



# PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

CITY OF NOVI

Regular Meeting

**April 11, 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 Howard (7:05 pm),  
Member Lynch, Member Maday, Chair Pehrson

**Absent:** Member Greco (excused)

**Also Present:** Barbara McBeth, City Planner; Sri Komaragiri, Planner; Lindsay Bell,  
Planner; Rick Meader, Landscape Architect; Beth Saarela, City  
Attorney

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Member Maday 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 APRIL 11, 2018 AGENDA MOTION MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER AVDOULOS.

**Motion to approve the April 11, 2018 Planning Commission Agenda. Motion carried  
5-0.**

## AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

Brian Cartwright, 246 Wainwright, said this is regarding the Robertson proposed townhouses, apartments, whatever you wish to call them, project along Old Novi Rd. And I wish to ask you a quick question and that is that how many of you live north of Twelve Mile?

Chair Pehrson said it's not a question and answer session, sir.

Mr. Cartwright said ok. Then let's continue and what it is that I'm providing you an opportunity. What it has been is that we have met with the developers twice. They are proposing three-story townhouses, 57 units, in a very small plot of land. That does not fit our community, our lifestyle north of Twelve Mile along the lakes.

We have blasted them verbally, packing the meetings, telling them no. Do you have another proposal, no. They said they know it does not fit the other houses, they know there's going to be problems, but all they say is "it's marketable" because they put it up Royal Oak, they put it up in Sterling Heights, they put up this exact thing that's everywhere else. They have nothing else to propose.

Mr. Cartwright said it does not fit, if you've driven along Old Novi you know, yes something has got to go there, there's blank land there. We realize, something has got to be there. This is not it, giant three-story buildings that are going to look down on everybody else that are one-story, maybe bi-levels, and that's it. We've got a completely different lifestyle, this does not fit our area, and we want at least some options and not have this driven down our throat which is not going to fit the area and is going to cause havoc along Old Novi, which can't handle any more traffic than it has right now. Thank you.

Dorothy Duchesneau, 125 Henning, said while perusing the City website over the weekend, I ran into information about a recent development called Manchester, located on the southeast corner of New Novi and Thirteen. I found it interesting that on a relatively major intersection, New Novi Road and Thirteen, with an existing Rite-Aid and an existing Shell Gas Station already on the two corners, and with a large amount of available land back then, that it was determined by the developer that no new businesses could be supported at that location because of a lack of population.

I found it more interesting that the City bought that argument and they let it turn into all housing. Not a pizza carryout, not a nail salon, not a major grocery store, not a dollar store, not a bank office, not a McDonald's, not even a drive-through Starbucks for those that are going up to M-5 or that are going to 275 and 6-96 in the morning. Nothing that provides any benefit to the surrounding, existing residents of the north of Novi, or induces anybody else from surrounding communities to do anything but drive by. More housing. No wonder my spending money goes to Walled Lake, it goes to Wixom, it goes to Commerce, and it goes to West Bloomfield. Nothing for me to buy.

On the other hand, on a tiny sliver of land across from and facing Pavilion Shore Park, and I'm referring to this area right in here, less than a mile from this main intersection on the north, and I mean on lots that are 100-110 feet deep, on two connecting residential subdivision streets. Thirteen Mile Road is considered residential, South Lake Drive is residential, Old Novi Road at that point is residential. 25 mile per hour speed limits. We don't even have a traffic light any longer.

Ms. Duchesneau said on this sliver, backing up to 90-year-old subdivisions, some non-thinking bean-counter consultant recommended commercial development, inspired by the natural and recreational features of the park and lake. Seasonal and year-round restaurant and entertainment, related goods and services such as sales, instruction, healthy food, fitness-related clothing, even rentals. Don't know why. You're not allowed to walk into Walled Lake from the shore of Pavilion Shore Park so that eliminates paddleboards, kayaks, canoes, and floaty toys. But you could put in worms. Except they already sell them at this little market down here called Lakeview Market.

