

REGULAR MEETING - PLANNING COMMISSION

CITY OF NOVI

August 9, 2017

Proceedings taken in the matter of the PLANNING COMMISSION, at City of Novi, 45175 West Ten Mile Road, Novi, Michigan, on Wednesday, August 9, 2017.

BOARD MEMBERS

Mark Pehrson, Chairperson

David Greco

Robert Giacobetti

Tony Anthony

John Avdoulos

Michael Lynch

ALSO PRESENT:

Barbara, McBeth, City Planner

Elizabeth Saarela, City Attorney

Kirsten Mellem, Planner

Rick Meader, Landscape Architect

Certified Shorthand Reporter, Diane Szach

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Novi, Michigan.

Wednesday, August 9, 2017

7:00 p.m.

** ** *

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: I'd like to call to order the regular meeting of the Planning Commission for August 9th, 2017.

Kirsten, if you could call the roll, please.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Here.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Here.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Here.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Here.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Here.

MS. MELLEEM: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Here.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Absent, excused.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: With that if we could stand for the Pledge of Allegiance. Member

1 Anthony, could you lead us, please.

2 (Pledge recited.)

3 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you,
4 sir.

5 I'll look for a motion to approve
6 or modify the agenda.

7 MR. LYNCH: Motion to approve.

8 MR. GRECO: Second.

9 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a
10 motion and a second. All those in favor?

11 THE BOARD: Aye.

12 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Anyone
13 opposed?

14 We have an agenda.

15 First audience participation. If
16 there's anyone in the audience who wishes to address
17 the Planning Commission on something other than the
18 public hearing noted, please step forward at this
19 time.

20 Seeing no one, we'll close the
21 first audience participation.

22 Any correspondence. I don't
23 believe --

24 MR. GRECO: No.

25 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Any committee

1 reports?

2 City Planner report, Ms. McBeth.

3 Good evening.

4 MS. MCBETH: Thank you. Good
5 evening. Nothing to report.

6 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Holy cow,
7 you're quick.

8 That brings us to our first public
9 hearing. It's Item Number 1, Text Amendment 18.825,
10 Off-Street Parking Requirements. It's a public
11 hearing at the request of staff to modify Section 5.2:
12 Off-Street Parking, and Article 2: Definitions, to
13 modify the minimum and maximum off-street parking
14 requirements and associated definitions to better meet
15 the needs of the City's current and future land uses.

16 Kirsten, good evening.

17 MS. MELLEEM: Good evening.

18 The proposed ordinance amendment
19 addresses the off-street parking requirements under
20 Article 5: Site Standards, Section 5.2: Off-Street
21 Parking Requirements.

22 Periodically staff review different
23 sections of the ordinance for updates in order to make
24 sure the ordinance text meets the needs of the City's
25 current and future land uses. The planning staff has

1 done extensive research of neighboring communities,
2 comparison cities, and industry standards from the
3 Institute of Transportation Engineers in order to
4 identify areas of improvement.

5 The proposed changes are detailed
6 in the memo in the Planning Commission packet, which
7 was available for review. The changes are proposed to
8 make it easier for applicants and staff to calculate
9 the minimum parking requirements and to be consistent
10 with industry standards and neighboring communities.
11 We currently have a mechanism for applicants to
12 provide less than the minimum parking required by
13 meetings the standards for the land banking spaces in
14 order to accommodate the current user but not to
15 encumber the future users of a development.

16 Based on the feedback from the
17 Planning Commission at the June 28th, 2017 meeting,
18 staff has included language that would create a
19 parking maximum. The parking maximum has four
20 parts:

21 1) Sets the maximum at 25 percent
22 of the minimum off-street parking requirement,

23 2) Requires a special land use
24 permit,

25 3) And does not apply to

1 single-family dwellings, two-family dwellings, or
2 sites requiring fewer than 50 spaces,

3 4) And finally provides a
4 mechanism for applicants to ask Planning Commission
5 for a waiver to allow parking over the 25 percent, if
6 the applicant can provide evidence that there is a
7 need for the additional parking based on typical peak
8 parking period.

