PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

CITY OF NOVI
Regular Meeting
August 28, 2013 7:00 PM
Council Chambers | Novi Civic Center | 45175 W. Ten Mile
(248) 347-0475

cityofnovi.org

CALL TO ORDER
The meeting was called to order at or about 7:00 PM.

ROLL CALL
Present: Member Baratta, Member Giacopetti, Member Greco, Member Lynch, Chair Pehrson, Member Zuchlewski
Absent: Member Anthony
Also Present: Barbara McBeth, Deputy Director of Community Development; Kristen Kapelanski, Planner; Elizabeth Saarela, City Attorney; Erica Morgan, Staff Engineer; Pete Hill, Environmental Consultant; Matt Carmer, Environmental Consultant; David Beschke, Landscape Architect; Rod Arroyo, Traffic Consultant.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
Member Giacopetti led the meeting attendees in the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA
Moved by Member Greco, seconded by Member Baratta:

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

Motion to approve the August 28, 2013 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 reported that the text amendment that the Planning Commission had recently reviewed regarding vehicle rental facilities in the light industrial district was approved for a first reading at Monday's Council meeting. There will be a couple of modifications for the second reading. Also approved was a contract with Clearzoning for a modification to the format of the Zoning Ordinance. Details on that project will be shared with the Planning Commission over the upcoming months. It's basically a reformatting of the ordinance to consolidate texts, provide better graphics, provide links to references and includes a zoning map for easier reference.

CONSENT AGENDA - REMOVALS AND APPROVAL
There were no items on the Consent Agenda.

PUBLIC HEARINGS
1. **BERKSHIRE POINT, JSP13-47 with REZONING 18.704**
   Public Hearing of the request of Ivanhoe Companies for Planning Commission's recommendation to City Council for rezoning of property in Section 18, on the west side of Wixom Road, south of Grand River Avenue from B-2, Community Business and I-2, General Industry to RM-1, Low Density, Low-Rise

Multiple-Family Residential with a Planned Rezoning Overlay. The subject property is approximately 29.20 acres.

Planner Kristen Kapelanski said the applicant is proposing to rezone with a Planned Rezoning Overlay or PRO a 29.2 acre site on the west side of Wixom Road south of Grand River. The parcels are currently made up of vacant land and vacant industrial property. To the north in the City of Wixom is an existing shopping center. To the east across Wixom Road are a car dealership and a shopping center. And to the west and south is property owned by Catholic Central High School that includes the school building, athletic fields and vacant land.

The subject property is currently zoned B-2, Community Business and I-2, General Industrial and the proposed zoning is RM-1, Low Density, Low-Rise Multiple-Family Residential. The site is bordered by B-3 and FS zoning to the north in the City of Wixom, B-3 and I-1 zoning to the east, R-4 zoning to the west and R-1 and I-1 zoning to the south. The future land use map indicates Community Commercial uses for the subject property and the properties to the east. The properties to the north are planned for Village Center Area on the City of Wixom's Future Land Use Map. The properties to the west and south are planned for Educational Facilities. The proposed rezoning would be contrary to the current recommendations of the Future Land Use map.

The applicant's concept plan shows an 86 unit detached single-family development. As you will recall, a PRO essentially creates a "floating district" with a conceptual plan and any ordinance deviations attached to the rezoning of the subject property via a PRO Agreement. In this case, the applicant has also included what they have termed the "Zoning Plan." This plan shows an attached residential development totaling 116 units. Staff has not reviewed the "Zoning Plan" against the standards of the Ordinance but the applicant would like this plan included in the proposed PRO Agreement as a layout plan showing the not-to-exceed 116 attached units they have proposed. Should the applicant move forward with the "Zoning Plan", revisions to any approved PRO Agreement and Concept Plan would be required. Staff and consultant reviews are focused on the 86 unit single-family plan termed the "Development Concept Plan."

Planner Kapelanski continued saying the applicant has proposed a public benefit, as required by the PRO Ordinance. The application materials and staff review indicate a reduced density over what would typically be allowed in the RM-1 District, protection of natural features via a conservation easement, several pocket parks to be located throughout the development, upgraded facades and a proposed nature path. At the suggestion of staff and other Novi officials, the applicant is now proposing a "Welcome to Novi" sign to be located at the entrance to the City along Wixom Road in lieu of the proposed nature path. It is the staff's opinion that the proposed public benefits go above and beyond the benefits associated with a typical development.

The planning review recommends approval of the proposed rezoning with PRO. The applicant has presented a reasonable alternative to the proposed Master Plan designation of Community Commercial. The proposed RM-1 zoning would provide a reasonable transition between the commercial properties to the north and east and the school uses to the west and south. It would also allow for the removal of the incompatible I-2 zoning currently in place. The proposal is also in compliance with several goals and objectives of the Master Plan as noted in the planning review letter. The applicant has made the argument that the proposed lots sizes are meeting a need for a development style that has not been fully addressed in the City which would meet an objective of the Master Plan to provide a full range of quality housing opportunities. The proposed lot sizes would complement other developments with similarly sized lots in the area including Knightsbridge Gate and the proposed Andelina Ridge. Deviations from the Zoning Ordinance can be approved as part of the PRO Agreement. The applicant has requested deviations to permit a smaller lot size and width than what would be required and also to permit deficient side and rear yard setbacks.

