



PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

CITY OF NOVI

Regular Meeting

April 23, 2014 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 or about 7:00 PM.

ROLL CALL

Present: Member Anthony, Member Giacometti, Member Lynch, Chair Pehrson, Member Zuchlewski

Absent: Member Baratta (excused), Member Greco (Excused)

Also Present: Barbara McBeth, Deputy Director of Community Development; Sara Roediger, Planner; Kristen Kapelanski, Planner; Adam Wayne, Engineer; David Beschke, Landscape Architect; Beth Saarela, City Attorney; Pete Hill, City's Environmental Consultant; Matt Carmer, City's Environmental Consultant.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Moved by Member Lynch and seconded by Member Anthony:

VOICE VOTE ON THE AGENDA APPROVAL MOTION MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER ANTHONY:

Motion to approve the April 23, 2014 Planning Commission Agenda. *Motion carried 5-0.*

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

No one in the audience wished to speak.

CORRESPONDENCE

There was no Correspondence.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

There were no Committee Reports.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPUTY DIRECTOR REPORT

Deputy Director McBeth said the City Council approved the request of Rose Senior Living at Providence Park Hospital for a Concept Plan. This matter will return to the Planning Commission for consideration of the Preliminary Site Plan after the City Council approves the agreement for this project. Ms. McBeth shared the flyer again with the Planning Commission members regarding the Placemaking Strategy Development Workshops that are scheduled for May 8th and May 22nd. Those are both Thursday evenings and the sessions will run from about 6 p.m. to 9:30 p.m. The Commission members are asked to let us know if they can attend. Staff is looking forward to these sessions - we think it will be a good learning opportunity and really focused on issues here in the City of Novi.

CONSENT AGENDA - REMOVALS AND APPROVAL

There were no Consent Agenda items.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. ORCHARD HILLS NORTH, JSP14-01

Public hearing at the request of Mirage Development, LLC for Preliminary Site Plan with a Site Condominium, Wetland Permit, Woodland Permit and Stormwater Management Plan approval. The subject property is 9.1 acres in Section 26, located on the south side of Ten Mile Road, between

Meadowbrook Road and the CSX railroad in the R-4, One-Family Residential District. The applicant is proposing a 12 unit single-family residential development.

Planner Sara Roediger said the applicant is proposing a twelve unit single-family residential condominium development. The property is located on the south side of Ten Mile Road, and is surrounded by single family residential homes, with the exception of the Orchard Hills Elementary School located to the south, and Novi Ridge Townhouses to the west. This property and a majority of the sounding area is zoned R-4, One-Family Residential, with the exception of the RM-1 Low-Density Multiple-Family west of the site. Similarly, the Future Land Use map indicates primarily single-family uses for this area with multiple-family and education facility uses planned for the properties to the west and south respectively. There is one significant open water regulated wetland on the northern portion of property, with minimal impacts due to the installation of the required boardwalk along 10 Mile Road. In addition, the site is heavily wooded and the vast majority of the site contains regulated woodlands. 57 regulated trees are being removed, requiring 132 woodland replacement credits, either as new trees or through contribution to the tree fund. The twelve single-family detached home development would be constructed on an extension of the existing Woodglen Drive and end in a cul-de-sac at the site's western border. The site plan is significantly similar to the previously approved site plan that was approved by the City in 2005, but has since expired. All reviews recommend approval of the plan, with the landscape review noting that the applicant has requested a waiver from the required berm along the northern property line, which would be supported by staff to due to the location of the existing wetland and standing water. A second landscape waiver is being requested to reduce the berm height along the southern property line, which is not supported by staff.

The applicant has also requested a number of variances from the subdivision ordinance and the City's design and construction standards, including one administrative variance and five City Council variances. These include variances for allowing a sidewalk on one side of Woodglen Drive, a cul-de-sac longer than 800 ft., pathways to be located more than 1 foot away from the future ROW line, providing less than 3 feet of cover on top of the storm sewer and to not provide a secondary access or stub street to the adjacent property. This evening the Planning Commission is asked to hold a public hearing and approve the Preliminary Site Plan, Wetland Permit, Woodland Permit and Stormwater Management Plan.

