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CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We'll call to order the August 23rd, 2017 Planning Commission meeting.

Sri, can you call the roll, please.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Good evening.

Member Anthony?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Absent, excused.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Here.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Here.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Here.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Here.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Here.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Here.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: With that,
could we rise for the Pledge of Allegiance, please.

Member Lynch, could you start us, please.

(Pledge recited.)

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, sir.

With that we'll look for a motion to amend or approve the agenda.

MR. LYNCH: Motion to approve.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a motion and a second. Any other discussion?

All those in favor?

THE BOARD: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Anyone opposed? We have a motion.

We do have several items on the agenda, but there are no public hearings at this time, so this would be your chance at our first audience participation. If there's anyone in the audience that wishes to address the Planning Commission on one of the matters for consideration, please step forward at this time.

MR. ZACK: Good evening. My name is Gary Zack. I live at 359 South Lake Drive.
Although I appreciate this project, I object to many aspects of the project. The whole project in some ways appears to be poorly thought out. It destroys precious green space and prime picnic recreation are in Novi's only natural park. And such a large building intended for municipal use is really inappropriate in a park as well as in a lake front residential area. In addition, very few Novi citizens are aware of this project, and most of those who are object to it.

I object to the variances for setbacks, landscaping, allowed parking, wetland setback and tree placement. The City Council promised repeatedly that they would respect all ordinances and the neighbors. Our ordinances were put in place to protect us from inappropriate development and to maintain adequate buffers between buildings. The park is 380 acres, therefore there is no justification for any variance. How can we expect to enforce these variances on developers in the city if we do not follow them ourselves. Allowing these variances sets a dangerous precedent and is disrespectful to the neighbors. If the building were relocated to another property or was 4800 square feet as shown in the conceptual plan presented by the city prior to the August 2016 ballot,
these variances would not be needed.

I object to the addition of any unnecessary traffic on residential South Lake Drive. South Lake Drive is a unique and very dangerous situation. You have a road bisecting residents' lake front yards, many residential driveways, and a path with bikes and pedestrian traffic including small children and animals, all of this on an already severely overloaded residential road. The goal should be to decrease the traffic on the road, not increase it by any amount. I also question -- object to the traffic study. The numbers in the study do not make sense. If there are 318 trips per average day and you divide by 24 hours, you get 13.2 trips per average hour. How can the maximum peak traffic hour add only 13 additional vehicles per hour? Even with the conservative assumption that traffic is evenly spread out over 24 hours, these numbers simply do not add up.

I object to the lighting plan for this development. The large amount of parking lot lights right next to houses is unacceptable as is the installation of high maintenance bollard lights on pathways in a park that is closed at dusk. I appreciate the dark sky and I'm not in favor of unnecessary light pollution in a dark area such as a
natural park.

I object to the fact that the pavilion recently constructed for handicapped access will now be located a significant distance from the nearest parking. Previously parking was located adjacent to this pavilion.

I also object that the majority of individual picnic sites available for families using the beach are now located in the rear of the park far from of the beach and separated by pavilions and paved parking areas. Thank you very much.


MS. TAO: Hi, good evening. My name is Lian Tao. I am the homeowner of 45257 Sedra Court, Novi, and I'm trying to express my concern with regard to the Taft Knoll III that was proposed.

I'm writing to say that I object to the request to develop this property, and because I'm concerned about the burden that might be placed on the public at large and the nearby homeowners in Taft Knolls I and II, in particular with respect to construction traffic, safety to the children playing in the subdivisions, home security due to construction
contractors entering our subdivision, and tree removal and timely completion. I mainly want to talk about the first three points here.

In the recent months vehicles related to preliminary work on the property -- on the proposed property have accessed the property via Jacob and the Danyas Way. The subject property has an established driveway off Taft Road, therefore there is no reason why construction traffic needs to access the property by our subdivision. The proposed site plan developer must be required to use the existing driveway off Taft Road as its construction entrance. I request a No Construction Traffic sign be posted at Jacob Drive and a No Construction Parking sign be posted at Danyas Way and Sedra Court respectively. Traffic violation tickets should be issued if construction vehicles access or park within our subdivision.

Furthermore, the weight of construction vehicles will put additional burdens on our streets which will cost unnecessary wear and tear on the road surface.

And the primary reason for our concern regarding the usage of our streets to access the development is that they put the children of our
subdivision, of our neighborhood at risk unnecessarily. The additional traffic of nonresidents will increase the likelihood of accidents of which we cannot accept.

