



PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

CITY OF NOVI

Regular Meeting

July 9, 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 Baratta, Member Giacometti, Member Greco, Member Lynch, Chair Pehrson, Member Zuchlewski

Absent: Member Anthony (excused)

Also Present: Barbara McBeth, Deputy Director of Community Development; Sara Roediger, Planner; Sara White, Planner; Brian Coburn, Engineering Manager; David Beschke, Landscape Architect; Gary Dovre, City Attorney.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Moved by Member Baratta and seconded by Member Lynch:

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

Motion to approve the July 9, 2014 Planning Commission Agenda. *Motion carried 6-0.*

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 only thing I have this evening is to ask Brian Coburn if he'll introduce our new staff engineer.

Brian Coburn, Engineering Manager, said it's my pleasure to introduce to you folks, Jeremy Miller, who's our new staff engineer. He is replacing Adam Wayne who got a promotion within the division and is now a construction engineer and will be overseeing the site plans that you all have seen and approved and he'll be watching the inspection and implementation of the construction on the field. Jeremy is a graduate of Laurence Tech. He's got a Bachelor of Science in Civil Engineering and he is currently pursuing his masters at Wayne State University.

CONSENT AGENDA - REMOVALS AND APPROVAL

There were no Consent Agenda items.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. ZONING ORDINANCE TEXT AMENDMENT 18.269

Public Hearing for Planning Commission's recommendation to City Council for an ordinance to amend Ordinance No. 97-18 as amended, the City of Novi Zoning Ordinance at Article 12, OSC, Office Service Commercial District, Section 1203, Required Conditions: In order to allow Outdoor Display Areas in conjunction with a permitted General Hospital Use.

Deputy Director McBeth said this is a request by Providence Park Hospital that would allow the outdoor display areas in the OSC, Office Service Commercial zoning district, in conjunction with a general hospital use. We understand that Providence Park is teaming up with the Varsity Lincoln dealership to display vehicles that are provided as part of honoring vehicles donated for use on the campus. The text amendment would allow the display of other donations as well, if the hospital chose to do that. So instead of vehicles it could be art or some other public display. There were a number of suggested restrictions to the ordinance amendment, including a limitation on the total number of display pads associated with the hospital, noting that the display must be compatible with the use of the general hospital and not out of character with that use. Also, maintenance of the corner clearance areas for traffic safety, compliance with outdoor lighting standards, limitation on the signage that would be provided, hard surface materials for the actual display pads and not a gravel or grass surface. Also, if the ordinance passes, there would be administrative approval of the site plan that would locate the two display pads. At the last meeting, the Planning Commission set the public hearing for tonight and we're looking for a recommendation one way or the other to the City Council for this request.

Peter Karadjoff, President of Providence Park Hospital, said I appreciate your consideration for this. We've entered into a pretty unique relationship with Varsity. They actually are donating a security vehicle and the maintenance of it in exchange for the display. The fact that we are a not-for-profit organization, this is underwriting some expenses. We're a community facility. This is really the community's money that we're offsetting the expense on. As we've entered into this, it's got a term on it, we may renew it or not. We think it's tastefully done and the cars are not on display anywhere but on the campus. So you can't see them from Beck or Grand River, and will be tastefully landscaped and show well. Keep in mind that we have a rather conservative image as a healthcare facility so we've really toned down any type of big colorful things that make us look like a used car lot. That being said, these will be nice, new vehicles that are consistent with what the community likes to see. We would make one request, respectfully, to modify the hard surface. Right now we have crushed gravel down on the pads that we would like to use. I think it would work well. What that does is if we end this agreement it allows us to convert it back to landscaping pretty quick. This is the first time we've done this so we're just trying to maintain some flexibility so that as we go forward, if we want to convert back it would be easier. It looks and displays just fine. It doesn't detract from the landscaping or function of the surface. So that's our only request.

Member Greco said I have some questions for the applicant. You indicated that you have an agreement with Varsity Lincoln, is it for a term of years right now?

Mr. Karadjoff said yes. I can't remember that it three or five years, but it's in that range.

