

**REGULAR MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NOVI
MONDAY, MAY 6, 2024, AT 7:00 P.M.**

Mayor Fischer called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL: Mayor Fischer, Mayor Pro Tem Casey, Council Members Gurumurthy, Heintz, Smith, Staudt, Thomas

ALSO PRESENT: Victor Cardenas, City Manager
Tom Schultz, City Attorney

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

CM 24-05-56 Moved by Casey, seconded by Smith; MOTION CARRIED: 7-0

To approve the agenda as presented

Roll call vote on CM 24-05-56	Yeas: Casey, Gurumurthy, Heintz, Smith, Staudt, Thomas, Fischer Nays: None
--------------------------------------	---

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

1. FY 2024-25 Budget and 2024 Millage Rates

The public hearing opened at 7:01 p.m. and closed at 7:02 p.m. with no public comment.

PRESENTATIONS: None

CITY MANAGER REPORT:

City Manager Cardenas reminded the Council that this week kicks off Public Services Recognition week and wanted to thank all the women and men that make up the fantastic staff for the City of Novi and that a whole week of activities are planned for them. Mr. Cardenas concluded by asking if Council members come across one of the City's employees, to please share their appreciation for everything they do every day of the week.

ATTORNEY REPORT: None

AUDIENCE COMMENTS:

Mr. Khurram Abbas, a resident of Asbury Park, stated his concern about how his neighborhood is impacted by its proximity to the south side of the City West proposal. He was deeply concerned about the rise of dense residential and rental units popping up over the city since May last year. He stated that many concerned Novi residents showed up at the Planning Commission meeting and voiced their concerns in person and email. He felt that it was safe to say the residents of Novi do not look favorably towards City

West as there were concerns about the infrastructure, particularly the roads. One of the members of the Planning Commission commented that the neighborhood's traffic was only due to construction. Mr. Abbas wanted to remind the Planning Commission members that construction in Michigan is the norm and will continue to be as such. He continued that sometimes it takes an exorbitant amount of time just to get out of Novi because of the traffic in the city alone. All the development associated with City West would make it worse than it presently is, and Novi would not be a desirable place to live anymore. Adding dense residential units would also put many more students in the school district, particularly Parkview Elementary. This increase in the student to teacher ratio will jeopardize the quality of the school district. It also takes a toll on the serene woodlands and wetlands around the area. Speaking as a Novi resident, Mr. Abbas feels the best course of action is to vote for the third option and leave the south side of Grand River from the City West proposal to minimize the impact of overdevelopment. Mr. Abbas then spoke as a resident of Asbury Park as well as a member of the HOA and stated that he lives on the south side of the subdivision and represents many homeowners up north whose properties are abutting City West south. He expressed that his neighborhood has one dense residential complex known as Central Park Estates on the northeast side of the subdivision. Recently the Planning Commission approved another apartment complex known as Central Park South which would be located on the east. Although this is not part of the City West proposal, he wanted to point this out because similar developments from the same developer are proposed on the northeast and the northwest side of his subdivision in the form of City West. Many residents showed up at the City Council meeting in July of last year and the City Council at the time sent the proposal back to the drawing board to try and address some of the concerns that residents had. Mr. Abbas expressed his appreciation for the Council and City staff for looking at this and proposing improvements. Unfortunately, he found out about this on Friday, and it didn't give them a lot of time to do a charter review and reach out to the homeowners. In the last City Council meeting, Member Casey mentioned that even a 100-foot setback might not be enough, and she wanted to see if they could accommodate a 200-foot setback. It was noted that the new setback for the parking area now stands at 75 feet instead of the originally proposed 50 feet, but Mr. Abbas did not feel like that is enough. If the City Council wants to proceed with this proposal on the south side of the city, then the Asbury Park homeowners request that the setbacks are increased to ensure that the homeowners in the North of the subdivision are not adversely impacted.

David Landry, 45471 Kimberly Court wanted to address the Council on meeting items four and five for City West. He represents the owners of the property on the southeast corner of Grand River and Beck, the Joanne Ward Trust, that is currently zoned B-3. He urged the City Council to follow the recommendation of the administration and suggested if the Council adopts City West, to exclude the southeast corner when it comes to item five. The whole corner is currently zoned commercial where the southwest corner is a hospital zoned OSC, the northwest corner is the large Home Depot zoned B-2, and the northeast corner is a bank zoned OST. It only makes sense that the entire corner be commercial because that's the way it's been forever and Mr. Landry thinks that is the better way to do it because City West envisions taking properties, buildings right up to the road and increasing height. If you do that, it's going to be a lopsided vision. He further stated that

it is easier to have all three corners as commercial corners. He suggested and urged the City Council that if City West is adopted, when it comes to item five, just apply it to the north side of Grand River and not the south side. He thinks it would solve several concerns. Number one would eliminate the cross-ability issue with pedestrians trying to cross Grand River. Also solved would be the adjacency issues from the folks who live on 11 Mile Road. This would give the City Council much control over how the south side develops. If the Council adopts the ordinance and it works on the north side, then developers on the south side are going to come and ask to rezone their parcels to City West because they want the density and the other benefits. If it comes to the Council within a rezoning request, that gives the Council the authority to decide exactly what is going to happen, the setbacks and things of that nature. Mr. Landry urged the Council not to include the southeast corner but apply it to the north side of Grand River only.

