

REGULAR MEETING - PLANNING COMMISSION

CITY OF NOVI

November 16, 2016

Proceedings taken in the matter of the PLANNING
COMMISSION, at City of Novi, 45175 West Ten Mile Road, Novi,
Michigan, on Wednesday, November 16, 2016

BOARD MEMBERS

Mark Pehrson, Chairperson

Robert Giacometti

Ted Zuchlewski

David Greco

ALSO PRESENT: Barbara McBeth, City Planner

Rick Meader, Landscape Architect, Kirsten Mellem, Planner,

David Gillam, City Attorney, Jeremy Miller, Staff Engineer

Certified Shorthand Reporter: Jennifer L. Wall

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

Novi, Michigan.

Wednesday, November 16, 2016

7:00 p.m.

** ** *

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Call to
order the regular meeting of the Planning
Commission for November 16, 2016.

Sri, can you call the roll.

MS. KOMARGIRI: Member Anthony?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Absent,
excused.

MS. KOMARGIRI: Member
Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Here.

MS. KOMARGIRI: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Here.

MS. KOMARGIRI: Member Lynch?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Absent,
excused.

MS. KOMARGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Here.

MS. KOMARGIRI: Member
Zuchlewski?

1 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Here.

2 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: With that,
3 if we could rise for the Pledge of
4 Allegiance.

5 (Pledge recited.)

6 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Call for a
7 motion to approve or amend the agenda.

8 MR. GRECO: Motion to approve.

9 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Second.

10 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Motion and
11 a second. All those in favor?

12 THE BOARD: Aye.

13 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: None
14 opposed. We have an agenda.

15 Presentations?

16 MS. MCBETH: None this evening.

17 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Audience
18 participation.

19 We have two public hearings
20 on tonight's agenda. If there is anybody
21 else in the audience who wishes to address
22 the Planning Commission at this time, other
23 than those two, please step forward.

1 Seeing no one, we will close
2 the first audience participation.

3 Any correspondence?

4 MR. GRECO: No correspondence.

5 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Committee
6 reports, City Planner Reports? Ms. McBeth.

7 MS. MCBETH: Thank you. Good
8 evening. I just wanted to report some
9 activity that took place at the November 14
10 City Council meeting.

11 Two of the text amendments
12 that the Planning Commission had recently
13 considered were approved for a first reading.

14 Those related to the Town
15 Center text amendments, related to the study
16 that was completed in 2014, and the other
17 clean-up items that the Planning Commission
18 recently reviewed. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

19 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you,
20 appreciate that.

21 Come now to our public
22 hearings.

23 First are matters for

1 consideration, I should say. Item number one
2 is American Interiors JSP16-55. It's the
3 consideration at the request of American
4 Interiors for the approval of the Preliminary
5 Site Plan, land bank parking and storm water
6 management plan.

7 The subject property is
8 located in Section 4 in the City of Novi,
9 north of West Road and east of Hudson Drive.
10 The applicant is proposing to construct a
11 21,437 square foot single story office and
12 warehouse building, consisting of office and
13 warehouse space and associated site
14 improvements. The applicant is proposing a
15 land bank up to 17 spaces of the required 66
16 parking spaces.

17 Sri.

18 MS. KOMARGIRI: Thank you. The
19 subject property is located in Section 4 at
20 the northeast corner of West Road and Hudson
21 Drive in the existing Beck North corridor
22 park. It is zoned I1, light industrial,
23 surrounding by same on all sides, with a

1 non-conforming residential use property zoned
2 I2, general industrial on south.

3 The future land use map
4 indicates industrial research and development
5 and technology for this property and
6 surrounding properties.

7 The properties to the east
8 and southeast are identified as parks.

9 There are no regulated
10 woodlands or wetlands on the property. The
11 applicant is proposing a 21,000 square feet
12 one-story building to accommodate their new
13 location for American Interiors office.

14 The proposed building
15 includes about 12,400 square feet of office
16 space, 1,660 square feet of mezzanine space
17 and 7,387 square feet of warehouse space.
18 They are moving their current facility from
19 Wixom to Novi.

20 The proposed facility will
21 currently host 21 employees with a future
22 anticipated growth for up to 30 employees.
23 The site access will be provided by a single

1 drive onto Hudson Drive and an eight foot
2 wide concrete path is proposed along West
3 Road frontage.

