

**REGULAR MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NOVI
MONDAY, APRIL 7, 2025, AT 7:00 P.M.**

Mayor Pro Tem Casey 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 25-04-39 Moved by Casey, seconded by Smith; MOTION CARRIED: 7-0

To approve the agenda as presented.

Roll call vote on CM 25-04-39 **Yeas: Casey, Gurumurthy, Heintz, Smith, Staudt, Thomas, Fischer**
Nays: None

PUBLIC HEARINGS: None

PRESENTATIONS - Assessing Presentation - Jan Ziozios, City Assessor:

The March quarter review for 2025 is closed and the Assessor wanted to talk about some of the numbers and the Michigan Tax Tribunal. As a reminder, the Assessor's primary responsibility is to annually inventory and value all taxable property in the City for the purpose of equitable distribution of the property tax burden. Approximately 68% of revenue for Novi's general fund is property tax revenue and of that, 68% comes from residential property tax base and 25% comes from commercial. Per post March board numbers, residential has increased 8.2% or \$4,555,254,170 in assessed value. Commercial and industrial has increased 6.3% or \$1,736,532,010. Personal property typically runs flat because it depreciates every year. There are a lot of exemptions that can go along with that but overall, there is a 7.4% for 2025 assessed values. The difference between assessed value and taxable value is 50% of the market value. Taxes are calculated on taxable value. Taxable value is a calculation that's based on last year's taxable value minus any losses multiplied by the inflation rate multiplier (IRM), which was 3.1% plus any additions. The taxable value for 2025 increased 5.9% for residential which encompassed the 3.1% plus any uncapping on taxable value, new construction and anything that they found throughout the year added to the tax roll. Commercial taxable value increased 4.6% and personal property was again flat. The total taxable value increased 5.2%. The Headlee Rollback this year is 0.9976 so that's the millage rate reduction factor. The Headlee Rollback permanently reduces the millage rate. This past year, the Assessor's office completed 860 parcel reviews of which 378 were residential site visits, 208 were commercial/industrial site visits. They also do desktop reviews as well using aerial maps, Real Comp and anywhere else they can find information about properties to help keep records up to date and accurate. The March Board of Review had 23 scheduled appointments, 25 written appointments, six walk-in appeals, 17 poverty applications, and 239 personal property appeals. Personal property appeals had a deadline of February 20 because the personal property contractor has a limited time to get all the information into the system before they send out notices. An important part of the Assessor's job is to defend Novi's assessment against appeals filed with the Michigan Tax Tribunal. They had 21 dockets in 2022,

28 dockets in 2023 and 21 dockets in 2024. There were several large and high value properties under appeal in 2024. All of the 2022 appeals have been resolved. Taxable value in contention is what is being fought over in an appeal. In 2022, when the market was still strong, 28% of the taxable value was under contention. In 2023 and 2024 when the market started to stabilize and slow down a bit, the percent of contention is almost 50% and that's typical. Even if assessed values are perfect, there are still going to be appeals coming in because people want to reduce their taxable value to get some tax relief. For all three years, the actual taxable value that was lost to date was \$17,935,630. Taxpayers have the right to appeal, and the Assessor's office has to defend the value the best they can. If a taxable value declines, that carries forward and becomes the new basis for the next year's taxable value. The burden of proof is on the taxpayer to convince the Board. Commercial and industrial appeals typically go to the Tax Tribunal but sometimes it's also residential appeals. If an appeal goes to the Tax Tribunal, then they have to defend the value and they incur costs to do that but it's a necessary part of defending the tax base. Municipalities primarily have three options to resolve an appeal. They can provide compelling market data to the petitioner to persuade them to withdraw, they can negotiate an agreement to settle the case, which will result in a lower CV and taxable value or go to trial. Sometimes a reasonable settlement cannot be reached and a trial could be necessary. An important offensive tool is to engage a third-party real estate appraiser to perform an independent appraisal of the property under appeal. This gives the Assessor leverage and support in negotiations. The petitioner typically does that as well. Then they're analyzing each other's records and negotiating from there. They do perform an in-house valuation disclosure but that depends on the complexity of the property and the market data that's readily available. Other things the assessing department does besides dealing with Board of Reviews is state & county reports, tax incentives, abatements, and more. They just complete the 2025 tax roll and will spend the rest of the year working on the 2026 tax roll which is the roll that will be audited in 2027. Last audit year they passed with flying colors, and she is convinced that they'll do the same. They are about transparency and education. They've done some cool little videos and did a podcast to explain different concepts to taxpayers.

