questions?

Chair Pehrson said we will let you know.

Member Avdoulos said thank you, Chair Pehrson. There's just a lot of stuff that has been presented and the staff has done a great job in pulling it all together, letting us know at least the answers provided by the applicant since our last Planning Commission meeting. And in saying that, one of the concerns when the project was first presented was that we're doing a PRO, we're looking to go to TC Town Center ordinance and the requirements of that particular ordinance are to have it be more pedestrian oriented. And I think that there's been some effort to provide that, but nothing really has changed in planning from what was presented at the last Planning Commission meeting. We had maybe a building shift, I think it's Unit 8 and maybe around 7. But nothing that really pushed the boundaries to make this more in line with the Town Center ordinance requirements. At least personally and based on what the Ordinance wants to see, a little bit more green space. We've got the area around Unit 4 that's been indicated that we're going to have green space there with potential St. John Providence funding, some activities there, but that Unit 4 has also been reserved as a temporary use and at some point, that can be sold and then something developed there and now we lose the green space.

Basically we have a development that's been broken up into x amount of units, that has buildings on each unit – they may be exciting buildings and a variety of uses, and then parking, but beyond that, there's no greenery going through the parking areas. I understand the concern about not having shared parking but then we just said that we're going to have an association that's going to maintain the entire property, so I don't understand why we can't look at designing the project holistically. It just feels like the developer is putting a road through, is creating the lots, is looking at setting up all the deviations and getting whatever in line for future users, but it doesn't feel like there's a push that makes it any more unique than a typical retail development. And so I think I'd like to see a little bit more push on the project to head more towards what the Town Center requires and what it's looking for.

Member Avdoulos said the deviations – I think we're working to minimize those with the City so I appreciate that. And then, if I'm understanding this correctly Barb and Sri, this is a PRO concept for this piece of property and there's individual units. We're trying to minimize the

amount of deviations for each particular unit, but each one of those units has to come in separate for their own Preliminary Site Plan approval and then Final Site Plan approval. So there may be adjustments based on finality of design. So what we have here are footprints, but we don't have the actual plans articulating exactly what will be going onto these sites.

Planner Komaragiri said yes, that is correct.

Member Avdoulos said so that's where I understand some of the issue and concerns trying to get this out of the way, but it's something that I'm still not comfortable with, especially with making this a little bit more unique and having that Unit 4 be something that is temporary and then can be used as something else and then we lose the green space. And then so what beyond the buildings and beyond the venues and beyond the activities that are going to be there, what will be drawing people to the site.

Mr. Adell said I can make it permanent. So if it has your approval, I won't put a building there. I'll keep it green space. I want to develop this project. The way it looks now, it's not going to look any better. And so to satisfy, fine, I won't put a building there. I'm the owner of the 23 acres, and so I won't put a building there, I'll keep it vacant. I don't mind to put that in the PRO to satisfy that. I thought we complied with the sidewalks since the last time we were here, we did more sidewalks. In fact, after the meeting, I discussed with Dan and I think we did put more sidewalks and more green space.

Member Avdoulos said and I think the plan that was provided and the response with the color plan, with the gazebo and the logo. That was encouraging because that's what I was picturing.

Mr. Adell said sure. So I'll do that now.

Member Avdoulos said in reading the responses, saying that you want to do that to your discretion.

Mr. Adell said I'm changing that now. It's off the table, not for discussion. That's a million five right there, I'm happy to give that back to the City. I mean, I don't think there's anyone walking around with a million five here. So I'm happy to take that off the table to satisfy that, if that meets your approval I won't build on there, I won't put a building on there. I'm going to fund having the DSO. I don't think there's a place in Novi that's going to bring the DSO on Thursdays, like strings and saxophones. I can well afford to bring them here. I can have yoga instructions - I don't see that at Twelve Oaks. I'm happy to forgo that building right now; that will stay a green space area. We'll build a bridge to the wetlands, we'll clean up and work with your landscape architect.

The way it sits now, and I drove here, it's now going to look any better. Time is on our side to move forward. I'm a business person. I own the largest religious network in the world, WADL, a TV station in Detroit, and 910 AM Superstation. And so there's no guarantees in business. You've got people that all flew in on their corporate jets here who are willing to drop twenty to twenty-five million a building and pay a million dollars an acre. And so if this doesn't get approved and they leave, it's not going to get developed. I don't know what better I can do. And so this is a great development, it's going to bring 3.4 million dollars in tax revenue. I sat here watching Berkshire Hathaway, and he's asking for a tax abatement. And I know Warren Buffet, he doesn't need a tax abatement.

