



PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

CITY OF NOVI

Regular Meeting

April 27, 2022 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

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

Absent – Excused: Member Avdoulos

Staff: Barbara McBeth, City Planner; Tom Schultz, City Attorney; Lindsay Bell, Senior Planner; Rick Meader, Landscape Architect; Victor Boron, Plan Review Engineer; Douglas Repen, Environmental Consultant; Doug Necci, Façade Consultant

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion made by Member Verma and seconded by Member Becker.

VOICE VOTE TO APPROVE THE APRIL 27, 2022 PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA MOVED BY MEMBER VERMA AND SECONDED BY MEMBER BECKER.

Motion to approve the April 27, 2022 Planning Commission Agenda. Motion carried 6-0.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

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

Dorothy Duchesneau, 125 Henning Drive, said I would like to thank the developer of Scenic Pines for not clear cutting the property while they decide if it is feasible to go forward. We have seen that happen too many times in the city. On the other hand, I would like to ask what the near-term plan is for the two homes on Pembine Street that were purchased to make up the Scenic Pines development. About two years ago, one of the renters was asked to move based on the development going forward. The other left this spring. Having two deteriorating, vacant homes in our small subdivision of only two streets does not improve the looks or increase the values of any of the neighboring homes. If they are not going to be maintained as rentals, please tear them down sooner rather than later, like what was done at the 210 Buffington property.

Seeing that nobody else wished to participate, Chair Pehrson closed the first public participation.

CORRESPONDENCE

1. CITY OF FARMINGTON HILLS: INTENT TO PLAN

City Planner McBeth said included in your packet is a notice from the City of Farmington Hills of their intent to prepare a master plan, similar to what was sent out for our Master Plan update.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

There were not any committee reports.

CITY PLANNER REPORT

City Planner McBeth had nothing to report.

CONSENT AGENDA - REMOVALS AND APPROVALS

1. SCENIC PINES, JSP18-76

Approval of the request of Singh Development LLC for a one-year extension of the Final Site Plan (1st request). The subject property is located south of South Lake Drive and east of West Park Drive in the R-4, One-Family Residential Zoning District and Section 3 of the city. The site plan proposes a 25-unit residential site condominium utilizing the One-Family Cluster Option. Final Site Plan approval was granted May 20, 2020.

Motion made by Member Lynch and seconded by Member Becker.

ROLL CALL VOTE TO APPROVE THE ONE-YEAR FINAL SITE PLAN EXTENSION FOR JSP18-76 SCENIC PINES MOVED BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER BECKER.

**Motion to approve the one-year Final Site Plan extension for JSP18-76 Scenic Pines.
Motion carried 6-0.**

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. TOWNES OF MAIN STREET JSP 20-35

Public hearing at the request of Singh Development for JSP 20-35 Townes of Main Street for recommendation to the City Council for approval or denial of Preliminary Site Plan, Phasing Plan, Wetland Permit, and Storm Water Management Plan. The subject property is zoned TC-1 (Town Center One) and is approximately 17.7 acres. It is located north and south of Main Street, east of Novi Road, in Section 23. The applicant is proposing a multifamily development with 192 townhouse-style apartments. The site improvements include a private street network, surface parking, and related open space amenities. The applicant is proposing construction in three phases.

Senior Planner Bell said the subject property is approximately 17.7 acres and is located north and south of Main Street, east of Novi Road in Section 23. The parcels are currently vacant. The property is zoned Town Center-1, with the same zoning surrounding it, except on the south which abuts I-2 General Industrial zoning. The industrial area to the south fronts on Trans-X Road and is used by a trucking facility. The area to the north fronts on Grand River Avenue and is developed with commercial uses. The east of the southern area is developed with Main Street Village, a multifamily townhouse community zoned RM-2. To the east on the north side of Main Street is the Atrium building, which contains restaurants, offices, and commercial businesses. Properties to the west front on Novi Road and are developed with commercial uses. The Future Land Use map indicates Town Center Commercial for the subject property and all areas surrounding it. The recommended density in the Master Plan for Land Use is 20 dwelling units per acre in this

