

REGULAR MEETING - PLANNING COMMISSION

CITY OF NOVI

June 8, 2016

Proceedings taken in the matter of the PLANNING
COMMISSION, at City of Novi, 45175 West Ten Mile Road, Novi,
Michigan, on Wednesday, June 8, 2016

BOARD MEMBERS

Mark Pehrson, Acting Chairperson

David Baratta

David Greco

Robert Giacobetti

ALSO PRESENT: Barbara McBeth, Director of Community Development

Rick Meader, Landscape Architect, Sri Komaragiri, Planner,

David Gillam, City Attorney, Adam Wayne, Staff Engineer

Certified Shorthand Reporter: Jennifer L. Wall

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Novi, Michigan.
Wednesday, June 8, 2016
7:00 p.m.

** ** *

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: This is the
regular meeting for the Planning Commission
for June 8, 2016.

Sri, can you call the roll.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Anthony?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Absent,
excused.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Baratta?

MR. BARATTA: Here.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member
Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPEPETTI: Here.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Here.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Absent,
excused.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Here.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member
Zuchlewski?

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Absent,
excused.

With that, if we could stand
for the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Pledge recited.)

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: With that,
I'll look for a motion to approve or modify
the agenda.

MR. GRECO: Motion to approve.

MR. BARATTA: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a
motion and a second.

Any other discussions? All
those in favor.

THE BOARD: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Anyone
opposed? We have an agenda.

Brings us to our audience
participation.

If there is anyone in the
audience who wishes to address the Planning
Commission at this time, please step forward.

MR. GIACOPETTI: On a matter
other than a public hearing?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: There is no

1 public hearing.

2 MR. TOROSSIAN: My name is Pat
3 Torossian, T-o-r-o-s-s-i-a-n, the president
4 of Asbury Park Homeowners Association.

5 The homeowners have had
6 concerns about the soccer fields and the
7 parking lot that's being proposed and being
8 approved I believe today.

9 The noise, lights,
10 headlights, future expansion, those concerns.

11 We met with the Blair, and
12 he's been gracious to try to accommodate the
13 needs of the homeowners. I have two
14 questions for the Planning Commission.

15 First question. Notices
16 were sent out to the homeowners, and they
17 were asked to vote, yes or no for whether or
18 not they wanted to proceed with this
19 proposal. Everybody voted no.

20 And I don't see that impact
21 or the results of that having any impact on
22 the decision. It's like you took all the
23 no's, you put it in the packet, you keep
24 going.

25 So that's the first

1 question.

2 Second question is,
3 utilization rate of the soccer feeds.

4 I live in Novi. I have
5 lived in Novi for 25 years. And I will tell
6 you, I have seen more soccer fields now that
7 I ever have.

8 When I look at the
9 utilization along Eleven Mile, out by
10 Deerfield, Taft Road, I rarely see them used
11 at all. At all. Let alone, having a
12 requirement of two more being added to the
13 roles, rather use that money more efficiently
14 for other things like paths so you don't
15 have, you know, to go onto the street, things
16 like for that safety issues.

17 So, those are my two
18 questions. I'd be happy to have this
19 interactive and your response.

20 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you,
21 sir. Anyone else?

22 MR. WARDEN: My name is James
23 Warden. I live in Asbury Park, at 28265
24 Mandalay Circle.

25 I also want to express my

1 appreciation to Mr. Bowman. He met with us,
2 as Pat mentioned, and has addressed some of
3 our concerns.

4 And my request to the
5 Planning Commission is to consider adding at
6 the Novi city cost some additional trees. I
7 think the latest plan from Mr. Bowman is much
8 improved compared to what was presented
9 during the public hearing. But I think there
10 still in -- there still is room for
11 improvement there, and I think the
12 replacement trees are covered in the current
13 plan, but I think if the City of Novi would
14 consider adding an additional 20 to 30 trees
15 along the area there, the strip where the
16 parking lot is, and the south edge of the
17 soccer field, I think that would also help to
18 address some of the concerns of the
19 homeowners like me.

20 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.
21 Appreciate it. Anyone else?

22 Seeing no one else, we will
23 close the first audience participation.

24 Are there any
25 correspondence?

1 I don't see anything on the
2 table. Any city committee reports? City
3 planner, Ms. McBeth.

4 MS. MCBETH: Good evening. I
5 just have one item to report this evening.
6 The action that the city council meeting of
7 Monday night, a slightly revised plan for the
8 Learning Care Academy was approved along with
9 the revised plans for the low rise overlay
10 development agreement.

11 So it's been -- shortly the
12 preliminary site plan will be submitted and
13 we will bring that in front of the Planning
14 Commission shortly as well.

15 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

16 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Very good,
17 thank you. Matters for consideration, item
18 number one, Grand River Soccer Park JSP16-20.
19 It's the consideration, the request of
20 Suburban Showplace, LLC and the City of Novi,
21 and for Planning Commission's approval of
22 preliminary site plan, woodland permit,
23 wetland permit, storm water management plan.

24 The subject property is
25 located in the I1 light industrial and is

1 located in section 16, west of Taft, and
2 south of Grand River Avenue. The applicant
3 is proposing two soccer fields and associated
4 parking on-site.

5 Sri.

6 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Good evening,
7 Members. As we know, Planning Commission
8 held the hearing for this project at our
9 previous meeting on May 25th and public
10 comment was gathered. A copy of all the
11 public responses from that meeting are
12 included in the packet for tonight. The plan
13 is presented before you for your
14 consideration and approval.

15 The subject property, as we
16 know, is located on the south side of Grand
17 River near Suburban Collection Showplace
18 between Taft and Beck and is zoned I1, light
19 industrial, surrounded by R1, one family
20 residential on the south, OST, office service
21 technology on the north and light industry
22 along all other sides.

23 The future land use map
24 indicates industrial, research development
25 and technology for the subject property, and

1 the property to the west and north,
2 industrial, research development on the east
3 and single family for properties on the
4 south.

5 There are few regulated
6 woodlands and wetlands on the property. The
7 current project is a temporary public private
8 partnership between City of Novi Parks and
9 Recreation and cultural service department
10 and Suburban Collection Showcase, LLC with an
11 intent to use it for no longer than five
12 years.

13 The fields will be used by
14 the city while the city develops permanent
15 fields elsewhere.

16 The community soccer fields
17 are considered a primary use for the property
18 and would be available during spring, summer
19 and fall, except during the Michigan State
20 Fair period and a couple of other events at
21 the Showplace.

22 During that time the
23 applicant is anticipating using the site for
24 parking and staging of exhibitors and
25 participant vehicles, only as a secondary

1 use. The applicant has provided additional
2 details for possible secondary uses in his
3 response letter.

4 The current plan includes
5 two U13 soccer fields and associated parking,
6 except for the handicapped spaces, which will
7 be paved. The rest of the parking lot and
8 the driveway will be gravel to serve the
9 temporary needs.