9 The packet also includes several
10 articles on parking minimums and maximums to inform
11 your decision, as well as some sample ordinances where
12 the requirements were modeled after for your
13 reference.

14 The Planning Commission is asked to
15 hold a public hearing and make a recommendation to
16 City Council, who will ultimately approve or deny the
17 amendment and may propose alterations as well. Staff
18 is here to answer any questions you may have regarding
19 the proposed amendment.

20 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.
21 This is a public hearing. If anyone wishes to address
22 the Planning Commission on this matter, please step
23 forward.

24 Seeing no one, and I don't think we
25 have any correspondence, we'll close the public

1 hearing and the audience participation and turn it
2 over to the Planning Commission for your
3 consideration.

4 Member Giacobetti.

5 MR. GIACOPETTI: May I start if you
6 don't mind?

7 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Please.

8 MR. GIACOPETTI: I want to thank
9 staff for doing this research that we asked concerning
10 parking maximums. It was very helpful and very
11 informative.

12 I have a question for staff, and
13 this might be for Beth, I'm not sure, concerning how
14 is parking garage space, is that considered off-street
15 parking?

16 MS. MCBETH: If I understand your
17 question correctly, yes, a parking garage if the
18 applicant chooses to build one, those spaces would be
19 included in the parking requirements.

20 MR. GIACOPETTI: In the minimum?

21 MS. MCBETH: Yes.

22 MR. GIACOPETTI: Because in terms
23 of the maximum, I think one of the projects that some
24 of the members had issue with was this very expansive
25 paved lot for an office building, and I would have had

1 no problem if the developer had built a garage that
2 went five stories down or five stories up as part of
3 the building, it was more just concerning the
4 pavement. And I didn't know if perhaps there could be
5 some language in the ordinance that would specify that
6 the maximum -- you know, that garage space is kind
7 of -- work with me here, kind of somewhere to work
8 with, that a garage would be a way -- would be the
9 appropriate way to exceed the maximum indoor parking,
10 or a parking structure, because really you're talking
11 about building up instead of out. I think that would
12 encourage the preservation of open space, it would be
13 an improvement for storm water.

14 MS. MCBETH: So through the Chair,
15 you're suggesting that an additional provision be
16 added encouraging the use of parking structure if the
17 applicant chooses to add over and above the maximum?

18 MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes, that would my
19 recommendation. Like I said, for that office
20 building, to me the solution, and I know that it would
21 have come at an expense to the developer, but the
22 solution would have been to include indoor parking
23 within the structure, and then he could build as many
24 spaces as he feels necessary, but then he is not
25 paving paradise.

1 MS. MCBETH: I believe we could add
2 something like that with the permission of the
3 Planning Commission.

4 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.
5 Member Avdoulos.

6 MR. AVDOULOS: I'd also like to
7 thank staff for the backup. It was very helpful and
8 it really helps to solidify the direction that we want
9 to take as a city and be environmentally friendly and
10 provide sustainable sites.

11 I think with looking at the
12 garage, because we see a lot of developments in the
13 work that we do use garages, and I know that also
14 plays in with height requirements and things like
15 that, so there are other things associated with it.
16 There are cities that I have done work with in Troy on
17 Big Beaver where a lot of the office buildings would
18 allow you to have some parking in front, but then they
19 would want parking garages behind that, so that, one,
20 you're not taking up a lot of land, and then they
21 didn't want to see a lot of pavement, because then
22 that contributes to the utilities and all the
23 hardships that go along with that.

24 So I am in agreement with these.
25 I'm also in agreement with some of the minimums that

1 have been proposed. I think those are -- you know, we
2 just have to roll along with the times. I don't
3 think -- you know, even when you look at some of these
4 golf courses, I don't think six people, you know,
5 drive together. Usually it's a foursome. So things
6 like that just make sense.

7 So I think this is cleaning it up
8 and being a little bit more up to speed with what we
9 need to do, and then with what is going on not only
10 across, you know, our county but within the state and
11 within the country. And I like the fact that we've
12 got some examples from around the country, not just
13 Michigan proper. So I appreciate that. So I'm in
14 favor of these amendments going to City Council.