area. The applicant is proposing to develop 32 townhouse-style buildings containing 192 multi-family residential units. The effective density is 10.8 dwelling units per acre. Parking would be provided in ground-level direct-entry garages. Small bays of additional parking spaces are proposed in a few locations. A private street network is proposed to connect the development to Main Street, Trans-X, and Sixth Gate. Sidewalks are provided throughout the development. The required open space is provided. Green space amenities include a playground in the southern central area, a gazebo and benches near the eastern pond, and a central common area promenade on the north side. A brick screening wall would provide a buffer to the surrounding industrial and commercial uses. The project is proposed to be developed in three phases, with the first phase consisting of buildings 12-22 on the south side of Main Street. Phase 2 would include buildings 23-34 south of phase 1. The third phase would consist of all the buildings north of Main Street.

Senior Planner Bell went on to say for this project the applicant is requesting several waivers as well as some variances that will need to be approved by the Zoning Board of Appeals. City Council can make a determination to approve the requested increase in the number of rooms allowed, up to a maximum of two times the number otherwise allowed. The applicant's plans indicate 960 rooms are proposed whereas 642 rooms are allowed if not increased by Council. There are 7 landscape waivers detailed in the suggested motion, 5 of which are supported by staff. The Planning Commission is asked in item 8 to choose between option a, which is the applicant requested waiver to reduce the number of multifamily unit trees required by 50%, or option b, the staff preferred waiver that would require the applicant to plant a number of shrubs to make up some of the deficiency in multifamily unit trees (which would bring it to effectively 65% of the requirement). Waivers for not meeting the lighting requirements are also requested.

Senior Bell continued to say the Façade review notes that in general the buildings are consistent with the intent and purpose of the Façade Ordinance. The applicant has agreed to modify the facades so that the buildings facing Main Street, which will be most visible to the public, will be in compliance except on the rear elevation. The requested Section 9 waivers for underage of brick or brick and stone, and overage of Lap siding are not along the public roadways and the overall appearance of the buildings would not be significantly improved by strict application of the percentage listed in the Ordinance. The applicant has provided a façade board with the proposed materials. A wetland delineation indicated there are small wetland areas on the site, which will be permanently impacted by the proposed development. Total impact area is 0.40 acre, which will require mitigation. The applicant indicates this mitigation will be constructed off-site at a location within the City on a parcel or parcels owned by the applicant. Detailed mitigation plans will need to be reviewed at the time of Final Site Plan submittal to ensure they meet the ordinance requirements. The variances to be considered by the ZBA include allowing a reduction in the required side yard building setback adjacent to the RM-2 District to 20-feet where it abuts a residential district. This is supported since it is essentially the same use. The other variance would allow perpendicular parking along a major drive: Salinger Circle. Staff notes that there are legal agreements in place between adjacent property owners for parking, utilities and access that impact this property. Those easements and agreements require amendments in order to allow the proposed development to proceed. The first condition of the suggested motion states that those amendments must be provided and approved before the City will approve the final site plan.

Senior Planner Bell concluded by saying all reviewers are recommending approval or conditional approval if the requested waivers and variances are granted and the other conditions are met. The Planning Commission is asked to hold the public hearing and consider making a recommendation to City Council to either approve or deny the Preliminary Site Plan, Phasing Plan, Wetland Use Permit, and Storm Water Management Plan. The City's wetland and façade consultants are also here, along with staff, to answer any questions you may have. The applicants Todd Rankine from Singh Development, Mike Noles with the Umlor Group, and Jason

Emerine with Seiber Keast are here to tell you more about their project.

Chair Pehrson invited the applicant to address the Planning Commission.

Todd Rankine, with Singh Development, said we think this project is great for this location to complete the downtown area. We also think that the addition of this type of use and residential foot traffic will greatly enhance the commercial uses that are already in place. With me tonight are Mike Noles and Jason Emerine. Mike will be giving the presentation for us tonight.