CONSENT AGENDA REMOVALS AND APPROVALS:

CM 24-05-57 Moved by Thomas, seconded by Casey; MOTION CARRIED: 7-0

To approve the Consent Agenda as presented.

- A. Approve Minutes of:
 - April 17, 2024 - Special Meeting
 - April 22, 2024 - Regular Meeting
- B. Adoption of Resolution seeking reimbursement from Oakland County for expenses associated with the City of Novi's annual Mosquito Control Program.
- C. Approval of Resolution Amending Annual Assessment for Special Assessment District 108-C Town Center Street Lighting Fund.
- D. Approval of Resolution Amending Annual Assessment for Special Assessment District 109-C West Oaks Area Street Lighting Fund.
- E. Consideration of approval of Resolution Regarding Second Amendment to Sublease Agreement and Memorandum of Amendment for Ice Arena Wireless Communications Tower.
- F. Approval of claims and warrants – Warrant 1155

Roll call vote on CM 24-05-57

**Yeas: Gurumurthy, Heintz, Smith, Staudt,
Thomas, Fischer, Casey
Nays: None**

MATTERS FOR COUNCIL ACTION:

1. Consideration of Recommendation from Council Rules Committee to amend Council Organization and Order of Business.

City Manager Cardenas stated that the following is a recommendation from the Rules Committee regarding a situation that occurs after an election. The Rules Committee has met several times following the election back in November and has come up with the proposed recommendation and changes in the next couple of motions with respect to creating new committees and sunsetting old committees.

Mayor Pro Tem Casey stated that as a member of the Rules Committee, quite a bit of time meeting was spent to discuss what recommendation for the rules they would bring to the City Council. As people who are reading the red line version, there were a couple of little things that the Committee decided to clean up. The big change is in the Committee structure. The Committee's real attempt after many years is to try to modernize the Committee structure and make sure they were focusing Committee work on the issues that matter. The other thing is the Cultural Arts Advisory Board, when that committee was formed, was always intended to be moved to a Council appointed committee, so they were trying to take steps to complete that initial process. Also, they are adding committees that came up through the goal setting process. The other big change was going through this as it was being discussed and documenting how committee chairs get appointed because in the past, they had somewhat of a practice of it being a seniority-based committee chair. Following a normal parliamentary process, having the mayor as the chair of the Council, appoint the chairs of Council committees, that opens the door for recognizing and appointing chairs who have an interest in the committee and specific knowledge that benefits the committee. It was noted that on page 10 of the rules, there is a note that the Library Board is one appointment per year when it's more like two to three. She thanked her colleagues on the Rules Committee, staff and the City Attorney for their work on the rules.

CM 24-05-58 Moved by Casey, seconded by Thomas: MOTION CARRIED: 7-0

Approval of Recommendation from Council Rules Committee to amend Council Organization and Order of Business.

Member Smith commented that section eight, item E of the rules talks about speakers using their time only for voice comment and that he thinks a "no" got taken out because it now says that there shall be audible indication of approval or disapproval of any remarks of the speakers by the public body. City Attorney Schultz was asked to review that before it is finalized.

Member Thomas wanted to thank the Committee for the work they did, specifically where it clarified how long the applications are for.

Roll call vote on CM 24-05-58

**Yeas: Heintz, Smith, Thomas, Casey,
Gurumurthy, Staudt, Fischer**

Nays: None

2. Consideration of the Recommendation from Council Rules Committee to adopt three resolutions establishing the “City Council Cultural Arts Advisory Committee,” the “Environmental Sustainability Committee,” and the “Long-Range Strategic Planning Committee”.

City Manager Cardenas started off by stating that this is in line with Council goals and is memorialized in the Council's rules just passed.

Member Smith expressed initial concern about ad hoc versus standing committees and the timing out of committees but after consideration, some standing committees are being dissolved. Some committees are required to be standing by the Council's charter. Member Smith stated that it was a good idea to have a time limit on committees, so you don't get into the case of a committee that has overstayed its welcome or isn't doing what it's supposed to be doing anymore.

CM 24-05-59 Moved by Smith, seconded by Thomas: MOTION CARRIED: 7-0

Approval of Recommendation from Council Rules Committee to adopt three resolutions establishing the “City Council Cultural Arts Advisory Committee,” the “Environmental Sustainability Committee,” and the “Long-Range Strategic Planning Committee.”