Member Greco said alright so right now it's a three to five year contract. With respect to the displays, I'm not clear. I understand the car dealer is donating vehicles and is it other vehicles that will be displayed there to be sold or the actual vehicles that have some sort of Providence Park Security on it?

Mr. Karadjoff said well actually a Providence security vehicle that they're donating, so we have their logo on the security vehicle. So as it's in use in patrolling the campus, there is their logo on that. We

didn't think that was controversial at all. The pads are for parking new cars out there for display. The two different spots; one up by the hospital so you can see outside the window of the lobby and one of the ring road on the inside of the campus. They'll change them out every couple of weeks so that they'll have something new.

Member Greco said now I have a question from the staff. Do you have any comments from the staff on the hard surface versus the gravel?

Deputy Director McBeth said our initial thought was that the hard surface would look better and be safer for the people that are pulling the cars in and out of that spot. That was our preference.

Member Greco said I think I tend to agree. I think the hard surface, from the pads that I've seen at other locations, looks a lot cleaner than the gravel. The gravel has a tendency to get weeds and grass in it. So I think I'd prefer the hard surface but I supposed I'll wait for the comments from my other commissioners. That's all I have.

Member Zuchlewski said relative to the hard surface, if concrete or asphalt, I don't like either one of them. If we're going with a hard surface, how about a brick paver? Would that be an option?

Mr. Karadjoff said I think we're trying to avoid the cost of installing and possibly removing something like that.

Member Zuchlewski said my thought was that in reading through this that it was for vehicles but it was also for artwork and other display type of things. So a paver would give you an option for whatever you decide to put up there. The other question, can you tell me about lighting?

Mr. Karadjoff said it's under the same lighting for the campus so there's no additional lighting that's provided. The car by the hospital is under a canopy and there are actually lights under there that have been part of the hospital.

Member Zuchlewski said so it's existing ambient lighting. Thank you.

Member Lynch said in one sense they are donating and then they're requiring you to put these cars on a hospital campus. Granted it's a unique way of marketing and maybe this is something we should consider, but are we going to have balloons and things like that out there?

Mr. Karadjoff said no, as I mentioned we're pretty conservative in our own image. You know our property is well landscaped and well maintained. It's an important component for us. When it comes to the display, there's nobody with a sandwich board walking around. We've really got it toned down to essentially just the car. It is rather limited. There are no prices on the car and nothing in the window. There's a little plaque that you have to walk up and read to see what kind of car it is if you're that interested in it.

Member Lynch said isn't there something inside?

Mr. Karadjoff said there was but we removed it because we wanted to come back to the Planning Commission to get the approval.

Member Lynch said if we approve this zoning ordinance change to allow something like this are we opening up Pandora's box for if somebody wants to park a truck there. I sympathize with you because I know that you need donations and I do think it's unique marketing. I'm wondering though if we're opening up ourselves to somebody coming in the future saying 'hey wait a minute you let Providence do it and we want to put this big clown or something in front of our hospital.'

Deputy Director McBeth said we're working with the applicant and the city attorney's office. I think we've got it pretty closely written that it's really limited to the OSC, Office Service Commercial District, associated with the general hospital and very limited in scope. That isn't to say that somebody else won't come in and make a request. The only other place that I'm aware of, outside the usual car dealerships that do this kind of display pad, is the Suburban Collection Showplace. So we've seen vehicles on display at that location.

Member Lynch said I drive by Varsity Lincoln quite a bit and it's a nice store. The way that they park the cars though, it looks like somebody is pulling out into the street and maybe that's just bad taste.

Mr. Karadjoff said if you would have listened to where they wanted to park the cars it might have looked like that. We grappled with the image. But at the same time, as long as we control the image, we can do it tastefully and we are getting real value. It's real hard savings that we're generating. They were on display for about six months or so and we really got no unfavorable comments about it.

Member Lynch said my concern is the primary use and function of the hospital is medicine and when people go to the hospital they are under a little bit of stress anyways. I'm going to trust your judgment on making sure that this doesn't add additional stress to somebody that wants to get their wife in to have a baby. People are kind of stressed out when they go there.