Claudio Rossi, with Mirage Development, said as mentioned, we are proposing a 12 unit single family residential project referred to as Orchard Hills North. This proposed development was fully approved back in 2006 before the significant economic downturn, which resulted in its postponement. We are now before the commission again to request your consideration of an approval that was once granted. The proposed plan is basically the same with a few minor changes as recommended by city staff and with the same variances that were previously approved. As you can see, the density has not been maximized in order to preserve most of the natural features. The size and styles of home will be very similar to the homes built in Orchard Hills West with starting prices expected to be around the 400s. I'd be more than happy to answer any questions that you may have.

Chair Pehrson opened the public hearing. Seeing no one wishing to speak, Chair Pehrson asked if there was any correspondence. Member Lynch read the correspondence.

Terry Croad, of Aspen Drive, said in general, I am in support of the development and I believe the developer has a right to reasonably develop his property. However there is concern with a pathway connection to Orchard Hills Elementary. I recommend that the proposed pathway, adjacent to lot 12, from Woodglen south to the school's property (existing playground) be built as part of the proposed development. Also, the proposed cul-de-sac is in excess of the City's standard maximum 800 foot length and will force all traffic onto Quince. This will cause additional trip generations. Also, the intersection of Woodglen and Quince is heavily impacted by existing traffic and has the greatest degradation and pot holes. Then, I support the wavier of the southern sidewalk, with the exception of the sidewalk adjacent to

lot 12, since a sidewalk will be constructed on the north side of Woodglen adjacent to the proposed homes. Finally, I support the waiver of the boardwalk location, as long as a boardwalk and 8 foot pathway is constructed along Ten Mile connecting the existing pathways on the east and west of the subject property.

Michael Schlotta objects the plan. Please consider landscape berm along the east edge of lot 1 that is adjacent to the address shown below. This project will destroy a good amount of wildlife and supporting habitats.

Pamela Brown objects the plan. I have lived here for 33 years. We just keep building and building. Not only is it becoming more like Livonia in terms of congestion, but it is impossible to enter 10 Mile now from Meadowbrook Glens. Can't we please save some empty land?

Kelly Thompson objects the plan. It causes more traffic for Meadowbrook Glens residents. We need to protect wildlife. Not every area is Novi needs to be developed.

Chair Pehrson closed the public hearing and asked the Planning Commission for comments or a motion.

Member Anthony said can you point out to me what areas on the site will have a berm? And what's the height of the berms that you're proposing to have?

Mr. Rossi said there is a berm on the south side; I believe it is three feet in height. The reason why we can't make the berm taller is because if we make it taller then we have to go wider. To make it wider, you're going to impact the road. The road would have to be shifted and then the lots would have to be shifted which would affect the big pond that's there and encroach on the wetlands. There's also a berm proposed in the center along the Ten Mile right-of-way between the wetlands. Again, we're requesting a waiver as far as the right-of-way. We have to keep that closer towards the Ten Mile Road right-of-way in order to minimize the impact of the wetlands.

Member Anthony asked how much land do you have between the road and your property boundary in order to put in a berm. What's the width of that section?

Mr. Rossi said 20 feet.

Member Anthony said so 20 feet for a three-foot high berm and the city is requiring how high? I think four-foot high? Let me direct this to the city. Alright David, without pulling out a ruler and doing some calculations, for 20 feet it seems like we can do a four foot berm, what do you think?

Landscape Architect Beschke said you can if you go steeper and it's not something that they're going to have to maintain in terms of mowing. It was approved before. It's a practical hardship for them to push forward like Mr. Rossi is saying. I don't want to get into the wetland buffers or the wetland itself. The other upside is that they heavily planted the berm and there's a ton of evergreens. They've done a lot more than they'd need to do, typically.

Member Anthony said so is the city position to still support the four foot berm?

Landscape Architect Beschke said I believe so. I couldn't recommend approval because there's no mechanism for me to do it through the ordinance, but there is for you if you see a practical hardship.

Member Anthony said ok and then the berm itself being three-foot, what type of landscaping would be on top of that berm?