Member Smith also said that he is looking forward to environmental sustainability and that it was one of his goals when he first got on the Council and the cultural arts, and the long-range strategic planning are very well needed.

Member Gurumurthy stated that she'd like to thank the Rules Committee for all the work that they have done and happy to see these new committees that'll help us move forward with goals and priorities. She also expressed that she's like to work with the city team wherever the residents are part of the committee to promote this diverse community to see how they can be engaged and serve. Member Gurumurthy had a couple of comments regarding the environmental committee. First, she wanted to add that one of the deliverables should be in terms of doing a study of all aspects of the environmental sustainability action plan based on the sustainable priorities for the city.

AMENDED MOTION

CM 24-05-59 Moved by Smith, seconded by Thomas: MOTION CARRIED: 7-0

Approval of Recommendation from Council Rules Committee to adopt three resolutions establishing the “City Council Cultural Arts Advisory Committee,” the “Environmental Sustainability Committee,” and the “Long-Range Strategic Planning Committee”,

and to include in the resolution for the Environmental Sustainability Committee a deliverable that the Committee will do “a study of all aspects of the environmental sustainability action plan based on the sustainable priorities for the city.”

Member Gurumurthy's second comment was that some committees gave reports back in 2020 and then maybe 2023. She wanted to encourage to add, just for the Environmental and the Strategic Plan committees, to be able to come to the Council with a presentation whenever appropriate, within six months or one year, to present to the Council to keep them and the committees actively engaged together. Mayor Fischer stated that it a good idea and asked Member Gurumurthy if she wanted that to be part of the resolution or is this just an action that staff can take on. Member Gurumurthy expressed that she would like it to be part of the resolution. City Attorney Schultz added that the final paragraph six does say that the three initial members of council will come back to the City Council and talk about who else might want to be or who ought to be added to the committee. City Attorney Schultz stated that he didn't know if it could be made part of the deliverable at that time or added as a reference to another report but that there is the idea that the committee members will eventually come back to City Council to talk about where it goes from there. Member Gurumurthy responded that she understood that it is a two-year term but that her request was to see where things are in terms of progress, and what the next steps are, within six months or one year, to come back and present.

AMENDED MOTION

CM 24-05-59 Moved by Smith, seconded by Thomas: MOTION CARRIED: 7-0

Approval of Recommendation from Council Rules Committee to adopt three resolutions establishing the “City Council Cultural Arts Advisory Committee,” the “Environmental Sustainability Committee,” and the “Long-Range Strategic Planning Committee”, and to include in the resolution for the Environmental Sustainability Committee a deliverable that the Committee will do “a study of all aspects of the environmental sustainability action plan based on the sustainable priorities for the city”, and that the Environmental Sustainability Committee and Long-Range Strategic Planning Committee will report back to Council with a presentation periodically.

Member Heintz briefly reiterated his appreciation for everyone's hard work on the Rules Committee and that he was excited about these new committees being formed, especially the Environmental Sustainability Committee. He followed up by saying that he looked forward to seeing what they can do to continue to help and support the city.

Roll call vote on CM 24-05-59

Yeas: Smith, Staudt, Thomas, Fischer, Casey, Gurumurthy, Heintz

Nays: None

3. Consideration to adopt Resolutions Regarding Sunsetting of the Recreation Center Committee, the Municipal Broadband Committee, and the Roads Committee, in accordance with the recommendations of the City Council Rules Committee.

City Manager Cardenas started by saying that this is a direct result of the action and recommendation of the Council Rules Committee and that some of these committees are being absorbed by new committees that were just formed. He followed by saying that this is the procedure to sunset what was previously on the books and actions have already been taken to have some of these committees absorbed into new ones.

Mayor Pro Tem Casey thanked all the committee members who served on these three committees for the time and effort that they put into the work that those committees did.

CM 24-05-60 Moved by Casey, seconded by Thomas: MOTION CARRIED: 7-0

Adoption of Resolutions Regarding Sunsetting of the Recreation Center Committee, the Municipal Broadband Committee, and the Roads Committee, in accordance with the recommendations of the City Council Rules Committee

Roll call vote on CM 24-05-60

**Yeas: Staudt, Thomas, Fischer, Casey,
Gurumurthy, Heintz, Smith
Nays: None**

4. Consideration of Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment 18.296 to establish the new City West zoning district, along with associated ordinance changes to reference the new district, and to amend text related to the EXO District, to reflect an underlying zoning of City West. FIRST READING