10 Six trees are being removed
11 within the regulated woodland boundary and
12 will require 18 replacement credits. The
13 applicant is proposing 27 evergreen
14 replacement trees along the edge of the
15 parking lot to screen it from the residential
16 area. Additional trees greater than eight
17 inch caliper have also been removed as part
18 of the land improvement permit which has been
19 issued, but they did not require replacement
20 trees as they are located outside the
21 regulated woodland boundary.

22 The city will providing no
23 parking signage along the proposed driveway,
24 for unobstructed fire and emergency access.
25 The city also intends to monitor for and

1 provide bike racks porta-johns and bumper
2 blocks and off-season monitoring of parking
3 lot.

4 The applicant has met with
5 the neighboring residents to address these
6 concerns. The revised plans now include an
7 improved circulation pattern in the parking
8 lot, which included narrowing the driveways
9 by a few feet so landscaping can be added to
10 the south side to further screen the parking
11 lot from the residential area.

12 Given the temporary nature
13 of the recreational use of the property, the
14 applicant is requesting landscaping
15 deviations from parking lot landscape and
16 screening, deviations from engineering design
17 and construction standards for paving,
18 stormwater and a taper line and few others.
19 They are listed in detail in all the reviews
20 letters and summarized in the motion sheet.
21 The deviations are requested to allow the
22 applicant an option to accommodate the
23 temporary recreational needs of the city,
24 through minimal disruption of the site,
25 therefore, keeping it flexible for future

1 development. Planning, wetlands, woodlands
2 and fire are recommending approval with
3 additional comments to be addressed with the
4 final site plan.

5 Landscape, traffic and
6 engineering are not currently recommending
7 approval given the deviations requested,
8 which are subject to Planning Commission and
9 City Council's approval.

10 For those uses not
11 specifically mentioned, the zoning ordinance
12 allows the Planning Commission to make a
13 determination for the minimum required
14 parking spaces based on staff's
15 recommendation. The current plan is
16 proposing 79 spaces which are deemed
17 sufficient by the parks based on the current
18 usage patterns in other facilities. The
19 Planning Commission is asked tonight to
20 approve the preliminary site plan, wetland
21 permit, woodland permit and the stormwater
22 management plan.

23 Following the Planning
24 Commission's consideration and approval of
25 the plan, the City Council will consider any

1 recommended deviations from the ordinance
2 standards related to the plan.

3 City Council will also
4 consider approval of an agreement regarding
5 the improvement and occupancy of the property
6 for community recreation fields.

7 We have our director of
8 parks, recreation and cultural services, Jeff
9 Muck, and the applicant, Blair Bowman is here
10 tonight to answer any questions you may have
11 for them.

12 And as always, all staff
13 will be glad to answer any questions you have
14 for us. Thank you.

15 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you,
16 Sri. I appreciate that.

17 The applicant is here,
18 wishes to address the Planning Commission.

19 MR. BOWMAN: Good evening. My
20 name is Blair Bowman.

21 Just to clarify, this is
22 actually Serveman, LLC is the technical owner
23 of this property. And I just want to make
24 sure that that's what the agreement reflects
25 and the record reflects.

1 I will say that before you
2 tonight, you know, in the earnest attempt to
3 fulfill a commitment and intent to truly
4 provide something from the standpoint of a
5 community giveback of meaningful nature, that
6 will assist and help the parks and recreation
7 program and the youth of the city as it
8 relates to some of the recreational aspects.

9 I will say, I will temper
10 that a little bit with that, you know, I did
11 not ever intend to expect, it would be of
12 this kind of significant magnitude to try to
13 accomplish, you know, the clearing, cleanup
14 and grading for a couple of turf fields that
15 was a product of discussion to help in the
16 pursuit of not a lengthy period of time, but
17 a significant period of time, five years to
18 help in the rotation of the improvement of
19 some of the existing athletic fields.

20 It was born out of an
21 intention that, you know, made a lot of
22 sense, I thought at the time, to provide
23 something I didn't intend to use this site
24 for any particular need, for probably that
25 period of time, easily.

1 Certainly looked towards
2 future development of it in some form or
3 fashion. In the meantime, if it could be
4 used for some positive public purpose, even
5 at a significant frankly expense that I was
6 expecting to go to, I could kind of put that
7 into the future bin and say that makes a bit
8 if win-win sense and even with the potential
9 of possibly on a couple of occasions, as we
10 could foresee, using the site to help
11 facilitate, particularly the State Fair.
12 Again it seemed to make an awful lot of
13 sense.

14 Now, I will say, and I have
15 met with the residents, and I'm going to say,
16 shame on me. I should have thought to
17 approach them.

18 I really even said to them
19 if I would have been developing this in a
20 normal way, I would have thought to probably
21 approach them ahead time and talk about any
22 concerns.

23 But it just never dawned on
24 me that a recreation type of a complex like
25 this, with the amount of buffer that's there,

1 that there would have been those concerns.
2 But after talking with them, I clearly
3 understand what their concerns are.

4 We have done what I believe
5 frankly are to the total limits of dealing
6 with this site, the fields are no longer of
7 full regulation size. They are positioned in
8 a U13 style sizes.

9 From what I understand,
10 they're going to be used largely for practice
11 type of operations, so hopefully that will
12 provide some accommodation. Then, of course,
13 the reconfiguration of the parking and the
14 placement of the replacement trees in a
15 evergreen fashion is something that we were
16 happy to do.

17 I will say, I want to state
18 it for the record, I said it many times to
19 them. You know, this being an interim use we
20 will be looking to use this, certainly I will
21 use the more intensely, under what will be,
22 you know, a light industrial ordinance or
23 whatever, applicable ordinance in the future
24 is on this property. I have certainly
25 pledged to them, under this approach, I will

1 certainly try to accommodate as best as I
2 reasonably can, and certainly in the future,
3 we have now established a dialogue and they
4 know where I'm located, they have my contact
5 information, if anything does occur on the
6 site, from either -- frankly, even if it's
7 the city's use, but certainly anything that
8 we do, if there is any concerns that arise,
9 we will continue to stay in contact, we will
10 address those.

11 If there is anything
12 persistent that really is a problem, that by
13 everybody's determination should stop, then
14 we will certainly make those accommodations
15 and be open to that for the period of time
16 that it's being jointly used.

17 So, I just wanted to say,
18 that it really is something we intended to do
19 as a very positive thing and to the extent
20 that its caused any concern or consideration,
21 we do apologize for that, we will work hard
22 to try to work with everybody to make it as
23 best as we can.

24 So there is any comments and
25 I will be happy to answer any questions.

1 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.
2 Mr. Muck, do you wish to address?

3 MR. MUCK: I will stand by for
4 questions.

5 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: In due
6 course, sir. We will close the applicant
7 comment and turn it over to the Planning
8 Commission for their consideration.

9 Who would like it start?

10 Member Baratta.

11 MR. BARATTA: Mr. Chair, thank
12 you. Rick, I have a couple of questions for
13 you.

14 Several of the issues that
15 have come up today is -- I wrote a few of
16 them down -- one was noise. I suspect that's
17 from the use of the soccer fields and
18 possibly the parking lot, headlights in the
19 parking lot, glare.