Landscape Architect Beschke said it's heavily landscaped with trees and shrubs mostly, mostly evergreens.

Member Anthony said but if it's heavily landscaped now, are you saying that they proposed that after the berm that the plantings would be heavily landscaped.

Landscape Architect Beschke said right, that edge is not a good woodland edge so they're going to be doing all new planting down the side of the road.

Member Anthony said so the additional landscaping would give the height and the visual effect that you're looking for with a four-foot berm?

Landscape Architect Beschke said I believe so.

Member Anthony said ok. I have one more question, one of the residents brought up a path that would connect Meadowbrook to the school, I'm unfamiliar with whether or not the school would want that. You can see from the aerial photos that there's already a natural path where people move through there. Could you help guide on that question?

Engineer Wayne said if I may defer to Sara, I believe she's been in contact with the school, or at least knows more information on our Non-Motorized Master Plan.

Planner Roediger said I would say that it's our stance that we maintain the path to the school. We haven't spoken with the school district at this point but following approval of the plan we would coordinate with the school district to ensure access. It makes sense to have the access there.

Member Anthony said I live in that area so it is a natural way that kids do walk and if you block that off it's going to create diversion.

Planner Roediger said as proposed right now it does dead-end into a fence. So when we get into the Final Site Plan if we need to shift that maybe, we can work with the school to see if they want it to be shifted a couple feet to the west to avoid the playground. But we'll work with the school to come up with something that is mutually agreeable. At a minimum, we will make them create a sidewalk to the school's edge so that there would be connection there in the future if that's ever desired by the school.

Member Anthony said great, thank you.

Mr. Rossi said I could probably comment on that a little because I've had a discussion with the school superintendent.

Member Anthony said well I was going to direct the question right to you. Can you put a path in there?

Mr. Rossi said we proposed a pathway alongside of lot 12 going to the south border of our property and the north border of the school where there is a chain linked fence there. The concern with the school is that it runs right into the playground and for security reasons they're not sure if they would want the path extended and whether they would extend it through their playground to get around the west end to go into the school doors. At this point, they've told us to keep the pathway, if it's being requested by the city, alongside lot 12. but they were going to have further discussions among themselves rather they were going to extend it around of whether there is a possibility of moving it to the west end off of the cul-de-sac and making more of a direct shoot to their north property line which would be at our west end.

Member Anthony said because that path would be consistent with our non-motorized transportation

plan, I would recommend that you do work with city staff to put in a pathway along the west side of lot 12. Would you object to that or have a problem with that?

Mr. Rossi stated that we have it proposed that way right now. Again, I don't know if the school would extend it through or not.

Member Anthony said I will limit my recommendation to working with the staff to be consistent with the Non-Motorized Master Plan, that way it doesn't involve the school and the school could be a later issue.

Member Lynch said I just have one question. Who owns the path? Is that the city's property? Will the city maintain it?

Engineer Wayne said all public pathways within common elements would have to have an easement over them where the city would maintain those and abate any trip hazards. The winter maintenance would most likely fall to the subdivision homeowners association.

Member Lynch said ok and the pathway is a concrete pathway?

Mr. Rossi said its asphalt.

Engineer Wayne said it would actually be required to be concrete unless it is actually ten feet wide, which I do not believe the applicant is proposing at this time.

Member Lynch said ok well it sounds like the developer is willing to do it. It sounds like the purpose of the berm is to isolate the residential from the roads. It sounds like the trees and everything do it. So I guess I'm in support of this proposal. You mentioned that it was approved in 2006?

Mr. Rossi said we got all of the final approvals back in 2006.

Member Lynch said so really the thing that's really outstanding is the path and you'll work with the school system. It sounds like the holdup is with the school system. It sounds like the developer wants it and the city wants it, it's just the school has to approve it. Ok I guess I'm in support of this project

Member Giacometti said I had a question concerning the secondary access driveway. If a waiver wasn't granted, would you be able to extend to Ten Mile Road?