15 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

16 Member Anthony.

17 MR. ANTHONY: Just to pick up where
18 Commissioner Giacometti left off. Perhaps language
19 could be used such as 125 percent -- maximum parking
20 is 125 percent of minimum parking, provided that the
21 parking footprint does not reduce green space below
22 some percentage or 10 percent of the property, some
23 control that as they're expanding the footprint, that
24 there is a minimum amount of green space that is
25 retained which would then allow or encourage the

1 multiple decks.

2 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Member Greco.

3 MR. GRECO: Yes, I just have a
4 question to pose to the commissioners. Maybe
5 Commissioner Avdoulos is the best one for this.

6 I like the ideas being proposed and
7 the ideas thrown out there, but was there any
8 discussion in Troy or with the projects about
9 encouraging or wanting parking structures, or parking
10 structures -- you know, parking structures may be
11 necessary in like a municipality like Royal Oak that
12 has a downtown area, but are there discussions with
13 regard to developers or even in the cities that you've
14 worked with on whether or not some communities are
15 appropriate or not appropriate for structures? I
16 mean, for example, the one that we're talking about
17 that was a month or so ago that we all felt was, boy,
18 that's a lot of concrete for one building. I remember
19 Giacobetti was the one to first kind bring it up, and
20 I think he was correct. If we put in an amendment or
21 add some of the language that we're talking about
22 today, that would provide that developer specifically
23 with if he really wanted all those spaces, he could
24 build up or down. Now, building down might be kind of
25 interesting, but building up, do we want another

1 structure attached to that structure. Is that
2 something that we want or don't want. Maybe we do.
3 I'm just throwing it out there as far as when you're
4 driving around and you're seeing a lot of structures,
5 is it necessary in a community like ours which may be
6 not as congested like a downtown area. So I just
7 throw that out for discussion. I'm not anti it at
8 all, I just think it's an interesting discussion.

9 MR. GIACOPETTI: If I may. I think
10 that these -- some of these projects that we've seen
11 come through in large part is that these are office
12 buildings that are seeking a sense of place that is
13 somewhat natural, and that's why they're choosing
14 Twelve Mile and Taft as an example. They're choosing
15 it because that's what they want, and I think that's
16 lost with excessively large paving. I think it's
17 better to go up than out to sort of maintain that
18 sense of place. I mean, I think a parking garage
19 would be preferred. Of course, you know, a concrete
20 structure is still subject to all the facade
21 requirements. Despite the fact it's a parking garage,
22 it still has to meet the muster of our facade
23 ordinance. So I think it would be attractive. I
24 mean, I think there might be some consideration as to
25 whether it goes in front or the rear of the building

1 for aesthetics, but --

2 MR. AVDOULOS: If I may, the area
3 in Troy is the Somerset area, so they wanted -- and if
4 you go down there, you'll see some parking up front,
5 but you'll see the major parking garage for the mall
6 behind. And then there are some office buildings that
7 are on the south part of the road that are next to the
8 old Somerset or Somerset South, and those have parking
9 garages behind them, too. So sometimes it's the
10 district.

11 If we take a look at Providence
12 Park, and they look to expand further, they also have
13 to look at the distance for visitors and patients to
14 get from Point A to Point B, so they may look at
15 putting up a parking garage.

16 And it's all -- it is cost. A
17 paved surface parking spot is \$10. You start doing a
18 garage, you're talking, you know, \$200 per space. And
19 then you start going underground and you're talking
20 \$2,000. So there's economics there. But I think we
21 just have to -- if we provide that opportunity just
22 written in, they could decide what to do, but I think
23 if it also goes beyond that 125, then it's a special
24 use that comes before us. But it's -- most of them
25 that we were dealing with were set up as districts,

1 and then you also look at facilities that are just
2 large campus that might want to -- they don't have any
3 more land, so that that's why they go to that.