The construction vehicles and high volume of unknown contractors entering the two-completed communities, that's Taft Knolls I and II also puts our properties at risk. In the first four months of 2017, there have been already nine daytime home break-ins occur within the City of Novi. Allowing construction vehicles to enter our neighborhoods would give the potential burglars the opportunity to pretend to be a contractor, and then break into a house when he observes homeowner schedules and knows when the homeowners are not at home. We are not open to the possibility of such risks.

In the past when the subdivision was in the process of being finished for Taft Knolls II, that is our subdivision when it was being developed, we had already experienced increased traffic to our existing homes by both contractors using our -- using our water and electricity without asking, and the potential buyers walking through our yards as if we are model homes. This type of activity
in addition to the recent home break-ins puts us at an unnecessary risk.

I think in terms of tree removal on the properties and in terms of my concerns for the timely completion of the new phase of the neighborhood I expressed to Sri.

So the owner of the property, of this proposed property is the same person who completed Taft Knolls II. After numerous extension and the broken promises, we all had very painful experiences in just getting the developer to complete his obligations, and those range from things within our homes to the completion of common areas and the sidewalks. I am confident that you can find numerous examples of issues the City of Novi has had with this developer. As past history indicates, we are sure this developer will have the same issues with this new development. With that being the case, we do not want to have any association to this development or have our community be used in this development.

Our families deserve to be left in peace with our neighborhood that has finally been completed. It is quite possible for the builder to continue his work, but not in a fashion that connects our homes to his new development. The request to
utilize our subdivision for construction traffic and to align the new development to our subdivision is an unnecessary burden and risk that we strongly object to.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

Is there anyone else?

MR. THOMOPOULOS: Good evening. My name is John Thomopoulos. I live at 425 South Lake Drive. So I live just east of the park, and I would like to talk to you tonight about the project for Lake Shore Park.

So clearly living right next to it I think it's safe to say that I'm probably most affected with the proposed new building. I know that there is a lot of concerns that neighbors have raised previously, some that are speaking tonight. I agree with those concerns, but rather than rehash the same concerns, I wanted to focus on specific plans that you have in front of you tonight, even though I'm opposed to the size and location of the building.

Having said that, I do want to thank Rob Petty and Jeff Muck. They did stop by my house to look over the plans and answer some questions that I have. So thank you, gentlemen. I appreciate
that.

The areas that I've got in particular of concern would be the current plans show new power lines going up right on the property line basically five feet from my house. I looked at the DTE and the NESC guidelines, and they recommend a minimum of 15 feet. So if there is something we can do to address that, I'd really appreciate it. Best of all, if you can bury the power lines, that would be even better, but having them five feet from my house seems like an unsafe situation.

I've asked that the existing trees between my house and the proposed building do not get taken down regardless of whether it looks like they might be diseased or not. They provide a lot of cover. I've got a two-story home and then a third-story lookout. Basically when I look west, I'm going to be looking at this building. So if we can leave the existing trees, that's beneficial for me, and that shouldn't be any cost to the city.

Given that when I'm in my kitchen, in my bedroom, on my deck, if I look west, I'm going to be looking at this building. You know, I originally built the house, it was next to a beautiful park. I think we all could agree that that's a very
desirable thing to have. We're looking at a 9400 square foot building replacing the park next to my house. If we can use a combination of solid fencing similar to what is there right now for the volleyball court with some new plantings, that can help alleviate sitting on the deck or sitting in the kitchen and watching people pulling in and out with their cars.

Because of the size of this building and the size of the parking lot, there is going to be quite a few cars coming in and out during the day seven days a week. It's a large building that is large because you're expecting a lot of people to use it. So there is going to be a lot of traffic there.

And then lastly, the key point that I wanted to bring up is with this large parking lot, there is probably going to be some new water runoff dynamics from what is currently there. It's not all asphalt right now. I know that there is plans to have some retention ponds. If we can make sure that those things are adequate so that my backyard doesn't start flooding because of the new grading, that would appreciated.

So if you do proceed with the proposed building, that once again if I could push a
button and make it go away I would, but if you do proceed with that, I'd like you to take these into consideration with the final plans.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, sir.

Anyone else?

MS. CHAKRABORTY: Good evening. My name is Debejyo Chakraborty. I am a resident of 45252 Sedra Court, and I have some concerns about the Taft Knolls III construction project.

