

MEMORANDUM



TO: PLANNING COMMISSION
FROM: MARK SPENCER, AICP, PLANNER *Mark Spencer*
THROUGH: BARBARA MCBETH, AICP, DEPUTY DIRECTOR
of COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
SUBJECT: SP 04-21 KARIM OFFICE CENTER 3RD EXTENSION
DATE: MARCH 17, 2008

Karim Boulevard Office Center, SP04-21, is proposed by Minasian Development Corporation. The Site Plan is for a speculative office building, located on the west side of Karim Boulevard, south of Grand River Avenue, in the OS-1, Office Service Zoning District.

Approvals for this project proceeded as follows:

- Preliminary Site Plan approval from the Planning Commission on June 9, 2004 subject to a number of conditions.
- Final Site Plan stamped approved by the Planning Staff on April 5, 2005.
- A one-year final site plan extension was granted by the Planning Commission on March 8, 2006, subject to the applicant providing the necessary conservation easement to the City Attorney's office, to be held in escrow. The applicant has provided the easement to the City Attorney.
- A second one-year final site plan extension was granted by the Planning Commission on February 14, 2007.

The applicant is requesting a one-year extension of Final Site Plan approval. The Zoning Ordinance allows for three, one-year extensions of Preliminary and Final Site Plan approvals. This is the **third extension request** for the subject property.

The Planning Department is not aware of any changes to the ordinances, or surrounding land uses, which would affect the approval of the requested extension for one year. **Approval of the one-year extension of Final Site Plan approval is recommended.**

Please refer to the attached letter dated February 29, 2008 from Ted Minasian requesting the extension of the Final Site Plan approval. Also attached are minutes from the Planning Commission meeting for Preliminary Site Plan approval and the first extension request as well as a reduced copy of the Preliminary Site Plan and a location aerial.

SITE PLAN EXTENSION REQUEST LETTER

FROM TED MINASIAN

FEBRUARY 29, 2008



MINASIAN
DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

*Minasian Construction Co.
Minasian Management Co.*

February 29, 2008

Ms. Angela Pawlowski
Planning Assistant
City of Novi Planning Division
45175 West Ten Mile Road
Novi, Michigan 48375

RE: SP04-21 Karim Boulevard Office Centre

Dear Ms. Pawlowski:

In response to your letter dated January 18, 2008 I hereby request an extension for the final site plan approval of the above-referenced project.

Regrettably, the speculative office market as well as the general economy has continued to worsen over the past year. I still feel strongly that this particular project in this location will ultimately be well received when the Michigan economy begins its inevitable recovery.

Please let me know if any additional information is needed to process this request.

Very truly yours,

Ted C. Minasian

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES EXCERPTS

JUNE 9, 2004

MARCH 8, 2006



PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
EXCERPTS
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 9, 2004 7:30 P.M.
COUNCIL CHAMBERS - NOVI CIVIC CENTER
45175 W. TEN MILE, NOVI, MI 48375
(248) 347-0475

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at or about 7:30 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Present: Members Avdoulos, Cassis, Gaul, Kocan (arrived late), Markham, Pehrson, Ruyle, Shroyer, Sprague

Also Present: David Evancoe, Director of Planning; Tim Schmitt, Planner; Tom Schultz, City Attorney;

MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION

1. KARIM OFFICE BUILDING, SITE PLAN NUMBER 04-21

Consideration of the request of Ted C. Minasian for approval of a Preliminary Site Plan and Storm Water Management Plan. The subject property is located in Section 24, on the west side of Karim Blvd. and south of Grand River Avenue in the OS-1 (Office Service) District. The subject property is approximately 2.99 acres. The Applicant is proposing a two-story office building.

Planner Tim Schmitt located the property on an aerial photo. Mr. Schmitt said that some of the surrounding properties were also zoned OS-1, with RM-1 to the west, and NCC to the north along Grand River Avenue. The project and surroundings are consistent with the zoning and the Master Plan.