Mr. Rossi said I think it would be very difficult to put a secondary access because of the huge open waterway that's there on the north end of the project in order to minimize the impact of the existing wetlands. On the northwest end is where our retention pond is so there is only limited space that you can do that. Again, we have not maximized the density of this property; we didn't even come in with an open space cluster option where we could have probably gotten 16 or 17 lots. We prefer to go with the eighty-foot wide lots. But I think we've done the best that we can and this is a very challenging piece of property with a lot of constraints. I think it would be very difficult to put in a secondary access.

Mr. Rick Hirth said the aerial shows some type of driveway or path. There is a pathway on the west end. We had granted the school permission to actually go through there to be able to do the addition on their school a few years back. We asked that they minimize any impact on the existing trees but we granted them permission to do that and that's where our temporary access will be for the main construction, sewers and roads. Then we'll finish up putting the sediment basin once all the major construction has been done so that we're not going through the existing sub.

Member Giacometti said that was my only question.

Chair Pehrson said the berm, just so I'm clear, three or four foot high works?

Landscape Architect Beschke said they've shown a variation between three and four feet - four feet where they can get it easy and three feet when they can't.

Chair Pehrson said ok and the city is ok with that?

Landscape Architect Beschke said yes.

Moved by Member Anthony and seconded by Member Lynch:

ROLL CALL VOTE THE PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN APPROVAL MOTION MADE BY MEMBER ANTHONY AND SECONDED BY MEMBER LYNCH:

In the matter of Orchard Hills North, JSP14-01, motion to approve the Preliminary Site Plan with a Site Condominium based on and subject to the following:

- a. The conditions and items listed in the staff and consultant review letters being addressed on the Final Site Plan; and
- b. City Council variance from Appendix C of the Subdivision Ordinance Section 4.05 of the City Code to permit a pedestrian pathway on only one side of the proposed road; and
- c. City Council variance from Section 11-194(a)(7) of the Design and Construction Standards of the City Code to permit a cul-de-sac street length greater than 800 ft.; and
- d. City Council variance from Section 11-194(a)(19)(a) of the Design and Construction Standards of the City Code to permit not provide a secondary access driveway; and
- e. City Council variance from Section 11.258(a) of the Design and Construction Standards of the City Code to permit a bicycle path to vary more than 1 foot from the future right-of-way; and
- f. City Council variance from Section 11-194(c) of the Design and Construction Standards of the City Code to permit less than 3 feet of cover to the top of the storm sewer; and
- g. Planning Commission waiver of the required berms in the locations of existing wetland and standing water; which is hereby granted; and
- h. Administrative variance from Appendix C of the Subdivision Ordinance Section 4.04(A)(1) of the City Code to not provide a stub street to adjacent property; and
- i. Planning Commission waiver of berm height to allow three foot berm height provided landscaping meets city requirements; which is hereby granted; and
- j. Applicant will work with staff to construct a pathway to the school west of lot 12 in accordance with the City's Non-Motorized Master Plan.

This motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Article 4, Article 24 and Article 25 of the Zoning Ordinance and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance. *Motion carried 5-0.*

Moved by Member Anthony and seconded by Member Lynch:

ROLL CALL VOTE THE WETLAND PERMIT APPROVAL MOTION MADE BY MEMBER ANTHONY AND SECONDED BY MEMBER LYNCH:

In the matter of Orchard Hills North, JSP14-01, motion to approve the Wetland Permit 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 12, Article V of the Code of Ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance. *Motion carried 5-0.*

Moved by Member Anthony and seconded by Member Lynch:

ROLL CALL VOTE THE WOODLAND PERMIT APPROVAL MOTION MADE BY MEMBER ANTHONY AND SECONDED BY MEMBER LYNCH:

In the matter of Orchard Hills North, JSP14-01, motion to approve the Woodland Permit 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 37 of the Code of Ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance. *Motion carried 5-0.*

Moved by Member Anthony and seconded by Member Lynch:

ROLL CALL VOTE THE STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN APPROVAL MOTION MADE BY MEMBER ANTHONY AND SECONDED BY MEMBER LYNCH:

In the matter of Orchard Hills North, JSP14-01, motion to approve the Stormwater Management Plan, subject to 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 Chapter 11 of the Code of Ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance. *Motion carried 5-0.*

2. CZ CARTAGE, JSP13-70

Public hearing at the request of CZ Trucking Realty, LLC for Preliminary Site Plan, Wetland Permit, Woodland Permit and Stormwater Management Plan approval. The subject property is located in Section 17, south of Grand River Avenue and east of Wixom Road in the I-1, Light Industrial District. The subject property is 17.78 acres and the applicant is proposing to construct a parking area for 72 trailer trucks.