20 I think there was a comment
21 that maybe 20 or 30 trees to screen the
22 parking lot from the adjacent homeowners.

23 I understand that this is a
24 temporary use, it's five years. I understand
25 it's industrial zoning and this is certainly

1 less intense, making it a soccer field.

2 So my first question is, I
3 see in this site that we have some -- I am
4 looking at the south end of the site closest
5 to where the homes are, that would be --
6 right where you see the street there. I see
7 that's the wetland. I see there is trees
8 there.

9 How many trees are we taking
10 out of that wetland area?

11 MR. MEADER: That's actually --
12 he's going to have to answer that question.
13 I don't want to give the wrong information.

14 MR. HILL: I'm Pete Hill from
15 ITC.

16 MR. BARATTA: Hi, Pete, how are
17 you.

18 My question is, the
19 homeowners have some objections to whether
20 there is going to be lights from the parking
21 lot, noise, et cetera.

22 So my question is, in that
23 wetland area, that's to the right side of the
24 plan where the street is, that's where the
25 homes are.

1 How many trees are we taking
2 out -- were you proposing to take out of that
3 area?

4 MR. HILL: Out of that area,
5 those trees are coming out, that wetland is
6 being (inaudible.)

7 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: And how
8 many trees are you adding just to the south
9 side of the parking lot as a screen?

10 MR. HILL: I don't know if Sri
11 maybe can answer this better than I can. But
12 the regulated woodland trees that are being
13 removed, as Sri mentioned, there is six,
14 requiring 18 replacement credits. The
15 applicant is proposing conifers, which under
16 the woodland ordinance, equated a one and a
17 half to one replacement ratio. So for those
18 18 required, they are providing 27 woodland
19 replacements in terms of pine trees. For
20 screening, some up on the berm, right along
21 Grand River, I think there is five. And then
22 22 kind of around the southern side of the
23 parking lot, yes.

24 And the plan that's up in
25 front of you there, may have more than 27

1 conifers on it.

2 MR. BARATTA: And what size trees
3 are those, do you know offhand?

4 MR. HILL: Minimum six foot tall.

5 MR. BARATTA: Six foot, okay. Is
6 it your opinion, that by adding those, let's
7 call it 20 trees there, that should -- with
8 the positioning of the trees, that should
9 provide an adequate screen or certainly more
10 of a screen than what you currently have with
11 those houses?

12 MR. HILL: I think so.

13 MR. BARATTA: We are not
14 taking -- you're not proposing to take down
15 any trees from that area, where you're adding
16 those 20 trees where the parking lot is,
17 correct?

18 MR. HILL: Correct.

19 MR. BARATTA: That parking lot
20 there, that's gravel, correct? I think the
21 appropriate -- I don't know if you are the
22 appropriate person to ask?

23 MR. HILL: That's my
24 understanding, it's gravel.

25 MR. BARATTA: That's gravel.

1 It's not paved.

2 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Except for the
3 handicapped spaces.

4 MR. BARATTA: Except for the
5 handicapped spaces. There is not going to be
6 any street lights in that area?

7 MS. KOMARAGIRI: They are not
8 going to be providing any streetlights. The
9 hours of operation are dawn to dusk, so no
10 additional lighting has been proposed.

11 MR. BARATTA: So we have got more
12 screening. You have no lights, so there
13 should be no issue, I would suspect, with
14 additional, let's call it light pollution
15 going into the houses.

16 Now I'm interested in noise.
17 Is there any barricades at all or is there a
18 gate or anything that is preventing cars from
19 going into that area, after dusk, being
20 proposed today?

21 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Is it general
22 policy of the parks not to provide any gates.
23 We don't have any gates on the facility,
24 (unintelligible) throughout the city, so
25 maintaining the city, there are no barricades

1 provided. But the park is open to proposed
2 signage, park is closed after dusk that.

3 MR. BARATTA: That will be
4 patrolled? Is that what the proposal is?

5 MS. KOMARAGIRI: The usual
6 patrol. No additional patrol.

7 MR. BARATTA: So if there is an
8 issue and the homeowners saw some cars back
9 there, they could call and say, X, we gotten
10 an issue.

11 MS. KOMARAGIRI: I would think
12 so, yes.

13 MR. BARATTA: And is there any
14 lights at all on the soccer field?

15 MS. KOMARAGIRI: No lighting has
16 been proposed. The facility is closed after
17 dusk.

18 MR. BARATTA: No speakers, no
19 lights. It's dawn to dusk, that's it?

20 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Nothing proposed
21 by the city.

22 MR. BARATTA: Thank you very
23 much.

24 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: That was
25 it.

1 MR. BARATTA: That's it.

2 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Very good.

3 Member Giacometti.

4 MR. GIACOPETTI: I have a couple
5 of questions for Jeff.

6 I have a question concerning
7 the utilization of existing soccer fields and
8 facilities, in terms of are they at their
9 capacity. Are there leagues that can't be
10 created because there are not enough fields.
11 Would you maybe give us some background.

12 MR. HILL: So, there is a
13 difference between what I would call game
14 fields and practice fields. We run most of
15 literally all of our at the ITC community
16 sports park. The rest of the soccer fields
17 around the city we have some practices at
18 Brookfarm Park, we have had some teams
19 practice at Lakeshore Park. Some of those
20 are just for convenience, you know, with the
21 coaches live in the neighborhood, they would
22 rather practice close by instead of traveling
23 to ITC.

24 The fields on Eleven Mile,
25 those are practice fields, we don't use those

1 for games typically. They're not as in good
2 of shape, ITC is irrigated, they are well
3 maintained.

4 But as Mr. Bowman stated,
5 there is a significant need to improve those
6 fields at ITC. Their current setup is an old
7 structure construction standard with a crown
8 method. If you spend any time out there, you
9 can stand on one end of the soccer field and
10 barely see the top of the soccer goal on the
11 other end.

12 So it's not conducive for
13 grid play. Any significant amounts of
14 rainfall causes us to potentially shut down
15 those fields. In fact, this spring there was
16 a significant amount of time at the start of
17 the year that we shut those fields down.

18 So when Mr. Bowman
19 approached us with this proposal, it just
20 made sense because we are going to need to
21 reconstruct those fields. Those are budgeted
22 out in CIP over the next few years. We need
23 to literally tear those down to scratch.

24 We install the irrigation,
25 install new drainage. So we need somewhere

1 to put those kids. And we are going -- we
2 would put those kids on these fields
3 primarily for practices. Again, reiterating,
4 we have no plans to do any kind of
5 application. We have no plans to install
6 lighting. I would say that most of this is
7 going to be held week nights. We are
8 cognizant of parents' schedules, we are
9 putting five, six, seven year-olds out there,
10 so they are not going to be there until dusk.

11 We are very cognizant of
12 what we need to do.

13 MR. GIACOPETTI: So the field
14 would primarily be used by elementary school
15 students between the hours of say five to
16 seven or five to eight, that's pretty much --

17 MR. HILL: On Saturday, if we
18 needed to play on there, we typically start
19 at 9:00 a.m., usually wrapped up by four.

20 Again, a lot of this will be
21 at flex because we don't know exactly how
22 long the time frame is going to take us. We
23 are going to have to start giving soon into
24 construction quotes and time frames for ITC
25 down the line.