Mr. Schmitt said that there are no regulated woodlands or wetlands. The Planning Review noted that the building height is proposed at 31 feet, but the 30 feet is the maximum allowed. Either the Applicant can reduce the roof height or the Applicant can seek a ZBA variance. There are minor items to be addressed at the time of Final Site Plan submittal.

The Landscape Review indicated four Planning Commission waivers are necessary. A berm is required between this property and the adjacent residentially zoned property. The Applicant requests the waiver in light of the substantial foliage in the area, and the Olde Orchards residents agree; a letter was enclosed in the Planning Commission packets for review. A waiver for the ornamental trees along the public ROW may not be necessary and the Applicant will address that issue at the meeting. The landscaping in the parking lot is deficient (by 1979 feet), and the Applicant has not provided landscaped islands every fifteen spaces.

The Traffic Review indicated that two opposite side driveway spacing waivers are required (150 feet required, 77 feet provided, and 200 feet required, 24 feet provided). The Traffic Consultant suggested no left turns be allowed from Karim Blvd to eliminate the interlocking left turn issue.

The Engineering Review and Fire Department Review indicated minor items to be addressed at the time of Final Site Plan submittal. The Façade Review indicated that a Section Nine Façade Waiver is required for the split-faced block and the percentage of asphalt brick proposed.

Ted Minasian, 41800 Eleven Mile, introduced himself. He explained that the Olde Orchard homeowners would prefer to keep the foliage between their properties and this development rather than having a berm installed. Mr. Minasian said he would add to the existing screening.

Mr. Minasian said that due to the difference in grade from the building elevation to the street, (a four-foot difference) the berm along the road would not be as practical as a curvilinear landscape wall. Mr. Minasian said that parking lot landscape waivers are required as a result of the new Ordinance language, which he believes needs to be reviewed and tweaked. The request for intermittent landscape islands does not take into account the fact an Applicant may have already provided abundant perimeter landscaping, which in this case Mr. Minasian has. He also commented that for every island a space or two is lost during the snowplow season. Mr. Minasian said he doubled the size of the building greenbelt and around the perimeter. Additionally, he has provided an island that lines up with the entrance but does not break up the fifteen spaces from the two handicapped spaces.

He asked for the waivers for aesthetic and practical reasons. He said that the plan meets the intent of the Ordinance.

Member Avdoulos reported that Mr. Wayne Hogan wrote a letter stating that there was not enough handicapped-accessible parking; he said that there should be nine spaces. He said that the van-accessible spaces should be split and one each located at the two busiest entrances. He said that the handicapped spaces are only eight feet wide and the other spaces are nine feet wide. There does not appear to be accessible curbs to the sidewalk, which could possibly force a handicapped patron into the drive lanes. He said that the spaces need to be longer than 17 feet.

Member Shroyer asked for clarification on the handicapped issues. Mr. Schmitt said that the letter was received by the City today, and he responded to the various issues. The Traffic Review already requested that the handicapped spaces be spread out. The ramps have also been noted and will be shown at Final Site Plan submittal. The other issues are ADA compliant. The spaces are required to be 8 feet by 19 feet (which is met with the overhang area allowed pursuant to the Ordinance). Six spaces are required, meaning only one van space is required. Mr. Schmitt said that in order for this plan to require nine handicapped spaces, the Applicant would need to provide at least 250 spaces. Mr. Schmitt reiterated that the ADA standards only require unloading area on one side of a handicapped space.

Member Shroyer asked City Attorney Tom Schultz whether the landscape waiver for more than fifteen spaces would need to be listed four times or whether one waiver covered the entire parking lot. Mr. Schultz responded that the Planning Commission was essentially approving the plan before them, so one waiver would suffice.

Landscape Architect Lance Shipman told Member Shroyer that the stormwater basin was not considered in the Landscaping Ordinance calculations. Mr. Shipman explained that the Applicant believes that their excess perimeter landscaping calculations ultimately provides more landscaping than what the Ordinance requires, if in fact the numbers are looked at as a whole.