To top it off, the recommendation is that the seasonal businesses use their parking in the back behind their business. The lots are only 100-110 feet. Residents already live back there, would you want business parking within five feet of your backyard? The concept in the Master Plan of creating a Pavilion Shore village out of selected lots of existing subdivisions had good intentions, but this needs to be totally revisited. I'd rather see that little corner gas station up here get turned into a walk-up ice cream stand, hot dog stand, coffee shop. That would be a good use to walk to from the park. Help somebody figure out how to remediate that contaminated parcel so that it's useful instead of an eyesore. Thank you.

Suzanne Ricks, 154 Linhart St, said I am here also because of the Robertson project. I'm a transplant to Novi from Rochester Hills, I moved here because of the diversity, the excellence of the community, the education for our people. And I picked a home because I wanted to have a lake living style. And I picked a lifestyle by living on Linhart Street and

although you can't stop progress, we can't let this be rezoned and change the flavor of our lake lifestyle. We can be challenged in ways to make these really cool properties be developed into homes for people where they can benefit the lake and the surrounding community.

There's also a lot of wildlife living in this area. They're going to be filling in a wetland area, if you see here, and that is really essential to the watershed surrounding the lake. This is all really important. We have swans, we have deer, that are just standing in our backyards and please don't change this. Challenge our community to make something that's very worthwhile and that would bring even more people to our community. Thank you.

John Thomson, 2350 Shawood St, said I'm a transplant from the City of Detroit. I've lived on Shawood for 38 years now and I can't think of a better place to live. All the homes in this surrounding area are single-family homes, a lot of them are mostly one-story. I moved here because of the atmosphere of the neighborhood, it was quiet, a lot of nature, it's really a nice place to come home after work and relax and appreciate the surrounding area.

I understand Robertson Homes is about to develop or are in the process of developing three-story residence in a small area just north of where we live. And they don't fit in with the size plus not fitting in this area. We were told at one of the meetings by a representative of Robertson Homes that they can't build any other style of residence except a massive, large capacity residence.

My wife and I drove by, this past weekend, Summit Street just east of Milford Road. Robertson Homes was building homes, single-family homes, single-family dwellings, that covered about 3 or 4 blocks in that area. They do build those homes, they told us that they didn't but they do. This is something that might be more appropriate for RA, I know it's hard to stop progress, that's a little unreasonable. That land is open and it's probably prime for development but we don't need large three-story buildings in our neighborhood. They don't fit, it's not what we're accustomed to.

Mr. Thomson said one thing, I don't know what kind of impact this statement would make, but it seems like our area that has been referred to as the North End for years, seems to be the stepchild of Novi. We lack to get any resources or attention from the City of Novi, and now there's an awful lot of attention in that area where we're at. So those are my feelings, I appreciate your listening. Thank you.

Michel Duchesneau, 1191 South Lake Drive, said I was here at your last meeting and presented the RM-2 requirements with the 75-foot front, rear, and side yard setbacks and clearly showed at that time that these lots are not buildable, other than this one here.

The reason I want to talk tonight is I want to talk a little bit about the similar dissimilar ordinance and some issues concerning when it is applied. The ordinance is also known as the gross dissimilarity ordinance. And paraphrasing the ordinance, it's 3.7.1, it says that for single family detached dwellings in the RA and R-1 through R-4 zoning districts, new dwellings shall not be grossly dissimilar in exterior design and appearance from dwellings in the surrounding area. No gross dissimilarity's are allowed for new dwellings.

Mr. Duchesneau said the ordinance then lists several adverse impacts to neighborhoods not complying with this requirement. It's a pretty lengthy list and you've heard it here tonight and you'll hear it again in the future. The Zoning Ordinance never envisioned building three-story single family attached homes in a platted R-4 subdivision.

In keeping with the intent of the Zoning Ordinance, the gross dissimilarity requirement needs

to be applied to any PRO Overlay that goes into this area in an existing subdivision. In particular, the gross dissimilarity requirement should be applied to the area known as Pavilion Shore Village located south of Thirteen Mile on Old Novi Road. This area can still be developed in a manner that meets the similar dissimilar ordinance. Thank you.