4 MR. GRECO: Just I pose that for
5 questioning. These are good points being made. I
6 mean, I worked in Southfield at a building for 13
7 years with a parking structure, and it becomes very
8 noticeable when you move to a new job where it doesn't
9 have a parking structure in the winter time, because
10 you never have to worry about either rain or snow or
11 anything when you're going to and from work. So it
12 definitely could be a plus for some buildings.

13 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

14 MR. GIACOPETTI: I think it just
15 compacts the footprint, and, you know, our aim is not
16 packing more buildings in, it's maintaining green
17 spaces. It's a different goal, but sort of the method
18 is the same by compacting the construction.

19 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Ms. McBeth,
20 with what we've provided, do you have enough to kind
21 of move forward if there were to be a motion?

22 MS. MCBETH: I think we do. I
23 think we do. We could present that to the City
24 Council, or if you'd prefer we can bring an update
25 back to the Planning Commission at the next meeting.

1 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: I am
2 confident you're going to wordsmith it correctly for
3 it to go forward.

4 MS. MCBETH: Great. Thank you.

5 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Anybody wish
6 to make a motion?

7 MR. GIACOPETTI: I have question
8 first for the members of the commission.

9 I found the one article that
10 discussed whether or not you should even have a
11 minimum, because it promotes driving, which is kind of
12 thought provoking. I'm not necessarily sure that's
13 good for our community, but would that be good for say
14 at a Town Center area or the main street area or those
15 special land districts that we should have a different
16 minimum for those areas, I mean, in the interest of
17 promoting walkability, or is it just way too premature
18 for that kind of consideration?

19 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Ms. McBeth.

20 MS. MCBETH: So that is a good
21 question. There could be opportunities to reduce the
22 required parking in the Town Center area. A lot of
23 times the considerations revolve around whether there
24 is public transportation as an alternative means, and
25 we don't necessarily have that in Novi at this point.

1 And the other possibility is if a public structure or
2 a shared structure or something were built that could
3 allow for some of the overflow as well, and currently
4 we don't have that either, or a public parking lot of
5 some kind, and I'm not aware of one of those at this
6 point.

7 MR. GIACOPETTI: Fair enough.

8 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

9 MR. GIACOPETTI: With that I would
10 like to make a motion.

11 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Please.

12 MR. GIACOPETTI: I'd like to make a
13 motion to recommend approval of the text amendments
14 for proposed parking minimums and maximums.

15 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: With the
16 additions of the comments brought forth.

17 MR. GIACOPETTI: With addition of
18 the comments discussed by commission members brought
19 forward at the meeting.

20 MR. LYNCH: Second.

21 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a
22 motion by Member Giacopetti, second by Member Lynch.

23 Any other comments?

24 Kirsten, please.

25 MS. MELLEEM: Member Anthony?

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Giacobetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Motion passes 6 to 0.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

Next is matters for consideration.

Item Number 1, Oakland County Security Study JSP17-47. It's a consideration at the request of Giffels Webster on behalf of 52-1 District Court for Preliminary Site Plan and Storm Water Management Plan approval. The subject parcel is located in Section 17, west of Beck Road and south of Twelve Mile, and is approximately 4.73 acres and zoned OSC, Office Service Commercial. The applicant is proposing a fence with limited access gates surrounding the building and employee parking, retaining wall cut into the berm along Grand River Avenue, and additional employee parking spaces near

1 the building.

2 Kirsten.

3 MS. MELLEEM: Good evening. The
4 subject property is located on Grand River Avenue,
5 west of Beck Road in Section 17. The site is the
6 existing 52-1 District Court. The applicant is
7 proposing security improvements to the 4.73 acres
8 site.

9 The subject property is currently
10 zoned OSC, Office Service Commercial. The properties
11 to the north and south are zoned the same. To the
12 west is zoned B-3, General Business, and occupied by
13 the ITC corridor. To the east is B-2, Local Business,
14 and occupied by Westmarket Square.

15 The Future Land Use Map indicates
16 public for the subject property. To the north and
17 east are designated as local commercial. To the west
18 is community commercial, and to the south is office
19 commercial.