Member Shroyer asked about the berm and opacity requirements. Mr. Shipman responded that the requirement is 80% winter, 90% summer, and that this plan may fall short without the berm. Additional evergreens may be required.

Member Shroyer asked about the façade. Chuck Fosse of Wah Yee Associates replied that the split-faced beige block is the 30-inch base around the building. The block would be laid in an ashlar pattern of various sizes. It will look more like rough-faced limestone. The balance of the building will be a medium-tan brick. The lighter shade and ample window design is meant to make the building less stark since it is a two story design next to other one story buildings. Member Shroyer supported the use of split-faced block as long as it is not used in excess.

Member Shroyer said that the southerly stub is a secondary access. City Engineer Ben Croy said that even with a shared drive with the southern neighbor the north drive would still exist and require the spacing waivers. The southerly stub is for consideration of future development (likely only one parcel due to its narrowness).

Member Shroyer asked who the Olde Orchard residents were who signed the letter. Mr. Minasian said that the first meeting they held was with the homeowners in general. The second meeting was with those residents who are directly affected or adjacent to those directly affected. Mr. Minasian produced a second letter that was not an e-mailed (unsigned) letter.

Member Shroyer said that he did not support the request for the ROW tree waiver. He said that the banks of fifteen parking spaces or less are required for environmental reasons. He believed that the Applicant should have designed a building that fit the parcel size.

Member Cassis asked about the building height. Mr. Minasian responded that the mansard roof line was designed to soften the look and serve the function of the screening fence (for rooftop appliances). He said he would redesign with the fences at the detriment of the building's aesthetics.

Member Cassis asked about the opacity. Mr. Minasian said that the setback along the north should be ten feet but he has provided twelve feet. He said he would work with the Landscape Architect to achieve the right amount of opacity with evergreens.

Mr. Minasian said that the split-faced block for this proposal is similar to his Pinnacle offices already built in the City.

Member Cassis did not get the impression that this building's Ordinance violations are so monumental. He preferred to have the roof shielding the rooftop appliances than a screening fence. Mr. Schmitt said that the Planning Department would work with the Applicant and the sightlines to achieve the desired look without needing a ZBA variance.

Member Cassis said that landscaped islands are a detriment during the snowplow season. He spoke from experience. He said that the island requirement is crazy. Their placement, where practical, would be welcome, but the excess landscaping around the building and perimeter is sufficient. Member Cassis will encourage the review of this new Ordinance; the idea was to increase the amount of landscaping on the property and in the case of this project, the amount has been increased.

Member Cassis said that Mr. Minasian builds beautiful buildings. He said that the location of this particular building proves that the Applicant has confidence in the future of this City.

Member Cassis supported the front wall landscaping over a berm design. He cautioned against becoming entrapped by Ordinance language, because not every property is going to be able to apply the requirements effectively.

Member Cassis confirmed with Mr. Croy that there is a potential traffic problem with the north entrance. Member Cassis noted that there isn't much traffic on Karim Boulevard so the location of this property's entrance is inconsequential. Mr. Croy responded that this spacing request is typical of the industrial parks; he acknowledged that the traffic in these parks is such that there is no real need for great concern. Member Cassis did not even support the "no left turn" request made by the Traffic Consultant. Mr. Croy replied that he typically agrees with the Consultant, and perhaps he felt that there may be a problem at peak traffic hours.

Member Cassis supported the project. He would expect that the Applicant would work with the Landscape Architect to arrive at a mutually acceptable landscape design.

Member Sprague did not have an issue with the façade request. He felt that the driveway locations were acceptable and questioned the need for the "no left turn" sign. He preferred the rooftop designed by the Applicant.

Member Sprague confirmed with Mr. Shipman that the foliage would have to be removed in order to add the berm. Member Sprague asked about the request for the wall instead of a berm. Mr. Shipman replied the building is positioned 3.5 feet higher than the road elevation, and there is a practical difficulty on the southwest corner in placing a berm. The height of the building is problematic, therefore creative solutions must be considered. He was confident that a design could be agreed upon that would not require a variance.