Steve Angus, 145 Linhart, said I spoke the last time and I feel strongly, like my other neighbors, that I'm against this. And I want to make sure that we do not rezone this. I took time away from my family, from my children, tonight to be here again.

One of our neighbors went and took some pictures of the property over in Royal Oak and I want to make sure that everybody can see these pictures. But you can see in the property that if you do not park in the garage, there's no parking and they had a plan for a few parking spaces but really did not have a plan for all these residents to park, 57 units on three acres. So my wife is really concerned, I have young children, that their plan is to exit on these local side streets, actually on my street on Linhart.

I'll show you kind of where their plan is. So they plan on exiting out on Linhart, as well as Wainwright, these local streets. We already have a lot of residents that actually people go through and try to cut the light in this area, so when you add 57 more homes in this area, and you can see that there's no extra parking, right, at this Royal Oak property, right, so if there's a Super Bowl party, or I think we might have some Michigan or Michigan State fans here. If they come for a game, where are those people going to park, right, friends and the neighbors, right? So there's already increase of 100 to 120 to 130 cars in the area. If they invite their friends over, there's nowhere for them to park.

Mr. Angus said thank you again for listening to me and I'll probably be back again when Robertson does present their proposal but I wanted you guys to see our concerns first and actually see some of the pictures of the exact properties that they're putting up over in Royal Oak. Thank you again.

Mike Atkinson, 220 Pleasant Cove Drive, said I moved here three years ago and the reason I decided to move here was when I found this gem, open lots, very eclectic. It was up north near the city. And the Robertson project, if it goes up, where it is on Old Novi Road will be extremely congested. The infrastructure of the road is not equipped to handle the additional hundred cars, which will absolutely bring down the property value of all of our homes. Not to mention, we're going to have all kinds of traffic which the country, northern element of the neighborhood is what actually gives it its value. So by putting up this project or allowing this project to take place, you're actually scarring the neighborhood. Thank you.

Maureen Zack, 359 South Lake Drive, said I'm talking about the proposed Robertson Brothers townhouse development near the corner of Thirteen Mile and Old Novi Road. Please do not change the existing zoning from B-3 and R-4 as is being proposed. Please keep it as it is. These townhouses would be wedged into an existing neighborhood where they just don't belong. Thank you.

Jerilynn Meldrum, 2027 Austin Drive, said I back right up to this. I'd like to ask that you do not change our R-4 residential zoning. I'd like to ask you to please hold true to our own City's Master Plan with regard to this neighborhood, my neighborhood. It clearly states multiple times the character, the uniqueness, the beauty, the natural surroundings. I mean, to quote it exactly from the Master Plan adopted on July 26, 2017 I quote the Walled Lake area predates most other development in the City and the City should develop a framework in which the neighborhood can continue to evolve without the loss of the basic atmosphere that makes it distinctive. Replacing multi-family looming over our homes, 57 condos in the middle of our neighborhood, these kind of condos are used to buffer industrial zones

against residents, are coming right into the middle of our neighborhood and it just doesn't fit.

Page 53 says the plan recognizes that the preservation of existing neighborhoods and the way of life they provide is key to preserving the character of Novi. It's awesome there. Please be my guest, come use my kayaks, come enjoy it. It's the most remarkable area in Novi as far as I am concerned. To do this to this neighborhood is taking away from every bit of its charm, its character, its authenticity. It would just be horrible. This particular neighborhood features many of the smallest single-family lots in the City and is generally an eclectic neighborhood with many architectural styles and homes built in many different eras. Improving and expanding homes without sacrificing the shoreline community character that make it attractive is the biggest challenge in this area. Ok, so embrace it.

Ms. Meldrum said this builder, I just noticed, a new home built in 2015 by Robertson Brother builders – this is on Tracey Trail, just a little bit that they got to build these same models right off Twelve and a Half Mile at like Old Novi or Novi Road. The seller put in most options available, this is right off the MLS listing, the seller has such high standards that she's already replaced the hardwood flooring. That doesn't scream quality. Hardwood floors are for life. It's not two years of walking on. It's not quality, it's not Novi standard quality. It doesn't adhere to the neighborhood.