Mike Noles, with the Umlor Group, said we are extremely proud of this project, and we hope we can count on your support. This project will bring an exciting, modern addition to the Main Street area. The City of Novi has been regularly recognized as one of the best places to live in Michigan due to the wide variety of commercial and recreational amenities, the great schools, and the unmatched municipal services. A decade ago, the city noticed that it was lacking a core downtown area. The Main Street area was determined to be the core area of the downtown. The city's Town Center Area Study was approved by the Planning Commission on March 26, 2014. This study is the backbone for the proposal that you have before you tonight. In the study, the city described a vision that includes features common to other downtown areas. Quoting from the study, "The development of the Town Center area will create a dynamic, attractive city core that provides residents and visitors with unique opportunities to participate in active community life and meet their needs for goods, service, housing, and entertainment." Several steps toward this goal have been achieved over the years, remodeling of the shopping center and inclusion of attractive streetscapes in several sections of the Novi and Grand River intersection. The Town Center provides a strong tax base for the city, but it also provides many jobs. Some of the business near Main Street have struggled recently; increasing the permanent residencies in the area will increase business.

Mr. Noles continued to say the project is in the heart of the TC-1 area. The site is currently vacant, and the site is pedestrian accessible to intermixed uses in the surrounding area. For practical reasons, we are requesting relief on a few of the standards, including flexibility in streetscape and landscape design, room count, and some setbacks. We are also requesting a waiver from providing on-site wetland mitigation, and we're proposing off-site mitigation; the applicant has several other properties in the city that are being considered for this. In addition to the unique physical features of the property, there are also some unique legal encumbrances including easements and agreements that need to be untangled. The amended easements and agreements are much less of a practical difficulty than an administrative one. Retained utility easements that are no longer needed can be found on several vacated roads in the city, such as Paul Bunyan. The utilities for this project will be routed through the entire development, and the old utility easements will have to be replaced with new ones. Likewise, the shared parking agreements are minimally affected because the parking provided exceeds the requirement for the site. There is no need to share parking with our neighbors anymore, so those agreements must be amended. What we hope to do, with the help of City Attorney Tom Schultz, is to get through the Preliminary Site Plan with your support and City Council's approval. Then we can unwind those agreements once we have a plan that is approved in terms of density and layout. It does not make sense to adjust those easements if the plan is not to be approved. Most of the utility agreements are to benefit the city, and we are replacing those with the city.

Mr. Noles stated the proposal is consistent with the requirements to promote a city center style development that encourages street vitality. Zoning calls for dense, multi-family housing. The proposed density is 11 units per acre which is well below the maximum density 20 dwelling units per acres permitted by Novi's future land use map approved in 2017. The site plan has been modified several times over the past year. We have worked with city staff and consultants to bring the best version possible before you. We are fortunate to come before you tonight with unanimous recommendations for approval, albeit that two of them are conditional. These two

conditions are for façade and landscape. We are open to adding the shrubs along the side of some of the units. There are some challenges to applying suburban landscape requirements to a city center style development. One of those challenges, for example, down Main Street there is a 36-inch storm sewer; you cannot plant a tree on top of utilities like this, limiting the space available to plant trees. Regarding the façade, one of the requirements was to modify the architecture for all the units that face Main Street with 100 percent masonry – we have done this. The remaining condition has to do with brick percentages on the sides of those same units.

Mr. Noles went on to say pedestrian amenities for this development are built into the streetscape. We are truly creating a pedestrian-friendly environment. On my map, I show covered and uncovered bike racks shown in stars. These are for-sale townhomes, not apartments. These residents will live and interact with Novi's city core to increase its vitality. Ms. Bell mentioned the promenade; we're adding a gazebo for some additional capacity for folks to gather in the core area. The promenade itself will have benches and a mail kiosk. The waiver is needed for ADA parking spaces for everyone to be able to access the mail kiosk. There is also a play area for residents with small children. In the open space calculations, balconies are called out, which is within the Novi ordinance. These are private balconies, so each unit will have a private outdoor area. Other units will have back patios if desired. While this is a very compact development, there are also some private outdoor spaces for residents to enjoy. What is displayed now is the masonry for the façade of the units along Main Street. The brick and the shingles have been placed into the graphic to display the modern features that will make this development feel urban. We have a flat roof look on these buildings from the street view because the roofs themselves are not very steep.

Mr. Noles concluded by saying we feel that this development is within the vision of the city center area. We have included all the amenities that the standard Novi development has and more while creating a modern and urban feel to the design of the buildings. Thank you for your time this evening, and we will be happy to answer any questions.

Chair Pehrson invited members of the audience who wished to participate in the public hearing to approach the podium.