Planner Kapelanski said the applicant is proposing to construct a new truck parking area for 72 trailer trucks on a vacant parcel adjacent to the existing CZ Cartage. The site is bordered by various industrial uses and vacant land with the existing CZ Cartage property to the west. The subject property is zoned I-1, Light Industrial with I-1 zoning to the north, west and east and I-2, General Industrial zoning to the east and south. The Future Land Use map indicates Office Research Development and Technology uses for the subject property and properties to the north, east and west with Community Commercial planned to the west as well. The majority of the site is covered by regulated wetlands and woodlands, most of which the applicant will not be impacting with development planned for the northern portion of the site only. The applicant is proposing a tractor trailer parking area on approximately 1.8 acres of the 3.2 acre site. The new lot would be connected to the existing CZ Cartage property to the west. The parking area would not be curbed and would be constructed of asphalt millings.

The planning, traffic and fire reviews recommend approval of the plan with minor items to address on the Final Site Plan submittal. The engineering review recommends approval of the plan but also notes the need for a Design and Construction Standards variance from the City Council for the lack of pavement and curbs. The landscape review recommends approval of the plan. The applicant is seeking Planning Commission waivers for the deficient amount of interior parking lot landscaping and to permit more than 15 contiguous parking spaces without a landscape island. Staff does not support these waivers. The wetland and woodland reviews recommend approval and also note that both a City of Novi Non-Minor Use Wetland Permit and Authorization to Encroach into the 25 Foot Natural Features Setback are required for wetland impacts and a City of Novi Woodland Permit is required for proposed woodland impacts.

Clif Seiber, with Seiber-Keast Engineering, said with me this evening is Paul Cornel the property owner and his advisor Wynn Berry. As was described, Mr. Cornel owns the existing CZ Cartage project on the property located just to the west of the subject property. He is purchasing the property next door to the east of him. A great majority of that property is regulated woodlands and has some wetland pockets on it but as was indicated a large area of that woodlands will be preserved except 7 regulated trees. We are requesting some waivers by the City Council primarily because this is not your typical kind of parking lot. In your normal parking lot, you have 24 foot aisles and it's open to the public. In this case, in order to park truck trailers the aisle width is actually 80 feet. In order to maneuver trailers in there, to introduce interior landscaping and landscape islands would be very disruptive to the operation. If those were in the way it would be just very difficult to make that work. For that reason, we're asking for consideration on the waiver. In light of the fact that there are so many trees on the site and the fact that those are being preserved we are showing now 76 landscape trees around the perimeter of this parking and we'd like some consideration from the Planning Commission to either waive a portion of those or all of those.

In addition to that, there was a comment from your woodland consultant. We did show the woodland line and the regulated trees based on the City's woodland map. He indicated in his review that he thought whenever there is some dispute as to where the location of that line is then a tree outside of that line could be considered regulated and therefore require replacement. If you look at the map that was supplied with that review letter, it's pretty clear that the woodland line showed on the City map is very close to the woodlands shown on the aerial photo. So we don't see where there is any dispute on where that line is or that it should be relocated. We think the 7 proposed trees that are being removed and the 14 replacements trees conforms with the City ordinance and we think going beyond that is a bit of a reach so we're requesting some consideration for that.

Mr. Seiber concluded noting finally, we are asking for a waiver from the City Council from the Design and Construction Standards for the surfacing of that parking area. We're attempting to use recycled material. We are proposing a 12 inch recycled asphalt material for that surface. Your staff engineer has suggested that aggregate be mixed with that recycled asphalt to provide some additional structural support, which we had agreed to and provided for on the plan. So we will be asking City Council for a waiver both on the hard surfacing and perimeter curbing for that parking area. Currently, Mr. Cornel has approximately 65-68 truck spaces on his site and this new addition will add another 68. So it will pretty much double his capacity for moving truck trailers in and out of his site.