1 MR. GIACOPETTI: They wouldn't be
2 for adult leagues?

3 MR. HILL: No.

4 MR. GIACOPETTI: That was my
5 primary question.

6 Secondary question for the
7 applicant, Mr. Bowman.

8 How long has the holding
9 company owned this parcel?

10 MR. BOWMAN: That's a good
11 question. I think it's probably about a year
12 and a half maybe now, maybe a little bit more
13 than that.

14 MR. GIACOPETTI: Acquired for
15 this intention primarily --

16 MR. BOWMAN: As a matter of fact,
17 we were in the process. We looked at it for
18 a while, then backed off of looking at it,
19 and then ended up putting it under contract.
20 And during second time that we were really
21 seriously considering it. It's more along
22 the lines of the master planning after this
23 being made the whole corridor, our pursuit of
24 the expansion parcels to the west of the
25 existing Showplace operations, it's really

1 looking more towards the long term, if there
2 is an opportunity, if was an opportunity to,
3 you know, acquire some property that might
4 work into an overall longer term master plan.

5 And I look at this as a
6 future long-term development site.
7 Realistically. Would it be something that
8 could support the overall Showplace
9 operations in conjunction with the future
10 years, sure. You know, I think we even
11 developed an overall kind of a corridor
12 improvement plan that showed even a
13 pedestrian bridge and things like that, in a
14 couple of different locations.

15 But realistically, you know,
16 this is something that -- it came out of a
17 conversation where I understood the interest
18 and the need. I simply uttered, we are not
19 going to be a whole lot with this for any
20 foreseeable time, and would it help, and you
21 know, gosh, if we could -- you know, on a
22 couple of occasions throughout the course of
23 a full annual period, 95 percent of the time
24 is what I think I said, we wouldn't be using
25 it and if the community could use it for the

1 better, you know, that would be -- that would
2 be great, so that's really how it all came
3 about.

4 MR. GIACOPETTI: Thanks. And I
5 guess a follow-up question really for staff.

6 Barb, prior to the
7 acquisition of this property, had there been
8 any other interests from other developers to
9 develop it in different ways in say the
10 last -- as long as you can remember?

11 MS. MCBETH: Just off the top of
12 my head, I don't recall any development plans
13 that I have seen for this property. So
14 nothing in the recent past.

15 MR. GIACOPETTI: But it is an
16 industrial one, so it could be used for
17 office or any number of uses, correct?

18 MS. MCBETH: That's correct.

19 MR. GIACOPETTI: Those uses would
20 be late and there would be light. They could
21 be -- you know, it could be open very late,
22 they could have lighting, they could create a
23 lot more traffic than we anticipated for
24 this?

25 MS. MCBETH: That's true. It

1 could be a general office use or a medical
2 office use or it could be some kind of light
3 manufacturing type of use. The light
4 industrial district is pretty broad and
5 allows a variety of uses that could be
6 possible for this property.

7 MR. GIACOPETTI: I just wanted to
8 double check, thanks. That's all of my
9 questions. Thank you.

10 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Member
11 Greco.

12 MR. GRECO: I do have a few
13 comments.

14 First of all, based on the
15 review of the materials, and what appears to
16 be the city's needs, it looks like with
17 respect to the utilization of the soccer
18 fields is something that will be utilized.
19 It looks like it was something that the city
20 is looking for.

21 Next, with respect, this has
22 been brought up previously at the previous
23 meetings, and this evening, and also by
24 Mr. Bowman, this is definitely a site that is
25 going to be developed at sometime in the

1 future and definitely going to be a site
2 that's going to be developed at sometime in
3 the future, with something much more, or more
4 rather intense than what's being proposed
5 here.

6 Just a comment, in answer to
7 a question, this is a public hearing. The
8 notices to the homeowners go out for input.
9 And, you know, I have been on the Planning
10 Commission for, you know, close to a decade
11 and, you know, most people, most individuals,
12 unless you're business people, sometimes with
13 either speculative purchases or looking for
14 land to develop, but particularly, residents
15 that live in the community, you know, don't
16 want to see a lot of development go up.

17 You know, even though it's
18 private property, you see open fields. I go
19 back to my hometown in New York and all the
20 open fields that we used to run through or
21 play hide and seek or play capture the flag
22 in now have either mansions on them, or
23 different -- you know, different things that
24 are there. And you look back on it fondly as
25 a child, but it is private property that can

1 be developed.

2 So with respect to the input
3 from the community, it's something that, you
4 know, it is -- you know, at many times
5 required by the ordinances and by the laws of
6 the State of Michigan because the residents
7 are so close there.

8 It's definitely something
9 that, you know, speaking on behalf of the
10 Planning Commission, but not specifically on
11 behalf of any member, that everybody reads,
12 everybody looks at them and everyone tries to
13 take into consideration because as you know,
14 or I'm sure you are aware, we are all
15 residents of the City of Novi here, so we are
16 all concerned about what's going on, not just
17 sitting on the Planning Commission.

18 But, that being said, as
19 Planning Commissioners, looking at plans,
20 looking at development, looking at private
21 property, looking at the needs of the city,
22 which in this case, is a little bit more of a
23 factor apparently, from Parks and Rec, then
24 we are usually looking at, we got to take
25 into account the ordinances.

1 So, I don't know if that
2 answers your question specifically, but I
3 know for a fact that we always look at and
4 listen to what the residents have to say,
5 maybe not do what the residents want to do
6 all the time, sometimes our hands are tied by
7 the laws of the ordinances, or particular
8 uses and what's going on here.

9 There are a lot, just
10 stepping aside from that, a lot of waivers
11 being requested here. But certainly
12 understanding the plan, the needs of the city
13 and what is actually happening on the site,
14 not necessarily against them, given what the
15 city is getting back, for right now. Again,
16 this a pretty, I would say less than moderate
17 use for the site.

18 I do have one question for
19 Mr. Bowman, though.

20 One of the waivers is --
21 looking through -- for the absence of a
22 required bike rack, all right. It is a
23 recreational field. I mean, we have heard
24 that it's going be -- I don't think five and
25 six year-olds are going to be riding their

1 bikes there. But it is going to be an open
2 field, that's going to be open, part of parks
3 and rec that, you know, kids or adults or
4 people may want to, you know, show up and,
5 you know, kick the ball around. I know I
6 have with my son on empty fields, when we are
7 not having practice.

8 Is there a reason for -- has
9 there been any discussion about why no bike
10 racks there?

11 MR. BOWMAN: Maybe I will answer
12 that in a bit of wholesale fashion as it
13 relates to some of the other required items.
14 And it goes to my original comment about
15 really just what was intended, never really
16 thinking that every ordinance for a typical
17 site plan process would apply to our trying
18 to temporarily assist in the parks and rec.