Member Sprague asked whether the additional provided landscape was equal to what was deficient on their plan. Mr. Shipman said that the Applicant has provided the appropriate ten feet along the north side. The rear property requires 29 feet, and that measures three feet from their parking lot. The south green space is largely the detention basin and not usable in the landscape calculation. There is a greater than 40% excess landscaping around their building: 4,880 square feet required, 9,918 square feet provided. Member Sprague noted that the overage is roughly 5,000 square feet, and the request for a waiver is for 2,000 square feet. He also acknowledged the damage that snowplowers do leave in parking lots. He had a general sense that the building is too big for the lot, but he will consider the other Commissioners' comments.

Member Avdoulos reviewed the architectural drawings. He said that the top of steel is 28.5 feet, and six inches for the metal deck and roofing would come close to thirty feet. The rooftop units will be six to seven feet for a height

of about 37 feet. The mansard roof will also be about 37 feet. Member Avdoulos said that the rooftop units will not be seen from the road. He was not concerned about the request for an additional foot. Member Avdoulos confirmed that the floor to floor measurement was fourteen feet. He said that could be reduced if the Applicant wanted to. Ultimately Member Avdoulos supported the Applicant going to the ZBA for the variance because it would result in a better design.

Member Avdoulos confirmed that the shingles would be textured asphalt with a shadow line. Mr. Fosse said the intent is to create a horizontal banding. Member Avdoulos supported the design, including the split-faced block. Member Avdoulos had no issue with the request for a landscape wall, especially because it can be tied into the look of the building.

Member Avdoulos asked about the fifty-foot radius that the fire marshal requested. The Applicant responded that they thought they had met that requirement, but he would be sure to work with the marshal to provide an appropriate design.

Member Avdoulos wanted to ensure that that the Applicant and the Planning Department use the same calculations when determining the parking requirement. Member Avdoulos likes landscaped islands but felt that none needed to be near the building because of the excess landscaping in that area. Member Avdoulos' coworker lives in Olde Orchard abutting the proposed berm location, and she told him she preferred the vegetation. Member Avdoulos noted that berms are often used to reduce headlight glare but this is an office building with daytime hours so the need for the berm isn't as necessary.

Member Avdoulos liked that Mr. Minasian agreed to spread out the handicapped parking spaces and was going to sprinkler the entire building. He agreed with Member Cassis that the variance and waivers for this property were not as great as they originally seemed. He did not think that the traffic warranted the "no left turn." He supported the project.

Member Pehrson felt that the architect was too overzealous in his design which results in the variances.

Member Pehrson asked about the berm. Mr. Shipman replied that if the waiver is granted, there are five criteria, along with a permanent preservation easement that are required in order for the waiver. One condition is that the same level of screening is provided. Mr. Shipman believes that additional screening material will have to be added.

Member Pehrson asked about the parking requirements. Mr. Minasian said that he and Darcy Schmitt were removing the same square footages but their numbers were coming out differently, and he would be sure that they come to an agreement on the number.

Member Pehrson asked about where the excess building landscape was. Mr. Shipman said that it does appear to be in the front of the building, and the Planning Department accepted the numbers provided by the Applicant and assumed they were correct.