Mayor Fischer asked of the appeal numbers listed for 2022, 2023 and 2024, what percentage actually go to trial and what percentage are closed in negotiations? Assessor Ziozios replied that none have gone to trial since she's been here and all of the 21 closures in 2022 were the result of negotiated settlements or withdrawals. The Mayor said he assumes that everything from 2020 and 2021 are closed as well, and Assessor Ziozios responded yes. She said that there are a few appeals where the stipulations are coming, and she can update the Council when those figures come in. The Mayor said Council just got their budget book and wanted to know what is assumed as far as revenue goes in the budget as it relates to what will happen with these appeal closures and is it assumed that when they look at the revenue should they assume that all of this potential lost review is baked in or does the Assessor assume they will lose, win or be somewhere in the middle. Assessor Ziozios responded that the question might be for Director Johnson but thinks that some wiggle room is accounted for in regard to what is outstanding. She also meets monthly with the City Manager to discuss what's outstanding. City Manager Cardenas responded that he believes it's in the middle in terms of looking back at the prior losses they've had and using that average as something is used in the proposed budgets provided to Council. The Mayor concluded by saying the presentation was very informative.

CITY MANAGER REPORT: None

ATTORNEY REPORT: None

AUDIENCE COMMENTS:

A student resident from 24764 Jamestown Road said that for the last few years, she has been keeping bees. She wanted to thank the City for becoming a bee city. She wanted to highlight the three statements that a city goes by to ensure the protection of pollinators. The first one was increasing the abundance of native plants. She was pleased to see many improvements in the City by supplying the people of Novi with native plants and she has personally noticed a great difference that has been made with the pollinators. The second was reducing pesticides and incorporating pollinator conscious practices into the City. She thinks this is something that can still be worked on but there's further research that must go into this. She wanted to say that there have been changes she's noticed. The third statement was community education and by providing pollinator awareness events, this can help habitat creation and management to inform people and destigmatize the already known info about bees, wasps and hornets because as pesky as they may be, they are all pollinators and environmentally important. As a high schooler, she would love to take part in other community education opportunities and her help is always available.

CONSENT AGENDA REMOVALS AND APPROVALS:

Member Smith removed Items E and F for later discussion.

CM 25-04-40 Moved by Smith, seconded by Gurumurthy; MOTION CARRIED: 7-0

To approve the consent agenda as amended.

- A. Approve Minutes of:
March 24, 2025 - Regular Meeting
- B. Approval of Resolution reappointing staff members to the Economic Development Corporation Board of Directors.
- C. Approval of the 2025 Summer Maintenance Agreement with the Road Commission for Oakland County for street sweeping and summer maintenance on selected County Roads
- D. Approval of Resolution granting the Novi Parks Foundation an exemption from the City's alcohol on public property policy for purposes of its July 18, 2025, fundraiser at Pavilion Shore Park
- E. Approval to purchase a new remote monitoring irrigation controller through Michigan Automatic Sprinkler in the amount of \$32,000, and amend the budget **(REMOVED AND LATER APPROVED)**
- F. Approval to purchase an automated GPS athletic field painter from Tiny Mobile Robots in the amount of \$49,005 and amend the budget. **(REMOVED AND LATER APPROVED)**
- G. Approval of claims and warrants – Warrant 1177

Roll call vote on CM 25-04-40

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

MATTERS FOR COUNCIL ACTION:

- 1. Approval of a three (3) year contract with two mutually agreed upon one (1) year renewal options with Suburban Arena Management, LLC for the management for the Novi Ice Arena, commencing on July 1, 2025.**

City Manager Cardenas stated this is a renewal of the agreement with the entity who has been operating the nearby ice arena for the last 25 years, Suburban Arena Management, who met with the Consultant Review Committee a few weeks ago. The Committee was pleased with the operation of the facility, which is now debt free, and he recommends the contract for Council approval.

Member Staudt said that the Committee had an opportunity to meet with Suburban, which they do every three to four years. They have been an outstanding partner. He remembers when the City ran the arena and didn't do a good job. Suburban not only did a good job running it, but they also saw the taxpayer dollars protected by going through the entire period and paying off the mortgage on the building. The Committee strongly supports the new contract.