Planner Kapelanski also said comments from all City staff and consultants on the proposed rezoning and PRO concept plan have been provided. The engineering review notes there are no utility concerns with the proposed rezoning and lists items to be addressed on the Preliminary Site Plan submittal. The traffic review includes several modifications to the concept plan and traffic study that will need to be addressed before the matter can proceed to the City Council. The applicant has been working with the City's traffic consultant and both are confident these issues can be resolved. The City's Traffic Consultant Rod Arroyo is here to address any traffic questions. The landscape review recommends approval noting ordinance deviations are required and supported for the lack of berms along most frontages. The wetland and woodland reviews recommend approval noting items to be addressed on the Preliminary Site Plan submittal. The City's wetland and woodland consultant is here this evening to address any environmental questions or concerns. The façade review states that the proposed renderings would be considered enhancements over what would typically be required by the ordinance. Additional elevations would be required to meet the City's similar/dissimilar ordinance provisions. The applicant has indicated these will be provided and has also noted in their response letter that the exact materials for the facades are still in flux but the ultimate design will include quality materials that will be above the minimum ordinance requirements. The fire review does not list any concerns with the proposed concept plan.

Gary Shapiro of Ivanhoe companies said he was glad to appear before the Planning Commission. He has been working with the current property owner on acquiring the property for several years and has worked with staff over the last year as well. The first option was a commercial development but that was problematic because of the environmental features. The second was industrial but that seemed like spot zoning. The next consideration was RM-2 zoning which would allow upwards of 500 units. That was a serious consideration because it would be a lower price point; something that Novi doesn't have and it would be right on the boarder of Wixom but the planners and consultants drove us in a different direction. RM-1 seemed like the logical choice. Originally the plan was laid out as a multi-family for either condos for sale or apartments but staff felt that was too dense. This site plan was revised numerous times.

Based on market studies the concept plan was ultimately determined which is a single-family, detached site condominium with a neighborhood design. Every single site backs up to an open space. We reduced the density dramatically to do something really unique. We're proposing a really walkable community with pocket parks and public roads which really give a good curb appeal. We proposed a pool and clubhouse area. We worked with consultants to make sure the parking requirements are correct. The road configuration are in a developmental stage. This is something that Novi does not have that is very unique. The original goal was to limit the development to 116 units so that there was some flexibility if the economy changed. The city attorney felt that should be dealt with in the PRO Agreement. The concept plan that is being proposed is an 86 unit detached single-family home development.

Brad Strader, the applicant's consultant, of LSL Planning said they have worked with Gary Shapiro and his firm for over 15 years now on a number of projects. He has an excellent track record as a good developer. He's assembled a good team and he's a really passionate and a very hands-on developer. The key thing about this site is that it's zoned B-2 and part of it is zoned I-2, the former Cadillac Asphalt Plant. The original plan for this site was commercial. We laid out different things and found the site configuration and the wetlands didn't lend itself very well to commercial but more importantly, Gary met with a lot of different retailers and commercial developers to try to gain interest and found that it doesn't work. It's sort of a dead end for commercial because it's behind a shopping center. This doesn't feel like commercial. It's next to a high school. If there's a need for commercial in this facility, it really should be up closer to the interchange.

Residential seemed like a more viable option and the PRO provides a win-win for the developer and the community by having higher quality development and getting some of the information upfront. We

came up with an attached plan with four units per building and basically the same road configuration and as we continued to study the market we found that that real demand was for high quality, detached single-family. So we used the same road layout but came up with the 86 unit plan. Amenities that would be over and above the typical development of a parcel include property combination and eliminating an industrial parcel. The high school has submitted a letter stating that this is a better use than the existing zoning or what would be allowed by the Master Plan. This is a good land use transition that would generate about 10% of the traffic that would be generated by the current zoning. Staff has been great to work with as were the consultants. The team is here to answer any questions you have and we look forward to your favorable recommendation to the City Council so we can move the project forward.

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

Member Lynch read the correspondence. Mike Stanford, General Manager of Varsity Lincoln, said this letter serves as a letter in support of the proposed Ivanhoe Companies known as Berkshire Pointe. We've been in communication with Mr. Shapiro to form his goal to eliminate the industrial zoning at Cadillac Asphalt. We support the condominium community that will be across the street from our property. We believe that the construction of this residential area will improve the community by strengthening the relationship between the residents, businesses, developers, schools and churches. We appreciate Ivanhoe Companies stated objective to construct a development that is both compatible and beneficial to all adjoining property owners.

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

Member Greco said he had a question regarding the 86 units versus the 116 units. He asked the applicant to explain how that fit into the request.

Mr. Shapiro said the concept plan going along with the rezoning is the 86 unit plan. The idea of doing multiple-family zoning was to make things a little more flexible so that if we did need to go to the 116 units, it would be a little easier to address later. If any changes to the 86 unit plan are made, including a change in the number of units, it would need to come back before the Planning Commission.

Member Lynch confirmed the units were detached.

Mr. Shapiro said that's correct.

Member Lynch said the PRO is the way to go. The development looks good and will fit in there nicely. Obviously the industrial and the high density commercial wouldn't be a good use for that property, mainly because of the traffic. It doesn't have the visibility that most commercial people want. It looks like these houses are in a lower price point than a lot of the homes in the area so I believe it does fill that need. The traffic study that had a marginal impact on the traffic on Wixom Road but that study was done when Catholic Central was on a summer break. Will the traffic study be revised?

Mr. Shapiro said the traffic generated would be dramatically less than commercial or industrial would be.

