

REGULAR MEETING - PLANNING COMMISSION

CITY OF NOVI

February 8, 2017

Proceedings taken in the matter of the PLANNING COMMISSION, at City of Novi, 45175 West Ten Mile Road, Novi, Michigan, on Wednesday, February 8, 2017

BOARD MEMBERS

Mark Pehrson, Chairperson

David Greco

Robert Giacometti

John Avdoulos

Ted Zuchlewski

ALSO PRESENT: Barbara McBeth, City Planner

Beth Saarela, City Attorney, Kirsten Mellem, Planner

Certified Shorthand Reporter: Jennifer L. Wall

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

Novi, Michigan.

Wednesday, February 8, 2017

7:00 p.m.

** ** *

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: I'd like to call to order the regular meeting of the Planning Commission for February 8, 2017.

Kirsten, can you call the roll.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Anthony?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Absent, excused.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Here.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPEPETTI: Here.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Here.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Lynch?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Absent, excused.

MS. MELLEEM: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Here.

1 MS. MELLEEM: Member Zuchlewski?

2 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Here.

3 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: With that,
4 if we could rise for the Pledge of
5 Allegiance.

6 Ms. McBeth, would you lead.

7 (Pledge recited.)

8 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you
9 very much. Look for a motion to approve the
10 agenda or modify.

11 MR. GRECO: Motion to approve.

12 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Second.

13 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a
14 motion and a second. Any comments? All
15 those in favor.

16 THE BOARD: Aye.

17 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have an
18 agenda.

19 Come to our first audience
20 participation. There is one public hearing
21 tonight.

22 If you wish to address the
23 Planning Commission on any other topic at

1 this point in time, please step forward.

2 Seeing no one, we will close
3 the first audience participation.

4 And correspondence?

5 MR. GRECO: I do not see any
6 correspondence.

7 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you,
8 sir. Any committee reports? I don't believe
9 so.

10 City Planner report,
11 Ms. McBeth.

12 MS. MCBETH: Thank you. I don't
13 have anything to report this evening.

14 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: You are
15 awesome.

16 Brings us to our first item,
17 which is the consent agenda for Novi Plaza
18 Facade, JSP15-40, it's an approval at the
19 request of Scott Manchanik (ph) and
20 Associates for the revised preliminary site
21 plan and section nine facade waiver.

22 The subject property is
23 located in Section 26 south of Ten Mile Road,

1 and west of Meadowbrook Road in the B1 local
2 business district.

3 The subject property is
4 approximately 1.6 acres, and the applicant is
5 proposing to remodel the existing facade in
6 the Novi plaza shopping center along with
7 modifications to an existing parking lot.

8 We have a motion?

9 MR. GIACOPETTI: Motion to
10 approve the consent agenda.

11 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a
12 motion by Giacometti and a --

13 MR. GRECO: Second.

14 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Second by
15 Greco.

16 Any other comments?

17 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

18 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Please.

19 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: I would like to
20 make a motion to postpone approval.

21 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a
22 motion already on the table to approve.

23 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: I understand

1 that, but I am waiting for maybe somebody in
2 the audience that was their rep to talk, then
3 I was going to interject that at that time.

4 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a
5 motion right now. We have to vote on it.

6 MR. GIACOPETTI: It's part of the
7 consent agenda.

8 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: I understand,
9 but the drawings and elevations, nothing
10 matches and the site is -- it's deplorable.
11 I think we need to bring this up before we
12 approve it.

13 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Kirsten,
14 can you call the roll, please.

15 MS. MELLEEM: Member Avdoulos?

16 MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

17 MS. MELLEEM: Chair Pehrson?

18 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

19 MS. MELLEEM: Member Zuchlewski?

20 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: No.

21 MS. MELLEEM: Member Greco?

22 MR. GRECO: Yes.

23 MS. MELLEEM: Member Giacopetti?

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Motion passes four
to one.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Next item
is a public hearing for Commerce Park,
JSP17-02, a zoning map amendment 18.706.

It's a public hearing at the
request of Premier Realty for Planning
Commission's recommendation to City Council
for rezoning of property in Section 16
located in the southwest corner of Twelve
Mile Road and Taft Road, residential acreage
to OST office, service technology. The
subject parcel is approximately 30.64 acres.

MS. MCBETH: Thank you, Mr.
Chair. Sri is absent this evening, so I get
to do her report.