Member Avdoulos said well if that's the case, then that would be exactly the amenities we're looking for. And I would like to see them working with the City to enhance that area. I would just work with the City to see what works best.

Mr. Adell said if you give me the zoning approval, which is what I'm requesting today. I'm asking with my hat in my hand to change the zoning from EXPO. I don't think the City needs two Expo centers. I cannot use the property, it's making the property useless. Tom knows. If the property stays as EXPO, you don't need two expo's. And so this is a 125 million dollar development that will bring in 3.4 million dollars in tax revenue. Sidewalks, I'm willing to sit down and work if you give me the zoning.

Member Avdoulos said we're not debating, at least I'm not debating the rezoning piece. I'm just looking at taking that step further in what you're rezoning it to, to enhance that. And I think that's all I'm looking for.

Mr. Adell said do you think it's a good plan, looking at it today? What are your thoughts on this, what would you like to see differently? It's hotel, entertainment, restaurant.

Member Avdoulos said I said that it's a good concept, it's great progress. But I think we just want to make sure that as we move forward and we're doing these PRO's that we're looking at people going from one zoning to another to meet the intent of that particular zoning. And if we open this up and add that extra green space, I think we're in the right direction.

Mr. Adell said it's done. I'm going to give you my word. I have seventeen licenses just with the Word Network. I don't think the FCC would be giving licenses to people with lack of candor or lack of character. If I give you my word, I'm not going to develop that area and I'm going to work with the City and staff.

Chair Pehrson said we have that noted in the record for the time being.

Mr. Adell said any other questions?

Member Avdoulos said no, I think we've got an answer. Thank you.

Mr. Adell said I'll make sure you're satisfied. I promise you.

Member Anthony said I think I'll keep this brief, but the offer for additional green space – I like that offer and would like to see us act on it to be able to work it into the agreement. Other than the traffic study, the other area that when we do go through this and if it does go through as an approval – there is a lot there. So I guess I would either look to staff for how we do this motion, and that has to do with each of the building requirements and that we limit or reduce any deviations from façade or from other areas of our Zoning Ordinance. And I presume that, for instance in 16 the deletions of the red text both in a. and b. do that – removing some of those. So my point is that when we do get to that point, that we look to staff for guidance.

Chair Pehrson said and I think it's also been mentioned that these will all come back to us for site plan approval, so we'll have discretion at that point in time as well. We're looking at the whole, not the individual units, right now. I think we have time on those.

Member Anthony said and that's my intent.

Member Maday said so my biggest concern that you addressed already was green space. I was looking at it and I understand the commitment to other places not have shared parking, but I was looking at Unit 6 and 7 – that could potentially be shared parking, which will allow added green space. But if you're proposing to not develop Unit 4, that's a huge game changer from my point of view of the proposal. But it would be nice if there was some type of cross there because if you're at a restaurant and waiting for a table, you walk across, listen to music, and take a walk while you're waiting for a table. I mean, that's what I envision.

Mr. Adell said Unit 6 would be Texas Roadhouse we're proposing. I think Unit 7 I'm looking at Void, it's by appointment only. I think it's 30 spaces.

Member Maday said if we could do a crosswalk right there so that you could walk right towards that area, that would be really nice.

Mr. Adell said I agree, so we'll put that on the plan. Happy to put crosswalks there. The last unit, I'm just going to wait for a smaller entertainment user that doesn't take a lot of parking. And so we can add more green space. I agree.

Member Lynch said if we're just talking about changing to Town Center, I have no issue with that. The green space thing I think is a smart idea. I think what your engineer said you're going to do with the Rouge and the restoration is great. But moving it to Town Center, I don't see any issue with moving it to that district. If that's what we need to get it going, it's my understanding that each of these plans will be coming in and we'll review them all. And as far as the façade stuff goes, everybody is worried about this façade stuff. As long as it meets the intent of the façade ordinance, I guess I don't have an issue with that. But right now, I would like to recommend that we just go ahead and get this thing going as Town Center.