Moved by Member Pehrson, seconded by Member Ruyle:

In the matter of Karim Boulevard Office Building, Site Plan 04-21, motion to grant approval of the Final Site Plan, subject to: 1) A positive recommendation for a ZBA variance for building height requirement (Section 2400) if the need for a variance cannot be eliminated through the Planning Department; 2) A Planning Commission Waiver for a required berm adjacent to residentially zoned property in the west (Section 2509.3.a.) as a result of the meeting that was held and the recommendation that comes from the Olde Orchard tenants; 3) A Planning Commission Waiver for a required berm and 13 additional ornamental trees adjacent to the public rights-of-way (Section 2509.3.b.) in light of the landscape raised area in the front of the building; 4) A Planning Commission Waiver for a deficit of 1,979 square foot of parking lot landscaping (Section 2509.3.c.) in light of the building and perimeter landscaping shown on the plan; 5) A Planning Commission Waiver for the required parking bays for parking spaces in excess of the fifteen spaces (Section 2509.3.c) as a result

of the Applicant's previous statement that he will work with the City to make sure that the proper spaces are considered in this plan; 6) A Planning Commission waiver for the minimum opposite-side driveway spacing (150 feet required, 77 feet provided) as a result of the hardship of the property which will require a waiver in any condition; 7) A Section Nine Waiver for current building design for the bottom facade; 8) Handicapped parking spaces being spaced differently with the property curb cuts addressed at the Final Site Plan per the letter from Mr. Hogan and through the direction of the Planning Department; 9) The Applicant working with the Fire Marshal to establish and create a fifty foot radius as indicated in the letter; and 10) The comments on the attached review letters being addressed on the Final Site Plan; for the reason that the Plan meets the master zoning plan.

DISCUSSION

Director of Planning David Evancoe said that there are criteria in the Ordinance that explain when the landscape islands can be waived:

1. Preservation of regulated woodlands or wetlands or existing trees will occur.
2. Stormwater runoff impacts will be lessened.
3. Traffic circulation will be substantially improved.
4. Vehicular and pedestrian safety will be enhanced.

Mr. Evancoe asked that one of these criteria be used as a finding in the motion. He supported the landscaped island criteria and said it was a benefit to the public. He cautioned the Planning Commission that this request for a variance will keep coming before them.

Member Cassis recommended that #3 applied and reminded the Planning Commission that this is Michigan and not Georgia or Texas. Piling snow on these islands are a detriment to traffic in a Michigan winter. The Planning Commission must consider practicality.

Mr. Schultz said that the criteria are meant to assist the Planning Commission in cases where there is an impracticality based on the parcel size or shape. Member Cassis said that he thought the Ordinance was written to increase the amount of landscape provided on each plan, and this Applicant was providing additional landscape.

Mr. Schultz said that if this requirement is waived for this Applicant, the Planning Commission will have to determine why they are going to waive it in every other case, and they are sure to follow.

Chair Markham supported the plan, but did not want to waive the landscaped islands. She also did not support the "no left turn" suggestion.

Member Shroyer asked the motion maker to add, "**The Applicant has worked very closely with the homeowners' association.**"

Member Shroyer said that he thought the waiver for the berm in the right-of-way was not necessary due to the height variance of the building and the topography of the land. Mr. Shipman said that he anticipated that there would not be a need for a waiver because they think they can work it out. Mr. Schultz said that the waiver would be subject to anything that is submitted on the next plan. Member Shroyer said that it could be added to the motion, and that he was in favor of the wall.

Member Shroyer thought that the winter and summer opacity requirements should be emphasized for the north and west borders to protect the adjacent landowners. He asked the motion maker to add all these items. Member Pehrson agreed. Member Ruyle agreed.

Member Shroyer would not support the motion because of the landscape island issue.

Member Ruyle would accept the landscape islands waiver being removed from the motion. Member Ruyle said he agreed that there is not a traffic problem that would warrant the "no left turn." Member Pehrson agreed to

remove the landscape island stipulation.

Mr. Minasian asked that the islands be allowed using a slightly different numbering than fifteen, as suggested by Member Avdoulos. He also noted that the daycare across the street is now a legal office. Member Pehrson asked whether moving the handicapped spaces would affect this count. Mr. Schmitt responded that it would remove the need for a variance.

Mr. Schmitt confirmed that the shortfall of landscaping was still covered by the motion, and Member Pehrson said it was.

Member Avdoulos agreed with the changes made to the motion.