Mr. Strader said the traffic study will be revised based on the 86 unit plan. Because the counts were taken after school let out when they had a summer camp going on, we checked with the City's traffic consultant and the traffic engineers had a trip generation rate for a high school so we took the actual counts and removed the summer camp counts and replaced them with what the estimates would be for the high school.

Member Lynch asked if there was any consideration given to an access point on Twelve Mile Road.

Mr. Strader said we looked at a number of options to connect it with Twelve Mile but that didn't work.

Mr. Shapiro said we looked at it and the consensus was that Twelve Mile is more of a beauty road in that area and we didn't want to create a cut through for that area. Right now it's not a paved road, I think there was a push at one time to make it a beauty road. We felt that would be a negative impact of cut through traffic and not be good for the school or the community as a whole.

Member Lynch said it seemed like a good marketing opportunity. Certainly if you had people coming into the site and they get caught in traffic on Wixom Road, it may hurt you. But if you're comfortable that it's not going to hurt the marketing of your property then that's fine.

Mr. Strader said there has been an emergency access provided as a third means of access to the property.

Member Lynch asked if Wixom Road will be a four or five-lane road in the future.

Planner Kapelanski said she didn't think it was planned for the very near future at this point, at least it didn't factor into the review of this development. So it may be in the Capital Improvement Plan, but it's probably quite a ways off.

Member Lynch asked if the developer would be donating right-of-way to the City.

Mr. Strader said we're donating the right-of-way and we're building the bike safety path that is in the proper place if further expansion occurs.

Member Lynch said this seems similar to the Knightsbridge Gate development.

Mr. Shapiro said yes, but more upscale. The driveways are longer, there is more open space and additional sidewalks.

Member Baratta said the traffic study is a concern because there is a project that's under construction over at Ten Mile and Wixom. You've also got Catholic Central. Are there going to be traffic issues?

Traffic Consultant Arroyo said there are a couple things to look at. As they indicated in their study, comparing what could go there to the current zoning this could be a significantly smaller traffic generator. The biggest concern that we've had regarding the review of this actual plan and the site is the access point to Wixom Road and the fact that it lines up with another boulevard. So we've made some comments, they've already provided us with a concept for a modified approach which works a lot better. So we feel that's resolvable. But I'm not going to tell you that it's going to work perfect. It's going to be difficult to getting out during the peak hour. We are looking to the revised traffic study to get all those numbers verified and check to make sure that everything is going to work the way it should, but it certainly is going to be less traffic coming out of there than commercial would be overall. It's just the differences with residential, you're going to have leaving in the morning whereas with retail, most of that would be PM peak hour traffic, which generally could be the worst in terms of congestion in this area.

We would of preferred an access point to Twelve Mile, a secondary access point because at least if you're having a hard time getting out to Wixom Road, you could go to Twelve Mile and there's better access to Grand River that way, but this is somewhat challenging because they don't actually have full frontage on Twelve Mile and there's not really the type of access to Twelve Mile that would even lend itself to a full access point.

Member Baratta said leaving Island Lake in the morning is an extremely difficult left turn. And to your point, if this were commercial, I think while the number of trips may be a little less with this plan versus commercial, I think as you indicated the timing of those trips will be a lot different. I don't think you'll have the same utilization of the roads at those peaks hours. Where would you have moved that access point to Wixom?

Traffic Consultant Arroyo said, it's always better to have an access point that doesn't align with another. So the preference would be using that southern access point and not having a north access point.

Member Baratta asked is there a light there?

Traffic Consultant Arroyo said no.

Member Baratta asked if there was a light in front of Target.

Traffic Consultant Arroyo said yes.

Chair Pehrson said relative to the overall concept, it's not too often that we've gone through a PRO process where we've seen the kind of generosity relative to visualizing what the space could be, where it might have gone, and I'm glad that we're not sitting here looking at five hundred units. Density is huge in this City relative to all the things that come with that, such as traffic, so I'm very much pleased with the 86 units. Some of the more important benefits that probably weren't listed include the environmental impacts and the sensitivity that you've put forward there and getting rid of that heavy industrial next to the school zone. The only concern that I would have would be the traffic. We know Wixom Road is going to become a very clogged, if it isn't already, roadway. So I will be supporting it.

Moved by Member Lynch and seconded by Member Greco:

ROLL CALL VOTE ON THE ZONING MAP AMENDMENT 18.704 APPROVAL MOTION MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER GRECO:

In the matter of Berkshire Point, JSP13-47 with Zoning Map Amendment 18.704 motion to recommend approval to the City Council to rezone the subject property from B-2 (Community Commercial) and I-2 (General Industrial) to RM-1 (Low Density Low-Rise Multiple-Family Residential) with a Planned Rezoning Overlay with the following ordinance deviations:

a. **Reduction in minimum lot size from 10,000 square feet (required) to 5,400 square feet (proposed);**
b. **Reduction in minimum lot width from 80 feet (required) to 45 feet (proposed)**
c. **Reduction in minimum side yard setback from 10 feet with an aggregate of 25 feet (required) to 5 feet with an aggregate of 10 feet (proposed);**
d. **Reduction in minimum rear yard setback from 35 feet (required) to 30 feet (proposed);**
e. **Lack of berms along the south, north and west frontages and lack of berm along portions of the east frontage;**