Mike Duchesneau, 1191 South Lake Drive, said I am glad to hear that Singh development is going to the off-site wetland mitigation within the city. It's been a concern with many of the proposals we've seen where applicants buy into a fund and put it elsewhere. The presentation said that these homes would be for sale and not for rent; as you've heard me say in the past, I firmly support homes for sale as opposed to homes for rent in Novi. There is one concern I have, and it has been a concern with other projects in the city, is with what happens in the preliminary phases for stormwater. Our ordinances do not necessarily call for good designs in early construction phases – it's up to the developer. Singh has had a couple of instances in Bollingbrooke where ground water ran into Shawood Lake, even though they are the most high-quality developer in the city. I hope the city can take this issue into consideration for this project and other projects, especially when there are residents in existing homes nearby.

Seeing that nobody else wished to speak, and there were no public hearing responses, Chair Pehrson closed the public hearing and turned it over to the Planning Commission for consideration.

Member Lynch said the property to the southeast is an RM-2 density. How does this compare to the density that is being requested here?

Senior Planner Bell said I know that it is Master Planned for the same density, but I would have to look up what the actual density is of those units.

Member Lynch said the reason I ask is because we have to make a decision based on adjacent properties, so I think it would be important to know the properties compare. I also would like to discuss the 50 percent increase in density is not really a 50 percent increase, going from 642 to 960 rooms.

Mike Noles said we're not getting an increase in density; we are actually under density requirements at 50 percent of the permitted density at this site. The waiver before you tonight is for room count, which is a different matter. The Novi ordinance permits a certain number of rooms, and those numbers are measured differently in the TC-1 District and the RM-2 district. The concern would be that we would put in dens rather than bedrooms, but then we could end up with 20 people living in a unit. The ordinance aims to prevent that by counting each of the rooms, and it assumes those other rooms are bedrooms. There are several reasons that you should not view those as bedrooms.

Member Lynch asked how many bedrooms will there be per unit?

Mr. Noles said three.

Member Lynch that makes sense. Really, the increase in room count should not be misconstrued as a 50 percent density increase.

Mr. Noles said if I may point out, the Planning Commission is permitted to increase the room county up to 1,200 based on the size of this property.

Member Lynch said I was a little confused about parking, but it looks like each unit has their own garage.

Mr. Noles said they have two garage spaces and two spaces in their driveway. We also have a couple of additional small parking areas.

Member Lynch said I think that the public and myself need to understand how the wetland mitigation will work. You are going to put it somewhere else in the city – how does that help this particular site?

Mr. Noles said looking at the delineation, we're not touching the existing pond. There is a little pocket of wetland toward the north of the property that we are eliminating – 0.4 acres of wetland. The city code allows that, but we must mitigate for it. Wetlands can be mitigated on either a 1.5 to 1 or a 2 to 1 basis, so we have to build more wetlands than what we're taking out. We have agreed to do that, but the question of where this will occur remains. We don't want to dig out new wetlands on site because that would push the buildings back and decrease density. We could add on to existing wetland complexes, such as the one adjacent to Twelve Oaks Mall or the Links of Novi.

Member Lynch said my understanding is that location is in the Rouge watershed. The Links of Novi is on the Huron watershed. I am assuming that if you mitigate that wetland that it would remain part of the Rouge watershed. These watersheds are made for the 100-year floodplain, and we retain that water on site. Is what you're saying is that the wetland mitigation area and the stormwater management is enough to contain runoff water?

Mr. Noles said the wetlands and stormwater management plans are separate issues. There is an existing regional stormwater management system for all the Town Center, and the wetland on site proposed to be eliminated is not part of it. It all runs down and exits into the Rouge Watershed. We're not impacting the stormwater management. We did a topographical and bathymetric survey on the existing ponds to prove that the volume in those ponds was sufficient.

The wetlands are an entirely different matter.

Member Lynch said I just wanted you to explain that because many times, residents feel that removal of a wetland will cause flooding. Really, you are accomplishing two things. First, you are still going to maintain the 100-year flood standard. Then, as far as wetland requirements go, that is more of a state enforced thing.

Mr. Noles said it is a city and state requirement; Novi's ordinance has certain requirements for wetlands. The requirements exist to prevent someone from just wiping a wetland out entirely. What we try to do is begin with avoidance as the first option, minimization as the second option, and mitigation as the third option. If there is an area where there is a stray, low quality wetland, those are eligible for being removed, but they still need to be mitigated. We are just asking to mitigate it somewhere else.