Member Greco said first, I'd like to thank the staff, our attorney, and the applicant for clearly working together both before our first meeting with the Planning Commission and then since that time to work together to come to something that is, I think, going to be an exciting place right in the gateway up by 96 for Novi. This is essentially a rezoning, which I think we all agree is there. Just like the applicant has indicated and the staff has indicated, is there some information that needs to be provided? Yes. I think we all agree on the rezoning and these things are going to be coming back to us. So with that, I'd like to make a motion.

Motion made by Member Greco and seconded by Member Lynch.

ROLL CALL VOTE TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF REZONING WITH PRO MADE BY MEMBER GRECO AND SECONDED BY MEMBER LYNCH.

In the matter of the request of Orville Properties, LLC, for the Adell Center JZ18-24 with Zoning Map Amendment 18.724, motion to recommend approval to the City Council to rezone the subject property from EXPO (Exposition) to TC (Town Center) with a Planned Rezoning Overlay.

The recommendation includes the following ordinance deviations for consideration by the City Council:

1. Planning deviation from Section 3.1.26.D for exceeding the maximum allowable building height of 65 feet and maximum allowable 5 stories, for the following, provided they conform to the 2015 International Building Code standards for High-Rise (Type I or Type II) construction:
 - a. Unit 5 Drury Hotel (84'-5", 7 stories proposed),
 - b. Unit 8 Carvana (75'-10", 8 tiers proposed), and
 - c. Unit 1 I-fly (70 feet)
2. Planning deviation from Section 5.12 to allow lack of required frontage on public road for Units 1 through 8. Frontage is proposed a proposed private drive, built to City standards;
3. Planning deviation to allow lack of required frontage on public road as listed in Section 5.12 for Unit 9. Frontage is proposed on a private access/secondary emergency access drive;
4. Planning deviation from Section 3.27.1.C to allow for not meeting the minimum requirements for exterior side yard building setback of 50 feet from I-96 Rights-of-way for Unit 1. A minimum setback of 32.5 ft. is requested;
5. Traffic deviation from Section 11-194(a)(7) of Design and Construction Standards Manual to allow exceeding the maximum allowable length of the proposed cul-de-sac street length of 800 feet, from the centerline intersection of Crescent Boulevard to the center of the bulb of the Adell Center Drive cul-de-sac. A maximum of 1,540 feet is proposed;
6. 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 maximum of 18 feet is requested;
7. Planning deviation from Section 3.1.25.D to allow reduction of minimum required interior side parking setback of 20 ft. for the following units as shared access is proposed between parking lots;
 - a. Unit 1: 14 ft. along West, 0 ft. along South
 - b. Unit 2: 15 ft. along South
 - c. Unit 3: 15 ft. along West and 5 ft. along South
 - d. Unit 4: 5 ft. along East
 - e. Unit 5: 10 ft. along West
 - f. Unit 6: 0 ft. along West
 - g. Unit 7: 0 ft. along East and 10 ft. along West
 - h. Unit 8: 10 ft. along East
8. Planning deviation from Section 3.1.25.B& C to allow the water tower is to remain on its own separate site (Unit 9). This is not a principal permitted use of a site. It is also not considered an accessory use, since its proposed use is not detailed; provided that the creation of a new, separate legal parcel of limited size for the purpose of housing the tower on its own shall be addressed in the PRO Agreement including, but not limited to, the prohibition of future uses in the event the tower is removed and requirements relating to maintenance obligations;

