



# PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

CITY OF NOVI

Regular Meeting

**December 8, 2021 7:00 PM**

Council Chambers | Novi Civic Center  
45175 W. Ten Mile (248) 347-0475

## CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 PM.

## ROLL CALL

Pursuant to the State of Michigan Open Meetings Act, all members participating remotely shall identify their physical location by stating the city, county, and state from which he or she is attending.

Present: Member Avdoulos, Member Becker, Member Dismondy, Chair Pehrson, Member Roney, Member Verma

Remote: Member Lynch – *City of Novi, Oakland County, MI*

Staff: Barbara McBeth, City Planner; Beth Saarela, City Attorney; Lindsay Bell, Senior Planner; Rick Meader, Landscape Architect; Humna Anjum, Plan Review Engineer; Douglas Repen, Environmental Consultant; Kerry Gray, Environmental Consultant

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

## APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Moved by Member Avdoulos and seconded by Member Verma.

## **VOICE VOTE TO APPROVE THE DECEMBER 8, 2021 PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA MOVED BY MEMBER AVDOULOS AND SECONDED BY MEMBER VERMA.**

**Motion to approve the December 8, 2021 Planning Commission Agenda. Motion carried 7-0.**

## AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

Chair Pehrson invited members of the audience who wished to address the Planning Commission during the first audience participation to come forward.

Berkshire Pointe Homeowners Association President Harish Siddappa, 49425 Harrier Place, said I very much appreciate Catholic Central, the City of Novi, and the Berkshire community coming together to work on this project. Catholic Central President, Ed Turek, and I have met several times since our last meeting. I appreciate all they have done to meet with our community and take our concerns into consideration when drafting their plans. We still have one major concern with this project that we are discussing, and that is the southern end of the road that goes through

the wooded area along the property line. Negotiations are still going on, and hopefully we can reach an amicable solution soon. The disturbance of the area described will have a direct effect on wetland mitigation in our community. We want all parties to be successful, but we are not there yet. Berkshire has commissioned two studies: one with Wayne State University and another with Michigan State University. These studies concern stormwater storage, water runoff, and other issues with regards to flooding. These studies are ongoing, and we request the city and Catholic Central consider the results in future plans when the studies are complete. A third point I would like to make is that we are concerned with the execution of this project. While it is still in its early phases, we would like to know:

1. How will the city manage its execution?
2. How will Catholic Central and the City of Novi hold the contractor responsible should they not follow approved plans?
3. How can Berkshire residents raise construction concerns to both the city and Catholic Central, and how will they be resolved?

This afternoon, Berkshire sent out a letter regarding the concerns I just stated via email, and paper copies will be sent out in the mail as well. This letter went out to several departments of the City of Novi as well as Catholic Central. I want to thank Novi and Catholic Central for addressing the lighting issue just outside of Catholic Central's main entrance we brought up at the last meeting. We hope to be able to continue working collaboratively, and we hope you take the concerns in our letter into consideration.

Leisure Co-Op resident Lori Reischauer, 140 Halford Boulevard, Wixom, said I have lived at that address since 1983. I was on Wixom's City Council for 12 years, so I am familiar with city government. I am very concerned about the wetlands. Years back, I believe when Catholic Central was first constructed, there was a huge water runoff problem that led to flooding that damaged some of the property at Leisure Co-Op. It is a very wet area, and I do not know if you really realize how wet it is or how extensive the problems can be. We have older homes, and we continue to routinely have water infiltration issues in some of our units' basements. This is very serious, and it really needs to be in the forefront of the Planning Commissioners' thoughts. Secondly, we are concerned about cut-through traffic. I don't know if there is anything that can be done to stop or discourage that, but a 50 and older community should not have a major cut through street for people going to a high school. We are already having trouble with cars cutting through just to get to 12 Mile Road. 12 Mile is a disaster, and it needs to be paved. I understand why only a portion of it is proposed to be paved, as it would be at the cost of Catholic Central, but it should still be discussed. Traffic speeds on 12 Mile are usually excessive, and the road itself is in such bad condition that trying to walk along it can be life-threatening. Our residents have no access to Novi's sidewalks, and we would like that to be addressed. We have to cut through the woods or walk on 12 Mile. There should be an access point somewhere near Leisure Co-Op to allow people to access the sidewalk. By the way, the sidewalk that goes east toward Berkshire is usually flooded. The retention pond does not currently address the water flow that is already there.