Member Lynch said as far as plantings go, I do agree with Mr. Meader. I understand that you don't want to plant over a water main line, but I don't want to pull away from the greenspace. I think if I were to vote in favor of this, it would include the option that is staff recommended and requires 6 shrubs for every tree that will not be put in.

Landscape Architect Rick Meader acknowledged that the shrubs will enhance the green space in place of trees, and he is satisfied with this exchange.

Plan Review Engineer Victor Boron stated that he wanted to verify the differentiation between wetlands and stormwater management. The City Engineer and I are confident that Seiber Keast did the necessary research for verifying the existing pond's volume and that the stormwater is controlled prior to its outlet downstream toward the Rouge.

Member Becker said there's a lot of pavement and housing covering the ground on this plan right now, and a stormwater flow is going to be generated that isn't there today because it is absorbed into the ground. You're comfortable with the existing detention pond being able to mitigate that stormwater?

Plan Review Engineer Victor Boron said we are now. At first, we were somewhat alarmed, but after going into the record, we found that the entire area around the site was designed for an even more intense amount of pavement. I believe this was designed sometime in the 1990s and it meets the current standards of 100-year rather than 10-year detention. Normally that would not be the case going back 25 years. The pond has heavily altered over the past decades, but now the pond and the off-site portions of the mitigation are working in concert as one stormwater system.

Member Becker said when I visited the site, the first thing I thought was that this development would bring new life to the Main Street area, which has struggled in the past. The area is going to become more pedestrian and bike accessible, which will attract a local audience for the businesses in the area. To me, this is where an urban residential development belongs. As I got into the list of variances and waivers, I recalled that we recently went through a similar process with the same developer on the north side of Twelve Oaks. Although I was not on the Commission at the time, my guess is that they did something very similar for Huntley Manor, which is a much more urban than suburban development. I'm not sure the process or form this would take, but it seems it would be efficient and practical if we were to come up with an urban residential development description so we can address some of the issues that suburban development standards can have on said urban developments. I do not think this is the last urban-style development that we are going to see in the city. Reducing the number of required waivers and variances for urban style developments would be better. Going through this process for every development takes up a lot of department time, and I think that would be the best way forward.

Member Dismondy said this seems like a challenging site, and the design looks good. What is the approximate price point for these units?

Mike Noles said that has not quite been targeted yet, as Singh is still in discussion with several different builders who may be interested in constructing this project. Given the style and square footage, I think they will probably be around the mid-400s to 500s. It may start a bit lower and creep a bit higher depending on the options that are selected.

Member Dismondy said it definitely should reactivate that area. Is financing playing a role in your decision to phase the development?

Mr. Noles said no, we do phasing for several reasons. Some is just for cash flow; if the development is there all at once, we'd need to carry it the entire time. Another, and probably more important, reason is if we pave all the roads for 172 units, you don't create any sense of urgency with buyers. When we control the phasing, we can also somewhat control the momentum of selling units. Lastly, it makes it easier to control the areas of construction, so when residents move in, they don't have construction next to them over the life of the job.

Member Dismondy asked is there on street parking? If you had more than two guests, would they be able to park on the road?

Mr. Noles said no, there is not on-street parking. There just isn't an opportunity because there are so many driveways. If there isn't a driveway, there's a fire hydrant or a major drive, but we also cannot have parking on a major drive. This is why we created a couple of parking lots throughout the site. The on-street parking on Main Street will remain available as well.

Member Dismondy asked for clarification on the waiver for lighting.

Mr. Noles said the ordinance requires 0.2-foot candles at the entrance locations, and we were short on that. Therefore, we added two coach lights at each of the front doors, and we included two coach lights on the garages; these were not part of the original scheme. That still did not satisfy the technicality because Novi's ordinance calls for 0.2-foot candles on every sidewalk and parking area. If there is a sidewalk that goes in between buildings or under trees, it just isn't practical to hit all spots.

Member Roney said I think this is a really exciting project. The Main Street area is a place we have always wanted to see grow, and I think having residents in the area will be very supportive of the businesses. My fellow Commissioners have asked a lot of good questions, so I am satisfied.