Member Sprague confirmed with Mr. Evancoe that the Planning Department would be able to provide administrative approval based on the changes made from the motion. Mr. Croy said that the Planning Department would also be able to address the radius issue at the western end and the southern end of the site. Member Sprague said he was concerned about the parking requirement being calculated on medical uses in the building and he does not believe that the building will house medical. Mr. Schultz said that these are issues that are typically dealt with administratively at Final Site Plan submittal.

Mr. Schultz asked that the berm waiver indicate that the same amount of screening will be provided and the existing foliage will be preserved.

Mr. Schultz commented that the "no left turn" requirement was not addressed in the motion.

Mr. Schmitt said that the "no left turn" is an issue in the comment letter. He said that the second driveway spacing waiver was not addressed in the motion either - **A Planning Commission Waiver for the minimum opposite-side driveway spacing (200 feet required, 24 feet provided).**

Chair Markham asked Member Pehrson if he was willing to add those items to his motion. He agreed as did Member Ruyle. Member Pehrson said he did not intend for the plan to have the "no left turn" requirement.

ROLL CALL VOTE ON KARIM OFFICE, SP04-21, MOTION MADE BY MEMBER PEHRSON, SECONDED BY MEMBER RUYLE.

In the matter of Karim Boulevard Office Building, Site Plan 04-21, motion to grant approval of the Final Site Plan, subject to: 1) A positive recommendation for a ZBA variance for building height requirement (Section 2400) if the need for a variance cannot be eliminated through the Planning Department; 2) A Planning Commission Waiver for a required berm adjacent to residentially zoned property in the west (Section 2509.3.a.), with emphasis on the winter and summer opacity requirements for the north and west borders to protect the adjacent landowners, as a result of the meeting that was held and the recommendation that comes from the Olde Orchard tenants, with a Planning Commission finding that the same amount of screening will be provided and the existing foliage will be preserved; 3) A Planning Commission Waiver for a required berm and 13 additional ornamental trees adjacent to the public rights-of-way (Section 2509.3.b.) in light of the landscape raised area in the front of the building if the issue cannot be resolved without a waiver on the next site plan submittal; 4) A Planning Commission Waiver for a deficit of 1,979 square foot of parking lot landscaping (Section 2509.3.c.) in light of the building and perimeter landscaping shown on the plan; 5) A Planning Commission waiver for the minimum opposite-side driveway spacing (150 feet required, 77 feet provided) as a result of the hardship of the property which will require a waiver in any condition; 6) A Section Nine Waiver for current building design for the bottom facade; 7) Handicapped parking spaces being spaced differently with the property curb cuts addressed at the Final Site Plan per the letter from Mr. Hogan and through the direction of the Planning Department; 8) The Applicant working with the Fire Marshal to establish and create a fifty foot radius as indicated in the letter; 9) The comments on the attached review letters being addressed on the Final Site

Plan; 10) The “no left turn” requirement listed in the Traffic Consultant’s review is not necessary; and 11) A Planning Commission Waiver for the minimum opposite-side driveway spacing (200 feet required, 24 feet provided; for the reason that the Plan meets the master zoning plan and the Applicant has worked very closely with the homeowners’ association.”

Motion carried 8-0.



AMENDED

PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 8, 2006 7:30 P.M.
COUNCIL CHAMBERS - NOVI CIVIC CENTER
45175 W. TEN MILE, NOVI, MI 48375
(248) 347-0475

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at or about 7:30 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Present: Members John Avdoulos (arrived 8:15 p.m.), Victor Cassis, Lynn Kocan, David Lipski (arrived 7:41 p.m.), Michael Lynch, Michael Meyer, Wayne Wrobel

Absent: Andrew Gutman (excused), Mark Pehrson (excused)

Also Present: Barbara McBeth, Director of Planning; Jason Myers, Planner; Tim Schmitt, Planner; Rob Hayes, City Engineer; Kathy Smith-Roy, Director of Finance; David Gillam, City Attorney

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The meeting attendees recited the Pledge of Allegiance, led by Member Kocan.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Member Kocan asked to remove Karim Office Center, SP04-21a, from the Consent Agenda, set aside the rules, and make Consent Agenda Removals the first item on the Agenda.