Berkshire Pointe resident Prabakar said we want to be good neighbors. We want the city, Catholic Central, and our community all to be successful. As noted by the neighboring community member, these are real issues we are dealing with. The soil in my backyard and several other yards is wet, and we feel that the construction will make it worse. Harish mentioned that we are negotiating with Catholic Central. If the road is moved further southeast, it would remove the need for mitigation. There are two benefits to this: you will not need to take out trees and mitigation efforts for construction would be much more relaxed. This was also noted by Davy Resource Group who suggested Catholic Central try other routes for the road to limit woodland destruction. Further, the Barr report says the type of soil on which the stormwater basin, wetland mitigation, etcetera is questionable. Catholic Central is leaving that to the contractors, which I think is questionable. We do believe that this is a five-to-ten-year project.

We want to be good neighbors, but we also want the city to look out for the interests of our neighborhood and Catholic Central's as well. I think the city needs to look at this road as part of the entire project, not just one small project. I would suggest that this portion of the project be deferred and that the project in its entirety should be considered. A last comment is concerning traffic increase. Many stadiums will be built as the project moves forward into the coming years, and we are afraid that extreme traffic increases will happen unless certain regulations are enforced on Catholic Central.

Seeing that nobody else wish to participate, Chair Pehrson closed the first audience participation.

## **CORRESPONDENCE**

City Planner McBeth said we received one piece of correspondence late this afternoon, and it has been included in your packet. It is from Jason W. Michener, and it is also concerning the Catholic Central Connector Road.

## **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

There were not any Committee Reports.

## **CITY PLANNER REPORT**

City Planner McBeth had nothing to report.

## **CONSENT AGENDA - REMOVALS AND APPROVALS**

There were not any Consent Agenda items.

## **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

There were not any public hearings.

## **MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION**

### **1. CATHOLIC CENTRAL CONNECTOR ROAD JSP21-17**

Consideration at the request of Catholic Central High School for Planning Commission's approval of Preliminary Site Plan, Wetland Permit, Woodland Permit and Stormwater Management Plan. The subject property is zoned R-4 One Family Residential, R-1 One Family Residential, and I-1 Light Industrial and is located in Section 18, west of Wixom Road and south of Twelve Mile Road. The applicant is proposing to construct a new driveway to provide a connection from the existing loop road to Twelve Mile Road through the northern area of the property. Utilities, stormwater detention and wetland mitigation are also proposed.

Senior Planner Bell said the subject property is in Section 18 south of Twelve Mile Road on the west side of Wixom Road. The full property is approximately 115 acres and is the existing site of Catholic Central High School. Catholic Central is proposing to construct a new driveway off Twelve Mile Road to connect to their existing loop road. Currently there is no road access from the Twelve Mile frontage. The new entrance to the property would include a signage wall entrance feature. No new buildings or parking is proposed at this time, although a gravel construction staging area is proposed to be located west of the new driveway. Three storm water detention ponds are proposed for stormwater collection and treatment. The Planning Commission held a public hearing on this project on October 6 but postponed action to allow the applicant to work with the adjacent Berkshire Pointe community on addressing the concerns raised by homeowners. Catholic Central held a meeting with representatives from the Berkshire Pointe Homeowners Association on October 13<sup>th</sup>, which City staff also attended. On November

1<sup>st</sup> the applicant submitted revised plans that reflect the measures they've taken to address the adjacent community's concerns.