My house was built in 1950, it's built on the property line. When I say I back right up to this development, the proposed parking for the liquor store or party store has cars able to drive three feet from my structure. So I live where it used to be a road and they closed that road so I had a front yard. Well now my house, my front and back yards used to be my side lots. So you can imagine, I'm not exaggerating. Three feet from my wall, from my oldest daughter's bedroom window, headlights. This is not preserving my quality of life, this does not preserve anybody's quality of life in the area, it really takes away from it. So I'd really just like to ask that we do what we say we're going to do in our own Master Plan. Please don't change my neighborhood's zoning. Thank you.

## **CORRESPONDENCE**

There was no correspondence.

## **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

There were no Committee Reports.

## **CITY PLANNER REPORT**

City Planner McBeth said included on the table this evening is the Planning Commission 2017 Annual Report. It outlines some of the many items that the Planning Commission reviewed last calendar year 2017. Six text amendments, five rezoning requests, 26 site plans, along with several other items including the Capital Improvement Program and the approval of the Master Plan for Land Use. You can keep that report for your records and we'll also put a copy of that on the webpage.

## **MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION**

### **1. LUCARI INVESTMENTS BUILDING IMPROVEMENTS JSP18-03**

Consideration at the request of Lucari Investments for Preliminary Site Plan and Storm Water Management plan approval for expansion of existing legal non-conforming structure. The subject property contains 3.12 acres and is located in Section 23, on the North side of Ten Mile road, west of railroad tracks. The applicant is proposing to remove a part of the front portion, and replacing it with slightly larger addition. The proposed addition results in a net increase of 957 square feet to the existing building of

5,129 square feet. The existing building is a legal non-conforming building as it does not conform to the setback requirements. There are no changes to the parking lot proposed. Few landscape enhancements are proposed.

Planner Komaragiri said the subject property is located on the north side of Ten Mile Road between Novi Road and the railroad. It is currently being used for office and outside storage space for Lucari Investments. It is zoned I-2 General Industrial surrounded by I-1 and I-2 on all sides. The Future Land Use map identifies this property and surrounding properties as heavy Industrial use and light industrial uses. There are no wetlands and woodlands on this property.

The existing building is considered a legally non-conforming structure as it does not meet the minimum front and side building setback requirements for the I-2 district. The applicant is proposing to remove the projected portion of the building which is approximately 1,600 square feet and replacing it with about 2,500 square feet, thus creating a net increase of about 950 square feet in building expansion. The net expansion is shown in yellow on the screen. The proposed addition is resulting in increasing the existing non-conformity by reducing the front building setback further by 4 feet and side yard setback by additional 8 feet. A site plan would require Planning Commission's approval if changes to existing non-conforming structure are proposed, prior to seeking Zoning Board of Appeals approval.

The applicant has worked with our landscape architect to identify the proper means to screen existing storage from the adjacent properties and Ten Mile Right-of-Way. Landscape improvements to the site include a 3 foot masonry wall in lieu of a berm, some building foundation landscaping and additional buffer trees. No additional changes to the site are proposed at this time.

Planner Komaragiri said it is staff's opinion that the proposed landscape improvements would provide better screening of outside storage use and provide a much better curb appeal. The existing conditions, as you can see from the picture in front of you, do not include any kind of landscaping in the front yard at this time. Proposed elevations eliminate the existing mansard roof and provide a significant improvement to the building façade from all sides.

Due to limited space available in the front yard and constraints due to existing conditions, the proposed improvements would require certain waivers from Landscape requirements, which are supported by staff. Additional on-site storm water improvements are not required due to the limited size of the proposed addition. Engineering is recommending approval.

The Planning Commission is asked tonight to approve the Preliminary Site Plan and Storm Water Management. The applicant Steve Agazzi is here tonight if you have any questions for him. We will be glad to answer any questions you have for us. Thank you.

Chair Pehrson said for the record, I'd like to acknowledge that Member Howard joined us at 7:05pm this evening.