Chair Pehrson opened the public hearing. No one from the audience wished to speak.

Member Lynch read the correspondence.

Dan Valentine supports the plan. I do not have any objections regarding CZ Cartage's request for additional parking area. I own the property directly in front of CZ Cartage at 48705 Grand River.

There was no additional correspondence and Chair Pehrson closed the public hearing.

Member Lynch said it sounds like this is a unique business. Those of us who have worked in a similar business know that you can put landscape islands in but they will get wiped out within a couple of months. So I don't have a problem with that waiver. As far as the trees though, I'm not exactly sure what the issue is.

Pete Hill, of ECT, the woodland consultant for the City of Novi, said as Mr. Seiber mentioned, the woodland map that is associated with our review letter shows that the woodland line cuts straight across a section of the property. The plan, as proposed, lists 17 trees being removed and seven of those fall within the regulated woodland boundary. There is a section in the ordinance, and that's what our office

referenced in our review letter, that basically states where physical or natural features existing on the ground are at odds with those shown on the regulated woodland map or in other circumstances where uncertainty exists, the community development director or his/her designee shall interpret the woodland area boundaries. So basically we were opening up the question as to whether or not it is appropriate to move the perfectly horizontal woodland line, as shown on the regulated woodlands map to incorporate those ten additional trees. So I think it would cause the developer to have to replace 35 as opposed to 14 total replacement trees. So it's a judgment call as to whether or not the line show on the regulated woodlands map is accurate and true to site conditions.

Member Lynch said thank you. It's an industrial site and it's located in an industrial area, you're surrounded by wetlands and woodlands, I don't want to put a burden on the applicant. This is unique and I believe it is a stretch to make the applicant put in all these trees. In my opinion, I don't think that it's necessary. So it sounds like you've got approval from the property owners around you, you're located in an industrial site; you got approval from the engineer. I agree with not putting in any kind of obstructions with the landscape islands. And in my opinion, I think that we might be going a little over the top forcing you to replace more trees than is absolutely necessary.

Member Anthony asked Landscape Architect Beschke if the parking lot where the trucks are stored comes all the way over to the property line of Providence Hospital.

Landscape Architect Beschke said I believe it's well short of that.

Member Anthony said all right I just wanted to make sure. When I look at that, it looks like there is either a creek or a wetland that's between this property and the Providence Hospital ring road. Do you know of either?

Landscape Architect Beschke said that could actually be a county drain.

Environmental consultant Hill asked Member Anthony to repeat the area he was referencing.

Member Anthony said see Providence Ring Road and then the property boundary. Now when we look at the subject property, that's indicated in the white, go all the way to the southern portion of it. There is a parking lot that continues off to the east which would then create an L-shape. In just looking at these maps, it does fall short, it probably is only in line with the property boundary, if you look at the eastern most of the two at the top and extend that all the way down. So there seems to be some buffer. In that, there is a linear feature, it looks like a creek, just to the west of Providence Hospital Road. Is that part of our stormwater drainage system or is that part of the wetland area?

Mr. Hill said I think it's part of the stormwater drainage and I think it falls off of the subject property.

Member Anthony said ok here's where I'm going with this. If we also look at the parking lot, that would be the L-shape down here, and I'm looking at some of the renderings of the wetlands there, that really comes over a considerable amount of wetland material. Is that correct?

Mr. Hill said I think the plan as shown indicates proposed wetland impacts.

Member Anthony said ok so it looks like it does come over some wetland area. So now let's stop and think for a moment on how the drainage pattern then moves in this area. Because one thing that I'm concerned about is that we have a stormwater drain that is probably tied into the rear system that runs parallel to Providence Hospital Road. We have a wetland area that would also have been hydrologically connected to it that we're now going to put a parking lot on. Now directly north of that, we have a pond that looks like there may be a hydrologic connection there as well. I'm ok with what is

proposed, provided that I know that that pond and that hydrologic linkage to that stormwater drain, that in the future if this were to be looked at could not be abated. So I'm asking you, when you look at this, as a professional that consults with the City, for the next person that comes up, once that parking lot comes in, are we in jeopardy of losing the hydrologic connection between the pond, which will remain as a retention pond, connecting up to the drain.