Senior Planner Bell continued to say in the current submittal the applicant has made the following revisions:

- The wetland mitigation area in the northeast area of the site has been shifted west to be further away from the property line with Berkshire Pointe. Additional woodland replacement trees are proposed to be planted between the wetland and property line to provide greater buffering. No vegetation will be removed directly adjacent to the property line to keep that buffer intact throughout construction.
- The plan has been adjusted to include all 320 woodland replacement credits on-site to address visual screening and noise buffering concerns. A new area of 50 woodland replacement plantings is established in an area currently devoid of vegetation to enhance screening along the neighborhood boundary.
- The southernmost stormwater detention pond was redesigned to be further away from the neighborhood. This change also prevents the removal of 5 woodland trees. About 68 additional woodland replacement trees are proposed to be planted around this stormwater basin.
- Additional evergreen trees have been placed near the curve in the road to screen vehicle headlights from the neighbors.

In addition to those changes, the applicant also states they consulted a geotechnical engineer about the concerns raised regarding slope stability of the mitigation basin. The consultant reviewed the plans and affirmed a slope stability study would not be needed, but they recommend close observation and testing during earthwork operations to ensure proper construction for soil stability.

Senior Planner Bell concluded by saying the applicant is requesting two waivers of landscaping standards, which are detailed in your packet. A waiver for a landscaped berm along the Berkshire Pointe property line is supported by staff because constructing such a berm would require removal of existing mature trees and greater impacts to existing wetlands. The other berm and greenbelt waiver along Twelve Mile Road is only partially supported: To the east of the proposed driveway where a berm would impact more existing wetlands and trees staff supports the waiver. However, to the west of the new driveway staff does not support waiving the requirement. In 2011, Catholic Central signed an agreement with the City to construct the required 4- to 6-foot-tall landscape berm with greenbelt plantings along Twelve Mile Road when future development was proposed. The applicant would still like to request the waiver from the requirement, so the Planning Commission would need to make a recommendation to City Council to consider amending that agreement. The proposed motion in your packet would require the motion-maker to choose between option d1 or d2 to address this waiver. The proposed plan complies with all other provisions of the Zoning Ordinance and City Code.

The Planning Commission is asked tonight to take action on the connector road Preliminary Site Plan, wetland permit, woodland permit, and stormwater management plan. Representing the project tonight are Catholic Central president Ed Turek and engineer Andy Wozniak alongside other members of their team. City staff and our consultants available to answer any questions you may have.

Catholic Central President Ed Turek said with me is our principal, Father Patrick Fulton, and our team. As described, we are back after a two-month delay. We did meet with the neighbors several times, and we had good conversations. I did not get a letter or email by 5 PM today, though, I'm sure it is on its way. As you heard, we have made major concessions to the project. We thank the city staff and their consultants for their recommendation approval, and now we are here requesting the approval of the Commission.

Chair Pehrson thanked the applicant and turned it over to the Planning Commission for their comments.

Member Avdoulos said I would like to thank both Catholic Central and Berkshire for working together on this. One of the reasons we tabled it last meeting was because there were many concerns and question and perhaps even information that wasn't fully understood. However, it seems that quite a bit of work has been done to get this in the right direction. It also seems as though the neighboring community and Catholic Central have an agreed to quite a few revisions to make it work. I know that there is concern, and there usually is concern on any plan, that it is executed correctly. That is something Catholic Central along with their contractors and the city will have to make sure happens. Once some of these issues are resolved and final plans are submitted for permitting, then it is up to the parties to respect the direction the project is taking and to make sure that all the items are being addressed. I know that many people are asking for guarantees, but when the documents are submitted to the city for construction, they are signed and sealed by registered professional architects and engineers. There is a responsibility to make sure that the projects are carried out properly. I know there were other issues brought up related to Leisure Condos and access to 12 Mile Road; I don't think this project can bear that. I think dialogue with the city moving forward about possible avenues for fixing those issues would be the right course of action. The only sticking point that I see related to the waivers is the berm along 12 Mile Road. I understand there was an agreement in place, and that is why our landscape architect does not support that particular waiver for the berm on the west side. However, if we allowed Catholic Central to go to City Council to possibly renegotiate the agreement, would that be an issue for our landscape architect? I understand your reasoning, but I look at other schools and institutions around the city that do not have large berms directly out front.