CM 25-04-41 Moved by Staudt, seconded by Casey; MOTION CARRIED: 7-0

Approval of a three (3) year contract with two mutually agreed upon one (1) year renewal options with Suburban Arena Management, LLC for the management for the Novi Ice Arena, commencing on July 1, 2025.

Member Heintz said his daughter recently completed ice skating lessons at the Novi Arena and it was fun for him to read the packet and watch her skate. He has enjoyed the services from the management company and to just be able to use this facility is awesome.

Roll call vote on CM 25-04-41 Yeas: Heintz, Smith, Staudt, Thomas, Fischer, Casey, Gurumurthy
Nays: None

- 2. Consideration of approval to award a pavement striping services contract to P.K. Contracting LLC and Royalty Pavement Markings.**

CM 25-04-42 Moved by Smith, seconded by Thomas; MOTION CARRIED: 7-0

Approval to award a unit price pavement striping services contract for Part A- Longitudinal line work to P.K. Contracting LLC., the sole bidder, in the estimated annual amount of \$173,540.20 and to award unit price pavement marking services contract for Part B – Symbols, Alphabets, & Crosswalks and Part B – Alternate #1 – Parking lots to Royalty Pavement Markings, in the estimated annual amount of

\$137,900.00. Both contract terms are one year with three one-year renewal options.

Roll call vote on CM 25-04-42

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

Nays: None

3. Approval of the FIRST READING of a Text Amendment allowing increased capacity in day care centers per conditions stated in the amendment.

The City Manager stated that the draft ordinance proposes new parameters to allow up to 75 children in day care centers on residential parcels at least 1.5 acres in size, located at the intersection of two streets, subject to minimum building setback requirements, and subject to Special Land Use consideration by the Planning Commission. This has been before the Planning Commission on two different occasions prior coming to Council for the first reading.

Member Heintz asked if there was a reason the parcel of land needs to be at least 1.5 acres as opposed to a smaller residential daycare center like houses. City Manager Cardenas replied that he believes it is because the petitioner that specifically made this request has a parcel around 1.5 acres. Barb McBeth, City Planner, reiterated that this person would be eligible under this standard of the ordinance. They would also be looking at a minimum size of a parcel that would be able to accommodate a daycare of up to 75 children, taking into consideration building setbacks and the number of people inside the building and play area. Member Heintz said the reason he asks is because he's had different residents talking to him saying that they're capped at, just for home daycares, the number of kids they can have. He inquired if only parcels with 1.5 acres were discussed. Ms. McBeth responded that there are a number of different standards for daycare facilities in the City. Daycares in the home, like Member Heintz mentioned, is often run by the people that own the home and are limited to six children and not typically be what they were talking about here. They would be talking about more of a commercial kind of daycare, not necessarily in somebody's home but more of a commercial building. Member Heintz commented those have different regulations or rules on that. Ms. McBeth stated that's correct and they are only focusing on these kinds of commercial daycares in the residential district at this time.

Member Thomas wanted to know if staff reached out to other daycares or checked what other communities were doing. She wants to understand how staff came up with what the standards should be. Ms. McBeth responded that they did take a look at other communities' ordinance and found there was quite a diversity of standards included in their ordinance and the other communities generally regulated it through their ordinance the size of the parcel, maybe the location on a major thoroughfare or on a corner lot, and typically the number of children that would be in a home. They looked at the daycare facilities in the City and looked at the commercial daycares in the business districts as well as some of those in the residential districts, but they didn't reach out to any individual daycare owners other than the applicant. Member Thomas said she noticed that adult daycares are going down from 60 people to 25, which seems substantial as it is less than half that would be allowed and she has concerns. She wants to know how that number came about and how does the City know that it can't sustain a higher number of adult daycare. Her concern is they've talked a lot about the aging community and how they're expecting the aging population to grow. She wants to know if they have an understanding of how many adult daycares there are in the community today and how it was determined that it should be cut in more than half. Ms. McBeth again, the part of the ordinance that they're amending is intended to