The subject property is 30.64
acres, vacant land located on the south side
of Twelve Mile and on the west side of Taft
Road in Section 16 of the city.

The subject property consists
of two parcels of land. The request is to

1 rezone from RA, residential acreage to OST,
2 planned office service technology. It is a
3 simple rezoning request and does not include
4 a planned rezoning overlay concept plan.

5 If the rezoning is approved by
6 the City Council, staff expects that the
7 applicant will submit a preliminary site plan
8 application for review and consideration by
9 the Planning Commission.

10 The subject property is
11 currently vacant. The property to the south
12 is used for the ITC transmission corridor and
13 runs parallel to the I-96 freeway. The
14 properties to the east across Taft Road are
15 developed with single family homes. Further
16 to the east, across the railroad tracks, the
17 land is developed with the Somnio building.
18 Land to the north is developed with an office
19 building and is used for outdoor storage.

20 The existing zoning of the
21 property is RA, residential acreage as is the
22 zoning to the south and to the east across
23 Taft Road.

1 The property to the north is
2 zoned I1 light industrial, to the west the
3 property is zoned OST, planned office service
4 technology district.

5 The future land use plan
6 recommends the following land use category
7 for the property. Office research
8 development and technology. The same is
9 recommended for the properties to the south,
10 east and west.

11 The requested OST zoning is
12 consistent with the recommendations of the
13 future land use plan. To the north across
14 Twelve Mile Road, the future land use plan
15 recommends industrial research development
16 and technology land uses.

17 With regard to the natural
18 features, there are woodlands and wetlands on
19 the subject site. A survey of the natural
20 features has been completed by the applicant,
21 but has yet to be confirmed by the city's
22 environmental consultant. We believe that
23 there are about two and a half acres of

1 regulated wetlands on the site.

2 Since the request is a simple
3 rezoning request, it does not include a
4 planned rezoning overlay concept plan,
5 impacts to the woodlands and wetlands will be
6 reviewed at the time of preliminary site plan
7 submittal.

8 Planning staff estimates that
9 the development potential of the site under
10 the current residential acreage zoning could
11 result in the construction of about 20 single
12 family homes, the actual number of units
13 being more or less, depending on the proposed
14 layout and the existing wetlands on the
15 property.

16 For purposes of completing the
17 traffic study, the applicant's consultant
18 used an estimate of 28 homes for the existing
19 residential acreage zoning and no more than
20 240,000 square feet would be possible under
21 the proposed OST zoning.

22 The city's traffic engineering
23 consultant has reviewed the submitted traffic

1 impact study and indicated that additional
2 traffic that is anticipated and generated by
3 the site under the proposed zoning
4 classification is not expected to degrade the
5 existing roadway network levels of service
6 below acceptable limits.

7 The consultant has noted that
8 additional trip generation estimates should
9 be performed at the time of preliminary site
10 plan submittal in order to determine whether
11 a full traffic impact statement will be
12 required once a proposal development plan has
13 been submitted.

14 The city's staff engineer has
15 reviewed the rezoning request and has no
16 concerns regarding the sanitary sewer
17 capacity nor the available city water
18 capacity under the proposed zoning district.

19 The impacts of the rezoning
20 land of this area to OST have been evaluated
21 previously by the engineering department to
22 determine viability of the proposed uses and
23 no concerns were found.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

The planning staff recommends approval of the rezoning for the following reasons.

The rezoning is consistent with the recommended land use on the future land use plan and will be consistent with the existing zoning to the west. The rezoning provides an opportunity to develop the property in conformance with the Master Plan for Land Use recommendations, and puts a vacant parcel of land to use.

The rezoning request fulfills three objectives in the Master Plan for Land Use, fostering a favorable business climate, showing support of development in the OST district and maintaining a competitive marketplace.

Finally, the rezoning will not have a negative impact on the public utilities. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, Ms. McBeth.

Is the applicant here and wish

1 to address the Planning Commission at this
2 time?

3 MS. FIELDS: My name is Stacey
4 Fields, and I am here on behalf of Premier
5 Realty.

6 We are just looking for some
7 rezoning for the Master Plan of the OST. I
8 am willing to take any questions you may
9 have.

10 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.
11 This is a public hearing. If there is anyone
12 in the audience that wishes to address the
13 Planning Commission on this particular
14 matter, please step forward.

15 Seeing no one in the audience,
16 I don't believe we have any correspondence.

17 MR. GRECO: No correspondence.

18 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Close the
19 public hearing, turn it over to the Planning
20 Commission for their consideration.