My main concern is the construction traffic would probably try to access it through Danyas Way or through the access through Sedra Court, and we want to be assured that this will not happen and the construction traffic goes off of Taft Road and there would be a No Construction Sign in Taft Knolls I and II because we have a lot of small kids and they're always playing. I wanted to raise this to Council and have this documented at the meeting tonight.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

Anyone else? If you guys want to line up towards the side just to expedite the stuff.

MR. DUNESKE: Good evening. My
name is John Duneske. I live at 357 South Lake Drive. I would like to address the issues concerning the Lake Shore Park new building.

So it's kind of I know some of this has been said before, but I just wanted to kind of recap at least a little bit of a timeline going back to 2014 when the conceptual plan was put together and the footprint was going to be 2400 square feet, two stories, being 4800 square feet together. Then July of 2016, a couple years later, the consultants M.C. Smith came by and the building was originally in 2014 on the west side. Now it's been moved to the east side of the park. And they were -- the original building was to be built for a party, day camp, programming classes, polling. That's what it was set up for. They took it out just before the election in August of 2016, they took out the word parties in there, and the rest of it remained the same.

January 2017 City Council, I just watched the video again today, Mayor Gatt and Council members were looking at concerns that this building was not going to be big enough for weddings and big events, and that's in contrast to what the city charter is in Section 15.12 saying they can't use it for banquet facilities, parties, weddings, big events
like that. So it's in contrast to what it's supposed
to be used for. The mayor was concerned about --
not so much concerned where it was located, being at
the front where the lake is at, his concern was
bigger, he wanted it bigger. He was concerned about a
building that was going to be built, 50 years from
now, 100 years from now is it going to big enough for
what the needs for a bigger rental like that.

The conceptual plan now is -- that
you are looking at right now in August here that I
just had a chance to look at just over the weekend
here briefly, I was looking now that you're moving one
of the shelters, and again I live close to the park
where there is vegetation, I look at where the trees
-- well 42 percent of the trees or 46 percent of the
trees are being moved and relocated to other parts of
the park like this. Right now there is a natural
barrier along the fence line on the east property line
between the homes, and you're going to be moving one
of the shelters, and it's going to be moving it closer
to the retention basin where now it's going to be more
going right into -- the parking lot is going to be
going right into our homes and looking into our
bedrooms, kitchens and dining rooms and so forth like
that. So the relocation of the parking lot so close
to the property line where our house is at is a very big concern and I would like that to be addressed also.

I understand that the building was asked to be for polling. It's -- you don't need a building that is 84 -- well, almost 10,000 square feet to do polling for Precincts 11 and 12 when you're only getting at general and primary elections about 600 people a day for both precincts. I mean, that's like 46 people an hour. So the necessity to have a large facility for polling, it's not necessary to have 10,000 square feet, nor is that big -- a need of a big building like this for the library. I was speaking to the director at the library, you need about 100 square feet. You've got a library kiosk and a vending machine drop box, it takes less than 100 square feet to put in a library. So again, the size of the building -- the needs don't justify the needs or the size of the building at all.

Day camp, I have been involved in the city for 40 years with scouts working with at church doing day camps. I've done day camps at Proud Lake and all the parks around town here, and when you do a day camp out there, you don't need an indoor facility. Whether you're at Proud Lake or whatever
park you're at, Maybury, whatever it is, shelters work fine. If necessary when kids -- when children come out, and my children did it 30 years ago, too, come out to day camp, if there's going to be inclement weather, you bring a raincoat for that day, otherwise you're outside. And if it was windy or sunny -- windy out that day, you have a drop cloth or a canvas that you roll up and roll down to help protect from the sun on the shelters like that.

So a lot of the concerns that we have right now -- and you're asking removal of the trees, there is a lot of variances that are being asked to be waived.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON:  Sir, if you can summarize, please.

MR. DUNESKE: Okay. Just one minute. A lot of the variances that you're being asked to be waived I'm asking not to waive.

So we're asking the Planning Commission please go back and review what the community needs are instead of what some people want. Needs or wants. Lake Shore Park is not meant to be a community civic center building out there. Please do not approve the variances requested for the Preliminary Land Site and just go back and review what that is
there and possibly either move it back into the property where it's not going to be affecting the residents.

Thank you.

MS. ZACK: My name is Maureen Zack. I live at 359 South Lake Drive, and I've lived there since 1992. I object to the excessively large building that is being planned for Lake Shore Park.