4 The site plan as proposed
5 would require 66 parking spaces. With the
6 initial submittal, the applicant proposed 43
7 spaces and to land bank 23 spaces to be built
8 when the business expands or if a need is
9 identified.

10 Per our zoning ordinance,
11 only 25 percent of required parking, which is
12 up to 17 spaces, can be land banked.

13 In order to comply with the
14 requirement, the applicant has submitted an
15 alternate plan via email which is on your
16 screens and also was provided in your packet.

17 Staff believes that the plan
18 complies with the ordinance but will need to
19 be reviewed in detail at the time of final
20 site plan submittal.

21 Approval of land banking of
22 parking lot construction shall be granted
23 based on Planning Commission's findings as

1 listed in Section 5.2.13.E which are included
2 in the motion sheet. Planning recommends
3 approval.

4 Storm water is proposed to be
5 collected by a single storm sewer collection
6 system and detained in an existing off-site
7 basin for the overall office park.

8 Engineering recommends approval with
9 additional details at the time of final plan
10 submittal.

11 The site plan is in general
12 conformance with the zoning ordinance except
13 a few deviations are identified in the
14 landscape review letter. Planning Commission
15 waivers are required for not meeting the
16 minimum requirements for parking lot
17 perimeter landscaping and for relocation of
18 building foundation. Landscape recommends
19 approval.

20 Based on the proposed office
21 use, in addition to the warehouse use,
22 traffic requires a traffic impact assessment
23 for the proposed site plan. Given that the

1 subject property is part of the Beck North
2 office park, staff suggests that the
3 applicant at the time of final site plan
4 submittal submit either a traffic impact
5 assessment statement or any other prior
6 studies prepared for the Beck North Corporate
7 Park or other additional information, if
8 determined, as a suitable replacement for the
9 traffic impact assessment, for review and
10 approval by the city traffic consultant.
11 Traffic recommends approval.

12 The proposed elevations exceed
13 the minimum required percentage for flat
14 metal panels, wood siding and exposed
15 concrete, which would require a Section 9
16 facade waiver.

17 Our facade consultant
18 supports the waiver as the proposed
19 alteration will significantly improve the
20 overall appearance of the building and is
21 consistent with the intent and purpose of the
22 facade ordinance.

23 The applicant has provided

1 colored building elevations and perspectives
2 and material sample board to further explain
3 the design. Facade recommends approval, so
4 does fire.

5 The Planning Commission is
6 asked tonight to approve the preliminary site
7 plan and storm water management plan. The
8 applicant, Rick Essig, from American
9 Interiors is here tonight with architect Stan
10 Cole and Charlotte Glaab from Neumann Smith
11 and the engineer Bob Emerine from Siber Kiest
12 to answer any questions you have.

13 As usual, staff is on standby
14 for any questions. Thank you.

15 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you
16 very much, Sri.

17 Does the applicant wish to
18 address the Planning Commission at this time?

19 MR. ESSIG: I am Rick Essig from
20 American Interiors. Thank you for the
21 opportunity to present tonight.

22 As Sri mentioned, we have our
23 architect and site engineer on staff. We are

1 a commercial office furniture dealership. As
2 Sri mentioned, we have 21 associates
3 currently. Very seldom are all on staff,
4 because we have salespeople, we have project
5 managers and we have designers. So on most
6 days, be quite honest, probably ten or 11
7 people in the office and the rest are out in
8 the field, or come for an hour, then leave
9 for the rest of the day or come in the
10 afternoon.

11 We are currently residing in
12 Wixom off of Wixom Road. We have been there
13 for about 16 years now, and we are excited to
14 be a part of the Novi community.

15 Neumann Smith has done a
16 phenomenal job in terms of the renderings
17 that they have done, and we simply want to
18 this building to be, not only a statement
19 piece for what we do, but blend into the
20 community and really be a place that Novi,
21 the community can be proud of and
22 representative in the architectural field
23 that we have done.

1 Our business is the interior,
2 so we want to make a statement obviously on
3 the inside, but the exterior also is very
4 important to us, because it's the whole --
5 the whole mesh that we are doing.

6 So, as Sri mentioned, we have
7 office, and we do have warehouse space, where
8 we store customer products, panels, chairs,
9 that type of thing. So very low impact.