Mr. Karadjoff said I think the way we had looked at it is sometimes in the hospital you have a little downtime when you're a family member and it gives them something to look at.

Member Lynch said I guess with that rationale it's fine with me. I would like to see some sort of professional looking pad surface. I understand your point, if you eliminate the contract in five years you want to minimize the cost to put the grass back in there, but at the same time you want to do it tastefully. I think that possibly a brick paver or something to make it look tasteful because Providence Park is a beautiful campus.

Mr. Karadjoff said and I think you would appreciate we would do nothing to detract from the landscaping we've done. So if we could even have the gravel that we have there approved because the people would appreciate the landscape we put in around it. I think that would display well.

Member Baratta said this is a question for the staff. When I read the proposed text ordinance, I guess I'm looking at it as we're creating this exception that is limited to OSC and a hospital, and we're relying on the hospital to have a certain standard, but if the standard changes is there anything in the ordinance that prevents that change. Is there anything we could look at and say it doesn't meet the standard?

City Attorney Gary Dovre said the revised standard, in response to your comment at the last meeting about it being a bit vague. Section B talks about compatibility with the use. That is a common standard zoning administration and enforcement term. In the situation you described, staff could simply say that is not compatible with that general hospital use. Staff's call stands unless and until it's reversed by the Zoning Board of Appeals or a court.

Member Baratta said so based on that, the cars are fine. So today if they want to put a car there we say it's fine. If they wanted to do a boat or Winnebago in three or four years from today because it's a different standard at the hospital, they would have to bring that to the staff.

City Attorney Dobre said the very last part in this ordinance, the location and materials for the display should be subject to administrative site plan approval. So yes, it would have to come to staff to review the proposal.

Member Greco said if I may, doesn't it say for the surface of the display pad? It isn't specific to what's on the pad. I'm sorry to interrupt. I don't necessarily think I have a problem with this, but there may be an issue regarding what is there. The standard is vague. Why is a car more compatible with the general campus hospital use than a boat? It's not. You can make an argument either way, but we do run the risk when passing this because there could be some piece of art that's objectionable. You run into first amendment issues once you allow this. Now once you allow it, you're kind of opening it up there to what's there. This is pretty vague. I don't know the difference between any piece of art, whether objectionable or not, or a vehicle or something else for sale. It could be a grill. Let's say they enter into an agreement with Home Depot and all of a sudden you have like a tool box on display with a grill or an outdoor patio set. So that would be the issue. Again I don't know that I necessarily object to it because I think I'm generally in favor of the agreements for the mutual benefit of the parties but we do run into issues about what we like and don't like once we approve it.

Deputy Director McBeth said we can continue to work with the attorney's office and the applicant can maybe tighten it up a little bit and say that the passenger car is the only item that requested at this point. We could specify that in the ordinance language at some point. If they wanted to display something else they would need to come back and discuss it at that time.

City Attorney Dobre said sorry I read that too quickly. The staff administrative site plan approval is for the material for the pad, not the materials on the pad.

Chair Pehrson said I agree with Ms. McBeth's direction. If we can go back and look at that, that would be great. We're taking the applicant at his word and I completely believe in the word that he's using which is tasteful, but what's not to say General RV comes and wants to do the same kind of thing. So I was initially not really in favor of this just for from the stand point of it looked too commercial. Now that it's scaled back and more in line with the passive display that you would probably just go by. I would much like to see the language tightened up a little bit and find that happy medium so that we don't allow us to get onto this slippery slope.

Member Baratta said is there a way to put an expiration date on this ordinance? Could we say it's three to five years based on this particular contract for a car. No changes, after that expires.

City Attorney Dobre said that's generally not a good idea on a zoning ordinance. I mean, yes you could, but the zoning ordinance is supposed to be setting a rule that is there forever. If you start saying it's three to five years, you're basically saying it's three to five years because that's the length of the contract.

Member Baratta said or can we sit down and say maybe we don't need a change in the ordinance. Maybe we're talking about a different vehicle.