19 So, we have gone well beyond
20 what I ever thought would be required. I
21 will just be very blunt. It still is in the
22 factoring process right now as to exactly
23 what the magnitude of those changes that we
24 did say that we would agree to put in. In
25 fact, for example, the sedimentation and

1 detention basin for natural feature
2 conditions, just wouldn't have considered
3 that that would be necessary, but we did.
4 But anything for the use of the property or
5 to make it functional for use, traffic
6 control measures, parking blocks, bike racks,
7 trash enclosures, bathroom facilities of
8 anything of that nature, that would be
9 something that, you know, we're -- and
10 believe me when I say this, this is a very
11 sincere, significant deal and I'm not just
12 saying that it's a major investment that we
13 are making.

14 The likelihood of which,
15 that any frankly significant value for future
16 value will be modest. It is for trying to
17 give back. It is significant for the
18 approach was to provide a significant base
19 and with some modest items that the community
20 might have to provide and probably with
21 access to resources that we don't have, be
22 able to provide, that really gets down to the
23 just taper lane, the trash enclosure, the
24 bike rack and things like that.

25 MR. GRECO: Thank you. Just a

1 final comment. I'm not sure you need bike
2 racks there actually, since it is on Grand
3 River. But I don't know. So anyway, that
4 concludes my comments.

5 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: So
6 Mr. Bowman, relative to, and David, relative
7 to the contractor, the agreement that is
8 going to be written, stipulations in there
9 relative to hours of operations, for others
10 than the state -- other than the soccer
11 fields, when the State Fair comes around,
12 times and uses, usage times, those are all
13 indicated inside the agreement right now?

14 MR. GILLAM: I'm double checking
15 because, in fact, there was a draft that was
16 just circulated this afternoon.

17 MR. BOWMAN: I have not seen the
18 latest draft. I certainly am willing to
19 address certain things because I think I
20 shared my communication with the city what I
21 talked about with the residents. That any of
22 those types of things that we are dealing
23 with, a logistic component of the midway
24 operator, we would keep those in the very
25 northern portion of the site, so keeping it

1 well away. For any of the traffic trailers
2 and, you know, vehicle parking aspect, we
3 will do that during only normal operating
4 hours.

5 So again dawn to dusk,
6 that's the proper approach, I would have no
7 problem to committing to that as well.

8 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: I think
9 from the last Planning Commission meeting,
10 who was the gentleman that was here?
11 (Unintelligible) When he was here. I think
12 there was more consideration relative to the
13 non-soccer operations as opposed to what
14 might be used this on the off-chance --

15 MR. BOWMAN: I will clarify one
16 thing because I believe he felt comfortable
17 in his answer, and even was correct, that the
18 camping areas for the State Fair will not be
19 on the site. What the midway operator does
20 with their empties and housing and components
21 there, they will have -- I think it is three
22 units that they have, there will be some --
23 they're bunk house style units. I just
24 wanted to make sure that was clarified.

25 The other thing will be that

1 even though logistically movement in and out
2 will limit it to those hours, that doesn't
3 mean that an empty trailer won't be parked on
4 that gravel surface throughout the course of
5 the fair. Or for example, where we might
6 need to move some of our stationaries onto
7 that area during Comic Con to free up space
8 on site for regular parking purposes. That's
9 the intention of it.

10 But again I will -- even if
11 it wants to be in written fashion, provide
12 that if there are issues that are a concern
13 to them, that they can certainly bring those
14 directly to my attention, if there is any
15 persistence to it or any problems, we will
16 correct it or stop the practice.

17 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: I have all
18 the confidence in the world that kind of
19 language will be included, and you as a
20 businessman in the city will take care of
21 that without the language even --

22 MR. BOWMAN: Absolutely.

23 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: To make
24 sure we have that. Mr. Gillam?

25 MR. GILLAM: The agreement as

1 drafted doesn't contain it, we can put
2 language in there that will deal with
3 Mr. Bowman's use of the property.

4 To the extent that the use
5 of the park is addressed that would follow-up
6 with the use of the ordinance and other
7 normal city policies.

8 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: As far as
9 the usage for the soccer fields, I'm
10 perfectly comfortable with them. I think
11 again we're going above the replacement trees
12 trying to eliminate the aspects that might be
13 of noise generation for the citizens. I
14 think that this use is going to be far less
15 than what might have been placed on that at
16 some point in time. So I would be in support
17 of this.

18 MR. BARATTA: I had one other
19 question. Let me address to this Dave.

20 Dave, we got a temporary use
21 here. And let me just preface this by
22 saying. I think it's a great use. I think
23 Mr. Bowman is doing a wonderful public
24 service. I think he's going beyond what,
25 frankly, what most people would do, to help

1 the city.

2 But my question relates to
3 this temporary use that we are going to have
4 as a result, we are not going do some things
5 that if were permanent use that we have to
6 require, such as the road taper, and some
7 other things that would have to be completed.

8 Did we have anything in our
9 ordinance that allows for a temporary, such
10 as this where we can give waivers, still be
11 somewhat consistent with our decision making?

12 MR. GILLAM: I am not aware of
13 anything specific as to a temporary use. I
14 think the fact that it is a temporary use is
15 a factor that the Planning Commission can
16 take into consideration in determining
17 whether or not the waivers are appropriate.

18 One thing would be the
19 permanent waivers. The other end because it
20 is a temporary use, you could make an
21 argument that it would be -- more or less
22 soften the impact maybe justify the waivers
23 as opposed to a more permanent use.

24 One comment as to the issue
25 with the deceleration lane, the traffic

1 lanes. Grand River is a county road in the
2 area, so its relative (inaudible) decision
3 that's going to be made by the county road
4 commission, not by the city.

5 MR. BARATTA: So in this
6 instance, assuming the recommended approval
7 of this project, there is -- if Mr. Bowman or
8 somebody else that would eventually purchase
9 the property should Mr. Bowman decide to sell
10 it, if he ultimately decides to sell it, they
11 would have to come back in front of the
12 commission and present a site plan that these
13 decisions we are making today in regards to
14 these waivers would not be applicable to that
15 unquote, final plan?

16 MR. GILLAM: That's correct. The
17 agreement as drafted for this particular
18 temporary use would apply the potential
19 purchasers of the property, if the temporary
20 use was going to continue. But if the
21 temporary use is no longer going to continue,
22 and if someone else is going to -- or Mr.
23 Bowman, or a certain man, for example, is
24 going to come and develop the property,
25 they're going to have to comply with every

1 single requirement of the ordinance or obtain
2 the appropriate waivers, same as anyone one
3 else would.

4 MR. BARATTA: Thank you very
5 much. Appreciate it.

6 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Member
7 Greco.

8 MR. GRECO: I would like to make
9 a motion.

10 In the matter of Grand River
11 Soccer Park, JSP-20, motion to approve the
12 preliminary site plan based on and subject to
13 the following the waivers, due to the
14 temporary nature and primary and secondary
15 uses proposed and subject to the City Council
16 approval of design and construction standard
17 variance, in the matters set forth in A
18 through O, in the motion, and the findings of
19 compliance with ordinance standards and the
20 and staff consultant review letters and the
21 conditions and items listed in those letters
22 being addressed on the final site plan, and
23 because the plan is otherwise in compliance
24 with Article 3, Article 4 and Article 5 of
25 the zoning ordinance and all other applicable

1 provisions of the ordinance.