City Manager Cardenas conducted a brief presentation outlining where we have been and where we are at this point. He stated that this is theoretically the second first reading as this was brought back to the Council from when it was initially brought up last summer. This is a direct result from the work was developed in the 2016 Master Plan, for the land use update. This is one of three districts with the two others being the Pavilion Shore Village near Walled Lake and what is now Sakura Novi. This is City West which was then recommended in 2016. The City West Ordinance was drafted by the planning staff with input from the City Attorney's office and the Planning Commission Implementation Committee. As shared before, this is the City West area, that is from Beck to Taft Road, north and south. The current zoning is RA, OST Industrial, and EXO. This is all under consideration to be rezoned and to be incorporated into the City West zoning area which is the current zoning for what is currently on the books. Since July 10, 2023, there have been several revisions per the Council's initial input on this matter. For example, the setbacks from single family residential has been revised. No buildings, either residential or non-residential, can be built within 100 feet of a single-family zoning district. It was acknowledged that the heights were a concern. City Manager Cardenas showed a map

that incorporated the sizes of the buildings, setbacks for residential and how determining how large those can be. This map exhibited several buffered areas around the City West District. The first buffer, in green, indicates a 100-foot buffer from single family residential with no buildings permitted within this buffer. The second buffer, in red, indicates a 200-foot buffer from single-residential and a height limited to a maximum 35 feet. The last buffer, in yellow, indicates a 300-foot buffer from single-family residential and a building height limited to 45 feet and buildings are not eligible for bonus height consideration. The City Manager stated that he wanted to provide some similarities of what those heights resemble in terms of recent recommendations or approvals that the Council has considered. Huntley Manor, which is on Grand River just east of City West and closer to Meadowbrook, has buildings at 28 feet and the Gateway Townhomes on the north side of Grand River and west of Meadowbrook Road are at 30 feet. The Griffin Novi Townhomes, which are off Haggerty, have a height of 37 feet and the clubhouse of that facility is at 40 feet. These building heights reflect buildings that are three to four stories, getting into the 40 feet range. The townhomes on Main Street, which is at the southeast corner of Grand River and Novi Road are at around 40 feet. Station Flats, which was denied by City Council is around 55 feet, again at the four-story area, giving a perspective of how tall these buildings are and what is being recommended in terms of how far they are from the current residential zoning. The City Manager gave a reminder that the hotel was removed from the south side of Grand River. He also stated that tons of environmental protections have been implemented and clarified in what was presented before the Council now. Next, indicated on a presentation slide, the horseshoe shaped neighborhood of Asbury Park, giving the perspective of how deep the residential lots are. Next slide looks west to east with the south on the left showing deep lots the farther you go east. The following slide looks west to east from the Beck and Grand River intersection where in the northeast corner, behind the USA to Go and the Starbucks, is where a lot of that north side development would be concentrated and to the east is Central Park Estates and the B-3 section, which was referenced earlier in public comment. City Manager Cardenas called attention to Asbury Park, where industrial currently is and the current industrial zoning only requires a 100-foot setback. The subsequent slide shows the view of a facility north of Asbury Park looking west to east and then an additional image showing an offset to that facility with a setback just over a hundred feet that is close to the property lines in Asbury Park. City Manager Cardenas recapped that as shown earlier, the taller the buildings are, the farther the setbacks are so that we're giving enough space to provide the gap between residential and mixed use as were being proposed. Finally, provided was a slide showing City West uses not allowed under I-1 zoning and uses not permitted in City West. This outlines the differences in uses that are being recommended as amended from the July meeting. Planning staff as well as Mr. Schultz were available to answer questions.

Mayor Fischer clarified that item four is to create the ordinance to establish the district and item five is to discuss whether to rezone the north side, the south side and/or both.

Member Staudt requested clarification that the recommended action is the approval of the zoning map and at the end of that, an option is required. City Attorney Schultz

clarified that at the end of creating the ordinance, one of the options will need to be picked.

Member Staudt stated that this had been a long process and that he still had concerns and questions but since the opportunities that the City Council would have to hear about projects as they come up and have some input made him feel better. He continued to say that he had spent many years listening to Mayor Landry and that his comments convinced him that the direction to go is to stay with just the north side and at some future point revisit the south side.

CM 24-05-61 Moved by Staudt, seconded by Fischer: MOTION CARRIED: 7-0

Approval of Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment 18.296 in order to establish the City West zoning district, along with associated ordinance changes to reference the new district, and to amend text related to the EXO District, to reflect an underlying zoning of City West, as described in option 2, subject to any modifications as determined necessary by the City Manager and City Attorney's office before consideration of Second Reading, for the reasons provided below. FIRST READING