City Attorney Dobre said I know Mr. Schultz looked at this and came up with this as the way this could be legitimized. I'm not talking about if he considered different approaches to this. I'd like to think that he thought this was the best approach. Whether there are others that are not as good, I'd have to talk to Tom.

Member Baratta said I'm looking at a non-profit entity who is looking for a modifications. I know we're talking about OSC, but what's the difference with the hospital here or a church over on Ten Mile wanting to display a couple of cars for a donation. I mean obviously on OSC, this is very limited, but is

there any reason that they shouldn't have the same limitations as the hospital. So going on that same track, I think there's a different way to solve this problem and give the hospital what I think is a very minor change to his current zoning through some sort of an approval process and not change the zoning ordinance for OSC. There's got to be a way of doing that.

Member Greco said is the issue here that this is a commercial type of use putting the car out there. If you have the different locations here, I mean the car being there, it could be anything, right? Like I said it could be a piece of art or decoration or Christmas tree. Is the problem here that is some sort of commercial type of exchange enterprise that it became objectionable? Something that was for sale, rather than a piece of art or decoration? And I'm wondering if that maybe is the fine tuning that we need here. If it's limited to a commercial thing. Because we do get into a problem even if it's inside the ring road and inside the building. I mean you can put a Christmas tree or another decoration there. Was the problem that it was some sort of commercial type of exchange?

Deputy Director McBeth said Ordinance Section 1203.2. states that everything in the OSC, Office Service Commercial district should be located within a completely enclosed building, with only a couple of exceptions. Outdoor storage and display shall be prohibited. So the red language included in the packet is in conjunction with the new added language. So they were cited because that was outdoor display.

Chair Pehrson said if I might, let us task you to draft the right language. I don't have a particular problem with this venture going forward but let's find the right language. So if the maker of the motion might want to include that so we can find that happy medium so we can carry this forward.

Member Giacopetti said I'm not sure I understand what we want to see in the language.

Chair Pehrson said I don't care what the language is right now until we have them go back and craft something that comes that looks a little bit more appropriate that says we're limiting to time. We're trying to find a solution that allows Providence Park to have this gift given to them that they can modestly show and demonstrate the car being onsite. To everybody else's point, that we are finding that limit to have non-objectionable things but also takes into account some of the things Mr. Greco brought forward like a piece of artwork like we have around this building. I know it's a different set of standards being a municipal building, but if somebody didn't like the green guy over here holding the globe and wanted to make and issue of it, if it were on your property we don't want them to be in any kind of jeopardy because we've allowed that to happen. Anybody and object about anything but we're just trying to find a happy medium here to allow those two cars on two beds within the property that they own.

City Attorney Dovre said in the course of looking at this arrangement, did you determine if any other hospitals, whether they are in Michigan or in the country have similar arrangements.

Mr. Karadjoff said, to my knowledge, there is nobody else doing this. In Michigan, I don't think there's anybody doing it at this point.

City Attorney Dovre said thank you.

Member Giacopetti said I have a few questions. Are there any tax implications to using hospital property for a commercial arrangement?

Mr. Karadjoff said there can be tax implications for a for-profit use of our non-profit space, we're pretty mindful of that. We've vetted this through our attorneys and I think they felt pretty comfortable that the donation of the vehicle far outweighed the display of the vehicles.

Member Giacometti said the other question I had in terms of your discussion with varsity is was this your absolute floor, two cars?

Mr. Karadjoff said there were a few ideas. We really were thoughtful of the cars we displayed and where we displayed them. There is nothing inside the hospital and nothing outside the perimeter road. So we really settle on these spots as being acceptable to both parties. I don't know if there was a ceiling or a floor on what we would do, but we really came to this conclusion.

Member Giacometti said when I read through this my initial reaction I think was similar to some of the other commissioners in that I didn't particularly care for this concept/arrangement, but seeing that he proposed location is relatively close to the hospital it's ok. I think a provision that I would like to see is a minimum setback from the road or maximum from the building in terms of its location. I think closer to the facility and further away from the road, I think would be acceptable. The other item that may prevent this becoming an issue with other OSC districts, is if there's a setback that's 300 feet, there may be a lot of facilities that wouldn't be able to accommodate that. So with those amendments, I think I would be ready tonight to approve this, but if you'd rather wait and go back, then so be it. I leave that to the commissioners.