Member Verma said I see that along Main Street, you have the brick façade that matches the rest of the buildings in the Main Street area. However, on the Grand River side you have chosen a different set of materials. What made you decide to do this?

Mike Noles said we don't have frontage on Grand River although it is on the Grand River side. We are proposing buildings along the vacated Paul Bunyan street. These units have a brick screen wall around the development since we can't fit in a berm due to the urban style of development. We added a 6-foot masonry wall, and then we increased the height to 8 feet along Trans-X Road, which is in an industrial district. If there was frontage along Grand River, then we would certainly match the elevations of those units with those along Main Street.

Member Verma said it looks like all the buildings will be enclosed in a parapet wall, correct?

Mr. Noles said it does not go all the way around.

Member Verma asked for clarification that all the benches would match the city benches.

Mr. Noles confirmed they would be.

Member Verma asked if the gazebo would have benches.

Mr. Noles said that they did not have the details of the gazebo layout settled yet.

Member Verma requested that benches be include in the gazebo so that people could sit and eat lunch there.

Mr. Noles confirmed that in the final design, benches will be provided inside the gazebo.

Chair Pehrson asked what is the approximate timeline for the phasing?

Mike Noles said it will be three phases. A fair target pace for a development like this would be 35 to 70 units per year. Using 50 as a middle of the road estimate, we are looking at three years.

Chair Pehrson said normally, when we see so many comments about waivers and variances, it raises a red flag. However, I like the phrase my fellow Commissioner used: 'thoughtful variances.' There has been a lot of work done to address the awkward uniqueness of the property, so I appreciate the effort both parties have put forth.

Motion made by Member Lynch and seconded by Member Roney.

In the matter of Townes at Main Street JSP20-35, motion to recommend approval to City Council the Preliminary Site Plan based on and subject to the following:

- 1. The applicant shall provide a fully signed and recordable amendment to the Main Street Area Reciprocal Parking, Access, Stormwater, and Public/Private Utilities Agreement, and any other documents identified by the City Attorney's office, in a form and manner acceptable to the City before or at the time of final site plan submittal to assure that all parties to those existing agreements are amenable to the changes proposed by the applicant. This preliminary site plan approval (and all related land development approvals) is null and void in the event such document(s) is not provided when and as required, and no final site plan will be approved by the City unless such document(s) is provided to the City.**
- 2. City Council determination per Section 4.82.2.b. for allowing an increase of maximum number of rooms allowed (642 allowed, 960 proposed) based on the following findings:**
 - i) That an increase in total number of rooms is compatible with adjacent uses of land in terms of location, size, character, and impact on adjacent property or the surrounding neighborhood.**
 - ii) That an increase in total number of rooms is compatible with adjacent uses of land in terms of location, size, character, and impact on adjacent property or the surrounding neighborhood.**
- 3. Waiver of the requirement to submit a Traffic Impact Statement, as the 2018 Traffic Impact Statement prepared by AECOM included this area in its assumptions.**
- 4. A section 9 waiver for the following deviations is hereby granted, as the overall appearance of the buildings would not be significantly improved by strict application of the percentage listed in the Ordinance, and the more prominent facades along Main Street will meet the standards:**
 - a. not providing the minimum required brick and stone (50% required) on the front (43% proposed) and side (32% proposed) facades for Buildings 1-7 and**