Steve Agazzi on behalf of Lucari Investments, 42900 Ten Mile Road, said I'd like to thank the members of the Planning Commission for site plan consideration. We feel we've worked diligently to meet the Ordinance. We had some struggles with the landscaping, but were able, to the best of our ability, to do as much as we can to meet and in some cases exceed the Ordinance.

We also did some architectural changes to the front of the masonry and the office

addition has a recommendation from the façade review, as well. We bought the property in 2014, we're in Farmington Hills. I'm second generation after my father in Farmington Hills. I live in Northville and we plan on making Novi our home.

Mr. Agazzi said we kindly ask for the support of the members. The building was built in 1967, I think it's seen its life cycle and we've made some substantial improvements that I think are going to truly benefit the Ten Mile corridor. We're making an investment in Novi and I think, you can see from the pictures, that it will really enhance the Ten Mile corridor with the proposed landscaping and full height masonry. So again I'd kindly ask for the members' support and I can answer any questions if there are any.

Member Lynch said there are two correspondences from the adjacent businesses. One is from Outdoor Accents, Inc. Mark Garmo, he approves. Tremar Industries, Cesar Damino also approves.

Chair Pehrson turned it over the Planning Commission for their consideration.

City Attorney Saarela said I have one comment. So we have mentioned here that any approval here would be subject to the applicant getting two variances for setbacks because it's an existing non-conforming structure. We just wanted to add, there would be one more variance to that, it would be a variance from the section 7.1.4.a regarding expansions of non-conforming structures, which says no such structure may be enlarged or altered in a way which increases its non-conformity. Such structures may be enlarged or altered in a way which does not increase its non-conformity. In this case, it's increasing the non-conformity so there will need to be a variance from that specific section in addition to the setback variance.

Chair Pehrson asked which section was it?

City Attorney Saarela said it's Section 7.1.4.a of the Zoning Ordinance.

Chair Pehrson said thank you Ms. Saarela.

Member Lynch said it appears that this site has been here for quite a while. It's an industrial site, at that time there was no landscaping requirement on that site. It looks like in order to meet the landscaping requirements, I mean it would be impossible. But the applicant is putting in new façade, putting in greenery, and that's the best he can do. I looked at it, it didn't seem like he could put much more there? Rick, are you pleased with it?

Landscape Architect Meader said I agree, I think they've done a great job. Some of the variances are for perimeter trees that there's not room for them. So I'm comfortable with any of the landscaping waivers they're asking for.

Member Lynch said so it looks like most of the waivers here are landscaping. They do have a couple about the minimum front yard, I don't see an issue with that. Side yard, I don't see an issue. To be quite honest with you, I haven't read 7.1.4.a, so I'm looking for counsel from my Chairman who probably knows more before I vote on this, but I'm certainly in favor.

City Attorney Saarela said you won't have to make the variance for that, that'll be going to ZBA.

Member Lynch said ok. With that, I'd like to make a motion.

Motion made by Member Lynch and seconded by Member Avdoulos.

**ROLL CALL VOTE TO APPROVE PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER AVDOULOS.**

In the matter of Lucari Investments: Building Improvements JSP18-03, motion to approve the Preliminary Site Plan for expansion of existing legal non-conforming structure based on and subject to the following:

- a. Landscape waiver from Section 5.5.3.B.ii and iii to allow the reduction of greenbelt width (25 feet required, 20-22 feet existing non-conforming, 18.3 feet proposed) along Ten Mile Road frontage as the appearance of the site will be much improved from existing conditions, even with a reduced greenbelt, which is hereby granted;
- b. Landscape waiver from Section 5.5.3.B.ii and iii to allow a 3 foot tall masonry wall in lieu of a required berm along Ten Mile Road frontage, due to lack of space, which is hereby granted;
- c. Landscape waiver from 5.5 for lack of adequate screening for loading zone as the proposed improvements will enhance the screening required, which is hereby granted;
- d. Landscape waiver from Sec. 5.5.3.C. for not providing the required interior islands as the required tree is provided in a suitable location;
- e. Landscape waiver from 5.5.3.C.(3) Chart footnote for missing parking lot trees as there is no room on the west end of the lot for trees, and other required landscaping and a screening wall is proposed along the south side of the parking lot, which is hereby granted;
- f. Landscape waiver from 5.5.3.E.i.c and LDM 1.d. for allowing absence of street trees due to conflict with an existing underground sanitary sewer line, which is hereby granted;
- g. The findings of compliance with Ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters and the conditions and the items listed in those letters being addressed on the Electronic stamping set;
- h. A Zoning Board of Appeals variance from Section 3.1.19.D. for reduction of minimum front yard setback for building (100 feet required, 22 feet existing non-conforming and 18 feet proposed);
- i. A Zoning Board of Appeals variance from Section 3.1.19.D. for reduction of minimum side yard setback for building (50 feet required, 20 feet existing non-conforming and 12 feet proposed); and
- j. A Zoning Board of Appeals variance from Section 7.1.4.a, for the expansion of an existing non-conforming structure.

