



City Council Study Session

Monday, March 17, 2025 at 6:00 PM

27400 Southfield Road, Lathrup Village, Michigan 48076

1. **Call to Order** by Mayor Garrett at 6:01 PM

Present: Garrett, Kantor, Jennings, Hammond

Excused: Barksdale

2. **Discussion Items**

A. **City Council Meeting Time**

Council members discussed the pros and cons of adjusting the start time of the City Council Regular Meeting to start at 7:00 PM vs. 7:30 PM or the Study Session at 5:30 PM vs. 6:00 PM.

Cons – include the potential of being limited on time during the Study Session and being rushed. Moving the Study Session time to 5:30 PM would limit potential participants.

Pros – Could have the benefit of being out of the meetings sooner in the evening. Being conscious of staff and the public's time.

Attorney Baker did mention that the City Council would have to approve any change during a regular meeting.

This item on this topic will be on the April 21, 2025, agenda.

B. **City Council Goal Setting**

The City Council continued their discussion regarding FY 26 Council goals.

Transparent

- Improve Website
 - Update the pages of the website to meet residents' needs
- Town Halls
 - Do one (1) Town Hall quarterly on a specific topic/structured
 - 1st Town Hall – Resident Priorities?
- Communication Plan
 - Add update to regular meeting agenda

Dedication to Service

- Maintain Robust & Attractive Corridors
 - Utilize Oakland County Resources to their potential
- Promote a Safe & Secure Community
 - Police Chief and/or designee will attend one community event per year (outside of theirs) and attend a City Council meeting per quarter

Fiscal Responsibility

- Contracts
 - Review all City Contracts during the annual budget process

Excellence

- Move Training/tracking to this bullet

Teamwork

- Golden Rule
 - Public acknowledgment of the good in people
 - Create a form for complaints online? Is it possible? “Submit an Information Form” on the website to be reviewed bi-annually.

Other

- Remove “Code Enforcement” and have it just be “Staff”
- Add 360 Evaluations & Revamp the City Administrator Evaluation Form

NOTE: The City Council decided to address items D & E before discussing item C.

C. San Jose Temporary Opening

Mayor Garrett discussed that we have explored additional options including seeing if Saratoga Blvd could be utilized. While that is off the table, San Jose Blvd will need to be opened to accommodate the emergency needs.

The council continued their discussion acknowledging that the road will be temporarily open during the I-696 construction period, however, there was consensus that the regular meeting agenda items should be tabled so the Council can finalize what the opening would look like (ex: temporary gate) before officially voting.

D. Council Rules of Order & Procedure Update

CA Greene & Attorney Baker reviewed the update that is under consideration during the regular meeting. This would add requirements to the video/audio recording during a public meeting.

E. Business Uses (Money Service & Small Box Discount Retailers) Moratorium

CA Greene reviewed the two resolutions that are under consideration during the regular meeting.

Mayor Pro-Tem Kantor asked questions regarding specific language listed in the resolution to see if it would impact another type of business (financial planners or other types of small box stores). Attorney Baker mentioned that the descriptions used came from the state definitions and financial institutions fall under a different category and the small box stores language was similar to the City of Southfield.

Councilmember Hammond had additional questions regarding the difference between cash advance and payday loans and how this impacts certain stores.

3. **Public Comments** (limited to 3 minutes)

Terry & Sarah Thompson – Original resident of San Jose Ct. In 1999 the builder informed the residents that the street would be closed, and a gate would be installed for emergency vehicles once construction was complete. The opening of the street would cause safety issues in the area. The emergency vehicle gate was supposed to be installed 20 years ago. It didn't happen then, why now?

Mayor Garrett – Noted that the street would not be open without some type of gate.

Richard Bryant – San Jose Ct. resident. They were told 25 years ago that the fence that is currently there was supposed to be temporary, and a breakaway fence was supposed to be installed.

Rick Wisz – Town Hall structure, the first one should be wide open, and then subsequent ones would be structured based on the feedback. Fiscal responsibility, performance, and cost of City contracts should be considered. Teamwork, recognition “warm & fuzzies”

Jonathan Terra – 1) missed the last study session and is having trouble understanding cameras in the study session, does not understand why Study Sessions are in meeting place while Council meetings are in Council Chambers; 2) understands one end of LV that enjoys not having cut-through traffic, it should be enforced on all streets.

Mayor Garrett mentioned that cost savings and this format allow for the Council to have an open dialogue without the pressure of immediately voting on an item.

San Jose Resident – Requested that the Council share pictures of what a temporary gate would look like.

Autumn Sousanis – Discussed Attorney Baker's recent suspension. Noted that the City did discuss gates at the last meeting, specifically siren-activated gates. Questioned if money is going to be

changing hands by opening up San Jose. Comment on fire hydrants and water flow believing that even if a fire truck makes it to a scene on time that proper flow isn't there. Shared their thoughts on rewriting resolutions after one is already approved. Noted that they are concerned about the San Jose temporary opening due to their children in the area.

4. Mayor and Council Comments

Mayor Garrett

- Reiterated that individuals feel bullied due to the videoing and actions taken by Ms. Sousanis and the private Facebook group.

5. Adjourn at 7:36 PM