talk about child daycare centers, but adult daycare centers are also covered in this section of the ordinance. They are only talking about in this section of the ordinance, facilities that would be in residential districts, usually on relatively smaller lots. She thinks that they all are familiar with child daycare centers in these areas. The Planning Commission, when they discussed it one or both times, said that they were uncomfortable with the idea of having 60 adults in a daycare facility of this size and there needs to be a bigger facility. The Commission felt that there would be a much higher standard of care so they agreed that they could reduce that number and present it to the City Council with the understanding that other standards in the ordinance already cover adult daycares. Adult daycares are allowed in the commercial districts, the office districts and a whole variety of districts as well. Member Thomas then wanted to know if known how many adult daycares facilities are in the community today and if any of them are above that 25. Ms. McBeth stated that research was not done because this came up at a later time, but the research could be done and brought back for the second reading.

Mayor Pro Tem Casey wanted to know why this is so specific about such requirements about the details of the lot such as it being on a major thoroughfare or having 200 feet of frontage on a major thoroughfare or having two entrances. Ms. McBeth said with the zoning ordinance they try to think of areas where a use may or may not be appropriate so to think of a lot within a subdivision with all the traffic that might come into the subdivision and disrupt the residential character of that subdivision. Their preference would be that it would be on a major thoroughfare and have enough width to provide good access in and out of the center and not be disruptive to the residential neighborhood as much as possible. They also considered the site that a minimum acreage would make sense for these because they're talking about 75 children and that's a lot of area inside the building as well as outside. They did a little bit of math and studied with the Planning Commission, and they believe that about one and a half acres could accommodate a daycare of up to 75 children and still have all the parking spaces and outside play area. The Mayor Pro Tem said she appreciates the answer because that makes a lot more sense to her now. Her next question is understanding the role of the City in the zoning ordinance for where in the City these types of childcare facilities. Taking a look at the zoning there's requirements in there that speak to the outdoor requirements and perhaps most of that is going to be covered by the licensing requirements of the state. She wanted to know if they run the risk of getting out of sync with the State requirements because the State requires a certain amount of square foot per child by age. City Attorney Schultz commented that he doesn't know whether they're out of sync on any particular regulation and they're preempted from regulating certain things and they don't regulate those things. They look at the licensing through the State as a separate thing and the zoning through the City. Mayor Pro Tem Casey then wanted to know if the City got into a situation where perhaps they did get out of sync with the State, what would that require of the applicant for example, what if the City requires less space than the State does, does that require any change to the ZBA. Attorney Schultz responded that the City couldn't actually allow something that the State does not allow and what the City may be allowed to do is a more restrictive regulation, so they stay within their range and make sure to not exceed that. The Mayor Pro Tem concluded by saying that she agrees with the previous speaker in needing to understand the logic, rationale and data behind making a decision on the adult daycare center piece. She'll expect to get further information for the second reading before she makes any decision at that point.

Member Staudt said this is a complex issue and there have been good points brought up. He would have liked to have seen this come through the Ordinance Review Committee. This is a lot more than just some basic zoning ordinances that are being reviewed and he felt bypassed on this. He would have liked to have seen this come through so they could have asked some of these specific questions and had time to think about it. He wanted to know how many daycare centers

are going to currently be affected by this ordinance directly. Ms. McBeth replied that currently in the residential districts they think there are a handful that would be covered by this ordinance, but they don't believe those daycares would be negatively impacted. Member Staudt said this feels like spot zoning. Before he agrees to a final resolution of this, he'd like to have answers to the questions about the new limit for adults and he'd also like to know who the businesses are that would be affected by this and whether anybody has reached out to them and let them know that the ordinance is going to change. He'll approve the first reading, but the second reading is going to be contingent on some good answers.

CM 25-04-43 Moved by Staudt, seconded by Casey; MOTION FAILED: 3-4

**Approval of Text Amendment 18.305 to amend various sections of the Zoning Ordinance to allow increased accommodation in day care centers subject to certain standards and conditions, including recommendations made by the Planning Commission, along with other minor changes, subject to further modifications as determined necessary by the city manager's office or city attorney's office.
FIRST READING**

Member Smith said that something that would help in the future with the second reading is a comparison of how the zoning would compare with what the State requires. If someone has an acre and a half, how many children could be in that area.