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.*

**ROLL CALL VOTE TO APPROVE THE STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER MADAY.**

In the matter of Lucari Investments: Building Improvements JSP18-03, motion to approve the Stormwater Management Plan based on and subject to the findings of compliance with Ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters, and the conditions and items listed in those letters being addressed on the Final Site Plan. This motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Chapter 11 of the Code of Ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance. *Motion carried 6-0.*



## **2. CORRIGAN WAREHOUSE JSP18-05**

Consideration of the request of Corrigan Moving Systems for Preliminary Site Plan and Storm Water Management plan approval for a new 61,800 square foot warehouse building. The subject property (45200 Grand River Avenue) contains 21.22 acres and is located in Section 15, on the north side of Grand River Avenue and east of Taft Road, in the I-1, Light Industrial District. The new warehouse building would be constructed south of the existing warehouse on the site.

Planner Bell said the subject property is in Section 15 on the north side of Grand River Avenue, east of Taft Road. Interstate 96 borders the property on the north. The parcel is 21.22 acres. It is zoned I-1, Light Industrial and surrounded by I-1 and I-2 zoned properties.

The Future Land Use map indicates Industrial, Research Development & Technology for this property and surrounding properties. There are wetland areas on the northeastern portion of the site, but these would not be disturbed by the changes proposed by the applicant.

The applicant is proposing a new 61,800 square foot building to the south of the existing 148,900 square foot building to accommodate additional warehouse storage space and associated office area. Existing access to Grand River would not change from the current configuration.

Planner Bell said the site plan as proposed would require a total of 271 parking spaces. The applicant is planning to provide 131 car spaces and 65 truck spaces for a total of 196 spaces. The applicant intends to request a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals for the deficit of 75 spaces, with the reasoning that the nature of their business requires a relatively large proportion of truck and trailer parking and relatively little car parking since they have only a few warehouse staff (about 40) and minimal visitors.

Stormwater would be collected by a single storm sewer collection system and bankfull detention provided for the new development. The site is located within a regional detention basin area. Engineering recommends approval with additional details required in a final site plan submittal.

The site plan is in general conformance with the landscaping standards but two waivers are requested. First, a waiver to allow greater than 25 contiguous spaces in a semi-trailer storage area. This is supported by staff because the largest bay is 27 spaces and is located between the new building and existing building, which is expected to provide effective screening. The second waiver requested is to allow less than 75 percent of the new building's foundation to be landscaped. This is supported by staff due to the nature of the vehicle loading area on the rear of the building because the rear area of the building is not readily visible from off-site locations as well as not. Landscape recommends approval.

Traffic recommends approval of the preliminary site plan. However additional comments and details will need to be provided in the Final Site Plan submittal.

Planner Bell said the new building will require a Section 9 waiver from the Façade Ordinance. The percentage of C-Brick exceeds the maximum allowed by the ordinance on 3 elevations and the percentage of flat metal panels exceeds the maximum amount on the north elevation. It is the opinion of our façade consultant that the C-Brick material and color proposed substantially has the appearance of natural clay brick, which is permitted. The overage of flat metal panels on the rear elevation will not be visible to the public. The applicant has provided building elevations and a material sample board to

further explain the design.