Landscape Architect Meader said the berm requirement is based on the zoning, which is RA, and not the use. I believe in being consistent unless there is a reason for not supporting it. I do support not having one where there is a wetland, but I don't see why they shouldn't have to meet the zoning ordinance requirements on the west side.

Member Avdoulos said that was the clarification that I wanted – just to recognized that it is based on zoning. Some of the other areas I have been looking at are school located in zoning districts, like R-4, that tend to be denser. This project is a bit different, so I wanted to get that clarification.

Member Becker said on that same topic, for the requirement of a berm to the west of the proposed road along the south side of 12 Mile, staff is recommending it be upheld and not waived. I seem to remember earlier this year an application that involved a commercial building proposal that had residences immediately behind the applicant's property. A similar berm was required according to our standard, but we allowed the applicant to forgo the berm by using a masonry wall instead. We had also allowed this for an existing commercial development adjacent to this one. My question to the staff is: would a masonry wall be acceptable in replacement of the berm, and has this been mentioned to the applicant?

Mr. Meader said they have not suggested it, and neither have we. It's something we could certainly consider. I don't think it's something they would want to do, but it would at least approach the same level of screening impact as the berm.

Member Becker asked in theory, it would be an acceptable replacement of the berm?

Mr. Meader said it probably would because we have accepted walls in other cases.

Member Becker thanked the Mr. Meader for the clarification and said I have read the back-and-forth discussion about the additional trees being proposed. I believe the applicant's proposal indicated a separation of about nine feet and the response from our consultant, Davy Resource Group, stated that a fifteen-foot separation is required for the long-term health of the woodland canopy trees as they mature. Is this correct? The difference between nine and fifteen feet is determined by the type of tree?

Davy Resource Group Environmental Consultant Kerry Gray said with the overall canopy, for larger shade trees, which is what is being required, fifteen feet would give them the opportunity to really grow. We did recommend, if they wanted to use something smaller, they could use a combination of understory trees, which are smaller canopy trees. In that sense, they would still be meeting the requirement, but it provides more of a layered and natural setting rather than a bunch of trees that are all the same height. We want to make sure they have the optimum growing environment because they are trying to fit many trees in a small area.

Member Becker asked then, for woodland subcanopy trees, the ratio is around five-to-one?

Mr. Meader said there are some subcanopy trees on our list that they could use. If it is on the list, then the ratio is one-to-one.

Ms. Gray said we suggested those species, which includes redbud, serviceberries, and some of the smaller understory trees that would typically be in a natural forest. It would mimic a more natural setting rather than a plantation of several large trees.

Member Becker said in that case, some of the trees are one-to-one and others are one-to-five?

Ms. Gray said correct.

Member Becker thanked Ms. Gray and then said in a response letter from Mr. Wozniak dated November 29, he suggested that the option of using understory trees offered by Davy Resource Group is problematic because it would severely limit the number of trees that could be planted. It is my understanding that the city would rather have actual trees planted instead of funds being added to our tree fund. Mr. Wozniak counter offered with the idea of planting replacement trees within the detention basin area. I would like to know from either the city or the consultants: what is the position on this option, first with regard to the effect on screening between the applicant's property and Berkshire Pointe, and then if it would be viable to plant these trees within a detention basin?

Mr. Meader said we allowed it for Catholic Central in their wetland mitigation area for the entryway landscaping project they did recently. That's okay in a wetland mitigation area, but I don't think we would want it in a detention pond itself. On the banks would be okay, but the trees need to be planted in a place that they will be successful.

Member Becker said it wouldn't be in the pond, it would be in the basin area as outlined. That would be acceptable?

Mr. Meader replied yes if they are placed properly. We would also be willing to work with them to find locations where the trees would survive.