2 MR. BARATTA: Second.

3 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a
4 motion by Member Greco, second by Member
5 Baratta.

6 Any other comments?

7 Sri, can you call the roll.

8 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member
9 Giacobetti?

10 MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

11 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

12 MR. GRECO: Yes.

13 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

14 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

15 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Baratta?

16 MR. BARATTA: Yes.

17 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes
18 four to zero.

19 MR. GRECO: I'd like to make
20 another motion. In the matter of Grand River
21 Soccer Park JSP-16-20, motion to approve the
22 wetland permit based on and subject to the
23 findings of compliance with the ordinance
24 standards of the staff and consultant review
25 letters and the conditions and items listed

1 in those letters being addressed on the final
2 site plan, and because the plan is otherwise
3 in compliance with chapter 12, article 5 of
4 the code of ordinances and all other
5 applicable provisions of the ordinance.

6 MR. BARATTA: Second.

7 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Motion by
8 Member Greco, second by Member Baratta.
9 Anyone else?

10 Sri, please.

11 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

12 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

13 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Baratta?

14 MR. BARATTA: Yes.

15 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member

16 Giacopetti?

17 MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

18 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

19 MR. GRECO: Yes.

20 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes
21 four to zero.

22 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Make
23 another motion for Grand River Soccer Park,
24 JSP16-20 to approve the woodland permit based
25 on and subject to the findings of compliance

1 with the ordinance standards and the staff
2 and consultant review letters and the
3 conditions and items listed in those letters,
4 being addressed on the final site plan and
5 because the plan is otherwise in compliance
6 with chapter 37 of the code of ordinances and
7 all other applicable provisions of the
8 ordinance.

9 MR. BARATTA: Second.

10 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Motion by
11 Member Greco, second by Member Baratta. Any
12 comments?

13 Sri, can you call the roll.

14 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Baratta?

15 MR. BARATTA: Yes.

16 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member

17 Giacopetti?

18 MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

19 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

20 MR. GRECO: Yes.

21 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

22 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

23 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes

24 four to zero.

25 MR. GRECO: Another motion in the

1 matter of Grand River Soccer Park JSP16-20,
2 motion to approve the stormwater management
3 plan based on and subject to the findings of
4 compliance with ordinance standards and staff
5 and consultant review letters and conditions
6 and items listed in those letters being
7 addressed on the final site plan and because
8 it is otherwise in compliance with chapter 11
9 of the code of ordinances and all other
10 applicable provisions of the ordinance.

11 MR. BARATTA: Second.

12 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a
13 motion by Member Greco, second by Member
14 Baratta. Any other comments?

15 Sri, please.

16 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member
17 Giacopetti?

18 MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

19 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

20 MR. GRECO: Yes.

21 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

22 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

23 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Baratta?

24 MR. BARATTA: Yes.

25 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes

1 four to zero.

2 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

3 All set. Thank you, sir.

4 Next is the public hearing
5 for zoning ordinance, text amendment 18.276.
6 It's a set for public hearing for the July
7 13, 2016 Planning Commission meeting, for
8 text amendment 18.276 to consider amending
9 the City of Novi zoning ordinance in order to
10 incorporate recommendations provided in the
11 Town Center area study.

12 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Thank you. As
13 you may recall, the Planning Commission
14 approved the Town Center area study in 2014.
15 The study was designed to evaluate and make
16 recommendation on land use, zoning, design
17 guideline and wayfinding. The study results
18 also offered modifications to zoning
19 ordinance, among other items to facilitate
20 the development of existing and vacant
21 parcels into a viable and active Town Center
22 area and coordinate and approve with
23 surrounding sub areas.

24 The map in front of you
25 shows the properties that are currently zoned

1 Town Center and Town Center One.

2 This map identifies all the
3 parcels that would be currently affected by
4 the proposed zoning changes zoned TC and TC1,
5 and may be affected if the property owner
6 chose to rezone to TC or TC1, which are
7 identified as TC commercial or TC gateway.

8 Some of the recommendations
9 are straight while some need further research
10 and review and some are identified to be
11 studied as part of the current master plan
12 for land use update. Staff has separated the
13 suggestions accordingly, and they're color
14 coded as shown on your screen for easy
15 understanding throughout the document, which
16 is provided for your review and comment.
17 Planning staff reviewed and recommended
18 modifications by the area study and are
19 proposing to amend the few sections of the
20 zoning ordinance. The current amendment
21 regarded as phase one will include the first
22 set of suggestions. Staff will do further
23 research on the phase two recommendations and
24 will present it before the Planning
25 Commission at a later time.

1 The staff version of the
2 proposed phase one amendment, which is
3 provided as part of your packet, is subject
4 to review and changes by city staff and/or
5 the city attorney's office.

6 The Planning Commission is
7 asked to review the proposed phase one
8 amendment, and if acceptable, set a public
9 hearing for the proposed text amendment for
10 the July 30th meeting. Thank you.

11 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you,
12 Sri.

13 Turn it over the Planning
14 Commission for thoughts or recommendation.

15 Member Baratta.

16 MR. BARATTA: Maybe you can help
17 me with this.

18 I read the information that
19 is provided. We would be really looking at
20 this area which was supposed to be a walkable
21 area of the Town Center.

22 I think over the period of
23 time, we kind of changed the character of
24 that because I really -- and just looking at
25 the way this was designed, we have got

1 restaurants, you have got a kind of a ring
2 going north and south with the highway, you
3 got restaurants, there is a barrier because
4 we now have a road that kind of bypasses the
5 intersection of Novi and Grand River, that
6 takes you back to Grand River.

7 So it's really -- then you
8 have got a shopping center. It's really not
9 walkable when you head to the southeast
10 corner.

11 And then we have got
12 Grand River, which is busy, then we have got
13 that Town Center area.

14 Again, we are not really
15 walkable from the restaurants, the shopping
16 center, unless you want to have some issues
17 crossing Grand River to get into that
18 southeastern corner, where the Town Center
19 is.

20 So we really changed the
21 character from what I think the initial
22 objective -- initial objective of this area
23 was, was to make it a cohesive walkable area,
24 with some apartments to the south, and I
25 would suspect some small shops on that

1 northeastern quadrant, and just connecting.

2 So really what we have today
3 is really more of a suburban shopping
4 environment.

5 You need cars, and that's
6 what we have there, unless we are changing
7 the character, to try to go back to something
8 more walkable. Some of the things we are
9 saying in the text amendment is, you know,
10 let's put restaurants with a drive-thru. If
11 you're a franchise restaurant, you don't have
12 a drive-thru, you're not going to locate
13 there. Even Starbucks they typically don't
14 locate a facility without a drive-thru, drug
15 stores, same way. They want the drive-thru
16 for that extra revenue, the drive-thru
17 convenience.

18 So really I guess the first
19 question is, are we trying to make this
20 walkable or are we taking that next step away
21 from the walkable environment to more of a
22 suburban shopping environment.

23 What that's I see here. We
24 are allowing some of these things.

25 MS. KOMARAGIRI: We have two

1 amendments that are being proposed within the
2 Town Center area.