Member Lynch said I guess the question on the table is if there was a 300 foot setback and I know one off the pads is off of Beck. I would have told you that I wanted pad right at the corner next to your sign at Grand River and Beck if I was Varsity, but will it affect your donations if it were so far back that nobody could see it.

Mr. Karadjoff said well it's not for display for anybody on Beck or Grand River, so you can't see it from those roads. I don't know what the setback is from Beck Road, it's inside the berm. It's probably 50-100 feet back from Beck Road. It's for display when you're on the campus.

Member Lynch said so it's all internal?

Mr. Karadjoff confirmed it's all internal.

Member Lynch said so would you have an objection just putting it into a parking stall and designating it as a display area?

Mr. Karadjoff said we contemplated that, it just wouldn't stand out. We have hundreds and hundreds of cars in the lot so in exchange for the donation they wanted some visibility and we kicked it around and they left the one by the hospital is probably the one that is the most noticeable and gets the most looks. So the one out by the road is also important, it just allows us another spot. So I think we'd like to keep the two vehicles the way they are. It took us a while where we were comfortable with this that it wasn't gaudy.

Member Lynch said do you have an objection that if a pad was made out of concrete pavers that you see. Gravel is messy.,

Mr. Karadjoff said I think something that would be low cost to install and low cost to take out and wasn't permanent. If I could just send a landscape guy out there say 'hey Jay would you pick those things up now' and it was that simple, we'd be pretty comfortable with that.

Chair Pehrson said relative to Suburban that was mentioned, are any of those cars displayed outside or is that all inside the building.

Deputy Director McBeth said some of those cars are outside the building as well.

Chair Pehrson said was there any amendment for that to have taken place

Deputy Director McBeth said that's a different district that allows outside display. It's unique to that district.

Member Baratta said at this point I would like to make a motion to table this zoning ordinance text amendment until we can get some additional language that encompasses the discussion the commission had. I think we were talking about some vague language and setbacks. I don't have them all written down here but I do think we need a hard surface for these pads either way. I think that's been consistent from what I've heard and I would make that part of that ordinance.

City Attorney Dovre said just a quick question as to the hard surface. I know the last question you asked was regarding the concrete pavers. Currently we're talking about concrete and asphalt, wouldn't concrete pavers be a third option.

Member Baratta said I would have no objection to that. Does anybody else?

Member Greco said I have no objection to that. If it's something that's not encompassed within what's already required.

Moved by Member Baratta and seconded by Member Greco:

ROLL CALL VOTE ON THE ZONING ORDINANCE TEXT AMENDMENT 18.268 APPROVAL MOTION MADE BY MEMBER BARATTA AND SECONDED BY MEMBER GRECO:

Motion to table the Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment 18.268 for revised language as discussed by the Planning Commission this evening. *Motion carried 6-0.*

MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION

1. ADAMS NORTH TECH CENTRE, JSP14-29

Consideration for approval of Preliminary Site Plan and Stormwater Management Plan. The subject property is 6.70 acres in Section 1 of the City of Novi and located at the northeast corner of Cabot Drive and MacKenzie Drive in the OST, planned Office, Service, Technology district. The applicant is proposing a 53,039 square foot speculative office building.

Planner Sara White said the applicant is proposing a 53,039 square foot office building on a 6.70 acre site. The subject property is located at the northeast corner of Cabot Drive and MacKenzie Drive in section 1. The proposed project is currently part of a larger parcel, which the applicant has said they intend to split to create this site. The subject property is zoned OST, Office Service Technology and is surrounded by OST on all sides. The Future Land Use map indicates Office, R&D, Technology uses for the subject property with the same use suggested for all surrounding properties. There are no regulated woodlands or wetlands on the site. The proposed development will result in a 53,039 square foot office building for a future tenant. A new sidewalk is proposed along MacKenzie Drive and connects internally with sidewalks throughout the site. Additionally, a sidewalk is required along the Cabot Drive extension at the time of that construction. The applicant has provided information related to the economic impact of the proposed project. The project is expected to create 130 jobs during the construction phase and 200-250 jobs once the building is fully occupied. The anticipated investment to construct the project is \$3.5 Million, not including future tenant improvements.