Mr. Hill said I don't think that is correct but I don't know if the applicant's engineer can shed some light on that.

Mr. Seiber said that is a very large wetland pocket.

Member Anthony said right and it's a large parking lot so you'd be losing a big chunk of that.

Mr. Seiber said but that's not the wetland that we're outletting to. That's a very large wetland. Actually, the one that we're outletting to is right up here. It's called Wetland A on the plan and what we're doing is outletting into that. In fact, you can see the woodland line right there and we're barely touching that. So really, we're just using that very northerly 10% of the property there and outletting to a small wetland pocket up there so that the large wetland pocket south of that is not being touched. In fact we're staying several hundred feet away from it.

Member Anthony said I see. And then you have your stormwater retention just to the south side of that. So we're looking at your parking that is actually north of that.

Mr. Seiber said way north of that.

Member Anthony said I apologize. I was looking at it coming further south and I was concerned with the impact that that would have there.

Mr. Seiber said that's a very nice treated area. There is a beach forest south of that. I think it would be nice to keep that intact.

Member Anthony said I'm happy with that location of the parking lot. I also agree with Member Lynch that by putting in interior landscaping into a truck storage area is not going to last for very long. Either the truck trailers are going to get damaged or the landscaping is going to get damaged. So I would support that waiver as well. And thank you for helping clear that up for me. I do appreciate it.

Chair Pehrson said if there are no other comments I agree with the request of the waiver for the interior landscaping and contiguous parking spaces being required for this. I also agree with Member Lynch that it's a judgment call relative to where that boundary line is for the woodland. I support that of the applicant at this point too.

Moved by Member Anthony and seconded by Member Lynch:

ROLL CALL VOTE THE PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN APPROVAL MOTION MADE BY MEMBER ANTHONY AND SECONDED BY MEMBER LYNCH:

In the matter of CZ Cartage, JSP13-70, motion to approve the Preliminary Site Plan based on and subject to the following:

- a. Planning Commission waiver for interior parking lot landscaping which is hereby granted;**
- b. Planning Commission waiver to allow more than 15 contiguous parking spaces without a landscape island which is hereby granted;**
- c. City Council granting a DCS Variance for the lack of curbing and paving; and**

- d. 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 19, Article 24 and Article 25 of the Zoning Ordinance and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance. *Motion carried 5-0.*

Moved by Member Anthony and seconded by Member Lynch:

ROLL CALL VOTE THE WETLAND PERMIT APPROVAL MOTION MADE BY MEMBER ANTHONY AND SECONDED BY MEMBER LYNCH:

In the matter of CZ Cartage, JSP13-70, motion to approve the Wetland Permit 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 12, Article V of the Code of Ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance. *Motion carried 5-0.*

Moved by Member Anthony and seconded by Member Lynch:

ROLL CALL VOTE THE WOODLAND PERMIT APPROVAL MOTION MADE BY MEMBER ANTHONY AND SECONDED BY MEMBER LYNCH:

In the matter of CZ Cartage, JSP13-70, motion to approve the Woodland Permit based on and subject to the following:

- a. 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; and
- b. Planning Commission approval of applicant's woodland delineation.

This motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Chapter 37 of the Code of Ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance. *Motion carried 5-0.*

Moved by Member Anthony and seconded by Member Lynch:

ROLL CALL VOTE THE STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN APPROVAL MOTION MADE BY MEMBER ANTHONY AND SECONDED BY MEMBER LYNCH:

In the matter of CZ Cartage, JSP13-70, motion to approve the Stormwater Management Plan, subject to 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 Chapter 11 of the Code of Ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance. *Motion carried 5-0.*

MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION

1. DETROIT METROPOLITAN CREDIT UNION, JSP12-69

Consideration of the request of Stucky Vitale Architects for a recommendation to City Council regarding the Preliminary Site Plan. The subject property is located in Section 23 at the northeast corner of the intersection of Main Street and Novi Road in the TC-1, Town Center District. The development area is 0.83 acres and the applicant has proposed a second story on the previously approved Detroit Metropolitan Credit Union.