3 The one is proposed by the
4 city staff based on the recommendations from
5 the study. The second one is for a
6 drive-thru amendment.

7 I just want to clarify. Are
8 we talking about the second one that's on the
9 agenda or --

10 MR. BARATTA: I was given
11 basically an overview, what I think both of
12 them were. Because it's really integrated,
13 as we look at this area.

14 MS. KOMARAGIRI: As of now, we
15 are kind of treating them both separately.
16 The current amendment based on the suggestion
17 is sticking with the intent of the Town
18 Center area study where we are trying to make
19 it a cohesive walkable kind of environment.

20 MR. BARATTA: So I guess my
21 suggestion is as we look at each of these
22 areas, we can't look at them as separate and
23 distinct.

24 We basically have one
25 integrated area, this intersection, we have

1 got the wall on the north, we have got the
2 shopping environment on the northwest corner,
3 the highway and Novi Road, then you have got
4 this section here. It's really one area.

5 What's happening in this --
6 from what I am seeing in this industry, is
7 consolidation of retail. Consolidation,
8 concentration, and if we are going to make
9 this really a robust, call it a walkable
10 area, you got to look at this whole area as
11 one, and not segments, or it doesn't work.

12 You know, in my interview
13 this week, I was asked the question where is
14 retail going. My answer was retail is
15 concentrated. If you look at why that
16 Novi -- why a mall is successful here,
17 because you can go all the way up to Lansing
18 and you really don't have a good mall. You
19 don't have Nordstrom, you don't have Lord and
20 Taylor. You got Sears, Penneys and Macy's.
21 But those are the draws, the inside of the
22 mall, because of those two, you've got some
23 upscale retail. And that's why we are so
24 significant here. And the southeastern
25 quadrant, again, if our goal is to make this

1 walkable, we have look at this entire area.
2 I personally think that when we allowed the
3 theater to go behind the former Builders
4 Square, over where those of you remember
5 Builders Square, is up where Kohls is, caused
6 this from changing the traffic pattern
7 significantly, where we used to have the
8 Bally's, where the Wal-mart is currently, I
9 think you would have seen a walkable
10 environment, you would have seen the
11 entertainment, you would have seen the
12 restaurants. We made that mistake. We are
13 not looking at it in totality.

14 So that's what I'm seeing as
15 we looked at the master plan. I know the
16 master plan is coming out for Grand River.
17 We look at this ordinance here, as we are
18 looking at some changes in it, I just think
19 we are making a mistake, unless we look at it
20 as an integrated process or program.

21 That's my opinion.

22 MS. MCBETH: I would like to
23 comment on that, too. So the study that was
24 completed in 2014, that was the intent, to
25 look at the TC and TC1 districts in total and

1 see what might need to be updated.

2 The last study had been in
3 probably the late '80s and '90s, when it was
4 developed and ordinance standards were
5 developed at that point as well.

6 So as Sri had mentioned,
7 there is a comprehensive list of ordinance
8 amendments. This is kind of the first step
9 that staff has recommended taking, several of
10 the smaller ones that are more easily
11 achievable at this point. And then we will
12 be coming back as some additional changes we
13 predict a little bit farther down the line.

14 I think we also need to take
15 into consideration that we do have some
16 undeveloped land in the TC and TC1 areas and
17 areas that would be ready for redevelopment.

18 We are not -- the staff is
19 not really quite ready to give up on the idea
20 that it could be a walkable area, especially
21 if additional residences come in. So if it
22 is created as more of a main street area,
23 it's possible that it could be still be a
24 viable walkable area.

25 MR. BARATTA: I'd really like to

1 look at that master plan for this area.
2 Because I also believe it could be walkable,
3 I really do. And, you know, I think we need
4 the residential. We need to concentrate it.

5 MS. MCBETH: Perhaps when it
6 comes back for public hearing, we could
7 provide the study again.

8 It's been a little while
9 since we have taken a look at it. We could
10 provide that again, take a look at those.

11 MR. BARATTA: Thank you.

12 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Member
13 Giacometti.

14 MR. GIACOPETTI: I'm on the same
15 page as Member Baratta.

16 Where I look at the local
17 communities that are sort of the benchmark
18 for walkability. I can't imagine
19 entertaining these ideas. I can't imagine
20 Plymouth, I can't Northville, I can't imagine
21 Grosse Pointe, entertaining this in a
22 district that is walkable. Hopefully
23 walkable retail. It seems like giving up and
24 going backwards.

25 I understand the developers

1 have come in and the market says, this is
2 what the market is interested in. But then
3 on the other hand, the planners tell us the
4 long-term vision is walkable communities.
5 The two are at odds right now. I was
6 questioned if I was frustrated at the City
7 Council hearing and it's just, you know, I'm
8 struggling to do that balance. I understand
9 what with the market wants, the market
10 doesn't apparently want to get out of their
11 car, but on the other side, I do believe with
12 the -- you know, the planning community says
13 that the future viability of the community
14 are more walkable. So, you know, I'm --

15 MR. GRECO: No comments right
16 now.

17 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Move
18 forward to set the recommendation?

19 MR. GRECO: Let me ask you this.
20 Let me put something to the Planning
21 Commission out there.

22 Before considering -- or I
23 mean, we could set it for a public hearing,
24 and we could get the study as part of our
25 packet and have the public hearing and the

1 study at the same time and, you know, make
2 our decision or we can always put off our
3 decision when we have the public hearing.

4 Does the members of the
5 commission sitting here want to have that
6 information first in advance of considering
7 setting it for a public hearing or do you
8 want set -- putting it out.

9 MR. BARATTA: See, I don't think
10 I'm ready at this point with the facts that I
11 have to analyze it, to really come up with an
12 effective plan to turn this area into
13 something that we are envisioning. Maybe we
14 need more work on it, maybe we don't have.
15 But again, I don't have that information to
16 make that decision.

17 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Is that
18 available, Barb?

19 MS. MCBETH: It is. We have it
20 on the web page that you can take a look at
21 any time. We could send you a link to it.
22 If you want to see it now, we can give it to
23 you, in two weeks at that meeting that's
24 coming up in two weeks, then have another
25 matter for discussion about it, if you like

1 to do that. Or, you know, we could provide
2 it, as Member Greco said, at the same time as
3 the public hearing.

4 MR. BARATTA: Would it be
5 appropriate to have a work session and go
6 through that with the Commission so we can
7 analyze it and maybe update it with some
8 additional recommendations before we bring it
9 to a public hearing so we have some
10 integrated plan we feel comfortable with?

11 MS. MCBETH: Yes, if the
12 Commission wishes, we could have a study
13 session, talk about and delve into the
14 details of that plan that was adopted in
15 2014.

16 This additional component
17 that we are going to get to here in a minute
18 is the drive-thru restaurants, which was
19 outside of the recommendations of that plan.
20 But if you wanted to, we could have a special
21 study session to talk about all of those
22 things.

23 MR. GIACOPETTI: Could we set a
24 public hearing, you know, for further out in
25 the future to give us time to review this?