Member Verma said first, I would like to acknowledge the work that Catholic Central and the Berkshire community have done by working together. About two months ago, it seemed that there were many problems with the proposal, but now they have all been settled. The new HOA president has brought a new set of three requests. However, I personally feel that when the

construction is going on, and when Catholic Central becomes the project manager, Berkshire should designate a single person to attend meetings regularly. It is not helpful to wait almost one month to express a concern. Those issues should be solved on site, directly between the two parties. I admire everyone working together, and I congratulate Catholic Central and the Berkshire community for reaching this decision.

Member Dismondy said I just would like to reemphasize that it was a very emotional meeting a couple months ago. Obviously, cooperation has increased since then, so it's great to see that the process works. It's all about the way the project is executed now.

Member Roney said I can't say anything much different than what the other Commissioners have said already. Certainly, it is great to see a community work with an outside entity to reach a compromise. I'm fairly new on the board, but it's nice to see.

Member Lynch said it's great to see that they are working together. Mark and I have been on the Commission for quite a while, and I think we both went through a similar situation that involved Island Lake and Oak Pointe Church. That project was brand new to the Commission, and I believe Mark was fairly new too at that point. Property owners have a right to develop their property. What we found out at that time was the city has limited authority to restrict development if the applicant develops their property within the set of ordinances that are made by elected officials. There was very little that officials could do, and in this particular case with Island Lake, did not go as well as I see this current project with Catholic Central and Berkshire going. In the former scenario, I understood that the church relied heavily on the low amount of funds they had, and they couldn't afford to meet many of the requirements around the perimeter of the property line. In that sense, I do appreciate Catholic Central working with the Berkshire community, and I think it will help. However, at the end of the day, this body is responsible for the ordinances and determining whether applicants are abiding by them.

Member Lynch transitioned by saying concerning the 12 Mile Road berm west of the driveway, I really do not think it is appropriate for the Planning Commission to change an agreement that was made by City Council and the applicant. We can approve the proposal and move it forward, but it goes directly to City Council where I believe it belongs. Since the agreement was made between City Council and the applicant, it is my belief that City Council and the applicant need to amend this agreement, not the Planning Commission. With respect to the tree planting, I have been adamant about this throughout my commission career: if trees are removed, they need to be replaced somewhere else on the site. I was never going to approve it if the applicant was just going to put money into the tree fund. I don't think it is appropriate in this case or in any other case when I know there is available land to replant trees.

Member Lynch concluded his statement by saying I feel so bad, and Mark and I both learned this throughout our time on the Commission is 'buyer beware'. That is why the government gives a condominium buyers handbook to potential buyers before they sign a purchase agreement that clearly states to not rely on verbal promises. Instead, it encourages going to the local government for drawings and plans; that may have helped in this case. I'm glad to see much of the emotion has subsided, and we're starting to make actual progress. Personally, I don't want to delay this project much longer. Catholic Central is certainly doing more than was done in the Island Lake and Oak Pointe Church scenario. I do want to reemphasize that I am not willing to deviate from an agreement that this body was not party to. There are a couple of options in the motion sheet. I would recommend to my fellow Commissioners that we use the motion that moves the project along but puts it back in the hands of the two primaries, the council and the applicant, to negotiate the 12 Mile Road berm.

Chair Pehrson asked City Attorney Saarela regarding the agreement Member Lynch spoke about, I am assuming, since it is a discretionary, piece that we do have the authority to decide on the agreement?

City Attorney Saarela said with respect to the agreement, I think all you could do today is to make a recommendation. Ultimately, it would have to be changed by City Council. You could make a recommendation one way or the other, and it would still go on to City Council. They would hear your recommendation, but they do not necessarily have to abide by them.

Chair Pehrson thanked Ms. Saarela, stated that he had no further comments, and turned it over to Member Avdoulos for a motion on the item.