The applicant has shown the extension of Cabot Drive as a future possibility, subject to additional development north of the proposed project. If this extension were to be built at the time of construction of *this* project, a sidewalk and additional landscaping would be required along the road. Because the location of the road is not finalized, the applicant will not show any of the future required improvements on this site plan. However, they have indicated that they are willing to work with staff and the City attorney's office to identify an appropriate mechanism to ensure these improvements will be made at the time of the road extension. The applicant is requesting a waiver of the required street trees along MacKenzie drive, as underground utility locations make planting problematic. Staff would support this waiver, provided that the number of street trees being omitted are placed elsewhere on the site, which the applicant indicates they have done. All reviews are recommending approval of the proposed plan with items to be addressed on the final site plan. The Planning Commission is asked to consider and approve the Preliminary Site Plan and Stormwater Management Plan. The applicant is here tonight to answer any questions that you may have, as well as city staff.

Joe Drolshagen of Northern Equities said this is the fourth building that's along MacKenzie Drive. It's a successful building. There are really no major changes between this and the other ones that surround it. We do have activity on our Adams South Building and so we always need to have an inventory going on and that's why this is proposed. We thank you for your consideration and for staff's hard work.

Moved by Member Greco and seconded by Member Lynch:

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

In the matter of Adams North Tech Center, JSP14-29, motion to approve the Preliminary Site Plan 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 the items listed in those letters being addressed on the Final Site Plan;
- b) Planning Commission waiver of street tree requirement due to the location of underground utilities, subject to the applicant providing an equal number of trees on-site to supplement landscaping, which is hereby granted; and
- c) Applicant to work with city staff and city attorney's office at the time of Final Site Plan to determine the mechanism needed to insure landscaping and sidewalk improvements along future master planned Cabot Drive extension upon construction.

This motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Article 23A, Article 24 and Article 25 of the Zoning Ordinance and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance.

Motion carried 6-0.

Moved by Member Greco and seconded by Member Lynch:

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

In the matter of Adams North Tech Center, JSP14-29, 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. **SET PUBLIC HEARING FOR AUGUST 13, 2014 FOR TEXT AMENDMENT 18.270 ABOVE GROUND STORAGE TANKS IN OST, PLANNED OFFICE SERVICE TECHNOLOGY DISTRICTS**

Planner Sara Roediger said tonight we have another text amendment request. This one is from Somnio Global to allow for the above ground storage tanks in the OST Zoning District. We currently allow for outdoor above ground storage tanks in our I-1 and I-2 Industrial Districts. The applicant has indicated that they are a research and development business and have a growing need to have above ground storage tanks. The OST districts are generally located along I-96 and M-5. They are looking to add language that is very similar to what's in the I-1 Zoning District in terms of how it will be regulated. We're still working with the applicant and the City's attorney's office for any additional details or changes. We'll complete a review before the public hearing but we've attached what they have proposed and we're looking to schedule a public hearing on the August 13th meeting. I'm happy to hear any comments or questions you may have before then.

Member Greco said make sure that the applicant is here to tell us why they need this change. That would be what I'm most interested in is why they need this.

Chair Pehrson asked if there are size limitations that they're suggesting?

Planner Roediger said the current ordinance language in the I-1 District has a 600-gallon maximum. They are proposing to not have that. We're actually in discussions right now with the fire marshal to see if the 600-gallon requirement is reasonable and if there's an alternative we could use because we are hearing from some businesses that that is an outdated standard in terms of today's needs. We're working that out with the fire marshal and we'll have that information for the public hearing.

Member Baratta said if they do put in a tank, is there some sort of berm or something they can put around this tank or will the fire code handle that?