21 Who would like to start?

22 Member Giacometti.

23 MR. GIACOPETTI: Ms. Fields, so

1 there is no -- there is no planned
2 development at this time?

3 MS. FIELDS: Not at this time.

4 MR. GIACOPETTI: This is in
5 anticipation of --

6 MS. FIELDS: In anticipation of
7 possibly some new development coming our way.

8 MR. GIACOPETTI: Premier Realty
9 is -- what kind of company, do you
10 represent -- are you representing here
11 tonight?

12 MS. FIELDS: We have land owners.
13 We own industrial office high tech facilities
14 in the area, metro Detroit, including Novi,
15 Plymouth, Canton Township. So we are looking
16 at possibly -- we have held this land for
17 quite some time. We are looking at possibly
18 redeveloping this site.

19 MR. GIACOPETTI: Your company
20 doesn't do any residential?

21 MS. FIELDS: No, sir.

22 MR. GIACOPETTI: You said you are
23 the current land owner of this site?

1 MS. FIELDS: I am representing
2 the current land owner, yes.

3 MR. GIACOPETTI: You are their
4 agent?

5 MS. FIELDS: Correct. Not really
6 their agent, more of a consultant.

7 MR. GIACOPETTI: I see. They're
8 not here tonight?

9 MS. FIELDS: Actually one of the
10 owners is here.

11 MR. GIACOPETTI: I mean, those
12 are my only questions. For the Planning
13 Commission, without a plan, I am less
14 inclined to support the project, but eager to
15 listen to any other questions.

16 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you,
17 sir. Anyone else? Member Avdoulos.

18 MR. AVDOULOS: Yes, I drive by
19 that site or that area quite a bit, and I
20 think the request to rezone meets with the
21 intent of our master plan.

22 I think the size of it and
23 what could be done there is, you know,

1 appropriate for the type of office use that
2 could be used there, so I have no objections.

3 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you,
4 sir.

5 I too, agree that the rezoning
6 meets the Master Plan. I think it's probably
7 better suited than the residential lending
8 for any particular means any way. I would be
9 in favor of it.

10 Member Greco?

11 MR. GRECO: Just a few comments.
12 I echo Member Giacometti's sentiments with
13 respect to -- I prefer to see what
14 potentially is going to be there, when we see
15 a rezoning.

16 That being said, it is in
17 compliance with our general plans for the
18 area, and I think the area that is there, you
19 know, with the highway backing up to it in
20 the area, that it is in Novi, I do think that
21 the rezoning is in compliance with what we
22 generally want in that area, and what we are
23 looking for and what we are hoping for.

1 MS. FIELDS: Part of the concerns
2 with going to the market and marketing the
3 plan to potential tenants or buildings for
4 the OST zoning, knowing that was master
5 planned is their first question is, what's
6 the zoning, and our answer to them is, you
7 know, the residential zoning that's there, so
8 that gives them a little bit of a deterrent
9 to proceed forward with our site, not knowing
10 that the zoning is not there. So I think we
11 run into some stumbling blocks there.

12 MR. GRECO: Some additional
13 (unintelligible) at the outset.

14 MS. FIELDS: On the outset that
15 they think we can't do it in the timing or
16 something along those lines. We feel that
17 OST zoning obviously would mean, submit any
18 plans to Planning Commission, they would fit
19 within that zoning.

20 MR. GRECO: All right. With
21 that, I would like to make a motion.

22 In the matter of the request
23 of Commerce Park JSP17-02, the zoning map

1 amendment 18.716, motion to recommend
2 approval to City Council to rezone the
3 subject property, from residential acreage to
4 OST office service technology, for the
5 reasons set forth in the motion sheet.

6 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Do we have
7 a second?

8 MR. AVDOULOS: Second.

9 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a
10 motion by Member Greco, second by Member
11 Avdoulos. Any other comments?

12 MR. GIACOPETTI: Again, I am not
13 opposed to the rezoning. Just in this
14 specific location, I would prefer to have
15 seen a concept plan for what plans go there,
16 given the amount of protected wetland and
17 woodland within this parcel, which is quite
18 substantial. So I am not in support, but
19 just my comments.

20 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Kirsten or
21 Ms. McBeth.

22 MS. MELLEEM: Member Giacopetti?

23 MR. GIACOPETTI: No.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

MS. MELLEEM: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Motion passes four
to one.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: All set.