Member Gurumurthy agrees with the previous speakers regarding the data to back up how they came up with the 25 number and specifically the impact that's going to cause. She encouraged further review of why daycares surrounded by residential can be 1.5 acres with 50 to 75 kids and daycares abutting nonresidential can have 120 kids and it's still 1.5 acres. If you have more kids, the minimum acres should be more than 1.5 acres.

Mayor Fischer echoes a lot of the same comments. The first thing that struck him was the fact that they're talking about how the size has to be exactly 1.5 acres, located at the intersection of a major thoroughfare and another street so it can't be someone right in the middle and this feels absolutely like a spot choice criteria and that makes him uncomfortable. He can't remember the last time they had a first reading that had this much discussion and consternation. He thinks it has to do with the fact this has to do with children and has to do with some complex issues. This should have gone to Ordinance Review where all of these questions could have been dissected at a committee level.

Roll call vote on CM 25-04-43

Yeas: Staudt, Casey, Smith

Nays: Thomas, Fischer, Gurumurthy, Heintz

CM 25-04-44 Moved by Staudt, seconded by Casey; MOTION CARRIED: 7-0

Refer text amendment 18.305 to the Ordinance Review Committee.

Roll call vote on CM 25-04-44

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

Nays: None

- 4. Approval of the Beautification Commission's recommendation on the Neighborhood Entryway Enhancement Matching Grant Program to award the grants to the following neighborhoods upon successful completion of the entryway work depicted in the applications: Berkshire Point (\$1,500), Chamberlin Crossing (\$5,000), Lochmoor Village (\$2,816.50), and Vista Hills (\$5,000).**

Member Smith thanked the Beautification Commission for doing the work on this and thanked the subdivision for wanting to step up their entryways and he will be supporting this. He liked the requirement for only non-invasive planting for the future and maybe next year's consideration, for planning only native species and making sure that any light is very directed so there isn't a lot of light pollution.

CM 25-04-45 Moved by Smith, seconded by Thomas; MOTION CARRIED: 7-0

Approval of the Beautification Commission's recommendation on the Neighborhood Entryway Enhancement Matching Grant Program to award the grants to the following neighborhoods upon successful completion of the entryway work depicted in the applications: Berkshire Point (\$1,500), Chamberlin Crossing (\$5,000), Lochmoor Village (\$2,816.50), and Vista Hills (\$5,000).

Member Staudt said this has been a successful program and it's done a big favor for many of these communities. A lot of them couldn't afford the signage that was necessary.

Mayor Fischer said they've had the same amount budgeted of \$25,000 and the grant amount of \$5,000 in effect ever since this started back in 2014/2015. He would ask staff and maybe the Beautification Commission to look at amending the dollar amount and maybe looking at some of the construction costs and things that have changed over the last ten years and maybe the total grant is still 50% but up to \$7,500 or whatever recommendation staff might have. They are a little shy on what they actually budgeted and maybe they could help some of the communities a little more as the signs cost and landscaping costs have gone up.

Roll call vote on CM 25-04-45 Yeas: Fischer, Casey, Gurumurthy, Heintz, Smith, Staudt, Thomas
Nays: None

- 5. Adoption of a Resolution Authorizing Distribution of the Proposed City of Novi Master Plan for a 63-day review and comment period.**

The City Manager said the long road of consideration for the master plan is now coming to Council for their consideration. After many months, the document is ready for consideration to be publicized for comment. If they agree with moving forward with this action, the following review that, following the review period of 63 day, a public hearing will be held for additional input before the plan could ultimately be adopted. The City's consultant, Beckett & Raeder, is here for a quick presentation to give them an overview of what included in the master plan.

Barb McBeth said she was there to reintroduce John Iocoangeli from Beckett & Raeder who has been their consultant and has been guiding Steering Committee through the process.