Member Avdoulos said before I make the motion, I want to encourage the continued communication once again between Catholic Central, their neighbors, and the city to ensure that everything is looked at and accounted for. Everyone working together makes the entire process a lot smoother.

Motion made by Member Avdoulos and seconded by Member Dismondy.

**In the matter of Catholic Central Connector Road, JS21-17, motion to approve the Preliminary Site Plan based on and subject to the following:**

- a. This approval applies to the road construction and associated improvements only, future phases depicted on the Master Plan will require additional approvals;**
- b. Landscaping waiver from Section 5.5.3.B.ii. and iii. For absence of berm along Berkshire Pointe, because construction of a berm would disturb additional existing woodland and wetland including mature trees which provide screening, which is hereby granted;**
- c. City Council approval of a Landscape waiver from Section 5.5.3.B. ii. and iii. for absence of required berm adjacent to the public right of way at Twelve Mile Road east of the new driveway, because construction of a berm would disturb additional existing wetland and woodland, which is recommended to City Council for approval; and**
- d. City Council approval of a Landscape waiver from Section 5.5.3.B. ii. and iii. For absence of required berm adjacent to the public right of way at Twelve Mile Road west of the new driveway, because construction of a berm would impact the proposed area of the detention pond, the entry wall, pond and landscaping all of which will provide a substantial visual buffer, and because there will be no structure located within 150 feet of 12 Mile Road, which is recommended to City Council for approval.**
- e. 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 Article 3, Article 4 and Article 5 of the Zoning Ordinance and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance.**

Andy Wozniak, with Zeimet Wozniak, said I wanted to bring up a couple points. Regarding the berm, this motion is just a recommendation to City Council, and we could amend the plans before their approval?

Chair Pehrson confirmed that is correct.

Mr. Wozniak said just for your knowledge, the berm on the west end where it meets the wetland, the pond is four feet higher than the road. It basically has a berm effect, and then as it moves



to the east, it levels with the road. Then, the landscape wall, like the wall at the south entrance, kicks in. That was by design, and by adding a berm it will lose the effect of the entrance. We want to mimic what we did on Wixom Road, so we will bring that up with City Council. Then, for the trees, we will try to put most of them on site, but we were not aware there was a subcanopy tree that had a one-to-one ratio. We will work in subcanopy trees. The other issue is that replacement trees in Novi need to be in a conservation easement. Basically, a conservation easement takes the land forever, and nothing can be done with the land. Forever is a long time, and things change. That is why we are hesitant to plant trees in areas where Mr. Meader would like us to plant them. We could plant all the way around the ponds, but once they are in a conservation easement, we lose that land forever.

**ROLL CALL VOTE TO APPROVE THE PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN FOR JSP21-17 CATHOLIC CENTRAL CONNECTOR ROAD MOVED BY MEMBER AVDOULOS AND SECONDED BY MEMBER DISMONDY.**

**Motion to recommend approval of the Preliminary Site Plan. Motion carried 7-0.**

Motion made by Member Avdoulos and seconded by Member Roney.

**ROLL CALL VOTE TO APPROVE THE WETLAND PERMIT FOR JSP21-17 CATHOLIC CENTRAL CONNECTOR ROAD MOVED BY MEMBER AVDOULOS AND SECONDED BY MEMBER RONEY.**

**In the matter of Catholic Central Connector Road, JS21-17, motion to approve the Wetland Permit based on and subject to the findings of compliance with Ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters, and the conditions and items listed in those letters being addressed on the Final Site Plan. This motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Chapter 12, Article V of the Code of Ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance. Motion carried 7-0.**

Motion made by Member Avdoulos and seconded by Member Verma.

**ROLL CALL VOTE TO APPROVE THE WOODLAND PERMIT FOR JSP21-17 CATHOLIC CENTRAL CONNECTOR ROAD MOVED BY MEMBER AVDOULOS AND SECONDED BY MEMBER VERMA.**

**In the matter of Catholic Central Connector Road, JS21-17, motion to approve the Woodland Permit based on and subject to the findings of compliance with Ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters, and the conditions and items listed in those letters being addressed on the Final Site Plan. This motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Chapter 37 of the Code of Ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance. Motion carried 7-0.**

Motion made by Member Avdoulos and seconded by Member Roney.