Fire recommends approval with additional comments to be addressed at the time of final site plan submittal.

The Planning Commission is asked tonight to approve the Preliminary Site Plan and the storm water management plan. Representing the project tonight are Michael Corrigan of Corrigan Moving and Storage, architect Matt Madden from Gillet Associates, and engineer Becky Klein from PEA, Inc. to answer any questions you may have.

Becky Klein with PEA, on behalf of Corrigan Warehouse, said this is a fairly substantial investment into the City of Novi and we believe it also represents a pretty nice upgrade to the view that you will see along Grand River Avenue. Right now, the site is pretty much a big green lot in front of an existing warehouse. This will be a much nicer architectural view plus a there is a substantial amount of landscaping and a berm being added there along Grand River.

We have applied for a variance on the parking, and as you heard, the waivers required for landscaping have the support of staff. So we believe this is going to represent a pretty nice enhancement to the City of Novi. Again, we appreciate your consideration and we request approval of this project.

Chair Pehrson asked if there was any correspondence.

Member Lynch said there is no correspondence.

Chair Pehrson turned it over to the Planning Commission for their consideration.

Member Lynch said first of all, Corrigan has been in Novi for a number of years and I'm really glad that the business is good enough that they're expanding. So I congratulate you on that.

Driving past there, I'm really pleased to see the aesthetic improvement along Grand River. If you look at what it looks like now versus where it would go with this approval and this aesthetic improvement, I think it's tremendous. It's kind of a win-win, the aesthetics are improved and the business is growing. And certainly the tax base will improve. And I'm very pleased that you're right here in Novi. The waivers, as far as the parking goes, I think are reasonable based on the type of business that it is. So with that, I would like to make a motion.

Motion made by Member Lynch and seconded by Maday.

**ROLL CALL VOTE TO APPROVE THE PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER MADAY.**

**In the matter of Corrigan Warehouse JSP18-05, motion to approve the Preliminary Site Plan based on and subject to the following:**

- a. A Zoning Board of Appeals variance from Section 5.2.12 for a required parking deficit of 75 spaces (271 spaces required, 196 spaces provided) as the applicant has demonstrated the nature of their business does not require additional parking with only 40-50 total employees expected and very few customer visits to that location. Extra space for truck parking could also be converted to additional standard length spaces should the property change use in the future;**

- b. Waiver to allow more than 25 contiguous parking spaces in the semi-trailer parking area between the two buildings, which will be effectively screened by the buildings and proposed landscaping, which is hereby granted;**
- c. Waiver to allow less than 75% of the building foundation to be landscaped because the area without landscaping will not be visible from Grand River Avenue, and is in a truck service area, which is hereby granted;**
- d. A Section 9 waiver for an overage of Flat Metal Panels on the rear elevation and for an overage of C-Brick on the other three elevations, which is hereby granted. The rear elevation will not be visible to the public, and the C-Brick material proposed has been determined to be substantially similar in appearance to natural clay brick;**
- e. The findings of compliance with Ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters and the conditions and the items listed in those letters being addressed on the Final Site Plan.**

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

Chair Pehrson asked if there is any discussion on the motion.

Member Avdoulos said I think it's great that Corrigan is able to expand. Our firm actually uses their services and I go there quite often for recycling or shredding of important paperwork, so I appreciate that.

I do have a concern related to aesthetics, at least in my opinion. This is an opportunity, it's a big billboard that we're putting up on Grand River, and Grand River is a major thoroughfare. I was just hoping to see something a little more interesting related to aesthetics. I know we've got these pilasters that are creating a rhythm but it's just one big blank wall, and I know it's a warehouse. The Berkshire Fulfillment Center that we looked at a couple months ago that's on M-5 and Fourteen Mile is like 193,000 square feet and they were able to break that down and create a nice façade for a main drag that a lot of people see. I don't want us to get conditioned that this is an industrial site and a warehouse – we're trying to create something nice as we drive along Grand River.