20 The site does not contain wetlands
21 or woodlands, but the property is surrounded by
22 wetlands to the north and west.

23 The proposed project addresses some
24 security concerns resulting from a county-wide
25 facilities study. The applicant is proposing the

1 following:

2 1. Surrounding the building and
3 west parking lot with a fence with two limited access
4 gates,

5 2. Along Grand River Avenue behind
6 the sidewalk, a retaining wall,

7 3. On the east side of the
8 building, behind the sidewalks, retaining walls,

9 4. To the north of the building
10 additional employee parking spaces and storm water
11 management accommodations for the increased impervious
12 surface.

13 Based on the preliminary site plan,
14 all reviewers are recommending approval. The plan
15 does require two ZBA variances and one Planning
16 Commission landscape waiver. The first ZBA variance
17 is for the location of the fence in the front yard
18 near the southwest corner of the building. The second
19 is for a reduced parking setback from the north parcel
20 lot line where the proposed new parking spaces are.

21 The Planning Commission waiver is
22 for a wall adjacent to the public right-of-way. The
23 applicant is proposing to cut the berm in half and
24 place a wall on the Grand River right-of-way.

25 Due to the reasons for the changes,

1 security enhancements needed for the facility, the
2 waivers and variances are supported by staff. The
3 retaining walls and parking spaces to north of the
4 building may result in existing trees to be impacted,
5 therefore the landscape review letter does specify
6 that any trees that die due to the changes will need
7 to be replaced. And every accommodation to prevent
8 this will be made.

9 The Planning Commission is asked
10 tonight to consider the Preliminary Site Plan and
11 Storm Water Management Plan. The applicant Anthony
12 Pontone and Mike Darga from Giffels Webster and
13 Alexandra Black, Administrator from the 52-1 District
14 Court and staff are here to answer any questions you
15 may have regarding the proposed project.

16 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.
17 I'd like to turn it over to the Planning Commission
18 for your consideration.

19 Member Lynch.

20 MR. LYNCH: Yes. I guess I don't
21 have a problem with it other than what does the wall
22 look like? Is this going to look like --

23 MR. AVDOULOS: That is my question.

24 MR. LYNCH: -- a barbed-wire fence
25 like a prison, or is it pre-prison? I mean, is it

1 going to be a cinder block, is it going to be a
2 decorative wall?

3 MS. McBETH: I believe the
4 applicant is present and they could answer some of
5 those questions.

6 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: If you can
7 stand and come to the podium and give us your name,
8 please.

9 MR. PONTONE: Hi, my name is
10 Anthony Pontone. I'm from Giffels Webster. The wall
11 that you guys have in question is roughly three-foot
12 high. The color is to be chosen by the owner of the
13 complex. They are mixed blocks. There is cut sheets
14 are available if the Planning Commission would like to
15 see, I'd be more than welcome to supply those.
16 Without a picture, it's kind of difficult to tell you
17 what it looks like exactly, but --

18 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Is it just
19 the wall, or is there anything ornamental on top of
20 the wall?

21 MR. PONTONE: Just the wall.
22 There's nothing ornamental above the wall, just your
23 standard retaining wall block.

24 MS. MELLEEM: In your packet on Page
25 108 is the cut sheets.

1 MR. LYNCH: Oh, I didn't see it.
2 Hang on, let me get to it. Page 108, I must have
3 missed it.

4 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We've only
5 got 47 pages.

6 MS. BLACK: Could I also comment
7 about the wall?

8 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Sure.

9 MS. BLACK: I'm Alexandra Black,
10 the Court Administrator. If any of you have been to
11 the Executive Office Building for Oakland County, when
12 you walk up, there's the sort of brick wall.

13 MR. LYNCH: That's the same, okay.

14 MS. BLACK: It's the same wall.

15 MR. LYNCH: All right. Hang on,
16 it's loading up. Okay.

17 MR. GIACOPETTI: If I may through
18 the Chairman.

19 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Member Lynch,
20 are you done?