In July 2016 a conceptual design based on the park's recreation and cultural services capital needs assessment determined that a building was needed for 4,800 square feet mostly for the kids camp. In August 2016, one month later, the voters approved a capital improvement millage which also included many other city projects.

The vote, the city-wide vote was very close. The yes vote was 50.66 percent versus no of 49.34 percent. So it just barely passed city-wide. Now, the park where the new building is going is in Precinct 11, and in Precinct 11 this millage was overwhelmingly voted down, it was voted a no vote in Precinct 11 by 61 percent of the voters.

So here we are in August 2017, and I'm looking in the packet, and the building size has mushroomed from 4,800 square feet back in July 2016 to
9,400 square feet. It has nearly doubled in size.
Consider the cost to the taxpayers. Consider the cost of building maintenance that will go on year after year.

The new plans called for only two changing rooms for the swimmers, one in the women's restroom and one in the men's restroom, totally inadequate for the crowds on the beach.

This new building as planned is not very park oriented other than for the kids camp. It functions more as a civic community center than a park building with all its multi-purpose rooms. According to the packet, the new building would have a 309 maximum calculated occupancy. This change in function from park-oriented to civic center community oriented will substantially increase traffic on South Lake Drive. South Lake Drive, a residential street, already has a dangerous mix of high traffic, drivers looking at the lake or speeding, and numerous pedestrians and bicyclists including children all using the very narrow, supposedly one-way bike lane, because there is no one-way bike lane on the other side of the street, and there is no block you can go around. So everybody is on the same narrow bike lane which is not very wide, and it's separated from the...
traffic only by a painted line.

Now, the reason for this building has been morphing around, and one of the reasons now given is for a polling location. Now, this new building is planned for Precinct 11. I live in Precinct 11, and as I said before, I've been there since 1992. Since then I have voted at an assisted living on West Park Drive, an elementary school on Novi Road between Thirteen and Fourteen Mile Roads, Brightmoor Church on Thirteen Mile Road, and where we are presently voting at Cross Point Meadows Church on Meadowbrook Road. So there are plenty of places nearby to vote, and we've never had any long lines ever the whole time I've been there.

As for senior citizens programs, frankly I'm a senior citizen and I'm not feeling the need. We have Meadowbrook, we have the city hall here. And a library presence, again, not needed. We have a wonderful library right here. And we even have a nicely decorated book box in the park. So this excessively large building and the many trees that are being removed according to the plan will destroy the up north vibe that people love at Lake Shore Park.

Furthermore, this building project is not very well-known and there is no sign in the
park about it, which is depressing citizen input. Few people would be inclined to look on the city website to discover, oh, there is a building going in.

And as far as like non-building issues --

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Ma'am, if you can summarize, please. Thanks.

MS. ZACK: Please do not put in a large building, and please there is the newly built pavilion that is near the restroom presently, it's very nice. There is handicap parking spots by it right now, and this new plan has moved the handicap spots, parking spots way away from the building, which is a problem for people who having trouble walking.

Thank you.

MR. ADAMS: My name is Mark Adams. I'm a resident, 1721 East Lake Drive. So this project won't directly affect me, but I'm here to support my neighbors.

I guess, you know, my biggest problem with this project is the process. And you say, well, we're the Planning Commission, da-da-da-da. We were supposed to have informational meetings on this project so the residents could provide their input, and that never happened. So you know, who
knows what is included in this project.

So I would encourage, you know, the Planning Commission to table this and have some informational meetings for the public or you're going to screw it up.

You know, I agree with all my neighbors, this building is probably twice as big as it should be. And I thinking on the way over, imagine this for just a second. If you went to Village Oaks Lake, the city has some property, and if you drop a 10,000 foot building inside of that subdivision, the residents would go nuts, you know.

The biggest problem is going to be traffic on South Lake Drive. It's a residential neighborhood, it's narrow, and you're going to pump all this additional traffic through. I've served on probably ten committees for the City of Novi, and one of the biggest problems we had with that area was the traffic on South Lake Drive, you know, it's been a battle for decades.

So I can probably keep you here all night, but I do think the building is about twice as big as it should be, and if I had to give you a constructive suggestion, have two buildings, put one at ITC park and make this one about half as big.
Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Anyone else in the audience wish to address the Planning Commission?

MR. BELL: My name is Adam Bell. I live at 1309 East Lake and I'm in a very unique situation here. Not only am I a local resident, but Lake Shore Drive, the Lake Shore Park was my design. I did the drafting design for it. I used to be a contractor for PEA. I'm good friends with Steve Sorenson who is here tonight. I've also been in discussions with park director Jeff Muck.