**ROLL CALL VOTE TO APPROVE THE STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR JSP21-17 CATHOLIC CENTRAL CONNECTOR ROAD MOVED BY MEMBER AVDOULOS AND SECONDED BY MEMBER RONEY.**

**In the matter of Catholic Central Connector Road, JS21-17, 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 7-0.**

## **2. APPROVAL OF THE 2021 PLANNING COMMISSION ANNUAL REPORT**

City Planner McBeth said the 2021 Annual Report lists several things the previous years' reports provided. However, this year Madeleine worked on it, and it looks much better with the maps and the graphics she added. We wanted to thank her on the record for that. You will note that it lists the zoning ordinance amendments and zoning map amendments. Other items include the Capital Improvement Program, which the Commission considers each year. The Planning Commission Rules and By-Laws were approved again this year in addition to the Raging Cycles Parking Study. There was one woodland use permit on a lot and 15 site plans. Some of those are highlighted in the report. As of November 19, 2021, when the report was prepared, 62 permits were processed through the Planning Division. The Planning Division was able to approve more than 10 permits administratively. The Planning Commission reviewed and voted on at least 17 items in the last year. Madeleine also included the committee work that was done in the last year. The Capital Improvement Committee met once in 2021, and items discussed are listed. The Implementation Committee met once and discussed two text amendments. The Master Plan and Zoning Committee met only one time to discuss one rezoning and the Master Plan update that is coming up. Finally, the Walkable Novi Committee met several times. Looking ahead to 2022, we have some updates to the zoning ordinances, we will begin the five-year review cycle and update for the Master Plan for Land Use, we will finalized the ordinance updates for the City West zoning district, and there will be more training opportunities.

Chair Pehrson said thank you to Madeleine for putting this together. It is amazing to reflect on how much actually gets done within the year, especially given how unique this year has been. I appreciate everyone's participation and all the work done on the Committees and elsewhere.

Member Verma asked do we talk to MEDC for updating our Master Plan?

Ms. McBeth said yes, they would like to be notified of that. We will be in contact with them as it gets underway.

Member Verma asked can you get some sort of a grant from them, also?

Ms. McBeth said yes there was discussion about a grant and whether it was appropriate in this situation.

Member Verma said some cities in Michigan are getting grants as they begin their Master Plan updating processes, so I suggest we emphasize to the City Manager that we apply for these funds.

Motion made by Member Avdoulos and seconded by Member Verma.

**ROLL CALL VOTE TO APPROVE THE 2021 PLANNING COMMISSION ANNUAL REPORT MOVED BY MEMBER AVDOULOS AND SECONDED BY MEMBER VERMA.**

***Motion to approve the 2021 Planning Commission Annual Report. Motion carried 7-0.***

## **3. APPROVAL OF THE NOVEMBER 17, 2021 PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**

Motion made by Member Avdoulos and seconded by Member Roney.

**ROLL CALL VOTE TO APPROVE THE NOVEMBER 17, 2021 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES MADE BY MEMBER AVDOULOS AND SECONDED BY MEMBER RONEY.**

***Motion to approve the November 17, 2021 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes. Motion carried 7-0.***

**CONSENT AGENDA REMOVALS FOR COMMISSION ACTION**

There were not any Consent Agenda items.

**SUPPLEMENTAL ISSUES/TRAINING UPDATES**

There were not any Supplemental Issues or Training Updates.

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION**

Seeing that nobody wished to speak, Chair Pehrson closed the second audience participation.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Motion to adjourn made by Member Lynch.

**VOICE VOTE ON THE MOTION TO ADJOURN MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH.**

***Motion to adjourn the December 8, 2021 Planning Commission meeting. Motion carried 7-0.***

The meeting adjourned at 7:48 PM.