9. Planning deviation from Section 4.19.2.F to allow alternate location for dumpsters, instead of required rear yard for units 1, 5, 6, 7 and 8, provided the proposed location does not impact traffic circulation and appropriate screening is provided at the time of preliminary site plan. The applicant requests dumpsters to be allowed in exterior/interior side yards;
10. Planning deviation to allow partial rear yards for Units 3, 4 and 5 to be located within the floodplain, as listed in Section 4.03A of Subdivision Ordinance, provided there is no danger to health, life or property are proposed. There appears to be no impacts proposed for Units 3 and 5. A pedestrian bridge is proposed on Unit 4;
11. Planning deviation to allow lack of required loading areas, as listed in Section 5.4.2., for unit 9 as requested by the applicant;
12. 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
 - a. Unit 1: exterior side yard
 - b. Unit 3: interior side yard (no double frontage)
 - c. Unit 5: exterior side yard or front yard under canopy
13. 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:
 - a. Unit 2: interior side yard (no double frontage)
 - b. Unit 6: exterior side yard
 - c. Unit 7: exterior side yard
 - d. Unit 8: exterior side yard
14. 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;
15. Planning deviation from standards of Section 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;
16. Façade deviation to allow the following allowable percentages listed in Section 5.15 of Zoning Ordinance for the buildings listed below:
 - a. Unit 1 I-fly (based on the assumption that no EIFS is being proposed):
 - i. The applicant shall provide revised elevations addressing comments provided in Façade review letter dated August 14, 2018 for Planning Commission's approval of Section 9 waiver at the time of Site Plan approval;
 - b. Unit 2 Planet Fitness
 - i. The applicant shall provide revised elevations addressing comments

provided in Façade review letter dated August 14, 2018 for Planning Commission's approval of Section 9 waiver at the time of Site Plan approval;

- c. Unit 5 Drury Inn:
 - i. Underage of Brick and Stone combined (50% minimum required, 46% on right, 46% on left and 36% on rear proposed);
 - ii. Overage of EIFS (25% maximum allowed, 43% on front facade, 47% on right, 47% on left facade and 58% on rear facade proposed)
- d. Unit 8 Carvana:
 - i. Underage of brick (30% minimum required, 7% proposed on front facade)
 - ii. Underage of combined brick and stone (50% minimum required, 7% on front, 30% on right facade, 30% on left and 39% on rear facade proposed)
 - iii. Overage of display glass (25% maximum allowed, 80% on front facade, 63% on right facade, 63% on left facade and 57% on rear facade proposed)

17. The applicant shall provide necessary information to identify the necessary deviations from Chapter 28, Signs from City Code of Ordinances for I-fly, Drury, Planet Fitness and Carvana prior to the City Council's consideration for tentative approval of PRO Concept plan;
18. The following deviations from Chapter 28, Signs, from City Code of Ordinances for the two development signs proposed for Adell Center as listed below;
 - a. Entranceway Sign Area (Section 28-1 & 28-5(b)(2)a) to allow for an increased sign area of 60 square feet. A deviation of 20 square feet is requested.
 - b. Entranceway Sign Height (Section 28-5(a) to allow for a 15' high monument sign. A deviation of 9 feet is requested.
 - c. Ground Sign Area (Section 28-1 & 28-5(b)(2)a) to allow for an increased sign area of 265 square feet. A deviation of 165 square feet is requested.
 - d. Ground Sign Height (Section 28-5(a) to allow for a 15' high monument sign. A deviation of 9 feet is requested.
 - e. To allow two ground signs on Unit 6. A maximum of one sign is allowed.
19. Planning deviation to allow Side Lot lines between Units 6 and 7, 4 and 5, 1 and 2 for not being perpendicular or radial to the road, as listed in Section 4.02.B Article IV, Appendix C-Subdivision ordinance of City Code of Ordinances;
20. 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 15% of total site area designed as permanently landscaped open areas and pedestrian plazas is required per Section 3.27.1.F.);
21. Traffic deviation from Section 7.13.1.D.to waive the requirement for required Traffic

Impact Study as the site falls under the study boundaries for the ongoing Comprehensive Traffic study by the City;

22. 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 the maximum allowable 4:1;
23. 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;
24. Engineering deviation from Section 4.04, Article IV, Appendix C-Subdivision ordinance of City Code of Ordinances for absence of a stub street required at 1,300 feet interval along the property boundary to provide connection to the adjacent property boundary;
25. Engineering deviation from Section 11-194(a)19 of the Design and Construction Standards for allowing gravel surface for the secondary emergency access road within Unit 2 lot boundaries until construction of Unit 2 site improvements or until an agreed upon timeline provided in the PRO agreement; and
26. The applicant shall conform to the maximum 15 bay parking requirement at the time of Site plan approval for individual units.