When I did this design, I took every tree and every green thought into my mind. Now, I don't frequent that park, and to be honest with you, the first time I went to that park was to do a site walkthrough. I'm sorry, I'm a little anxious right now, I'm not a good public speaker. Nonetheless, the first thing that caught my eye were these big cottonwood trees, and I told my boss we've got to save these trees. We've got to save as many trees as we possibly can to keep the neighbors happy.

I worked on that -- I worked at PEA for approximately seven months. I think I billed 160 hours to the project. So Not only again am I a
resident, but this is partially my design. I did the drafting. The blueprints that you see, the preliminary design was done by me. I have 18 years of drafting and design. I originally started doing power plants. PEA subcontracted me out. I started doing parking lot design. I said, hell, if I can design a power plant, I can sure as hell design a park.

Now, I have no knowledge about park design. The neighbor to the west, Ms. Iszler I believe is how you pronounce her name. She's the parks director for Wayne County. I strongly suggested to my boss that we get Ms. Iszler involved, because that's what she does for a living. She's been doing it for a numerous amount of years.

Mr. Thomopoulos, you were correct, this man here has the biggest concern. His line of site is going to be so impacted by that current 30 foot, 34 foot setback. That's what I still don't understand even though that I did the design. According to code it's a 75 foot setback. It's 30 feet, maybe a little more. That's ten yards. That's a first down. He has an amazing home, absolutely beautiful.

I agree that the building is a bit large. I haven't looked at the blueprints for this
building. I've been focused only on site design and parking lot layout and drainage and grading.

Now, as far as my biggest concern is, yeah, there is what did we do, 129 lots, 129 parking spaces, and -- can I approach you with a sketch?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: No, it's okay.

MR. ADAMS: Okay. Well, the City of Auburn Hills, the City of Bloomfield Hills, one of their standard parking designs is called double striped parking. That's basically where you have 10 feet center to center, and within that 10 feet is a two-feet row, two foot of four-inch parking stripe, and that essentially allows an extra buffer. So parking spaces are tight. People go to this park in big trucks, minivans, SUVs, and they have kids and they're bringing toys, beach balls, lawn chairs, bicycles. Think of how many door dings you're going to have. Think of how many car incidents you may have. If you increase that 9 foot spacing, which is City of Novi ordinance, to a 10 foot center to center, you reduce the parking spaces by approximately 10 percent. So instead of 129 you might have 113. Again, I'm in a tough spot. I've
kept quiet during many City Council meetings because I had a conflict of interest. I no longer work for PEA, but nonetheless I'm still a resident and I value the concerns of my neighbors and my friends. So this guy here in my opinion has the biggest voice amongst all of us. Respect his lot, respect his view, respect his neighborhood.

I am more than willing to answer any other questions. I worked on this job again for quite a while, and I did so many conceptual layouts that my boss says why are you doing that, that's not what I told you to do. I said, well, we need other options. I actually looked at a back door entrance down Dixon cutting through the bike trail, and it can be done. It would be about a half-mile of paved road. Yeah, it might intervene with the bike trails, but the bike trails can work around that. And by doing a back door entrance, you could reduce traffic influx.

A lot of hard work has been put into this. I know there have been a lot of voices and concerns, and there has been a lot of good thought by very high-skilled professionals. So it all goes back to my big concern is a 34 foot setback from the front versus 75 foot which is by code, and the pure scale of the building. I agree that it could probably be split
into two buildings. We did look at putting the building in the soccer field area. It wasn't very accessible, but nonetheless it could be done.

So I guess my other complaint, it's not necessarily towards you folks, but just it seems like the City of Novi has not been very transparent on this project. I didn't learn about this project until today through a Facebook posting. So I went to the city website and I looked up legal notices, and nothing appeared. The latest post was actually dated August 24th, which is tomorrow, about noxious weeds.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Can you summarize, sir, please.

MR. ADAMS: That's all I have to say. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Anyone else?

With that we'll close the first audience participation and move on to the agenda at hand.

Correspondence?

MR. LYNCH: Okay. First -- most of them have to do with Taft Knolls III, and to save time, I think Ms. Tao basically read her letter here. I also noticed that there is another very similar letter from Ms. Amy Wang that will be put into the
public record, but I don't think I can do it justice. I think that Mr. Tao explained the concerns.