John Iocoangeli before starting his presentation, wanted to thank the administrative staff, City Manager, City Attorney, Barb, Charles and Council Member Staudt for his service on the Steering Committee. The overview of the plan has some major components. They talked about the master plan process; they had community engagement which included a survey and open houses, guiding principles, future land use, framework and a very specific action plan that will help the Planning Commission with their annual work program. The report is broken into two components. The first is an analysis of characteristics, demographics, features, real estate market, and economic development. The second is existing and forecasted future transportation improvements. The transportation section of the master plan was done by Hubbell, Roth & Clark, their subcontractor that looked at the forecasting of traffic volume and capacity. Then they had a Steering Committee that was composed of the Planning Commission, City Council, and administrative staff members that worked on the process for two years on the process. There's eight step in the master planning. We're at step number five, which the City Manager has articulated. This is the City Council authorization for plan distribution, goes through all of the external agencies, the surrounding communities, the State, the County, the public utilities that operate within this area and they give them, under state statute, 63 days to review the plan, make any comments that would be forwarded to the planning department after the 63 day review period. Then the Planning Commission would hold a public hearing to solicit other comments prior to its final adoption of the plan. If the City Council has specific comments, please forward those over to Barb as well. Community engagement strategy started off in 2022. They had 842 responses to the internet based survey and they had printed copies. They had open houses February 25th and March 2nd of 2023, taking a look at redevelopment areas, areas of concern that the community had relative to future land use and their impacts. The various chapters that are included are Community Demographics, Natural Features & Resiliency, Housing, Market Analysis, Economic Conditions, Transportation Framework, Connectivity, Neighborhood Density, Future Land Use and Action Plan. Future land use framework, the City currently has 22 land use categories. They've paid that down to 17 with an emphasis on mixed use districts. The mixed use categories are in response to market trends that are starting to favor a variety of uses: walkability, less surface parking, greater density and building mass. There's primarily a focus for these primarily in the central core of the City along the I-96 corridor relative to the many large commercial developments that are here in the community that are starting to see some transformation based on the retail market conditions. They have a future land use map that outlines the 17 existing land use categories. The primary major categories are residential, commercial, recreation, office, industrial and other. Each one of the land use categories has a sheet that talks about the purpose of the category, the regulated uses that would typically be in each of these districts and what the build form should look like relative to current development and future development patterns. The categories are single family, multiple, manufactured home, public park, public/quasi-public, and private parks. Part of the appeal of the residential areas in Novi is that many of the residential subdivisions that have been built over the years have a significant amount of open space that's integrated within developments so private parks are a land use category in the plan. Residential includes single family, multiple family, suburban low rise, and manufactured housing. Commercial includes commercial mixed-use, general mixed-use, Town Center mixed-use, neighborhood commercial, and community commercial. Recreation includes public and private parks. Office includes office, service & technology as well as office service commercial and community office. Industrial includes industrial/office and general industrial. The Other use includes public/quasi-public uses. The mixed-use are new districts that have been included in the future land use, many along the central corridor of the City along I-96, is primarily in response to current market conditions and future anticipated trends based on what's going on with the brick-and-mortar retail

throughout the country. The Zoning Action Plan is a bridge between the future land use map and the zoning code. They are recommending only one change and that the inclusion of a planned unit development overlay district within the zoning code that would encourage more mixed use development as some of these retail centers start to transform into more mixed use development. The Action Plan is specific and has 30 different actions under five categories. Some of the actions were carryover from the previous plan that the City administration felt was still pertinent and still wanted to implement, some additional ones based on the sequencing that came out of the Steering Committee and some of what their priorities were. These basically form the background for the Planning Commission's annual action program where they would pick and choose these based on their area of responsibility to work on in the future.

The Mayor said he knows that a lot of work went in from staff, Council members and to the residents. It's a very comprehensive approach that has gone into this the last two or three years.

Member Staudt said it was an interesting progress. He wanted to recognize John Avdoulos who chaired most of the process through as Planning Commissioner. They talked a lot about a lot things and he always saw his role in this group is bringing it back to Novi. Consultants love to look at similar kinds of cities, sometimes other states and sometimes throughout Michigan. In the end, there was a lot of discussion about mixed uses that didn't come out of this plan. In the previous plan, the City West project that they just approved in the past year, and it took a long time to get approved. There are several overlay districts that are being proposed as part of this master plan. There was a lot of compromise and a lot of discussion. He is satisfied that this represents the best interests of the City of Novi. He knows some people are uncomfortable with some of the densities that are involved and uncomfortable with commercial on main roads but that is leading towards the trend of making things more walkable. He thinks with the long discussion about City West, there's a lot they'd like to be able to do, for example, cross the road safely, but most of these are on one side of the road and a good improvement for the City.