Planner Kapelanski said this project is located at the northeast corner of Main Street and Novi Road. The property is surrounded by vacant land to the north and west, Ace Cutting equipment on the opposite side of Main Street to the south and City Center Plaza is on the opposite of Novi Road to the east. The subject property is zoned TC-1, Town Center and is bordered by TC-1 zoning on all sides. The applicant previously proposed and received Preliminary Site Plan approval for a 3,000 sq. ft. financial institution with an accessory drive-through use. The applicant has now added a second story to the building and slightly altered the site layout resulting in a 5,686 sq. ft. building with an accessory drive-through. The City Council previously approved the Preliminary Site Plan, Woodland Permit and Stormwater Management Plan in 2013 after a recommendation from the Planning Commission. All relevant disciplines have reviewed the revised layout and building and are recommending approval of the Revised Preliminary Site Plan. The Planning Commission is asked to make a recommendation to the City Council this evening.

Mike Blanek said as was stated by Planner Kapelanski, we received approval last year for this project with a one story, 3,000 square foot credit union facility and then we received City Council approval. Then by the time the sale of the property went through, it was later in the summer so they decided to wait until 2014 to start the project. During that time, they reassessed their intention for locating the branch here in Novi and they wanted to increase the size of the branch by adding the second story. We've also changed design a little bit. The site plan is very similar to what was approved last time. We added some additional parking to accommodate that second story which meets all the requirements of all the ordinances in the City. The building is pretty much the same footprint as before, except we have the second story. The exterior is traditional brick and stone. So we're here tonight to ask for approval of the revised scheme.

Member Zuchlewski asked if the second story be used by the credit union or is that going to be a lease space.

Mr. Blanek said it's going to be used by the credit union. Typically, credit unions are community based organizations and they were intending to maybe have it available to local community area organizations for a meeting hall but we don't have enough parking. There was concern about rather we have enough parking to support that kind of use and the times and days that would be asked for so at this time it's strictly going to be for the credit union staff.

Member Lynch said let me begin by thanking you for working with staff. It looks like there are no issues with this. It looks like a good project.

Moved by Member Lynch and seconded by Member Anthony:

ROLL CALL VOTE THE REVISED PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN APPROVAL MOTION MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER ANTHONY:

In the matter of Detroit Metropolitan Credit Union, JSP12-69, motion to recommend approval of the Revised Preliminary Site Plan subject to the conditions and items listed in the staff and consultant review letters being addressed on the Final Site Plan. This motion is made because it is otherwise in compliance with Article 16, Article 24 and Article 25 of the Zoning Ordinance and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance. *Motion carried 5-0.*

2. APPROVAL OF THE APRIL 9, 2014 PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Moved by Member Giacobetti and seconded by Member Lynch:

VOICE VOTE ON THE APRIL 9, 2014 PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES APPROVAL MOTION MADE BY MEMBER GIACOPETTI AND SECONDED BY MEMBER LYNCH:

Motion to approve the April 9, 2014 Planning Commission Minutes. Motion carried 5-0.

CONSENT AGENDA REMOVALS FOR COMMISSION ACTION

There were no Consent Agenda Removals.

MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION

There were no Matters for Discussion.

SUPPLEMENTAL ISSUES

There are no Supplemental Issues.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

No one in the audience wished to speak.

ADJOURNMENT

Moved by Member Lynch and seconded by Member Anthony:

VOICE VOTE ON MOTION TO ADJOURN MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER ANTHONY:

Motion to adjourn the April 23, 2014 Planning Commission meeting. *Motion carried 5-0.*

The meeting was adjourned at 7:57 PM.

Transcribed by Valentina Nuculaj

April, 2014

Date Approved:

Richelle Leskun, Planning Assistant
Signature on File