There is another letter here from Jeff Gedeon, 25458 Danyas Way, Novi. He supports the landowner's right to develop, however the concerns are construction traffic, tree removal, and then the timely completion. There was some words in here about a different construction entrance and a very well-written note that will be put into the public record.

And then I have -- I believe that's all of them. Amy Wang and Ms. Tao basically have the same thing.

Oh, I do have one from Finhas Hasan, 25293 or 45293 Sedra Court basically in support of Jeff Gedeons' letter. All this will be put into the public record.

Oh, I do have one more, and this is for Taft Knolls. It's by Wendy Mutch, 24740 Taft Road. A note with concerns about traffic, the number of homes that are going to be proposed, and then infringement on the wetlands and woodlands, and this letter will be put in the public record also.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, sir.
Committee reports?

City Planner report, Ms. McBeth.


Chairperson Pehrson: Thank you.

We come to our first item which is the consent agenda, and I'll just read it. It's A123, also known as Fountain Office Park, JSP17-21. It's a consideration at the request of Etkin, L.L.C. for the approval of a traffic waiver for same-side, opposite side driveway spacing. The subject parcel is located in Section 15, west of Cabaret Drive and south of Twelve Mile Road, and is zoned OST, Planned Office Service Technology. The applicant is proposing to develop the 31.25 acre parcel for two buildings, one office/lab space of 128,936 square feet, and the other for an assembly building at 53,469 square feet including associated site improvements.

Mr. Giacopetti: I'll make a motion to approve the consent agenda.

Mr. Lynch: Second.

Chairperson Pehrson: There's a motion by Giacopetti, second by Member Lynch.

Any other comments?

Sri, can you call the roll, please.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?
MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacopetti?
MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?
MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?
MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Zuchlewski?
MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes 6 to 0.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

Next is Matters for Consideration.

Item Number 1 is Lake Shore Park Building JSP17-43. It's the consideration of NSA Architects, Engineering, Planners for the approval of the Preliminary Site Plan and Stormwater Management Plan. The subject property is located in Section 3 west of Old Novi Road and south of South Lake Drive and is zoned R-4, One-Family Residential. The applicant is proposing an update to Lake Shore Park in the City of Novi including a community center, parking lot, pavilion, and a bike
Good evening. How are you, Kirsten?

MS. MELLEM: Good. How are you?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Good.

MS. MELLEM: The subject property is located west of Old Novi Road and south of South Lake Drive in Section 3. The applicant is proposing an update to Lakeshore Park including a 9,400 square foot community center, 129 parking spaces, a large pavilion, a shed addition to the existing toilet facilities, and a bike path.

The subject property is currently zoned R-4, One Family Residential. The properties to the west and east are also zoned R-4. To the north is Walled Lake.

The Future Land Use Map indicates Public Park for the subject property. The properties to the west and east are indicated as single family.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Can we get the images on the monitors in front of us if that is possible, please. Thanks. Sorry.

MS. MELLEM: The site contains woodlands and wetlands, but not in the areas of the proposed development.
The proposed project is focused on South Lake Shore Drive. Three structures are proposed:

One is a 9,400 square feet community center with rooms to support Lake Shore Park daycamp and to serve as a voting location for two precincts.

Two is a new, large, open-air pavilion for visitors to picnic and host events.

Three is a shed addition to the existing toilets building near the south end of the park to store maintenance equipment.

Site amenities include an amphitheater and covered porch adjacent to the community building, 129 parking spaces including 7 barrier free, 46 bike parking spaces, several new playgrounds and active recreation spaces, rain gardens, and a bike path.

The applicant is seeking four waivers from the Planning Commission and two variances from the ZBA:

1, a landscape waiver for lack of berm along South Lake Shore Drive.

2, a landscape waiver for lack of street trees along South Lake Shore Drive.
3, a landscaped waiver for
relocation of foundation plantings away from the
foundation.

And, 4, Section 9 facade waiver for
underage of brick and overage of standing seam
metal.

The first ZBA variance was for
reduced building setback from the front yard.

The second ZBA variance is for
reduced building setback from the east side yard.

The Planning Commission waivers are
all supported by staff. The first landscape waiver is
due to topography of the site and maintain the beach
access. The second landscape waiver is due to not
enough room between the street and right-of-way to
place the street trees. The third landscape waiver is
supported because the foundation plantings will appear
to be at the foundation when planted across the
pathway and meet the intent of the ordinance.

The Section 9 facade waiver is
supported because the underage of brick is due to the
extensive use of stone which is visually equivalent to
brick and the use of materials provides well-balanced
proportions and composition of materials.