And subject to the following conditions:

a. **Applicant providing additional elevations or renderings to comply with the similar/dissimilar Ordinance provisions;**
b. **Applicant revising the concept plan and traffic study in accordance with the recommendations in the traffic review letter prior to consideration by the City Council; and**
c. **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 Preliminary Site Plan.**

This motion is made because:

a. **The applicant has presented a reasonable alternative to the proposed Master Plan**

designation of Community Commercial as outlined in the planning review letter;

b. **The proposed multiple-family zoning provides a reasonable transitional use between the commercial properties to the north and east and the school uses to the south and west and would accommodate the removal of the incompatible I-2 zoning;**
c. **The site will be adequately served by public utilities and the proposed zoning and proposed use represents fewer peak hour trips than the current zoning would require; and**
d. **The proposed concept plan shows the preservation and enhancement of wetlands on the site. *Motion carried 6-0.***

MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION

1. **SKYZONE, JSP13-21**

   Consideration of the request of Mode Development, Inc., for Preliminary Site Plan and Stormwater Management Plan approval. The subject property is located in Section 9 north of Magellan Drive and east of West Road in the I-1, Light Industrial District. The subject property is 6.26 acres and the applicant is proposing to construct an 80,230 square foot building with associated parking and landscaping. Approximately half of the building will be used as an indoor trampoline center and the remaining space will be speculative office and manufacturing space.

Planner Kapelanski said the applicant is proposing to construct an 80,230 square foot building on the north side of Magellan Drive. To the north is vacant land and to the south, east and west are existing industrial and office uses in the City of Novi and the City of Wixom. The subject property is zoned I-1 and mostly surrounded by I-1 zoning. The Future Land Use map shows Industrial, Research and Development and Technology uses for the subject property and the surrounding properties. There are no natural features on the property. The applicant is proposing an approximately 80,230 sq. ft. building. Approximately 25,600 square feet would be used for an indoor recreational trampoline center with the remaining 48,198 sq. ft. as speculative office and manufacturing space. Associated landscaping and parking areas would also be constructed.

The planning review is recommending approval of the plan. The applicant has proposed front yard parking and the Planning Commission is asked to make a finding that the proposed parking is compatible with the surrounding land uses. The Zoning Ordinance standards for indoor recreational uses would require more parking than has been proposed. The applicant has provided a parking study for the indoor recreation use demonstrating adequate parking will be provided on site and staff supports the required parking variance. The engineering, landscaping and fire reviews are recommending approval with items to be addressed as part of the final site plan submittal. The traffic review recommends approval of the plan noting a same-side driveway spacing waiver is required. The façade review also recommends approval of the plan and the required façade waiver for the overage of ribbed metal panels.

Maria Dagostini, of Mode Development, said just as a matter of clarification, the footprint of the building has since been reduced; it is not 80,230 square feet anymore. The total square footage of the building is 73,798. The Skyzone portion of the building is 25,600 and the vacant speculative portion of the building will be 39,698 square feet of shop/industrial space and then approximately 4,250 square feet of office. The second floor may or may not be built; it really depends on the needs of a future tenant. It is a multi-space building with one common owner. The parking of the front yard does meet the City's requirements to not exceed 50% of the area between the minimum front yard setback and the actual building setback.

Member Lynch confirmed that the front yard parking has been approved in other instances.

Planner Kapelanski said that's correct, there are several properties in the area that have front yard parking. The Zoning Ordinance just requires that the Planning Commission find that it's compatible with

the surrounding uses before it can be approved.

Member Lynch said ok, it looks like it's compatible.

Chair Pehrson said we are looking at this as a multi-use facility. Skyzone is going to take about 25,000 square feet and we're hoping that they're going to be wildly successful. What would happen to the parking requirements should they need to take more of this relative the City's parking requirements?

Planner Kapelanski said Skyzone is building to their needs at this point. If they were to expand into some of the other areas of the building staff would potentially have to look at the parking again. They have presented us with a parking study from another location that shows that they have more than enough parking for their use, so staff is fairly confident with the information that they presented. The staff will take a fresh look at it if they were to expand into the other area of the building.

Chair Pehrson said he had no objections and it seemed like a good fit.

Moved by Member Baratta and seconded by Member Greco:

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

In the matter of Skyzone, JSP13-21, motion to approve the Preliminary Site Plan based on and subject to the following:

a. **Planning Commission finding that the proposed front yard parking is compatible with surrounding development, which is hereby made;**
b. **Planning Commission waiver for same-side driveway spacing (105 feet required, 57 feet provided), which is hereby granted;**
c. **Section 9 façade waiver for the overage of ribbed metal panels on the north elevation, which is hereby granted; and**
d. **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 it 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 6-0.*

Moved by Member Baratta and seconded by Member Greco:

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

In the matter of Skyzone, JSP13-21, motion to approve the Stormwater Management Plan, based on and subject to the findings of compliance with the 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 it 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. **TRIANGLE PLACE, JSP13-53**

Consideration of the request of Trowbridge Companies for Preliminary Site Plan and Stormwater Management Plan approval. The subject property is located in Section 36, on the east side of Haggerty Road, north of Eight Mile Road in the B-3, General Business District with a Planned Rezoning Overlay. The subject property is 0.48 acres and the applicant is proposing a 2,420 square foot speculative office and retail building.