10 So I have been a part of
11 American Interiors for 20 years. This is our
12 first time in doing this, we are ready to get
13 going. We are excited and obviously ready to
14 make the investment with Novi.

15 Any questions of me or my
16 staff? Obviously Neumann Smith can answer
17 architectural questions. That's not my
18 forte.

19 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have
20 several questions. Thank you, sir.

21 With that we will turn it
22 over to the Planning Commission for their
23 consideration. Who would like to start.

1 MR. GIACOPETTI: Through the
2 Chair, I have a question for the applicant.

3 You have 21 associates you
4 said on-site?

5 MR. ESSIG: Yes.

6 MR. GIACOPETTI: At any given
7 time how many customers do you have coming
8 and going?

9 MR. ESSIG: Coming and going,
10 some days we don't have any. Other days,
11 coming and going, we will have six or seven.
12 So on a weekly base, total, ten, 12.

13 MR. GIACOPETTI: If you could, I
14 mean, the way the ordinance is written, is
15 that you can only land bank 25. If you could
16 land bank more, how many would you land bank?

17 I mean, the ordinance
18 requires what, 65, 66 spaces, and you're
19 only -- you're required to build at least 43,
20 land bank. If you could build less, a
21 smaller parking lot, how many would you want?

22 MR. ESSIG: 35, 36. Typically
23 when we have presentations and a lot of the

1 customers come in, they typically carpool.
2 For example, if we have -- one of my
3 customers, Denso, for example, they might
4 bring two of their facility people and they
5 will typically carpool. I mean, normally if
6 they have four or five people, we might have
7 two cars.

8 So very seldom if we have --
9 in our groups, very seldom is it bigger than
10 a group of four people. I mean, on rare
11 occasions, maybe twice a year, we will bring
12 a customer in, they might have ten people,
13 but that's on rare occasions.

14 Normally, it's an individual
15 or no more than four individuals.

16 MR. GIACOPETTI: That would be --
17 the 35 to 36 would be the ideal size for you?

18 MR. ESSIG: 35, 36, 40, correct.

19 MR. GIACOPETTI: Okay. I have
20 another question, but it's for our landscape
21 architect.

22 Rick, if you don't mind, in
23 the facade review, there was a recommendation

1 that there would be some more trees, fencing.

2 There was a recommendation in
3 the letter about adding some more trees. I
4 didn't know if you had seen that and if that
5 was consistent with your general
6 recommendation landscape recommendations.

7 MR. MEADER: I didn't see his
8 review. Let me take a look at it really
9 quick.

10 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Was it in
11 facade or landscape?

12 MR. GIACOPETTI: It was in the
13 facade recommendation or review.

14 MR. MEADER: Basically, without
15 having read it, I think they have enough
16 trees. There is a few requirements, they
17 need to change their calculation, all cuts
18 in. They don't have quite the right
19 calculation, but basically I think they have
20 enough trees.

21 MR. GIACOPETTI: On the second
22 page, on the top, it says additional
23 evergreen plantings are recommended to

1 conceal the trucks, loading dock.

2 MR. MEADER: This is talking
3 about on the east side. There is not really
4 anything over there to screen. I wanted them
5 to actually put more perimeter trees on
6 there, perimeter, parking trees which are not
7 evergreen, just to shade out that as much as
8 possible, that big paved area, but evergreens
9 would be fine. There is not really anything
10 to the east to worry about in terms of
11 someone seeing it. So I wasn't worried about
12 as much about the screening. But the
13 evergreens could be nice. It would block the
14 view more, but I think that you really are
15 not going to be able to see much from the
16 road, anyway, based on how much is between
17 the road and the loading area, which is
18 pretty much behind the building anyway.

19 So I mean, if you want to go,
20 that's fine, but that's not generally what we
21 use for perimeter trees.

22 MR. GIACOPETTI: I am now clear
23 more on your recommendation. That was my

1 question. I support it. Well thought out.
2 Thank you.

3 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.
4 Member Zuchlewski.

5 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Just a couple
6 quick questions for the architect, I guess.

7 I don't see any rooftop
8 equipment in the elevations.

9 So my question would be, I
10 think, is that where they have the delivery
11 door, but the truck coming into the bay. All
12 right. There is no intakes shown on the
13 wall, fresh air intakes or anything. So I am
14 assuming they're getting their fresh air from
15 up off the roof someplace, and so that we
16 don't have to worry about truck diesel or
17 anything like that?