Mayor Pro Tem Casey thanked staff for the work it took to create a memo that tried to educate and clarify. Mayor Pro Tem Casey stated it took a lot of time to make the memo clear for everybody reading it and commended staff for hearing the feedback the City Council related to in as much care and protection that could be put into the environment. Much in the memo was highlighted in yellow for the Council to pay attention to and for what was being recommended and even with additional environmental protection of the woodlands and wetlands, there would be a bonus height. It was a creative way to look at trying to protect the environment. Some clarification was needed regarding parking and what is the setback required since the intent is that buildings are going to be as close to Grand River as possible, making the parking in the rear of buildings in some or many cases. Ms. Bell stated the setback is 75 feet and that it requires either a berm or wall to provide an additional buffer for the shielding of headlights. Mayor Pro Tem Casey asked if it was possible to extend the setback to a hundred feet and Ms. Bell stated that it was. It was then requested that it be considered that a hundred feet pretty solid between residential for both parking and buildings and then as the building height increases, the setback will also increase. It was asked of Ms. Bell to talk about what the requirements are for a berm and reiterated that it is only for the south side for now. Ms. Bell stated that the landscaping ordinance deals with buffering between single family and multiple family districts and other types of districts like the industrial district adjacent to residential and that there are all kinds of different standards for berm heights but that is already in the ordinance but believed that a few more notes about landscaping had been added that address greenbelts and some of the additional landscaping requirements that are specific to this district. Mayor Pro Tem Casey noted that generally one should expect that there will be strong buffering between the residential and whatever is going to be in the City West on the south side.

Ms. Bell followed by saying that we still want to be careful about the natural features that are already existing so like what has been done in the Town Center district where it's more permissive for walls and things like that which provide screening instead of a berm which require tree clearing and grading and can take up a lot of area that could be saved for wetlands and woodlands. The Mayor Pro Tem Casey thanked Ms. Bell for predicting that she would inquire about that as it is the intent to protect as much that can be within ordinances and laws so that there is flexibility for wetlands and woodlands to stay and not be torn down to build a berm. The next question asked by the Mayor Pro Tem related to Grand River and stated that during a conversation last June, she was firm in wanting to have significant conversations with the Road Commission for Oakland County and have a strong in-depth understanding of knowing what choices the County could agree to and then the Council could determine which of those choices makes sense based on how things lay out. It was requested that Ms. Bell address what conversations have been with the ROCC from the perspective of how Grand River might need to be reformed in that district. Ms. Bell said there haven't been many detailed conversations with the ROCC yet but had asked them about options for a pedestrian crossing, like a bridge, and that they were open to that. Ms. Bell thinks if this moves forward and the district is established, then the ROCC would have more substantial information. Mayor Pro Tem Casey wanted to note that it is something she is still focused on and hopes that the newly formed Mobility Committee will continue to ask questions and keep an eye on how those conversations are going. The third question asked by Mayor Pro Tem Casey was, what role does the City Council have in approving developments in City West, both north and south, assuming the ordinance passes first reading? Does it come early like seen in the PRO or in total? Ms. Bell responded by saying that at the baseline level of development, she is sure they've left that with the Planning Commission as a standard site plan development project and for the MDO option, they would need to come to City Council after a public hearing at the Planning Commission which is more like a PRO kind of process but it doesn't involve rezoning its projects that are of mixed use or a stand-alone residential project because the residential can only be done if it's under the mixed use development option as that would come to the Council as a site plan approval if the land was already zoned City West.

Member Smith commented that overall, he thinks it looks good and will make that area of Novi improve a lot. He remembers when he was driving through Novi before he lived here, going down Grand River. Member Smith stated that he is glad to hear that a pedestrian bridge over Grand River would be considered and that his vision for something like this would be something like the brew pub that just opened on the north side of Grand River and people in Asbury Park can walk to it instead of getting in their car. He also stated that he is glad that there will be a chance to talk more about what gets into the south side. He said option 2 is appropriate so people south of there are not adversely impacted. Member Smith then asked Ms. Bell if there is bonus height for a building, say going from two to three stories and maintaining the same footprint, capacity has increased by 50%. What happens with parking? If a building gets a bonus floor for preserving green space, is that lost because a bigger parking lot is needed? Ms. Bell responded by saying that we'd need to look at section five of the ordinance, to see what parking was required but usually with additional square footage comes the additional

need for parking. She continued by saying that some of it would be needed unless there was some kind of structured parking or underground parking but for the most part there is going to be additional parking but that there is some flexibility. With a mix of uses, if you can show that those uses would have different demand patterns, a parking study analysis could be done to show how parking could be shared, to bring down the required parking numbers.

Member Thomas reiterated that she appreciated the amount of work that Planning did, and that they listened to what the Council was saying. She stated that the idea is to build a vibrant, walkable area that is of mixed use. Member Thomas asked what if all of the development proposals were for housing. Ms. Bell answered no, to do housing it has to be at the mixed development level and that is not a principal permitted use in the text that has been written so it can only come under the mixed-use development option which automatically comes to the City Council.