Planner Kapelanski said the applicant is proposing the development of an approximately 2,420 square foot single story office building on the east side of Haggerty Road, north of Eight Mile Road. To the northeast are Benihana Restaurant and a Coney Island Restaurant, both in the City of Farmington Hills. To the west is a regional detention basin, owned by the City and the Sheraton Hotel behind that. To the south are a detention basin and a Taco Bell. To the east in the City of Farmington Hills is a hotel. The subject property is currently zoned B-3, General Business. This property was rezoned from FS, Freeway Service with a Planned Rezoning Overlay to facilitate the development of this site several years ago. The site is bordered by OSC, Office Service Commercial to the west, FS, Freeway Service to the south, and ES, Expressway Service in the City of Farmington Hills to the east. The future land use map indicates community commercial uses for the subject property with office uses to the west and although not shown on the map, expressway service and quasi-public uses in the City of Farmington Hills. There are no wetlands or woodlands on the subject property as indicated by the natural features map.

As previously noted, the property was rezoned with a PRO. At that time the applicant presented a concept plan which has been attached to the PRO agreement. Any variances that could be identified at that time were included in the PRO agreement and therefore will not appear before the Zoning Board of Appeals. The planning review, landscape review, engineering review and fire review all recommended approval with minor items to be addressed at the time of revised Final Site Plan submittal. The Façade Review recommends approval of the Section 9 façade waiver for the overage of asphalt shingles. The applicant did submit conceptual elevations along with their PRO. The conceptual elevations show a similar building façade to the one currently presented with the Preliminary Site Plan. The traffic review recommends approval of the plan and the requested waiver of the Traffic Impact Assessment, given the fact that the conceptual plan and use has already been approved as part of a PRO Agreement.

Bruce Michael of Trowbridge Company said he was available to address any questions. The primary tenant is probably going to be FedEx Office for this site. The building location has moved slightly to avoid the gas main easement.

Member Baratta asked if the pipe that leads into the existing detention basin is for the existing hotel and has that been taken into account.

Planner Kapelanski said I believe it has. I think the hotel had just been approved or was just under construction when the PRO was approved. The conceptual plan didn't include the details that the site plan would include with regard to stormwater. Engineering did not have any concerns with the proposed storm water detention and the applicant has taken into account any impacts on the detention basin to the south.

Mr. Michael said we found that the original concept plan detention calculations were actually in error and off by a factor of 10; the decimal place was in the wrong spot. So this time around what we've done is we've made sure that we've got all that considered as well as any of the drainage around the street that has to be handled.

Member Giacopetti said asked if a new driveway would be constructed to the site or if an existing driveway would be shared.

Mr. Michael said it's a new driveway.

Moved by Member Baratta and seconded by Member Greco:

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

In the matter of Triangle Place, JSP13-53, motion to approve the Preliminary Site Plan based on and subject to the following:

a. **Waiver of the required Traffic Impact Assessment, which is hereby granted;**
b. **Section 9 façade waiver for the overage of asphalt shingles, which is hereby granted; and**
c. **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 revised Final Site Plan.**

This motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with the approved PRO concept plan and PRO Agreement and Article 15, Article 24 and Article 25 of the Zoning Ordinance and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance. *Motion carried 6-0.*

Moved by Member Baratta and seconded by Member Greco:

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

In the matter of Triangle Place, JSP13-53, 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 items listed in those letters being addressed on the revised Final Site Plan. This motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with the approved PRO concept plan and PRO Agreement and with Chapter 11 of the Code of Ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance. *Motion carried 6-0.*

3. **EBERSPAECHER PARKING, JSP13-60**
Consideration of the request of Eberspaecher North America, for Preliminary Site Plan and Stormwater Management Plan approval. The subject property is located in Section 22 at 43700 Gen Mar in the I-1, Light Industrial District. The subject property is 8.66 acres and the applicant is proposing to add parking to the site to accommodate an additional working shift as well as an outdoor storage tank.

Planner Kapelanski said the applicant is proposing to reconfigure and/or add 147 parking spaces at the existing industrial site at 43700 Gen Mar. The new parking is needed to accommodate an additional working shift on the site. The site is bordered by warehouse and industrial uses to the north and east, vacant land to the south and residential uses to the west. The subject property is zoned I-1, Light Industrial and is bordered by I-1 zoning to the north and east. The property to the south is zoned OS-1 and the property to the west is zoned R-4. The Future Land Use map indicates Industrial, Research and Development and Technology uses for the subject property and properties to the north and east. Public uses are planned to the south and residential uses are planned to the west. There is a small amount of regulated woodlands and wetlands on the property concentrated along the western property line.

The applicant is proposing to expand the existing parking area along the northern border of the site and add additional parking spaces along the western wall of the building. Additional landscape areas would also be created. An outdoor storage tank is proposed at the southeast corner of the building. The planning review recommends approval of the plan noting the Planning Commission is asked to make a finding that the proposed front yard parking is compatible with the surrounding developments. A Zoning Board of Appeals variance is required for an underage of parking based on the size of the building and the additional mezzanine and office areas proposed inside the building. The applicant is confident sufficient parking has been provided on the site and staff supports the request for a variance based on the information provided by the applicant. A variance from the City Council will be sought to permit loading and unloading activities outside of the hours listed in the City Code. Zoning Board of Appeals variances are required for the size of the outdoor storage tank and the lack of screening. Staff has no

issue with these variances given the location of the tank. The engineering, traffic and fire reviews all recommend approval with items to be addressed on the next plan submittal. The landscape review recommends approval of the plan. There are two waivers required for the lack of a berm along the northern frontage and along the right-of-way. Staff supports these waivers.