Planner Roediger said we require a masonry wall or landscaping with the outdoor storage tanks. The one that comes to mind is at Beck North. They have a free standing storage enclosure that completely screens it for the masonry unit.

Member Baratta said it does screen it so when we're talking about screening that's more visual, I'm looking at more of safety issue in addition.

Planner Roediger said yes. Its security gated as well.

Member Zuchlewski said I have one more question, is this a gasoline or propane or oil tank?

Planner Roediger said it could be any of those things. It's for flammable material, which is coordinated with the fire department as to how to regulate it, to make sure it's secure, and that they have inventory of what's out there.

Member Zuchlewski said so it would be all inclusive and a mode of some kind so that the material doesn't seep out. It would be a contained type.

Planner Roediger said right, all in accordance to the fire code.

Moved by Member Greco and seconded by Member Baratta:

ROLL CALL VOTE TO SET THE PUBLIC HEARING FOR TEXT AMENDMENT 18.270 MOTION MADE BY MEMBER GRECO AND SECONDED BY MEMBER BARATTA:

Motion to set public hearing for Text Amendment 18.270 for above ground storage tanks in the OST, Planned Office Service Technology District for August 13, 2014. *Motion carried 6-0.*

3. PLANNING COMMISSIONER OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES

Deputy Director McBeth said on your table this evening was a form provided. Thank you to everyone who responded for committee selections. It was interesting to hear that the committee selections from the five commissioners who responded indicated that they would like to be on the same committees on which they currently serve. It looks like there are just a couple of openings there for the other two members who have not yet identified selections. This is usually a two part action that the Planning Commission takes. There's the election of officers - that's the far left column, the Administrative Liaison Committee. That's usually done by vote. The committee selection is a separate matter. Mr. Chair the Administrative Liaison Committee is the first thing that's voted on: the chair, vice chair and secretary.

Officers:

Motion by Member Lynch, seconded by Member Greco to elect Mark Pehrson as Chairperson of the Planning Commission.

Motion by Member Lynch, seconded by Member Baratta to elect David Greco as Vice-Chairperson of the Planning Commission.

Motion by Member Baratta, seconded by Member Greco to elect Mike Lynch as Secretary of the Planning Commission.

Motion by Member Baratta and seconded by Member Zuchlewski:

ROLL CALL VOTE ON PLANNING COMMISSION OFFICER MOTIONS NOTED ABOVE MADE BY MEMBER BARATTA AND SECONDED BY MEMBER ZUCHEWSKI.

Motion to elect the Planning Commission Officers as noted above. *Motion carried 6-0.*

Deputy Director McBeth said for the Capital Improvement Program and the Budget and Planning Studies Committee, it's usually two members plus one alternate. There's the annual review of the Capital Improvement Plan in which that committee meets with a couple of City Council members and administrative staff to review of CIP before it comes to the Planning Commission for a public hearing. In the past, the Budget and Planning Studies Committee has also looked at Planning Commission activities and made recommendations in terms of reports and studies the Planning Commission would like to undertake.

The Environmental and Walkable Committee meets about six times a year, Thursday evenings before the Parks Recreation and Cultural Service Commission meeting. For that, we usually have three Planning Commission members. We have two that have already volunteered.

The next committee is the Implementation Committee. That's the committee that would choose to take up or review Zoning Ordinance Text Amendments.

The next one, because it appears in the Planning Commission rules, is the Main Street Committee. As you know that committee has not met in a number of years. Two members are indicated.

The next one we think may be an active committee in this coming year, the Master Plan and Zoning Committee. This committee reviews zoning requests that are not consistent with the Master Plan. Also, this year we expect to undertake review of the Master Plan.

The final committee is the Rules Committee. Periodically, this committee will be called to look over the Planning Commission Rules and Bylaws.

Committees:

The Planning Commission worked together as a group to determine the following committee appointments.