18 MS. GLAAB: No. Exactly. We do
19 have rooftop units, but they are recessed
20 well. So you can't see them from the street
21 level. You see it on the elevations, on the
22 screen there.

23 If we look at the bottom

1 elevation, on that left roof, there is a
2 little dip where it goes down, that is where
3 that well is. All the rooftop units are even
4 further below that, so we can't see them.

5 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Nice.

6 The only other question that
7 I have is that the elevation in the upper
8 right-hand corner that shows the truck into
9 the building. If you look at the concrete
10 floor that that truck is backing up to, looks
11 like it's about 18 inches higher than the
12 backing of that truck, the loading, was there
13 a reason for that difference in elevation?

14 MS. GLAAB: I'm not sure I am
15 understanding the question.

16 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Right in the
17 corner here, as you come up right there, if
18 you look at the back end of the truck, there
19 is about 18 inches that it wouldn't match.
20 So I am wondering is the truck lower for a
21 reason.

22 MS. GLAAB: I think the truck is
23 just shown more graphically, but the dock

1 level is well within the building, so if
2 that -- they have smaller trucks, bigger
3 trucks, the dock level will help to bring it
4 down to the elevation.

5 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: And the last
6 question is, they're going to be using hi-los
7 inside?

8 MS. GLAAB: Yes.

9 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: So is there a
10 battery charging bank for the hi-los or are
11 they battery operated --

12 MS. GLAAB: I believe so.
13 Rick -- yes, that is correct. I am not
14 aware -- I don't know exactly what type of
15 hi-lo they're using. I know there will only
16 be one, and yes, it's battery operated.

17 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Okay. I was
18 just -- if you got a battery rack to charge,
19 ventilation is required for that, a
20 separation of some kind.

21 Those are my questions. I
22 just thought I would see what's going on.
23 Thank you.

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

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.
Member Greco.

MR. GRECO: Just a few comments.
Looking at the review, I mean, the building
looks really nice. I think it looks really
good. We are glad you're moving from so
close, we will still take you. Definitely
take you.

In looking at the review from
the staff and the letters on the -- any kind
of -- I will say either compromises or
waivers seem to make sense, no doubt, given
the site, and what we are looking at, so I am
going to support this.

I assume we have all looked
at the motion sheet, is everyone comfortable
in the amendments.

I would like to make a
motion. In the matter of American Interiors,
JSP16-55, motion to approve the preliminary
site plan with land bank parking and a
Section 9 waiver based on and subject to
items A through H set forth in the motion

1 sheet, and because the conditions and items
2 listed in the staff and consultant review
3 letters, being addressed on the final site
4 plan and this motion is made because the plan
5 is otherwise in compliance with Article 3,
6 Article 4 and Article 5 of the zoning
7 ordinance and all other applicable provisions
8 of the ordinance.

9 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Second.

10 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a
11 motion by Member Greco, second by Member
12 Zuchlewski. Any other comments? Sri, can
13 you call the roll.

14 MS. KOMARGIRI: Member
15 Giacopetti?

16 MR. GIACOPEPETTI: Yes.

17 MS. KOMARGIRI: Member Greco?

18 MR. GRECO: Yes.

19 MS. KOMARGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

20 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

21 MR. GIACOPEPETTI: Member
22 Zuchlewski?

23 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

1 MR. GIACOPETTI: Motion passes
2 four to zero.

3 MR. GRECO: I'd like to make
4 another motion. In the matter of American
5 Interior JSP16-55, motion to approve the
6 storm water management plan based on and
7 subject to the following.

8 The findings of compliance
9 with ordinance standards in the staff and
10 consultant review letters, and the conditions
11 and items listed in those letters being
12 addressed on the final site plan.

13 And this motion is made
14 because the plan is otherwise in compliance
15 with Chapter 11 of the Code of Ordinances and
16 all other applicant provisions of the
17 ordinance.

18 MR. GIACOPETTI: Second.

19 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a
20 motion by Member Greco, second by Member
21 Giacometti, any other comments?