The following items shall be addressed in the PRO Concept Plan prior to City Council consideration of Planned Rezoning Concept Plan, and/or items listed above based on Planning Commission's determination:

1. The applicant shall revise and provide the accurate legal description of the subject parcel and the road rights-of-way for the Ring Road prior to PRO Concept plan and PRO Agreement approval;
2. A list of end users for each unit as listed in the applicant's response letter dated July 3, 2018 shall be included on Sheet 02;
3. The applicant shall consider pedestrian activity and connections across Adell Center Drive and to the various parcels throughout the site on either side of Adell Drive in an effort to provide a more walkable district;
4. The applicant shall provide a secondary access point to the parking lot for Unit 5;
5. Sheet 2 states that the proposed building and parking lot layouts are conceptual only. This is not consistent with the Concept Plan as submitted. This note shall be removed; Any notes that refer to the Concept Plan as subject to change at the time of Preliminary Site Plan approval shall be removed from all plans;

6. Changes to allowable uses listed on Sheet 2 shall be made as listed below
 - a. Regroup as permitted uses and special land uses as listed in Section 3.1.25.
 - b. A note shall be added that each of the uses is subject to Use Standards in Article 4 of Zoning Ordinance;
 - c. Drive-thru is allowed in TC subject to special land use and certain conditions. They shall be located within 300 feet from intersection of two arterials. Units 6 and 7 do not qualify for drive-thru use. All references to drive-thru shall be eliminated.
 - d. Medical offices and laboratories is a not a permitted use under TC district. This item shall be removed;
 - e. Last two bullet points on sheet 2 that references to other uses and accessory structures shall be removed;
7. The applicant shall remove note number 5 on sheet 12 since pavement markings will be reviewed as part of the individual Units' site plan reviews;
8. The applicant shall submit additional information as requested in the Planning review letter to allow staff to verify any additional deviations that may be required to be reviewed at this time; and
9. The applicant shall revise the length of the drive aisle in the southeastern parking lot in Unit 5 to be no longer than 150 feet to conform to the fire code requirement.

If the City Council approves the rezoning, the Planning Commission recommends the following conditions be made part of the PRO Agreement:

1. The creation of a new, separate legal parcel of limited size for the purpose of housing the water tower on its own is a required deviation that will need to be addressed in the PRO Agreement. No other use than the existing tower shall be permitted, maintenance of this Unit must be addressed in the PRO agreement;
2. A irrigation plan and any necessary easements that demonstrates the applicant's intent will be required at the time of the approval of the Roads and Utilities plan;
3. The applicant shall indicate the proposed decorative brick wall on Sheet 2, PRO Concept Plan;
4. The applicant shall develop the road with a three-lane cross-section to further accommodate left-turning activities and provide a wider "buffer zone" for large vehicles entering/exiting the various facilities without entering into the opposing traffic through lane, at the time of Preliminary Site Plan approval;
5. The applicant shall provide a list of restricted uses on the PRO Concept plan, to be included in the agreement to ensure a quality development. Some of the staff recommended uses are as follows:
 - a. Gas Stations
 - b. Sexually-oriented businesses

- c. Medical/Recreational Marijuana Uses
 - d. Hookah bar/lounges or similar uses
 - e. Vape shops or similar uses
 - f. Convenience Stores
 - g. Fast-food restaurants
 - h. Fast food restaurants with a drive-through
 - i. Tattoo parlors
6. The applicant shall confirm understanding that they may be subject to certain off-site and/or on-site mitigation measures as a result of the region-wide traffic impact study. Any mitigation measures that are determined as part of the region-wide traffic impact study shall consider existing congestion and network deficiencies absent this project, as well as the proportion of existing versus future traffic, in evaluation and determination of responsibility of such measures;
 7. The applicant shall provide an approvable wetland/woodland restoration plan for the southerly portion of the site at the time of Wetland permit/Preliminary Site Plan approval for Roads and Utilities;
 8. The applicant shall stake the trail proposed on the south part of the site prior to construction to allow for the City of Novi's staff and consultants to approve the alignment prior to the applicant's construction of the trail;
 9. The timeline for paving the temporary gravel secondary access in the event Unit 2 is not completed within a certain period of time shall be addressed in the PRO agreement;
 10. The applicant shall obtain all necessary off-site easements for connecting secondary emergency access to the west prior to Final Site Plan approval for Roads and Utilities;
 11. The applicant shall note that the following would possibly require an amendment to the PRO agreement, unless otherwise agreed upon:
 - a. Any major changes to building and parking layout from the approved PRO plan
 - b. Any deviations from ordinance requirements that are not requested/approved at this time
 - c. Any change of use for any of the units that are not listed as part of the allowable uses
 - d. Reduction of established minimum parking count, below the offered maximum of 5 percent reduction. A shared parking study may be required at that time
 - e. Any future redevelopment for any of the units, other than what is shown on the Concept Plan
 - f. Deviations from the Sign Ordinance that are not identified as part of the current review

12. Unit 4 remains green space and park area with the applicant to work with staff on the design.

13. The applicant should incorporate enhanced pedestrian flow and shared parking elements for Units 6 & 7 with pedestrian crossings.