21 MR. LYNCH: Yes.

22 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Member
23 Giacopetti.

24 MR. GIACOPETTI: My question is
25 concerning the materials, the fence, the materials

1 used for the fencing.

2 MR. PONTONE: The fencing will be
3 aluminum.

4 MR. GIACOPETTI: Aluminum chain
5 link?

6 MR. PONTONE: No, ornamental.

7 MR. GIACOPETTI: Ornamental. You
8 don't have a picture?

9 MR. PONTONE: Within the detail
10 sheet there will be a cut sheet from Ameristar. I do
11 have roughly a picture of that.

12 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Can you pull
13 that up at all, Kirsten?

14 MS. MELLEEM: I don't have it on the
15 computer.

16 MS. BLACK: It's supposed to be the
17 black style --

18 MR. GIACOPETTI: Black ornamental?

19 MS. BLACK: Yes, black ornamental.

20 MR. GIACOPETTI: Okay. That's
21 fine. That's my only question. That's what I was
22 hoping for.

23 MS. BLACK: We don't do chain link.

24 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Very good.

25 Any other comments? Anybody want to make a motion?

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MR. LYNCH: I can do that.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Go for it.

MR. LYNCH: As soon as I find it.

In the matter of Oakland County Security Study JSP17-47, a motion to approve the preliminary site plan based on and subject to the following:

Landscape waiver from Section 5.5.3.B.ii and 5.5.3.B.iii for a wall in lieu of a full berm along a public right-of-way is hereby granted,

A Zoning Board of Appeals variance from Section 3.1.23.D to allow a reduced parking setback for the proposed additional parking spaces on the north property line,

A Zoning Board of Appeals variance from Section 5.11 to allow a fence in the front yard,

The findings of compliance with the ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters, and the conditions and items listed in the those letters being addressed on the final site plans.

This motion is being paid because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Article 3, Article 4 and Article 5 of the Zoning Ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MR. AVDOULOS: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: There is a motion by Member Lynch and a second by alphabetically Avdoulos.

Any other comments?

Kirsten, please.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Lynch.

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Motion passes 6 to 0.

MR. LYNCH: I'd like to make another motion in the matter of Oakland County Security Study JSP17-47. Motion to approve the Storm Water Management plan based on and subject to the following:

The findings of compliance with

1 Ordinance standards in staff and consultant review
2 letters and the conditions and items listed in those
3 letters being addressed on the final site plan.

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

8 MR. ANTHONY: Second.

9 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: I think we go
10 Lynch and we'll go Anthony on that one.

11 Kirsten, will you call the roll,
12 please.

13 MS. MELLEEM: Member Avdoulos?

14 MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

15 MS. MELLEEM: Member Giacopetti?

16 MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

17 MS. MELLEEM: Member Greco?

18 MR. GRECO: Yes.

19 MS. MELLEEM: Chair Pehrson?

20 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

21 MS. MELLEEM: Member Anthony?

22 MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

23 MS. MELLEEM: Member Lynch?

24 MR. LYNCH: Yes.

25 MS. MELLEEM: Motion passes 6 to 0.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: All set.

MS. BLACK: Thank you so much for
your time.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Matters for
discussion. Does anybody have anything?

Supplemental issues?

Our last audience participation.
Seeing our last audience participant sitting there not
wanting to say anything, I'm going to subject that we
close the audience participation.

We'll look for a motion to adjourn.

MR. LYNCH: Motion to adjourn.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: All those in
favor?

THE BOARD. Aye.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thanks. We
stand adjourned.

(The meeting was adjourned a 7:26 p.m.)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, Diane L. Szach, do hereby certify that I have recorded stenographically the proceedings had and testimony taken in the above-entitled matter at the time and place hereinbefore set forth, and I do further certify that the foregoing transcript, consisting of (28) pages, is a true and correct transcript of my said stenograph notes.

Diane L. Szach

Diane L. Szach, CSR-3170
(Acting in Wayne County)
Oakland County, Michigan
My Commission Expires: 3/9/18

August 21, 2017.