CM 25-04-46 Moved by Staudt, seconded by Casey; MOTION CARRIED: 7-0

**Adoption of a Resolution Authorizing Distribution of the Proposed
City of Novi Master Plan for a 63-day review and comment period.**

Mayor Pro Tem Casey said she enjoyed reading the document and the information on the demographics was eye opening. She was surprised to see that they're considering themselves 91% built out. That opens the door for them to start to talk about what comes next, redevelopment versus new development. She wanted to thank the Mayor and her colleagues for the foresight to start their Long-range Strategic Planning Committee because she thinks that is going to be one of the next steps of this process. She thinks some of the values that was identified through feedback from the residents are some of the ones they can start using as the basis for some of the work and would love to get that raw data to the Committee. She appreciates the goals they set in the Action Plan. She wanted to call attention to the increased focus on sustainability but thinks that is something that they're all going to need to start paying more attention to as the years pass. She also appreciates the recommendation for the ADUs because that was something that was recommended in conversation. All and all, she views the plan favorably. She thinks the opportunity that was missed was what it means to age in place. There are planning commissioners who reference it as well as the Council in terms of the types of housing that are being built in the City. Part of the definition that was in the master plan talked about low maintenance living and she thinks that's a piece of it but what she hears talked about the most is high interest in first floor living. That doesn't mean apartment, it doesn't mean high rise. It means people want a house,

maybe not 3,000 to 5,000 square feet, but a smaller standalone house and everything they want to do on a daily basis is on one floor. She feels like that was an opportunity for them to make a stronger statement in terms of what again in place means and how truly a gap in the community in terms of styles of houses because they are adding a lot of townhomes and multistory buildings which is great for young people. As we look at people who want to move out of their family home and stay in Novi but there's not much for them to move into. She knows they can't regulate that, but they can make a point to talk about it in the master plan so developers can read their interest. She'd like to echo Member Staudt's comments and thanked all who worked on the plan.

Member Smith thinks it's an excellent document and thanked the staff and everyone involved in producing it. He would encourage the residents to read it as it will make them want to drive, walk or bike around the City and look at things differently and get a better idea of what goes into planning. In the Goal section, he appreciated all the environmental and mobility points, encouraging green buildings, reducing heat islands, trying to find ways to either through ordinances or incentives, reducing runoff, looking at parking requirements and all of the active mobility plan implementations. It's great to have walkability but they need to make sure there's good places to walk to. He looks forward to seeing what happens and it's going to be interesting to see the City in 20 years.

Member Thomas wanted to know what happens during the 63-day review with the public comments. John locoangeli responded that all the comments are compiled and then presented to the Planning Commission for consideration as part of the final step in the plan process. There may also be comments from external agencies like Oakland County or MDOT and if the residents provide comments, all that get aggregated and they present that to the Planning Commission and they decide what comments are incorporated into the plan. They also maintain copies of the comments as part of the appendices to the plan just to make sure that everybody's comments are recognized. Member Thomas then said that potentially, comments could create adjustments to the plan and Mr. locoangeli responded yes. Member Thomas loves the sustainability efforts and the accessory dwelling units and things they talked about in the Aging Committee like the ability to have multi-generational families living in the same property. She has concerns about the raising density. There comes a point where people still need some space. There are two sides to it. Obviously they want to keep people in space so they can have open space and more parks and have more walkability but then they also want people to have space to live in. Increasing density is always a concern. Getting more people into smaller spaces is always a concern for her as far as standards of living. She wanted to know how the general public is notified that this plan exists, so they are able to read it and make comments. The City Manager replied that it's on the City's website, social media and all the different tools that they use to usually announce any kind of public hearing as required by the State of Michigan.

Member Gurumurthy thinks it's an amazing job on the plan and it's very comprehensive. She thinks the consolidation from 22 to 17 land uses with an emphasis on mixed-use is good as it makes them more creative. She did not see in the master plan any goals focused on becoming an intelligent or smart ready city whether it's autonomous vehicles or EV or scalable infrastructure to support 5G or 6G. She thinks it's key to think about it right now, especially in the master plan. They currently have a master plan from 2016, and she wanted to know how do they keep track of what's been completed, what's on going and then are there some items that transitions into new action items. Mr. locoangeli replied that it comes down to local preference and how they want to achieve that. In some communities, they work with the Planning Commission on an annual basis, or every other year, and put together a report that looks at all of the goals in the master plan and provides an update on what's been accomplished, which ones are going to show up in the work