We can't dictate how to design the building but what I'd like to see is perhaps some subtle adjustments, if we can, to help improve this so that maybe in the evening and even during the day it's a little tighter. So just from the elevation, we've got these light fixtures that are on the front that are randomly placed on the metal panel. I would like to suggest that those lights be located within the reveal of each one of the piers and have some uplighting and downlighting so that we enhance the façade.

And then it's a minor little thing, but again, the doors that are shown are randomly spaced and it would be nice if they were equally spaced off of the pilasters.

Member Avdoulos said and I don't know if there will be any lighting off the berm area up front, I'm glad to see that we have landscaping, but again this is an important thoroughfare that we're trying to enhance all the way from border to border and as the new buildings and new developments are coming about, I think we'd like to see that character be part of what we're looking at.

Member Avdoulos said, I have no issue with the facility, I have no issue with the business being there. This is just a great opportunity to help set the tone for a lot of other buildings that are going to be coming in the future and again, just because it's industrial doesn't

mean we have to accept the most simple and minimalist of architecture. So if we could work, perhaps with the City, to do some of those enhancements. I'm sure that there's photometrics involved with some of the light that's coming off of the fixtures that are on the building, but I'd like to see some of that worked on with City.

Member Anthony said I'd like to make a friendly amendment to our motion to simply put a request in for the developer to work with the City to add additional architectural features to the façade of the building on the front side.

Both the maker and the seconder of the motion agreed to the proposed amendment.

**ROLL CALL VOTE TO APPROVE THE PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER MADAY.**

**In the matter of Corrigan Warehouse JSP18-05, motion to approve the Preliminary Site Plan based on and subject to the following:**

- a. A Zoning Board of Appeals variance from Section 5.2.12 for a required parking deficit of 75 spaces (271 spaces required, 196 spaces provided) as the applicant has demonstrated the nature of their business does not require additional parking with only 40-50 total employees expected and very few customer visits to that location. Extra space for truck parking could also be converted to additional standard length spaces should the property change use in the future;
- b. Waiver to allow more than 25 contiguous parking spaces in the semi-trailer parking area between the two buildings, which will be effectively screened by the buildings and proposed landscaping, which is hereby granted;
- c. Waiver to allow less than 75% of the building foundation to be landscaped because the area without landscaping will not be visible from Grand River Avenue, and is in a truck service area, which is hereby granted;
- d. A Section 9 waiver for an overage of Flat Metal Panels on the rear elevation and for an overage of C-Brick on the other three elevations, which is hereby granted. The rear elevation will not be visible to the public, and the C-Brick material proposed has been determined to be substantially similar in appearance to natural clay brick;
- e. The findings of compliance with Ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters and the conditions and the items listed in those letters being addressed on the Final Site Plan;
- f. The applicant is to work with City staff to add and/or modify architectural features to the building façade, as noted in the discussion by the Planning Commission.

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.*

**MOTION TO APPROVE THE STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER MADAY.**

**In the matter of Corrigan Warehouse JSP18-05, motion to approve the Stormwater Management Plan based on and subject to the findings of compliance with Ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters, and the conditions and items listed in those letters being addressed on the Final Site Plan. This motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Chapter 11 of the Code of Ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance. *Motion carried 6-0.***

Member Avdoulos asked if there are any units on the roof of the warehouse.

Ms. Klein said no.

Member Avdoulos said ok, no other questions.

### **3. APPROVAL OF THE MARCH 14, 2018 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES**

Motion made by Member Avdoulos and seconded by Member Lynch.

#### **ROLL CALL VOTE TO APPROVE THE MARCH 14, 2018 MINUTES MADE BY MEMBER AVDOULOS AND SECONDED BY MEMBER LYNCH.**

***Motion to approve the March 14, 2018 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes.  
Motion carried 6-0.***

#### **SUPPLEMENTAL ISSUES**

There were no supplemental issues.

#### **AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION**

There was no audience participation.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

Moved by Member Lynch and seconded by Member Avdoulos.

#### **VOICE VOTE ON THE MOTION TO ADJOURN MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER AVDOULOS.**

***Motion to adjourn the April 11, 2018 Planning Commission meeting. Motion carried 6-0.***

The meeting was adjourned at 7:48 PM.