Member Heintz then asked if the current direction is option two, rezoning only the north side at this time, did it mean that there was a timeline that would be in place before the Council needed to decide about the south side? Ms. Bell answered no. City Attorney Schultz said the text would be there for if and when people came in to take advantage of the map amendment. Member Heintz stated that overall, it seems like a great option to start with the north side and that talking with residents in the area, being mindful of green space, woodland and wetlands, the Council wants to be careful when planning the south side.

Member Gurumurthy thanked the Planning staff for all their work based on feedback that was provided last year for the updates, especially with district requirements between the north and south side. She noticed that the natural resources and features were put as a separate line item when looking at the MDO. She continued with wanting to keep a focus on the pedestrians and bicyclists and that when looking at the active mobility plan, there were detailed study and analysis that were done regarding signage, guard rails, bike lanes, street lighting and even a high visibility crosswalk crossing. Member Gurumurthy would like to include integration of pedestrian and bicycle safety measures outlined in the active mobility plan, so this is looked at as one of the focused criteria in the MDOs. She commented that she is also supportive of the north side and then waiting on the south side.

Mayor Fischer thanked the entire planning team for all the information as it was laid out from last year, previous memos and this entire packet and that they did an amazing job in laying it out in a way that is easy to read the maps with the setbacks, showing what is being done to make sure that the higher buildings are pushed away from existing residential. He thanked City Manager Cardenas for communicating throughout and giving ample time to consider all this information. The mayor addressed the building heights and bonus floors with the understanding that to get bonus floors above the maximum five floors allowed on the north side, a bonus floor can be added by adding 15% workforce housing, providing LEED certification, having underground parking. He thinks those are the types of things that need to be considered not just in the City West

ordinance but even in other development ordinances. He further commented that he would like to give potentially two bonus floors for a platinum LEED certification and would like to see the Council be more flexible on how many floors would be bonus floors in the second reading. The mayor stated that he came into this expecting to support option one and thinks that if we go through and we have an ordinance on the books and a district on the book that explicitly calls out different sections in the city, to not do the rezoning all at once is kind of piecemeal and sets up for a situation where the city will have I-1 use next to City West use next to I-1 use. He implored his colleagues to think about what that means and gave the example of an auto repair shop or manufacturing shop coming in and there is nothing that could be done if the area has not been rezoned from I-1. Mayor Fischer further stated that if the corridor is to be cohesive, that he strongly thinks the Council should consider doing both rezonings.

Member Staudt asked if the B-3 located at the corner could be excluded in this ordinance because it is carrying forward all the things in the ordinance that are both south and north side. City Attorney Schultz answered yes, and that the way option one is written the Council would be adopting the text right now and that does not have anything to do with B-3 as the matching option one for the next agenda item on the map does exclude the B-3. Member Staudt confirmed that since option two has already been picked, then the next item must also be option two as they are a matched pair. Member Staudt asked if in the language of the ordinance, could the B-3 property be excluded at this point. City Attorney Schultz stated that it's not in the language of ordinance at this point and for the next item, only option two can be picked and that would only do the north side so B-3 on the south side wouldn't get rezoned. City Attorney Schultz followed by saying that if option one had been chosen now, then option one could be chosen for the next item and that would allow the B-3 parcel to be excluded.

Roll call vote on CM 24-05-61

**Yeas: Thomas, Fischer, Casey, Gurumurthy,
Heintz, Smith. Staudt**

Nays: None

5. Consideration of Zoning Map Amendment 18.741 to rezone up to approximately 250 acres of property located north and south of Grand River Avenue, east of Beck Road and west of Taft Road, from Light Industrial, Residential Acreage, Office Service and Office Service Technology to City West District. FIRST READING

City Manager Cardenas started by stating that this item is the map portion of which the text portion was just discussed and the corresponding motion for the map would lead to option two.

CM 24-05-62 Moved by Staudt, seconded by Casey: MOTION CARRIED: 7-0

Approval of Zoning Map Amendment 18.741 to rezone up to approximately 250 acres of property located north and south of Grand River Avenue, east of Beck Road and west of Taft Road, from I-1 Light Industrial, RA Residential Acreage, OS-1 Office Service, and

OST Office Service Technology (excluding the B-3, General Business properties at the southeast corner of Beck and Grand River Avenue), to CW City West District AS DESCRIBED IN OPTION 2 for the reasons provided below. FIRST READING

Option 2: Rezone only the north side of Grand River Avenue between Beck Road and Taft Road at this time consisting of approximately 144 acres of land to the City West District. This option would leave the potential for the south side to be rezoned at some point in the future without having to fully amend the draft City West zoning ordinance. In the meantime, the south side of Grand River Avenue would remain zoned primarily Light Industrial, and any new development proposed would need to meet the I-1, Light Industrial District standards (or RA or B-3, in the case of two properties near the southeast corner of Grand River and Beck). This would also leave open the option for a developer to request a rezoning of the land on the south side of Grand River to City West if that district is needed to support a particular development.