The site plan was reviewed as a
combined Preliminary and Final Site Plan. The majority of viewers have recommended the Preliminary site plan, but have not recommended the Final Site Plan. Therefore, once the Planning Commission makes their decision, the applicant will be submitting a Revised Final Site Plan to address the comments in the review letters.

The Planning review noted that the building does not meet the setbacks of the district as it pertains to non-residential buildings in residential districts, which requires a 75 foot setback from all parcel lot lines. The building is deficient on the north and east sides and requires ZBA variances. The bicycle parking location is further than 120 feet from the main entrance and the applicant in the response letter has stated that they will move the racks closer to the building entrance and alleviate this required waiver. There are some items that need to be addressed on the Revised Final Site Plan submittal.

The Engineering review had minor comments, which most of them pertain to the Final Site plan requirements.

The Landscape review noted the three waivers that are needed. In addition, the
Landscape Architect is requesting additional landscape screening along the east side of the building between the proposed building and the residents on the east.

The applicant has responded in the response letter that two of the items the Landscape Architect noted as potential waivers will no longer be needed as they will meet those standards.

The Traffic review did not identify any waivers required and only had minor comments, which pertain to the Final Site Plan submittal requirements.

The Facade review identified the need for a Section 9 facade waiver for the underage of brick and overage of standing seam metal, which is supported by the consultant. The underage of brick is because the applicant has proposed a mostly stone facade, which is visually equivalent to the brick. The overage of the standing seam metal is because of the roof lines. Overall, the building exhibits well-balanced proportions and composition of materials.

The Fire review is the only reviewer that is not recommending the Preliminary Site Plan due to deficiencies that are required to be on the site plan. The applicant has stated in their
response that the three items will be addressed on the next site plan submittal.

The Planning Commission is asked tonight to consider the Preliminary Site Plan and Stormwater Management Plan. The applicant, staff, and consultants are here to answer any questions you have regarding this project.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

Who from the city would like to review this with us? Please come up.

MR. RAY: Good evening. My name is Frank Ray. I'm president of NSA Architects, Engineers, Planners. I'm here tonight to just give a brief introduction of the project, and I'm also representing our entire design team which is sitting here behind me, and Jeff Muck is going to be answering any questions related to programming and operations of the building.

Can I get the colored site plan up there?

MS. MELLEM: It should be on your desktop.

MR. RAY: It's on here, but it's not on there.

MS. MELLEM: You can switch the
computers.

MR. RAY: Thank you. What I would like to do, planning did a really good job with some of the details. What I would like to do is talk a little bit about the background on our approach to the design and how we came to the plan in front of you.

First and foremost, this is a park, and our approach to this has always been every step of the way is how can we enhance the park experience for the residents. It's not just about a building, it's not just about a playground, it's about the experience for the residents.

Our approach was to sort of step back, take a look at the master plan of this end of the park, and there was a couple of objectives that we identified early. Again, we had a programmatic requirement from the city, who is our client, to provide a certain amount of space to function in the building, and we can talk about that in a moment.

The thing that was really a concern to us is the amount of green space on the property and how we can make a cohesive site plan and take advantage of any natural features that we have on the site and maybe organize the site a little better than what we had before.
The existing site plan, you know, we had dirt access road that kind of bisected the site and separated the green spaces on the site, and one of the major decisions that were made was to relocate the access road to the west side of the site and reconfigure the east green space to allow more continuous green space for the residents. You know, we're adding a new pavilion and we're adding a small maintenance garage in addition to the existing restrooms on the south side of the site. One of the reasons we put the maintenance garage down there was also to minimize noise and disruption on the north end of the site. And so in order to maximize that green space, we decided that locating the building on the north side of the site would be really important to maximize that green space, maximize the green park experience.

The other thing that we were dealing with is stormwater management. The park really had no stormwater management. So, you know, we want to follow current ordinances, we want to do responsible, sustainable design. We added two detention ponds on the site. All the water is going to be going through those detention basins and filtered and exit into Shaw Lake. So that was a real
important goal for us to maintain and update the park accordingly to today's sustainable and responsible design standards. And the City of Novi has some very good, current, modern standards that apply, and we really tried really hard to achieve all of those standards.

The roadway itself goes through the entire site. It has parking along the entire roadway adjacent to this green space. So there is convenient parking for the entire park adjacent to the parkway. On the east side of that roadway we identified a bike lane, provided extra space for the bike lane, it connects the south shore down into the mountain bike areas to the south. There is no pedestrian crossings there, there is no vehicle crossings there, it's a very safe route for the bikers.