This motion is made because the proposed Town Center zoning district is a reasonable alternative to the Master Plan for Land Use, because the development will improve a property that is blighted, and because the likelihood of alternative development is unknown and the potential for less favorable development exists. *Motion carried 6-0.*

Chair Pehrson said Mr. Schultz, is it on the record that we also had talked about Member Avdoulos' concern about enhanced pedestrian flow and Member Maday's shared parking element. Should we include that as part of the investigation for the applicant to work with staff as a friendly amendment?

Member Greco and Member Lynch agreed to the friendly amendment.

City Attorney Schultz said so in the last section that Member Greco read from with the following conditions to be included, Member Greco added number 13, so that makes number 3 of the prepared motion which talks about future uses of Unit 4 able to be struck. And there are, just for clarification purposes, just a couple of other references that you wouldn't have picked up to Unit 4, which would be superseded by your number 13.

Chair Pehrson said the motion will carry with that.

3. **UNLISTED USE DETERMINATION FOR CARVANA AS 'VENDING MACHINE FULFILLMENT CENTER'**

Consideration of the request of Carvana for an Unlisted Use Determination under Section 4.87 of the Zoning Ordinance. The applicant is requesting a determination on the appropriateness of a Vending Machine Fulfillment Center as a Special Land Use in the TC, Town Center District.

Paul Magy from the law firm of Clark Hill said I have the privilege of representing Carvana. We think this is a very exciting development, we're really delighted to see how the Planning Commission approved this change in zoning from EXPO to Town Center. We also are here because we believe that Carvana would be an outstanding use and would fit well within this concept that's been proposed with the Town Center. It seems to be an issue as retail has evolved over the years and as there are new concepts in retail, a question actually arose as to whether or not, or how, a concept like Carvana really fit within retail. And indeed, if you look within the Town Center permitted uses for retail, there are a number of concepts that this could fit in, whether as the general sale of merchandise – however, that's defined. But also, in the B-section as a showroom.

We have this merged concept where people have this new environment of retail are able to do their shopping online and either arrange for delivery at their home or arrange for delivery on site. But it's an exciting use, and it's also a much less intense use than one might ordinarily think of as it relates to acquisition of previously owned vehicles. It's a real nice opportunity for the City of Novi, and it's an opportunity for Carvana to make its entrance into the Michigan

market where we believe it will be very successful and it has been successful in other markets.

We have here this evening Arwa Lulu, who is the project manager who flew in. We're grateful for the time that Sri has spent working with Carvana to be able to obtain additional information, have questions answered. Carvana is very excited about being a part of this concept and would really like to move forward if it can, and indeed Arwa flew in in order to be available to you and answer whatever questions that you may have. We believe it fits well within. I'm not actually clear that this use is what you would consider to be an unlisted use, I think it could fit well within. But if you think it needs to be fit in somehow, we're here to answer the questions that will allow you to feel comfortable with that decision that will allow Carvana to be a very production and meaningful part of the Novi community.

Arwa Lulu from Carvana said as Paul summarized, we are really excited to be here and an emphasis and thank you to staff for working really closely with us. Since we are being determined as an unlisted use, Carvana had some extra work to do with the City and we're more than happy to share that information about Carvana. We're very excited about the way that we're disrupting the car industry. We're not your traditional car dealer, but at the end of the day we're providing the car to customers in just a more innovative approach. As Paul mentioned, as retail emerges and changes, we have to keep up with those times but also make sure we can still deliver the same kind of merchandise that consumers look for on a daily basis.