Mayor Pro Tem Casey inquired if the Council is making the zoning map change the minute the vote happens, assuming it passes, or is it tied to when the second reading for the ordinance is approved? City Attorney Schultz replied that they are tied together. Mayor Pro Tem Casey stated to be clear, that based on previous conversations, the language in what's in option two clearly says that the south side will remain as is, zoned light industrial, RA or B-3, as in the case of the two properties, and that hopefully alleviates the concern raised moments ago.

Mayor Fischer reiterated that he thought option one is the more appropriate option and again, if the Council thinks it's the right zoning, it should be moved to the south side. With that being said, he does agree with the audience comment participant who said that the B-3 should be left as is but would implore that we move to the south side sooner rather than later to make sure that some of those uses just outlined in I-1 do not end up there to our detriment.

Roll call vote on CM 24-05-62

**Yeas: Fischer, Casey, Gurumurthy, Heintz,
Smith, Staudt, Thomas,
Nays: None**

6. Approval of Resolution for 2024 Millage Rates

City Manager Cardenas commented that this is the final step in the budget process and that there had been consideration with the budget sessions, the public hearing that was earlier tonight and now is the formal resolution to adopt the millage rates. He continued to say that nothing has changed in the last two years for millage rates, no increase in taxes, so this is the annual procedure that is required by this date and the Budget Act.

CM 24-05-63 Moved by Smith, seconded by Gurumurthy: MOTION CARRIED: 7-0

Approval of Resolution for 2024 Millage Rates

Roll call vote on CM 24-05-63

**Yeas: Casey, Gurumurthy, Heintz, Smith, Staudt,
Thomas, Fischer**

Nays: None

7. Approval of Resolution for Fiscal-Year 2024-2025 Budget and Acknowledging the Multi-Year Budget, Including Projections of Future Fiscal-Years 2025-2026 and 2026-2027.

City Manager Cardenas said this was the final step in the process in adopting the resolution for next year's fiscal budget that has been considered, proposed and presented to the Council and even though future years are being acknowledged, next year's budget is what is being approved.

CM 24-05-64 Moved by Smith, seconded by Casey: MOTION CARRIED: 7-0

Approval of Resolution for Fiscal-Year 2024-2025 Budget and Acknowledging the Multi- Year Budget, Including Projects of Future Fiscal-Years 20252026 and 2026-2027.

Roll call vote on CM 24-05-64

**Yeas: Gurumurthy, Heintz, Smith, Staudt,
Thomas, Fischer, Casey**

Nays: None

8. Consideration of recommendation from the Older Adults Needs Committee to support funding for free transportation within the PEX service area for all riders 55+ and all residents experiencing a limiting disability who are unable to drive.

City Manager Cardenas noted that this is a reaction to the decision made at the last meeting when the Older Adults Needs Committee came and clarified a recommendation to City Council, which is expanding the fee list rate and ridership for everyone over 55 and all residents experiencing limited disability.

Mayor Pro Tem Casey acknowledged the recommendation coming from the Older Needs Committee and appreciates the conversation with the Council. The recommendation is to expand their initial decision from the last meeting.

CM 24-05-65 Moved by Casey, seconded by Smith: MOTION CARRIED: 7-0

Approval of recommendation from the Older Adults Needs Committee to support funding for free transportation within the PEX service area for all riders 55+ and all residents experiencing a limiting disability who are unable to drive.

Member Heintz requested clarification on what the goal is, to help older adults with potentially some of which would be in financial need or just providing a free service to everyone that is 55 and up. Member Heintz further said he was all about trying to provide services and resources to the residents but thought it is important to ask if there is a need for an entire group or basically try to provide assistance if there is a financial need and wondered if there was a way to assess if there is a higher proportion of individuals that have financial need compared to individuals that are less than 55. City Manager Cardenas stated that the City has not been tracking the usage of anyone 55 and over without disabilities and it has not been tracked for years because it has been free. He further stated that there is some data with respect to people that have used the service that require some kind of a device, either a wheelchair or scooter, but that does not really take into account everyone without a disability. He continued to say that there has been no financial impact in terms of our population that needs financial support so unfortunately there has not been time to crunch or gather some kind of assembly of knowledge to present with confidence of the absolute need. Member Heintz did a quick Google search which indicated the over 65 group had a higher mean income in Novi compared to the under 25 so if the City is providing a free service for those individuals that are above a certain age, then he thinks it is important for the Council to consider what the goal was. Member Heintz closed by saying that the Council should consider a further discussion later to see if the right goals are being met.