- **Administrative Liaison Committee:** Member Greco, Member Lynch, Chair Pehrson
- **CIP & Budget Planning Studies Committee:** Member Giacometti, Member Lynch, and Member Zuchlewski (Alternate)
- **Environmental and Walkable Novi Committee:** Member Baratta, Member Giacometti, Member Zuchlewski
- **Implementation Committee:** Member Anthony, Member Greco, Chair Pehrson
- **Main Street Committee:** Member Giacometti, Member Zuchlewski
- **Master Plan & Zoning Committee:** Member Giacometti, Member Lynch, Chair Pehrson
- **Rules Committee:** Member Baratta, Member Greco, Chair Pehrson

Motion by Member Greco and seconded by Member Baratta:

ROLL CALL VOTE ON PLANNING COMMISSION COMMITTEE SELECTIONS NOTED ABOVE MADE BY MEMBER GRECO AND SECONDED BY MEMBER BARATTA.

Motion to appoint Planning Commission Committee members as noted above. *Motion carried 6-0.*

2. APPROVAL OF THE JUNE 11, 2014 PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Deputy Director McBeth said our attorney's office has taken a look at those and have a couple of minor modifications that will be incorporated.

Moved by Member Greco and seconded by Member Baratta:

VOICE VOTE ON THE JUNE 11, 2014 PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES APPROVAL MOTION MADE BY MEMBER GRECO AND SECONDED BY MEMBER BARATTA:

Motion to approve the June 11, 2014 Planning Commission Minutes. *Motion carried 6-0.*

CONSENT AGENDA REMOVALS FOR COMMISSION ACTION

There were no Consent Agenda Removals.

MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION

Member Giacometti asked who chairs the Main Street Committee said that it hasn't met in a while.

Deputy Director McBeth said the Main Street Committee has not been active for a number of years. That committee includes a couple of members from the Planning Commission and a couple of members from the City Council and staff members. That committee was really active as Main Street was first coming through and starting to develop. But that committee fell by the wayside and has not chosen to meet for

a number of years. So if the Rules Committee decides to meet this year, one of staff's suggestions will be that we eliminate the Main Street committee. It can always be reactivated at some point in the future, if needed.

Member Giacometti said I just find it ironic that this year we went through an exercise of review updates to the Main Street plan and the committee never met which seems like a wasted opportunity to maybe handle some of the issues outside of the meetings and maybe bring a cleaner product to the commission meetings.

Deputy Director McBeth said that is considered a 'city committee' so it involves not just Planning Commission members but other groups as well. We can look into that and see if there's any interest to continue with that.

Member Giacometti said I have one other matter for discussion. This is just for my general education. In an OSC District where display is not permissible, what's the intent of that provision? Not just here, but do other communities have similar ordinances?

Deputy Director McBeth said a number of districts have the provision that prohibits outdoor storage or display and those would be the less commercial zoning districts or non-industrial zoning districts. Staff understands that certain uses typically provide some outside uses. For a general industrial use you would expect that they would have some products that would be stored outside. Gas stations sometimes have products that are stored outside for sale. That's generally understood. There are a number of districts where we don't expect things that would be kept outside - like an office district. It's an aesthetic standpoint for that district. It's the characteristic of that district that products will be completely contained within a building and they will not have pallets or boxes of goods and materials kept outside.

Chair Pehrson said the place-making event, is there an output from that?

Deputy Director McBeth said yes. We're working on the final output from that event and we appreciate your attendance. The group that is putting it together hopes that everything will be wrapped up within a couple months of completion.

SUPPLEMENTAL ISSUES

There are no Supplemental Issues.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

No one in the audience wished to speak.

ADJOURNMENT

Moved by Member Baratta and seconded by Member Zuchlewski:

VOICE VOTE ON MOTION TO ADJOURN MADE BY MEMBER BARATTA AND SECONDED BY MEMBER ZUCHLEWSKI:

Motion to adjourn the July 9, 2014 Planning Commission meeting. *Motion carried 6-0.*

The meeting was adjourned at 7:59 PM.

Transcribed by Valentina Nukulaj

July, 2014

Date Approved: July 23, 2014

Richelle Leskun, Planning Assistant
Signature on File