1 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: To the
2 impetus of setting the public hearing, now
3 to --

4 MR. GIACOPETTI: I was thinking
5 like September, October.

6 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Is it --

7 MS. MCBETH: There was two
8 things. We do anticipate that development
9 plans will come in for the Main Street area
10 at some point coming up. We have had some
11 preliminary discussions. And maybe one or
12 two of these would be important to those
13 reviews. The second impetus is the applicant
14 has requested review for drive-thru
15 restaurants of a certain limited nature in
16 the TC district, Town Center district, which
17 is mostly on the north side of Grand River.
18 So those two things have brought this at this
19 time.

20 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Did we have
21 open -- does it look like the agenda is
22 coming up or going to be filled?

23 MS. MCBETH: I think the agenda
24 in a couple of weeks is going to be quite
25 full. We will be getting into July. I don't

1 think we have projected too far out into July
2 yet, so we could take a look at the agendas
3 in July.

4 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We can look
5 at a July time frame to -- if you could shoot
6 the link to us, provide us with a little
7 direction. And then maybe look at the July
8 time frame because I think that's usually
9 slower amount of movement. Maybe we can set
10 aside one of the Planning Commission dates
11 for a study session, to have a discussion
12 open to the public, as it is, but just, you
13 know, be able to talk about this particular
14 topic.

15 MS. MCBETH: That sounds good.

16 MR. GRECO: I think what we could
17 do, probably today, what I'm hearing is reset
18 the matter for consideration, number two, for
19 a future meeting as a matter for
20 consideration to consider setting it for a
21 public hearing after we have had a chance to
22 look at everything.

23 MR. BARATTA: Okay.

24 MR. GIACOPETTI: Isn't it just to
25 table --

1 MR. GRECO: Should we just table
2 it.

3 MR. GILLAM: That would work,
4 yes.

5 MR. GRECO: Make a motion to
6 table the matter for consideration number
7 two, of the request to -- or consideration to
8 set a public hearing for zoning ordinance
9 text amendment 18.276 to a future meeting.

10 MR. BARATTA: Second.

11 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a
12 motion by Member Greco second by Member
13 Baratta.

14 Any other comments?

15 Sri, can you call the roll.

16 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

17 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

18 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Baratta?

19 MR. BARATTA: Yes.

20 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member
21 Giacopetti?

22 MR. GIACOPEPETTI: Yes.

23 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

24 MR. GRECO: Yes.

25 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes

1 four to zero.

2 MR. GRECO: I'd like to make
3 another motion to table the matter for
4 consideration number three on the agenda, to
5 consider setting public hearing for zoning
6 ordinance text amendment 18.277, to a future
7 Planning Commission meeting.

8 MR. BARATTA: Second.

9 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Motion by
10 Member Greco, second by Member Baratta. Any
11 other comments?

12 Sri, can you call the roll.

13 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member
14 Giacometti?

15 MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

16 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

17 MR. GRECO: Yes.

18 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

19 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

20 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Baratta?

21 MR. BARATTA: Yes.

22 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes
23 four to zero.

24 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Next item
25 is the approval of the April 27, 2016

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Planning Commission minutes. Any
modifications or changes?

MR. BARATTA: Motion to approve.

MR. GRECO: Second.

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

Sri, can you call the roll.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Baratta?

MR. BARATTA: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member
Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes
four to zero.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: The
approval of the May 11, 2016 Planning
Commission minutes.

MR. BARATTA: Motion to approve.

MR. GRECO: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Motion by

1 Member Baratta, second by Member Greco.

2 Any other comments? Sri,
3 please.

4 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

5 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

6 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Baratta?

7 MR. BARATTA: Yes.

8 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member

9 Giacometti?

10 MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

11 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

12 MR. GRECO: Yes.

13 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes
14 four to zero.

15 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

16 Any supplemental issues?

17 Last audience participation.

18 Is there anyone in the audience that wishes
19 to address the Planning Commission at this
20 time?

21 Seeing none, close the
22 audience participation.

23 MR. BARATTA: Mr. Chairperson, I
24 did have one supplemental issues.

25 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Go ahead.

1 MR. BARATTA: You know, one thing
2 that I would like to -- just the panel to
3 consider, you know, when we are going through
4 our discussions and discussions with some
5 council, I think Councilman Munch made a
6 presentation to us regarding the landscaping
7 and all old growth, new growth, et cetera.
8 You know, some things came up, we, you know
9 got -- we are a mature city, and I think -- I
10 don't remember if this percentage was
11 accurate or not, but about 12 or 14 percent
12 of the city hasn't been developed, I don't
13 know if that's the right number.

14 And as we do these projects,
15 you know, we got this old growth, it's
16 surviving that natural flora. When we do
17 these projects and approve them, what you
18 will see, and I was looking at the Ten Mile
19 and Beck Road project, I think it's Vallencia
20 (ph) where they put in the hedge, it's not.
21 It wasn't the right landscaping. So last
22 year they died, they're under warranty,
23 sometimes they replace it, sometimes they
24 don't.

25 So the question is, with old

1 growth flora, should we protect it? Should
2 we keep the older trees, should we allow the
3 developers to do clear cutting and even
4 though it's economically viable to do that,
5 trust me, I know what they cost, and
6 require -- be a little more stringent on --
7 let me rephrase that. We should be a little
8 more particular on what we let get cut down.
9 That was brought up in the council meeting in
10 several of our questions.

11 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Address
12 that. Barb, that came up two or three
13 sessions ago, we were talking about the
14 woodland ordinance in general, maybe again,
15 have Pete show up and provide his input
16 relative to what that ordinance is, and then
17 try and find that wonderful balance between
18 taking everything down and, you know, just
19 I'll throw money at it, here is your tree
20 replacement.

21 I think Mr. Schultz was here
22 as well, I know he was cringing because there
23 are certain things we can and can't do
24 relative to that, so --

25 MS. MCBETH: I wonder if it would

1 be appropriate at that same study session to
2 also bring up this topic and maybe have two
3 topics.

4 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Sure.

5 MR. GRECO: That would be great.
6 I think so.

7 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Now can
8 I --

9 MR. GRECO: Motion to adjourn.

10 MR. BARATTA: Second.

11 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: All those
12 in favor.

13 THE BOARD: Aye.

14 (The meeting was adjourned at 8:10 p.m.)

15 ** ** **

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25


1 STATE OF MICHIGAN)
 2) ss.
 3 COUNTY OF OAKLAND)

4 I, Jennifer L. Wall, Notary Public within and for the
 5 County of Oakland, State of Michigan, do hereby certify that the
 6 witness whose attached deposition was taken before me in the
 7 above entitled matter was by me duly sworn at the aforementioned
 8 time and place; that the testimony given by said witness was
 9 stenographically recorded in the presence of said witness and
 10 afterward transcribed by computer under my personal supervision,
 11 and that the said deposition is a full, true and correct
 12 transcript of the testimony given by the witness.

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

17 IN WITNESS THEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand at the
 18 City of Walled Lake, County of Oakland, State of Michigan, this
 19 5th day of July 2016.

20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25



 Jennifer L. Wall CSR-4183
 Oakland County, Michigan
 My Commission Expires 11/12/15