program and which ones are too far down the road yet for consideration. The Action Plan should be reviewed and evaluated based on success of its achievement so that's usually incorporated in the Planning Commission's annual report. The work program is really their long range work program and every year they should be picking out one or two of the goals that they feel are achievable for that year and incorporating them into the work program. This is really the blueprint for the Planning Commission for at least the next five years. Member Gurumurthy said that they already have a master plan from 2019 and there was a list of action plans and still wants to know how they disposition those. Mr. locoangeli replied that the Steering Committee went through the 2016 plan and decided which ones they felt were important enough to carry over and those are highlighted in this plan so the Planning Commission can see which ones from 2016 have moved over to the 2025 master plan. They did make a linkage between the goals in 2016 and 2025 by bringing some over and then highlighting them appropriately for continued work. There were some items in 2016 that were completed.

Member Heintz said he didn't want to be redundant, but he agrees with everything that's been said already. He enjoyed really those guiding principles. He loves promoting welfare, health and safety. The environment is strong for him and celebrating diversity. The environmental piece, his favorite is surprisingly not inside the environmental stewardship but definitely overlapping with the goal of incentivizing energy efficient best practices to promote people to make those change. He loves the tie in, the crossover, of how they can do things and make impact development positively but intertwined with sustainability. He loves how environmental stewardship is more or less integrated in multiple areas. He encourages residents to read and comment as well.

Member Staudt mentioned that they are in the early stages of doing a long-term community plan and wondered where the master plan fits into that. He asked Mr. locoangeli is there thing that are in the master plan that he would expect the City to carry forward in this 25-year community plan that they're working on and has Mr. locoangeli been involved with any of that in the past. Mr. locoangeli said he thinks some of the guiding principles and some of the longer-term goals in the action plan could be reflected in a long-term strategic plan. The Mayor Pro Tem mentioned that the master plan could serve as a foundation or framework and once you build off of, that is typically in a community strategic plan. You're going to be looking at the master plan, finances, capital improvement, programming, parks & recreation and if there is a senior committee, those strategies will be looked and then picking from those strategies, those that should get integrated into the overall strategic plan. Not everything in the master plan should go into the strategic plan but some of the key concepts and themes should be looked at by City Council as part of that process. Member Staudt said that residents have a hard time separating density and affordability. Novi's property values are extraordinarily high and the only way they get to affordable housing isn't through single family homes that are \$200,000 because they're not going to happen anymore. It's important for residents to understand that when they talk about some of these densities, they are trying to make the City of Novi affordable and attainable for all residents, not just those who can afford a \$700,000 condo or a \$3,000 a month apartment. They're working towards this and it's an ongoing situation, but they recognize that density is sometimes a nasty word in the business they're in. They are really attempting to make things affordable and attainable for everybody.

Roll call vote on CM 25-04-46

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

CONCENT AGENDA REMOVALS

- E. Approval to purchase a new remote monitoring irrigation controller through Michigan Automatic Sprinkler in the amount of \$32,000 and amend the budget.
- F. Approval to purchase an automated GPS athletic field painter from Tiny Mobile Robots in the amount of \$49,005 and amend the budget.

Member Smith wanted to give kudos to the staff for finding innovative solutions to save water and convert gas equipment to electric equipment for the field striper and for finding grant money to get that done so there's no impact on the City for getting it all paid. The GPS guided is cool and could probably sell ticket just to watch that thing. He did want to know if drinking or city water was used to water the fields, and the City Manager responded that it is city water.

CM 25-04-47 Moved by Smith, seconded by Casey; MOTION CARRIED: 7-0

Approval to purchase a new remote monitoring irrigation controller through Michigan Automatic Sprinkler in the amount of \$32,000 and amend the budget; and approval to purchase an automated GPS athletic field painter from Tiny Mobile Robots in the amount of \$49,005 and amend the budget.

Roll call vote on CM 25-04-47

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

AUDIENCE COMMENTS: None

COMMITTEE REPORTS: None

MAYOR AND COUNCIL ISSUES: None

COMMUNICATIONS: None

ADJOURNMENT – There being no further business to come before Council, the meeting was adjourned at 8:17 P.M.

Cortney Hanson, City Clerk

Justin Fischer, Mayor

Transcribed by Becky Dockery,
Account Clerk

Date approved: April 21, 2025