Chris Coleman the facilities specialist of Eberspaecher said Eberspaecher in the process of growing significantly. Our headquarters is actually in Novi on Haggerty Road. We also have a small office area just to the south of our headquarters that we've recently moved into. We have a facility in Brighton and in Wixom as well. We've recently got new business from Chrysler. At this facility we actually do the automotive exhaust system. So we do a lot of welding and assembly. We're looking to add approximately 200 jobs for this facility. When we started this facility didn't have enough parking so we're looking to bring it as close as possible to what the code requires but there is just really not enough room on this property to add enough parking. But we've done the calculations and figured out what it would take to accommodate the employees that we're going to be bringing into this building.

Moved by Member Greco and seconded by Member Baratta:

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

In the matter of Eberspaecher Parking Lot Expansion, JSP13-60, motion to approve the Preliminary Site Plan, based on and subject to the following:

a. **Planning Commission finding that the proposed front yard parking is compatible with surrounding development, which is hereby made;**
b. **Zoning Board of Appeals variance for the underage of required parking spaces;**
c. **Zoning Board of Appeals variance for the oversized outdoor storage tank;**
d. **Zoning Board of Appeals variance for the lack of screening around the proposed outdoor storage tank;**
e. **City Council variance to permit loading and unloading activities to take place outside the permitted hours identified in the City Code;**
f. **Planning Commission waiver for the lack of a berm along the northern property frontage and along the right-of-way, which is hereby granted; and**
g. **The findings of compliance with the 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 it 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 6-0.*

Moved by Member Greco and seconded by Member Baratta:

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

In the matter of Eberspaecher Parking Lot Expansion, JSP13-60, 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 it is otherwise in compliance with Chapter 11 of the Code of Ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance. *Motion carried 6-0.*

4. **"HOW TO BRING GREEN AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT TO THE CITY OF NOVI"**
Deputy Director McBeth said Jim Newman is here from the Detroit Chapter of the US Green Building

Council, and as a consultant specializing in helping clients attain energy-efficient and sustainable buildings, is known to many of us here in Novi as a local expert on the many forms of green or sustainable development. It's been a few years since Jim was last here to make a presentation and give us more information on the impacts that buildings and developments can have on the environment and to discuss the ways that those impacts can be mitigated. He's here tonight to build on what the Planning Commission already knows, and to share some additional information with a brief powerpoint presentation. There will then be an opportunity to allow the Commission to ask questions on this topic.

Jim Newman said the USGBC is a coalition of about 20,000 companies: manufacturers, cities, EPA, suppliers, and many government institutions. This is what we promote – environmentally responsible and economically profitable buildings that are healthy places to live and work. It's about people, plant and profit. The rationale is if a company does really good things for people and for the planet and doesn't make any money, they don't stay around very long. So this is what we look at. I'm very active in a number of organizations and very familiar with the EECBG and the Energy Policy Act of 2005. I speak around the world on a lot of these subjects.

Why do people change? It's really for only two reasons, they realize it's in their best interest or they're forced to. Both of these are happening today in our business. The forced-to part of it is the laws, government regulations and going-green initiatives. Companies realize it's in their best interest because the sustainability committees for the building owners and managers' associations here in the Detroit area are realizing that some of these laws that force us to conserve energy are helping us save money and making our buildings better. They realize it's probably a good thing to do. A lot of them were much opposed to US Green Building Council when it first started to gain some traction. The LEED standards are going to make the building cost more money up front, but by costing more money, you're saving it in the long run. It was the perception several years ago of what a green building was supposed to be. But here's the reality, LEED homes and businesses are green.

The triple bottom line is all about people, environment and economics. Sometimes known as the three P's: people, planet, profit. Social, economic, environmental, this is what it's all about. One of the US GBC's mottos when they first began really gaining traction in the early 2000 was 'build green, everyone profits'. Not just the person who builds the building, but also the people who are in the buildings. It's a healthier building.

Mr. Newman showed a slide on the energy usage of buildings. LEED certified buildings can provide energy savings anywhere from 10% to 50%. Carbon saving is at 30%. Water use is another thing that we look at very heavily, as water is becoming more scarce and costly. As far as waste, when you building a building, a lot of that waste goes to landfill. We find that general contractors who build LEED buildings, at first they're opposed because it'll cost them more money and take more time, but once they've gone through a LEED certified building, they want to do it on all their buildings whether they are certified or not because they save money. LEED certified buildings lease and sell faster and for more money. So if somebody is building a LEED building, not necessarily because they want to do great things for the environment, although there are builders who do it for that reason as a primary reason, they do it for the people who are going to be in the building and they do it to make money.

Mr. Newman explained how LEED works. It stands for Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design. It's a system. We don't tell architects or engineers or building owners or developers how to build their buildings, we just give them idea on how to do it better. This is what we look at: site planning, water management, energy management, material use, and IEQ. The innovation and design is something that we do for something that goes either beyond what we're asking for or exemplary performance like in diversion from landfill. Sustainable development is using just enough and leaving the planet better when you leave so you don't compromise the ability for future generations to meet their own

needs. It's like the tradition of the Indians who look at how their actions will affect seven generations down.