So I just want to thank you again for making time for us, as you remember we were here last month. So we're excited to understand what our next step here in Michigan will be; we are certainly excited if we can be a part of the City of Novi development. We don't typically go with the multi-use developments, but because Carvana is trying to build up their community it is a sense of community when you purchase a car with Carvana. You become a part of that community. It an entertainment experience, the family comes together and joins in on the process to watch the car being unloaded. We make it a virtual experience for everybody. So it would fit in with that Town Center community vibe that the City of Novi is after. Thank you.

Member Lynch said I tried to figure out when the Ordinance was written about the used cars, and it was written several years ago. And I think at the time, they were thinking of these big used car parks on the side of the road, and that's my impression of when that Ordinance was written. I have no issue with the special use, I think it fits in well to the Town Center district. I think it meets the intent – the intent of the Ordinance when it was written was to stop these big giant lots full of used beat up cars. I don't believe that Carvana does that, so I guess I am in total support of the extended use. With that, I'd like to make a motion.

Motion made by Member Lynch and seconded by Member Avdoulos.

ROLL CALL VOTE TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF UNLISTED USE MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER AVDOULOS.

In the matter of Unlisted Use Determination, motion to recommend approval to City Council to allow Carvana, 'Vending Machine Fulfillment Center' as the described unlisted use, as an appropriate use subject to Special Land Use Conditions in Town Center District based on the following motion:

- a. Carvana is not expressly authorized or contemplated in City of Novi Zoning Ordinance as a as a principal permitted use or a principal permitted use subject to special conditions;
- b. The proposed use is an appropriate use in the TC District but only in the location and as part of the development proposed at 43700 Expo Center Drive, and not in other locations in the TC District, and therefore this determination is subject to and contingent upon the City Council's final approval of the proposed PRO rezoning for the property as a whole;
- c. A trip generation report or any additional information as required by our City Traffic Consultant, will be submitted at the time of Special Land Use Consideration.

This motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Article 4, Section 4.87 the Zoning Ordinance and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance. *Motion carried 6-0.*

City Attorney Schultz said I just wanted to confirm that Member Lynch was reading from the slightly revised version that was at your table. The revised item B, with the additional specification that the use is appropriate on this particular site.

Member Avdoulos said I, too, think it's an appropriate use for the site. I think what was interesting and I appreciate you being here last time and showing us the video and walking us through it, but I guess one of the questions from the Planning staff was taking a look at the building itself and what it looks like, the structure of the building. And god forbid in 50 years, there's a use change, and can that building be repurposed into something. And as I was thinking about it for the last couple days, I think it can. There's enough people out there that could come up with some really good ideas to repurpose buildings. Our office is in an old Ford valve plant that went silent in the late 70's, and now it's repurposed into an office building with 40-foot tall ceilings.

On this same property, we have this big giant building that's going to come in that people are going to skydive in, and so that's a big hollow building. And if that ever gets repurposed, I'm sure someone will find something to use that building for. So I became a little more comfortable with the concept of the building so I think, with that and it's not a big giant car lot – it's actually sustainable in the way that it's vertical rather than spread out. It's unique. So I think it has a lot of attributes as to what Mr. Adell is looking to bring to the site and it actually adds to it. So I'm in favor and I think it's a good use.

Member Maday said I just want to say I was worried about the reuse of the building, but given how amazing to me this concept is and how innovative it is, to me it's worth the potential risk of having trouble filling it. To me, it's worth it and I'm excited.

4. ELECTION OF OFFICERS AND APPOINTMENTS TO COMMITTEES

City Planner McBeth said as you know, each July the Planning Commission typically elects its officers – that's the Chairperson, the Vice Chairperson, and the Secretary. And also the Planning Commission makes assignments for the various Planning Commission committees. We mailed the selection form out and we got a little bit of feedback from one of the members. So it has been updated with what we have so far.

Member Anthony said I'd like to make a motion for our current Chairman if he is willing to

remain as our Chairman. You do a very good job of having us all be heard and how you manage the public and opinions.

Motion made by Member Anthony and seconded by Member Avdoulos.

ROLL CALL VOTE TO ELECT CHAIR PEHRSON AS CHAIRPERSON OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MADE BY MEMBER ANTHONY AND SECONDED BY MEMBER AVDOULOS.

Motion to elect Chair Pehrson as Chairperson. Motion carried 6-0.