22 Sri, please.

23 MS. KOMARGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

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

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. KOMARGIRI: Member

Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. KOMARGIRI: Member

Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. KOMARGIRI: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. KOMARGIRI: Motion passes

four to zero.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: All set.

MR. GRECO: Welcome.

MR. ESSIG: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Next on the agenda is the Goddard School JSP16-50.

It's a consideration at the request of Hobbs and Black on behalf of Derick and Bobbie Doe for approval of a preliminary site plan, storm water management plan.

The subject property is located in Section 17 of the City of Novi,

1 north of Grand River Avenue and east of Wixom
2 Road.

3 The applicant is proposing to
4 construct a single-story day-care building
5 consisting of 9,689 square feet, outdoor
6 recreation area, which includes two play
7 structures, two canopies and associated site
8 improvements.

9 Kirsten, good evening.

10 MS. MELLEME: So we have the
11 Goddard School here. The applicant is
12 proposing to construct a single-story
13 day-care consisting of a 9,689 square foot
14 building, outdoor recreation area, and play
15 structure and associated site improvements.
16 The project is 2.10 acres located on the
17 north side of Grand River Avenue and east of
18 Wixom Road in Section 16, to the north is the
19 City of Wixom and existing commercial uses,
20 to the west is PNC Bank, offices and Grand
21 Diner. To the east is vacant land and to the
22 south are existing industry uses.

23 The zoning map shows the

1 subject property is currently zoned B3,
2 general business. To the north is the City
3 of Wixom, zoned also B3, general business.
4 To the east and west are also B3, general
5 business. And to the south is I1, light
6 industrial and I2, general industrial.

7 The future land use map
8 indicates community commercial for the
9 subject property and properties to the east
10 and west as well as to the north in Wixom.
11 And to the south is intended to be office
12 research development and technology.

13 The natural features map,
14 there are no wetlands or woodlands. The site
15 plan shows the applicant is proposing a
16 day-care facility for approximately 150
17 children. The building is about 9,600 square
18 feet with two playground areas and a
19 detention pond.

20 There are several ZBA
21 variances that the applicant is seeking. The
22 applicant is proposing 16,959 square feet of
23 outdoor recreation space, where 22,500 is

1 required, which results in a deficiency of
2 the 5,544 square feet, which is supported by
3 staff due to the site constraints and
4 adequate outdoor recreation areas being
5 provided.

6 The applicant is also
7 proposing two canopy structures, one is
8 usually only allowed due to the site size,
9 but we are supporting this deviation due to
10 the need to protect children from the sun.

11 The applicant is not
12 proposing any loading spaces, which is
13 supported by staff since all children are
14 escorted to the building and all deliveries
15 will be scheduled around pickup and drop-off
16 times.

17 The fourth one is the
18 applicant is proposing the dumpster in the
19 secondary front yard. This site has two
20 frontages, one on Grand River and one on
21 Twelve Mile, so it doesn't have a rear yard,
22 which means that there is no place to put the
23 dumpster based on our ordinance. So the

1 location that they propose is adequate and
2 preferred by staff.

3 So the applicant is also
4 proposing a painted guardrail on the
5 southwest and west sides of the property. So
6 the southwest of the building and to the west
7 side, proposing this painted black guardrail,
8 kind of bubbled here in red, to protect the
9 outdoor recreation areas. Staff doesn't
10 believe this is esthetically pleasing and
11 appropriate for the proposed location.

12 There are some shrubs that
13 are being proposed to kind of block it
14 between the parking lot and the guardrails so
15 it's not easily visible, but it's not
16 proposing shrubs along the whole guardrail.

17 The additional reviews from
18 engineering and traffic recommend approval of
19 the same side, opposite side driveway waiver
20 for both entrances on Grand River Avenue and
21 Twelve Mile Road.

22 Staff does support this
23 waiver, however, would like to point out that

1 the applicant should still consider combining
2 their driveway with the future owner of the
3 property to the east, in order -- so there is
4 only one curb cut on Grand River. Grand
5 River is highly traveled, and it would make
6 less curb cuts and less traffic issues if
7 there is only one curb cut on that road.

8 The landscape review letters
9 recommend approval of several waivers as well
10 on the greenbelt trees, street trees, parking
11 lot perimeter trees and building foundation
12 plantings, which are supported by staff.