The people who developed US Green Building Council were two land developers. They started it in 1993, which was the germ of the idea. It really started gaining traction with the first generation of LEED standards in the year 2000 and we've brought up the LEED version four which is about to come out the end of this year of beginning of next year. A lot of the laws, standards and codes being made are much more stringent in 2010, and are getting more stringent every year, than they were in 2000. So if you wanted to take a look at it and use it as part of your building code to get a little bit above what the IECC or the IGCC of the ICC building codes are, you can do that. LEED was never meant to be a standard. Many cities and states said 'oh this is pretty good.' Let's say that all our buildings, if they get any money from the state or city, have to be LEED certified. In the year 2000, to get LEED certification cost a lot of money. Why did it cost a lot of money? Nobody knew how to do it and most of the manufacturers didn't have the products.

These are the kinds of things you can do today. I talked to your City Manager the other day. He said 'well as far as fast permitting, you can't get much faster than we are. We're pretty fast, we typically do building permit reviews in less than a week.' We're used to cities that take two to four weeks, and what does that cost a builder? If those cities can go from two to four weeks to less than a week like Novi does already, then that's a good thing for them. Passage through the ZBA, easing some restrictions, giving people higher densities, and quicker inspections are other incentives you can provide for those who are going to build a LEED certified building. What those cities who are taking longer to do are doing; they are taking the LEED building to the top of the pile instead of the bottom of the pile when it comes in. That means a lot to a builder. If they can pick up a week or two, they make more money getting something done sooner. Educating building inspectors is a big one because a lot of building inspectors will say; if it's not in the book you can't do it. So we've had to educate building inspectors in advance of some of these earlier LEED buildings.

Another thing the city can do that doesn't cost anything and is good for them is to help with the marketing and publicity when you do get LEED certified buildings. The Energy Policy Act of 2005 says if you beat ASHRAE energy standard by 50% you can pick up about $1.80 per square foot in tax deduction. So if you're building a 100,000 square foot building, then $1.80 a square foot is $180,000 and if you're in the 35% tax bracket, that's over $60,000 in tax credit. The State has a number of organizations now: Michigan Saves, MEDC and others where you can seek funds. Novi used some of the EECBG money to fix some buildings here in Novi. Some of the other things you can do are zoning incentives, and higher density for green buildings. If you get LEED certified buildings, it shows. It provides good publicity to the city. It helps the builder, the owner and the developer. If you bring more LEED certified buildings in Novi, you'll bring in a higher tax base.

Chair Pehrson thanked Mr. Newman for his presentation.

5. TOWN CENTER STUDY

Deputy Director McBeth said our City Council recently approved funding for review of the Town Center area of the City - including properties at all four corners of the intersection of Grand River Avenue and Novi Road - both north and south of Grand River Avenue and east and west of Novi Road, south of the i-96 interchange. Due to recent significant public and private reinvestment in these areas, the renewed energy brought by a number of new land owners, and because more than 25 years have passed since the Town Center area was first envisioned, the City believes it is time to undertake the following three tasks: review and update the recommendations of the Master Plan for Land Use, review and update the Zoning Ordinance standards and the Town Center Design Guidelines , and review and make recommendations for Wayfinding signage.

We note that geographically, Grand River Avenue and Novi Road is a significant intersection in the City of Novi, with considerable pass-by and destination traffic to and from the homes and businesses in this area. We also note that this study area is similar to the area that was included in the Four Corners Report prepared by our department in 2011, which shows that the taxable value of the properties within this area is more than 88 million dollars. The businesses have made significant investments in this part of Novi.

For the Town Center Study, the City's consultant, Carlisle Wortman has been assisting the City's planning staff with this project, and has been working behind the scenes over the last few weeks. We've met with a few of the key stakeholders in the study area, informed them of the progress and asked some key questions about the character of the area, the mix of land uses that is provided and planned for, accessibility to and around properties, and really sought to get their thoughts on how the properties would be develop and evolve from where they are today.

Tonight, our consultant Don Wortman who is going to provide a brief presentation on the work done to date, and will let you know where the project is headed from here. We have scheduled An "Open House Drop-In Session" for interested parties to learn more about and to participate in this study. The Open House is scheduled for 7:30 a.m. to 9 a.m. on Wednesday September 11th. It will be located in the Banquet Quarter meeting room of the Civic Center, at 45175 W. Ten Mile Road. The session is open to the public. The Planning Commission will receive notice of the meeting, and would be welcome to attend and participate, along with property owners and tenants in the study area, and any other interested members of the public.

Consultant Don Wortman said you've got a wonderful asset at this location in the city and now it is time to take a look at it again and do some important planning. Our efforts will provide a review and analysis of the Main Street and Town Center area. This could lead to changes in your master plan and also zoning adjustments. Another part to this would be our efforts in assisting with some way finding - an analysis of the signage for that particular area.

The city has had a long history with this area. You've done great planning over the past 20-30 years. Starting with the 1986 plan: you've done Master Planning efforts, you've had steering committees that have been formed and provided analysis, you've developed design guidelines that have been implemented, and you've also created zoning standards which have been important. It's fine to take a look at these again and evaluate. Some are still very good and are working, others can be tweaked. We hope to provide some suggestions and changes on where to go on this.

The other thing about this too is it's a partnership. It's public and private work. We've been talking with the individual property owners and listening to them as to what their ideas are in this particular area especially in terms of rather or not it's residential, commercial, office, etc. I think what's most important is to update that vision, I mean that's what planners are here for, to look long range and develop a blueprint moving forward. As I said, what we're trying to do is update that original study and build on some of the energy that recently been injected into the area. Things have been changing, there's been a rejuvenation. There's an upswing in the economy that's a factor in this too. So I think now is the time to re-examine some of these zoning and land use issues.