- 17-32 and rear (20% proposed) facades for all buildings.
 - b. exceeding the maximum allowed percentage of lap siding (50% allowed) on side (buildings 1-7 and 17-32 only) and rear (all buildings) facades (proposed: side – 60% and rear – 55%), provided vinyl siding is not permitted;
 - c. not providing the minimum required brick (30% required) on the front elevations for Buildings 1-7 and 17-32 (20% proposed).
 - d. not providing the minimum required brick (30% required) on the rear elevations for all buildings (20% proposed);
5. Landscape waiver from Sec. 5.5.3.B.ii for lack of berm between the site and adjacent commercial and industrial uses as the applicant proposes a brick wall to provided alternate screening;
 6. Landscape waiver from Sec. 5.5.3.B.ii for reduction in required greenbelt width and number of trees along Trans-X Drive;
 7. Landscape waiver from Sec. 5.5.3.B.ii for deficiency in required greenbelt trees along the south side of Main Street due to conflicts with underground utilities;
 8. Landscape waiver from Section 5.5.3.F.ii to allow a reduction in the total number multifamily unit trees provided (576 required, 287 provided) with the condition that 15% of the total unit trees are substituted with fruiting/flowering shrubs (at a ratio of 6 shrubs/tree = 518 shrubs) are added to the plans;
 9. Landscape waiver from Sec 5.5.3.D. for deficiency in foundation landscaping coverage along the interior drives as landscaping added to sides of buildings makes up for the shortage;
 10. Landscape waiver from Sec. 5.5.3.E.ii. for the use of subcanopy trees up to 30% of the unit landscaping trees (25% maximum required) as there is limited room for canopy trees;
 11. Waiver from section 5.7.3.E. to allow an increase of average to minimum light level ratio for the site (4:1 maximum allowed, 4.81 provided).
 12. Waiver from section 5.7.3.K for not meeting the minimum light levels in various parking and walkway areas (0.2-foot candles required, some areas 0.0-foot candles);
 13. The followings would require Zoning Board of Appeals approval:
 - a. variance from section 3.6.2.H to allow a 20-foot building setback adjacent to RM-2 District (117 feet required).
 - b. variance from section 5.10 to allow perpendicular parking on a major drive.
 14. The findings of compliance with Ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters and the conditions and the items listed in those letters being addressed on the Final Site Plan.

ROLL CALL VOTE TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN FOR JSP20-35 TOWNES OF MAIN STREET TO CITY COUNCIL MOVED BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER RONEY.

Motion to recommend approval of the Preliminary Site Plan for JSP20-35 Townes of Main Street to City Council. *Motion carried 6-0.*

Motion made by Member Lynch and seconded by Member Dismondy.

In the matter of Townes at Main Street JSP20-35, motion to approve the Phasing 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.

ROLL CALL VOTE TO APPROVE OF THE PHASING PLAN FOR JSP20-35 TOWNES OF MAIN STREET MOVED BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER DISMONDY.

Motion to approve the Phasing Plan for JSP20-35 Townes of Main Street. Motion carried 6-0.

Motion made by Member Lynch and seconded by Member Dismondy.

In the matter of Townes at Main Street JSP20-35, motion to approve the Wetland Permit based on and subject to the following:

- a. The off-site wetland mitigation plans showing mitigation to be constructed within the City of Novi in accordance with Chapter 12 of the Code of Ordinances being provided in the Final Site Plan submittal,**
- b. 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.**

ROLL CALL VOTE TO APPROVE OF THE WETLAND PERMIT FOR JSP20-35 TOWNES OF MAIN STREET MOVED BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER DISMONDY.

Motion to approve the Wetland Permit for JSP20-35 Townes of Main Street. Motion carried 6-0.

Motion made by Member Lynch and seconded by Member Roney.

In the matter of Townes at Main Street JSP20-35, 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.

ROLL CALL VOTE TO APPROVE OF THE STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR JSP20-35 TOWNES OF MAIN STREET MOVED BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER RONEY.

Motion to approve the Stormwater Management Plan for JSP20-35 Townes of Main Street. Motion carried 6-0.

MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION

1. APPROVAL OF THE APRIL 13, 2022 PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Motion made by Member Lynch and seconded by Member Dismondy.

ROLL CALL VOTE TO APPROVE THE APRIL 13, 2022 PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER DISMONDY.

Motion to approve the April 13, 2022 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes. Motion carried 6-0.

CONSENT AGENDA REMOVALS FOR COMMISSION ACTION

There were not any additional consent agenda items.

SUPPLEMENTAL ISSUES/TRAINING UPDATES

City Planner McBeth said just a reminder to the members of the Master Plan Steering Committee that we have a meeting next Wednesday, May 4 at 6:00 PM in the Activities Room.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

Chair Pehrson invited members of the audience who wished to address the Planning Commission during the final audience participation to come forward. Seeing that nobody wished to participate, Chair Pehrson closed the final public participation.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn made by Member Lynch.

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

Motion to adjourn the April 27, 2022 Planning Commission Meeting. Motion carried 6-0.

The meeting adjourned at 8:12 PM.