Next on the agenda is matters for
consideration.

Item No. 1 is 18.284 zoning
ordinance Text Amendment to set a hearing for
March 8, 2017 for Text Amendment 18.284 to
allow outdoor display the OSC office service
commercial district and to allow for above
ground storage tanks in the OST planned
office service technology district.

Kirsten.

MS. MELLEEM: The proposed
ordinance amendments addressed two previously

1 approved text amendments from 2014 that were
2 inadvertently excluded from a clear zoning
3 ordinance reformatting, and is therefore
4 going through the process to reinstate the
5 ordinance language.

6 The first one is to allow
7 outdoor display in connection with the
8 permitted general hospital use, making it a
9 temporary special land use reviewed by the
10 building official.

11 The second ordinance amendment
12 is to allow outdoor placement of above ground
13 storage tanks in OST with the same conditions
14 as required in I1, with three modifications
15 proposed. There are no additional changes
16 from previously approved language as are
17 currently proposed.

18 The Planning Commission is
19 asked tonight to review the proposed
20 amendments, and if acceptable, to set a
21 public hearing for March 8, 2017.

22 At that time, the Planning
23 Commission may make a recommendation to City

1 Council who will ultimately approve or deny
2 the amendment and may proposed alterations as
3 well.

4 Staff is available to answer
5 any questions you may have regarding the
6 proposed amendments.

7 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.
8 Member Greco?

9 MR. GRECO: I have a question.
10 My question is more to our legal counsel. I
11 mean, once these are passed ordinances,
12 aren't they passed ordinances, and that's it,
13 and if they are inadvertently left out of
14 something, they still are the law of the city
15 or was the clear zoning -- was there a new --

16 MS. SAARELA: A new --

17 MR. GRECO: A new approval for
18 the clear zoning that did everything --

19 MS. SAARELA: Yes.

20 MR. GRECO: So it adopted that as
21 an ordinance, so that's why these were left
22 out and why we need to do these to add it
23 back in?

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

MS. SAARELA: That's correct.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: A non-legal question, but the amendment, does it cover billboard signages as consideration of a vehicle being parked on hospital -- being grounds as being -- something like what's going on right now, where they have vehicles I think at Varsity there, is this considered part of that, or is that something else covered in the different amendment?

MS. MCBETH: I believe that's a different amendment.

I will look at this again before it comes back for a public hearing, but I believe that's a separate amendment.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Very good.

MR. GRECO: I would like to make a motion to set both text amendments for a public hearing.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Motion by Member Greco, second by Zuchlewski.

Any other comments?

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

Kirsten.

MS. MELLEEM: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Giacobetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Motion passes five
to zero.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

The second item is approval of the October
26th, 2016 Planning Commission minutes. Any
changes, modifications?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Motion to
approve.

MR. GRECO: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Motion by
Giacobetti, second by Member Greco.

Kirsten, please.

1 MS. MELLEEM: Member Zuchlewski?

2 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

3 MS. MELLEEM: Member Avdoulos?

4 MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

5 MS. MELLEEM: Chair Pehrson?

6 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

7 MS. MELLEEM: Member Giacobetti?

8 MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

9 MS. MELLEEM: Member Greco?

10 MR. GRECO: Yes.

11 MS. MELLEEM: Motion passes five

12 to zero.

13 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Brings us
14 to matters for discussion.

15 Supplemental issues?

16 Last audience participation.

17 No one in the audience, we will close the
18 audience participation.

19 Look for a motion to adjourn.

20 MR. GRECO: Motion to adjourn.

21 MR. GIACOPETTI: Second.

22 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: All those
23 in favor.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

THE BOARD: Aye.

(The meeting was adjourned at 7:17 p.m.)

** ** *

STATE OF MICHIGAN)

) ss.

COUNTY OF OAKLAND)

I, Jennifer L. Wall, Notary Public within and for the County of Oakland, State of Michigan, do hereby certify that the meeting was taken before me in the above entitled matter at the aforementioned time and place; that the meeting was stenographically recorded and afterward transcribed by computer under my personal supervision, and that the said meeting is a full, true and correct transcript.

I further certify that I am not connected by blood or marriage with any of the parties or their attorneys, and that I am not an employee of either of them, nor financially interested in the action.

IN WITNESS THEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand at the City of Walled Lake, County of Oakland, State of Michigan.

2-28-17

Date

Jennifer L. Wall CSR-4183
Oakland County, Michigan