We're also taking a look at your circulation patterns such as the extension of Crescent Boulevard and the city's plans for Flint Street. Those are important tie-ins and it will affect land uses. I think our challenge is: what is the appropriate land use in those areas and how do we interface that with appropriate changes in our transportation and our roads system.

The Town Center area incorporates ten sub-areas. It starts with the Town Center area as the main focus that would be the properties owned by Simon and the Wal-Mart facility. It also extends in that

hotel and office area. We've included the Lee BeGole Street and area which would be the northeastern portion of the site. We've included the Anglin property that is anticipated to be going through some changes. The Grand River and Novi business area, Main Street area, surrounding residential, Flint Street area and the Trans-X area have all been included in this project. So these are ten separate sub areas. They all have their unique characteristics and we've been analyzing each one of these as we're moving forward here in this effort.

During our stakeholder interviews, there are certain themes that have emerged. Some of the comments that we've received are that there's a general belief that residential and office uses are right now the biggest movers in terms of future development. There's also perception that retail is over built, so if we're moving forward and looking at land uses, office and residential may be more favorable than additional retail areas. The other thing that we've been hearing is that residential uses are preferred along the Main Street area and that would be a beautiful tie-in especially with some of the adjoining residential areas to the southeast. Requirements for first floor retail or non-residential uses such as office may be unrealistic. There may be nothing wrong with having first floor residential in selected areas. Another comment we've been hearing is that the design standards are good but continue to allow the flexibility. And you have that now in your zoning ordinance with the waivers that can be provided. So those are some of the themes that we've been hearing.

Ms. McBeth indicated that we are going to be scheduling this drop-in open house on September 11th and you're welcome to stop by. Individual notices to property owners will also be sent out regarding that. In terms of the next step, we want to continue with the property owner input, we want to solicit input the from the Planning Commission, and we want to help make some recommendations on these Master Plan designations. Another thing is that we're going to be looking at the pedestrian plazas especially along Grand River and finding out if they're still functional and work well and what they should look like moving forward. We will be making zoning ordinance suggestions and adjustments and the way finding package by looking at the signs and how you can navigate more efficiently. Those are some thoughts here moving forward and I'd be happy to answer any questions.

Chair Pehrson asked what kind of time are you looking at to do the study.

Deputy Director McBeth said there's been some work going on behind the scenes for a few weeks now and we're going to have that open house September 11th. After that we're hoping to also have an open table at the Fall for Novi event which is on September 21st, people will be welcomed to come to that too and provide their input. We're also going to seek some public input through a survey. So as all those things come together, we're planning to bring something before the Planning Commission before the end of the year.

Member Lynch asked what are we doing specifically at looking at benchmarking other communities that have gone through this change to pick the best of what they've done and try to apply it to Novi.

Deputy Director McBeth said we have talked to some other communities about their mixed use areas. I'm sure some of those thoughts will be incorporated into the final work.

Mr. Wortman said his firm provides planning services to the city of Troy, Plymouth and Northville. We've learned some things too in terms of the trends in land use and planning for an appropriate use of uses for commercial, retail, office spaces, etc. But certainly we want to expand our view point too and look at what other communities are doing both in terms of Master Planning but also zoning.

Member Lynch said you mentioned Northville and Plymouth which have done a wonderful job. There are two cities in Indiana that have done an outstanding job with housing and shops below the

housing. It's fantastic what they've done. And even in North Carolina there are several cities that have done an excellent job.

Chair Pehrson asked are we doing anything to incorporate the things that we were looking at for the four corners of Meadowbrook - Ten Mile area as well as far as that future vision to incentivize the folks that are there. I mean we're not going to pick up and move the Mobil gas station, right? But maybe the southeast corner, maybe we do something there. Are we looking at trying to find ways to incentivize those folks too?

Deputy Director McBeth said we're going to definitely look at the plans developed for the Ten and Meadowbrook project. We don't know yet whether the results will be any kind of economic incentives as were proposed with that corner. This area wasn't initially thought of as one of the areas highlighted for those kinds of new development incentives but that could be something we could take a look at. We should also highlight too that Flint Street on the southwest quadrant of that corner, engineering has been looking at their plans to realign that street with Crescent Boulevard coming in from the north side. So it would be very important to take a look at that area. There are some redevelopment opportunities with the concrete plant leaving and the road re-alignment.

6. APPROVAL OF THE AUGUST 14, 2013 PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Moved by Member Lynch and seconded by Member Greco:

VOICE VOTE ON PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES APPROVAL MOTION MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER GRECO:

Motion to approve the August 14, 2013 Planning Commission Minutes. *Motion carried 6-0.*

CONSENT AGENDA REMOVALS FOR COMMISSION ACTION
There were no Consent Agenda Removals.

MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION
There were no Matters for Discussion.

SUPPLEMENTAL ISSUES
There were no Supplemental Issues to discuss.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION
No one in the audience wished to speak.

ADJOURNMENT
Moved by Member Lynch and seconded by Member Baratta:

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

Motion to adjourn the August 28, 2013 Planning Commission meeting. *Motion carried 6-0.*

The meeting was adjourned at 8:52 PM.

Transcribed by Valentina Nuculaj
September, 2013
Date Approved:

Signature on File

Richelle Leskun, Planning Assistant