Member Thomas commented that some things that she considered when working with older adults is who needs the free rides, and her thought process is that people who cannot drive themselves, and that we want to make sure that our older adults, our citizens, can get to their doctor's appointments. Member Thomas then spoke about her personal experience with her mother who needed to get dialysis and the difficulties of getting her mother, who has a scooter, back and forth. She also said that when a person is retired, their income typically drops and that is a concern, so when she is looking at this it is important to make sure that everyone who needs medical care gets the care, if people cannot get themselves around, we make sure they get themselves around, or if people cannot drive or maybe should not be driving, they can get help. Member Thomas said she thinks a lot of 55 years olds would not want to be called seniors, but she would rather overshoot than miss people who need help.

Member Staudt noted that it was disappointing the last time Council voted on this, taking services that were being provided by the city and adding a cost to them, so he is pleased this is being addressed again. He stated that as long as he has been serving, there has been a city run senior transportation system that has been well managed and provided a service long before many communities were, allowing people to go to City Hall, the library, to vote and do things that were critical to their life, at no cost. He is pleased that the City is going to continue to provide that service to our seniors and those who are disabled at no cost.

Member Gurumurthy commented that she had been talking to different diverse community members, especially in this age group, and her understanding is the main use

of this transportation is mainly for medical purposes. She stated she was happy about this because it matches with the current City of Novi transportation.

Member Smith then mentioned that he thinks this is a good start but thinks the Council should look at people who are younger and either cannot or should not be driving. He further stated that he thinks it is a great platform for the new Mobility Committee and hopefully that gets looked at.

Mayor Fischer said that he was happy to have this back before the council and appreciates the Older Adults Needs Committee taking another look. He added that a promise was made years ago to people 55 plus to provide this service at no cost and just because changes are made to who is driving, who is providing the service, the free service should not be taken away. He said that he thought the Council sounded like they were going to get behind continuing this for our seniors and he thinks that is a great accomplishment for them to all be proud of. He further stated that as the Council gets more information on ridership, they can discuss looking at under 55 on an income needs basis or hardship where they can apply for a subsidy through the city. The mayor would like to see the program start on July 1st with PEX and would like to get data on who is using it and have a further discussion if they discover people who are missing out on rides because of a hardship with their income. The mayor commented that based on current ridership, extended hours, and expanded rout area he expected an increase in costs and confirmed with City Manager Cardenas what the budget is for senior transit and if he was comfortable with the increase since it would be contained within the budget and the City Manager replied yes.

Member Smith requested clarification that the motion included within the PEX boundaries was free rides in which Mayor Fischer stated that was correct.

Roll call vote on CM 24-05-65

**Yeas: Heintz, Smith, Staudt, Thomas, Fischer,
Casey, Gurumurthy**

Nays: None

CONSENT AGENDA REMOVALS: None

AUDIENCE COMMENT:

Khurram Abbas of Asbury Park thanked the Council as well as City staff for the discussions about City West, including staff that had reached out to talk to the residents and to those who came and looked at the actual area. Mr. Abbas stated that the proposed amendment to change the parking setback from 50 feet to 75 feet was better but expressed concern about what would happen to those residential protections under option two. Mr. Abbas commented that he was in favor of light industrial and that if Council spoke to the houses up north, they would hear that industrial is the best use over there. Mr. Abbas noted that he thought option two is better than option one with the understanding that the proposed protections stay in the literature. Aside from City West, Mr. Abbas, being in telecommunications, wanted to propose that the broadband

committee be reformed since there is only one broadband provider where he lives and feels there are dismal options. Mayor Fischer asked that the City Manager follow up with Mr. Abbas regarding the ramifications of the discussion and the new utilities committee to subside any broadband questions.

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

1. Older Adult Needs Committee

Mayor Pro Tem Casey noted that the committee met last week, and they did look at a couple of major sections in the final report. The next meeting is on May 20th.

2. Ordinance Review Committee

Mayor Fischer stated that the committee did meet this evening to talk about a couple of different items including a potential fireworks ordinance. Also discussed was the overlay option that Mayor Pro Tem Casey referred to the committee.

3. PRCS Grant Citizen Advisory Committee

Member Thomas stated that the committee met a couple of weeks ago to discuss the possibility of adding improvements to Lakeshore Park and possibly coming up with a proposal to pursue grant money.

4. Consultant Review Committee

Member Staudt stated that the committee met this evening and discussed moving forward on projects related to public safety and talked about potential owner representatives and what the next steps are. The committee will also meet again soon to talk about a potential RFQ as well as the prosecutor's contract and making amendments to that.

MAYOR AND COUNCIL ISSUES: None

COMMUNICATIONS: None

ADJOURNMENT – There being no further business to come before Council, the meeting was adjourned at 8:15 P.M.

Cortney Hanson, City Clerk

Justin Fischer, Mayor

Transcribed by Becky Dockery,
Account Clerk

Date approved: May 20, 2024