Member Anthony said I will make a motion again that we remain the same for Vice Chair. Member Greco with his legal background really helps us in difficult situations when it comes to how are we going to modify or craft our motions. I think it's a great asset that we should keep.

Motion made by Member Anthony and seconded by Member Lynch.

ROLL CALL VOTE TO ELECT MEMBER GRECO AS VICE CHAIR OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MADE BY MEMBER ANTHONY AND SECONDED BY MEMBER LYNCH.

Motion to elect Member Greco as Vice Chair. Minutes Motion carried 6-0.

Member Anthony said my next motion is to keep Member Lynch as secretary. He is the steadfast anchor in our group and we will keep him.

Motion made by Member Anthony and seconded by Member Avdoulos.

ROLL CALL VOTE TO ELECT MEMBER LYNCH AS SECRETARY OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MADE BY MEMBER ANTHONY AND SECONDED BY MEMBER AVDOULOS.

Motion to elect Member Lynch as Secretary. Motion carried 6-0.

Chair Pehrson said for Committee selections, is there any changes to that other than the vacancy?

City Planner McBeth said no, in fact the person who has reported in has requested the same spots that he had in the prior year. Other than that, there wouldn't be any changes to the numbers that would be needed for each committee. There was a potential possibility that the Walkable Novi Committee might be reduced from three Planning Commission members to two members. It hasn't happened yet but we did get that indication, so we thought a good way to handle that would be to have three Commission members but two as regular members and one as an alternate. And if that comes about then the alternate would not need to attend the meetings.

Chair Pehrson said are we okay with this selection?

Member Anthony said we need an alternate.

Member Lynch said we've got one member that's not on a committee and I think integrating into the Planning Commission, it's kind of important to have at least one

committee assignment.

Member Maday said I talked with Barb and I would be up to filling in wherever is needed. Based on my background, realistically the Environmental and Walkable Novi Committee would be the best fit.

Member Anthony said put me as the alternate and Maday as a member.

Member Lynch said shouldn't there be two of us on the CIP Committee?

City Planner McBeth said that's true, two and one alternate.

Member Lynch said for now, it's just me.

Chair Pehrson said we can put Member Maday there. And Member Greco as an alternate.

City Planner McBeth said I will update this and send it out by email. If I make any mistakes, please let me know.

5. PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING CALENDAR FOR 2019

City Planner McBeth said it's that time of year, too, to think about Planning Commission meetings for next year. We have provided some suggested dates for 2019 following the pattern that we typically have had on Wednesday evenings at 7pm. I think there are two months where there would just be one Planning Commission meeting, and one other month – I believe it's May – that only has one meeting.

Chair Pehrson asked if there were any objections to the calendar. There were no objections.

6. APPROVAL OF THE JUNE 27, 2018 PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Motion made by Member Lynch and seconded by Member Greco.

ROLL CALL VOTE TO APPROVE THE JUNE 27, 2018 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER GRECO.

Motion to approve the June 27, 2018 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes. *Motion carried 6-0.*

7. APPROVAL THE JULY 11, 2018 PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Motion made by Member Lynch and seconded by Member Greco.

ROLL CALL VOTE TO APPROVE THE JULY 11, 2018 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER GRECO.

Motion to approve the July 11, 2018 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes. *Motion carried 6-0.*

SUPPLEMENTAL ISSUES

Chair Pehrson said the Open Meetings Act and the Pavilion Shores meeting. Mr. Schultz had some comments.

City Attorney Schultz said as I understand it, MKSK has been hired to help staff write an Ordinance text amendment for an overlay district, which would then come to you for recommendation of the text and its review to City Council. Member Lynch is correct that any time that a quorum of you is together, it's an Open Meetings Act issue. So just from a conservative standpoint, I'd be happier if less than three of you were there, but I can't say you can't go. I can say if you decide that you do want to go, it really is something in which you are not permitted to participate. You'd be there to observe, you wouldn't be there to participate. So I would pay attention to that; it doesn't mean you can't go. I appreciate the question being raised.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

Nobody in the audience wished to speak.

ADJOURNMENT

Moved by Member Lynch and seconded by Member Maday.

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

Motion to adjourn the August 22, 2018 Planning Commission meeting. *Motion carried 6-0.*

The meeting was adjourned at 8:44 PM.