Moved by Member Wrobel, seconded by Member Meyer:

Motion to approve the Agenda of March 8, 2006 as amended. Motion carried 5-0.

CONSENT AGENDA - REMOVALS AND APPROVAL

The Consent Agenda was moved to "Consent Agenda Removals for Commission Action."

CONSENT AGENDA REMOVALS FOR COMMISSION ACTION

1. KARIM OFFICE CENTER, SP04-21A

Consideration of the request of Ted C. Minasian for a one-year Final Site Plan extension. The subject property is located in Section 24, on the west side of Karim Blvd. and south of Grand River Avenue in the OS-1 (Office Service) District. The subject property is approximately 2.99 acres. The Applicant is proposing a two-story office building.

Ted Minasian addressed the Planning Commission. He was seeking a one-year extension of his Final Site Plan approval. The expiration date on this plan is April 5, 2006. The Conservation Easement has been approved, but it has not been executed because he has not proceeded with the project. It is part of the approved site plan; when the project moves forward, the easement would be executed. He said that the easement could be signed now, with the understanding that it not be recorded until the project moves forward. The scope of the project could change. He continues to try to purchase the adjacent property. If that happens, the easement could be changed. He would prefer to wait until the project goes forward before the easement is recorded.

Planner Tim Schmitt agreed with Mr. Minasian's comments. The easement could be signed and held in abeyance at the City Attorney's office. He suggested that the executed easement be received by the City Attorney within 120 days. City Attorney David Gillam said that everyone is in agreement that this is the appropriate way to handle this. The document could be forwarded with a cover letter that indicates the easement will not be recorded until such time that the project moves forward. If the plans changes or the project is not built, the easement will be destroyed and it will be a non-issue.

Member Lipski arrived at 7:41 p.m.

Moved by Member Kocan, seconded by Member Wrobel:

In the matter of Karim Office Center, SP04-21a, motion to approve a one-year Final Site Plan extension, with the Conservation Easement being executed within 120 days but held under escrow at the City Attorney's office until the project goes forward.

DISCUSSION

Member Meyer was concerned about the letter sent by the Applicant, citing the hard economic times in Michigan as the reason why the plan was not moving forward. He wondered why then, the Applicant was considering purchasing neighboring land to build something even bigger. Mr. Minasian responded that his first choice would be not to even sign the easement. But, he understood that the City has a greater comfort level with his executing the document. It is understood that the easement would not be recorded until the project moves forward.

Chair Cassis said it seemed like all sides are comfortable.

ROLL CALL VOTE ON KARIM OFFICE CENTER, SP04-21, FINAL SITE PLAN EXTENSION MOTION MADE BY MEMBER KOCAN AND SECONDED BY MEMBER WROBEL:

In the matter of Karim Office Center, SP04-21a, motion to approve a one-year Final Site Plan extension, with the Conservation Easement being executed within 120 days but held under escrow at the City Attorney's office until the project goes forward. *Motion carried 6-0.*

REDUCED SITE PLAN

LOCATION/AERIAL MAP



City of Novi, Michigan

SP 04-21- Karim Boulevard Office Building Aerial Photo



Legend
Tax Parcel

Created using the GIS
Geographic Information
System of

The City of Novi
43715 Road Two Mile Road
Novi, Michigan 48220
(248) 547-4300

2000 Census Tracts

| | | |
|-------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Project | Michigan State Parks | Water Projects |
| State | South State 2010 | Michigan State Parks |
| Metropolitan Area | MI 2000 | Michigan State Parks |
| Map Date | Intermittent Park | |

Date Created
January 8, 2008
Project Manager
Timothy R. Schmitt



Created by:
Timothy R. Schmitt, AICP
Planner, Plan Review Center