13 The facade review letter
14 recommends approval and a Section 9 facade
15 waiver for overage of asphalt shingles.

16 The applicant, Mr. and Mrs.
17 Doe and representatives from Hobbs and Black
18 and the engineer are also here to answer any
19 questions you may have about this proposed
20 project. Thank you.

21 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you,
22 Kirsten.

23 Does the applicant wish to

1 address the Planning Commission at this time?

2 MR. DOE: Thank you all. Thank
3 you, Kirsten, for the introduction to the
4 project. Thank you Planning Commission,
5 Mr. Chairman.

6 I'll introduce myself. My
7 name is Derick Doe. This is my wife, Bobbie
8 Doe. We are representing the Goddard School
9 project and we're thrilled to be developing
10 and looking to get established and join the
11 Novi community.

12 We have had a great working
13 experience with the Novi Planning Department
14 throughout the process. It's been a good
15 learning experience for all of us I think,
16 and we kind of -- we have had some very good
17 dialogue throughout the project duration.

18 I think as a result of that,
19 we actually have a better product that we can
20 showcase. We are very excited about the
21 location. We are very excited about joining
22 Novi. We have got a beautiful building that
23 we are looking to showcase, and we are

1 excited to get started here soon.

2 On a personal note, I just
3 wanted to talk about briefly Bobbie and I
4 both, we have got a child that attends a
5 nearby Goddard School, and it's been a great
6 experience for us. The development for the
7 little guy has been just -- it's a joy to
8 see. He's changed our lives.

9 The Goddard School product
10 has just -- we can't say enough about it.
11 That's really what led us down this path. So
12 we are thrilled about the opportunity to
13 actually locate the business here in Novi.
14 And we just want to take this opportunity to
15 actually make available the Goddard School
16 product to other families similar to what we
17 have experienced.

18 So with that said, I want to
19 open it up, answer any questions you have
20 about the project.

21 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Very good.
22 Thank you very much. Turn it over to the
23 Planning Commission for their consideration.

1 Member Zuchlewski.

2 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Kirsten, I have
3 a question for you.

4 There was discussion about a
5 guardrail in the front as you turn in and
6 face the building, the cars coming in. I
7 didn't look for a detail until now. Is that
8 guardrail -- is that like a highway
9 guardrail, medium guardrail or is it -- I
10 mean, or would bollards be better there?

11 MS. MELLEEM: So, I don't know
12 what the Planning Commission would prefer.
13 If it's screened, I think it would be okay,
14 but it's not screened along the whole west
15 side.

16 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: So it's probably
17 galvanized?

18 MS. MELLEEM: Exactly. They're
19 going to paint it black to kind of match with
20 the fence. But it is, I believe, a standard
21 highway guardrail.

22 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: The next
23 question I had, you had a comment about

1 combining the driveways, so that driveway
2 could share with the property to the east.

3 If that was going to happen,
4 first off, would we need an agreement or
5 tenants or landlord, you know, to share that
6 property. Obviously there would be people
7 going back and forth across two properties.

8 So would there have to be
9 some kind of an agreement between property
10 owners to share that?

11 MS. MELLEEM: Yeah, so someone
12 came in earlier this week that was looking to
13 purchase that, and so -- that discussion was
14 amenable to it, but combining those to
15 driveways together, it would be a shared
16 access agreement they would have to come to.

17 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: My other
18 question, and my concern then would be
19 whoever that other property owner is, and
20 whatever that facility is going to be there,
21 you know, or the curb cut as it is today,
22 you've got in and out turn right, turn left,
23 then you have got a straight in.

1 So would there be people
2 coming -- obviously people then coming and
3 sharing that curb cut from the adjacent
4 property, what would happen -- what kind of
5 congestion would we experience so close
6 because it looks like, you're making a quick
7 right in or quick right out, which is fine.

8 The quick turn out east could
9 be a problem waiting for traffic to clear,
10 and then so would there be a possible
11 congestion point right at this first one or
12 two parking spaces to the east? Or would
13 this whole curb cut shift over so that the
14 property shared in the curb cut shared in the
15 middle of both properties?

16 MS. MELLEM: Right, that's what
17 the idea would be to shift it over. They get
18 additional parking spaces if they want to, or
19 if could be green space. The issue with the
20 property to the east is that there is no
21 other space for a curb cut, and I don't
22 think -- we don't believe Oakland County Road
23 Commission would allow them a curb cut there

1 because it's too close, create more conflict,
2 I believe, by having those so close together.
3 So this is a compromise I guess for both of
4 those properties to be able to have that.

5 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Likely, if that
6 becomes a bottleneck, then the people really,
7 instead of going out onto Grand River would
8 probably use Twelve Mile to exit the
9 property?

10 MS. MELLEEM: Right. That
11 driveway is already much larger than we
12 usually see for a curb cut. It has the three
13 lanes. I think their intent was so that
14 there wouldn't be any traffic for people
15 trying to turn left onto Grand River versus
16 turning right.

17 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: I believe the
18 applicant indicated that it's not a drop-off
19 in front of the school, the parents actually
20 park and walk the kids into the school
21 building. There is no staffing up front?

22 MR. DOE: That's correct. Yes,
23 they park and bring the children in. There

1 is not a drop-off option.

2 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: That's all I
3 have. Thank you.

4 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Anyone
5 else?

6 Just from looking at it, I
7 think it fits the property well. Typically
8 when we see this many Zoning Board of Appeal
9 kind of requests, kind of get a little bit
10 nervous. I think this property is pretty
11 much warranted, based upon the size and the
12 shape of it. So I have no issues with this
13 particular applicant or proposal.

14 Member Greco.

15 MR. GRECO: Just a brief comment.
16 I don't have any issues either. I mean, some
17 of the, again, compromises and waivers and
18 things that you're going to have to do going
19 forward from here again, I think they make
20 practical sense with the way the site is,
21 with the property to the west, or rather to
22 the east being vacant, you know, doesn't make
23 any sense for us to send them out to get a

1 sharing agreement. We have sent applicants
2 out before, and usually without there being
3 at least an idea on what's going on next
4 door, there is really no way for anyone to
5 agree.

6 All right. I would like to
7 make a motion, in the matter of the Goddard
8 School, JSP16-50, motion to approve the
9 preliminary site plan based on and subject to
10 the items listed in A through L in the motion
11 sheet, which includes the findings of
12 compliance with ordinance standards in the
13 staff and consultant review letters and
14 conditions and the items listed in those
15 letters, being addressed on the final site
16 plan.

17 And this motion has been made
18 or is being made because the plan is in
19 otherwise compliance with Article 3, Article
20 4 and Article 5 of the Zoning ordinance and
21 all other applicable provisions of the
22 ordinance.

23 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Second.

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

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a motion by Member Greco and second by Member Zuchlewski.

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

MS. KOMARGIRI: Member Giacobetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. KOMARGIRI: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. KOMARGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. KOMARGIRI: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. KOMARGIRI: Motion passes four to zero.

MR. GRECO: Like to make another motion in the matter of the Goddard School, JSP16-50, motion to approve the storm water management plan, based on and subject to the finding of compliance with ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review

1 letters, and the conditions and items listed
2 in those letters being addressed on the final
3 site plan.

4 This motion is being made
5 because the plan is otherwise in compliance
6 with Chapter 11 of the Code of Ordinances and
7 all other applicable provisions of the
8 ordinance.

9 MR. GIACOPETTI: Second.

10 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Motion by
11 Member Greco, second by Member Giacometti.
12 Any other comments? Sri, please.

13 MS. KOMARGIRI: Member
14 Zuchlewski?

15 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

16 MS. KOMARGIRI: Member
17 Giacometti?

18 MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

19 MS. KOMARGIRI: Member Greco?

20 MR. GRECO: Yes.

21 MS. KOMARGIRI: Member Pehrson?

22 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

23 MS. KOMARGIRI: Motion passes

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

four to zero.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: You're all set.

MR. DOE: Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Next on the agenda is matters for discussion. Any of those? Supplemental issues?

Last chance for audience participation. No one in the audience who wants to. Jeremy doesn't want to pipe up and say anything.

Look for a motion to adjourn.

MR. GRECO: Motion to adjourn.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: All those in favor?

THE BOARD: Aye.

(The meeting was adjourned at 7:33 p.m.)

** ** *

1

2

STATE OF MICHIGAN)

3

) ss.

4

COUNTY OF OAKLAND)

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

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

12

13

14

15

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

16

17

18

19

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

20

1-4-17

21

22

23

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