So, you know, our goal was to provide a new park and to bring modern conveniences and modern technology and modern solutions and sustainable solutions to the park. It's a comprehensive plan. There is a lot of nuances in the plan. We located the building to the north on the north end. The building itself is 9,400 square feet. There's 8,400 in that program area. We can discuss the interworkings of the plan if you'd like to.
The inspiration behind the design of the building was for a park setting, and our inspiration was related more to national park solutions, state park solutions, you know, how can we identify the building as a park-like building and not a municipal building. That was not our intent. We don't see it as a municipal building, we see it as a park/camp building.

The main use space is a camp of approximately 4,000 square feet. It's an inside/outside space. To the east we're providing a patio area. It's not quite an amphitheater, it's more of a patio area. There is some steps and just a simple patio, and that's really for day campers during the day to utilize the outdoor space and to play outside. It's a park, we want to enhance that.

One of the biggest design challenges we had is working with the existing road into the park and the pedestrian bridge or pedestrian tunnel underneath the road, and maintaining grades. And we're servicing the lake users with a restroom that is inside the building. One of the other goals that we had is to make that as convenient as possible for the lake users. So there is two sets of restrooms in this building, they're each about 500 square feet.
It's 1,000 square feet just for restrooms, and the square foot adds up quickly in buildings. So there is an outside access directly into these restrooms, you do not have to go through the building to utilize these restrooms. There is a graded walkway without any steps or any railings. It was designed to accommodate, you know, everybody, handicap accessible. Again, it's there for the lake users.

That parking that is adjacent to the building is designed for the building. It's also designed for lake users. It is convenient to the lake users. The reason for the variance that we're asking for on the north side is primarily due to some very significant grading challenges that we have on the north side of the site, and that northwest dimension that we have between the roadway and Shaw Lake is very tight, and even as it is we have a six-foot retaining wall on the south side of that parking lot. So for every five feet we move that building south, that retaining wall gets another five feet higher. So that was a real challenge for us, and that was one of the main reasons we're asking for zoning variance for the front yard setback.

That side yard setback, we're still working on it. We're trying really hard. We want to
accommodate our neighbor to the east. We think we're going to make that work, and that's something that we can discuss in detail. You know, we're really close to a permanent solution that will not allow that variance, so we're happy about that. We have a little more flexibility east and west than we do north and south.

With that I'd just like to turn it over to you for questions. And again you can feel free to give us any input that you can to make this project a success. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

With that we'll turn it over to the Planning Commission for consideration. Who would like to start?

MR. GIACOPETTI: I'll start. I have a lot of concerns about this project. Some of them were expressed by the community members, some of them are -- they're not -- we're not in the business of reviewing programmatic needs, and we understand that and it's helpful to understand how the project was to come together, but my concern is that we're trying to squeeze I guess a square peg into a round hole here where we're trying to build a facility in a space that can't accommodate it with -- under our
current ordinances without some variances. That is my primary concern really. And we probably could -- with a greater budget we probably could accommodate this project and accommodate all the other concerns as to why you placed it there. And I think -- you know, I respectfully disagree with our facade consultant. Again, it seems like budget was driving the facade and the design of the building as opposed to holding ourselves up to the same standard that we hold developers to. And we've had this discussion before about the pavilion restrooms. So I'm -- did you look at other sites for the building, or was it just cost prohibitive to accomplish that?

MR. MUCK: So, no, we did not. This has mainly been driven as far as the north end enhancements to the residents on the north side. We've heard repeatedly over the years we've turned away kids from our daycamp. We have 60 kids a day on average at the daycamp, and at times we have 60 kids on the waiting list.

MR. GIACOPETTI: I'm sorry, let me clarify, Jeff. Did you look for other sites within the park, not elsewhere in Novi? It's an enormous park.

MR. MUCK: Actually we did, and I
believe as Frank mentioned earlier, we looked at placement in the back of the park. That was in fact brought up by council members at one point. But as we dove further into that, it was going to increase costs. We were going to have to build a second building at the front of the park anyway to accommodate beach users. Now you're going to need two parking lots, you're going to move the building farther away from the beach, so the camp kids or any programs that might be in that building wanting to use the beach would be much farther away, so --

And then the thought process of going through doing an entrance through 12 1/2 and Dixon, the amount of trees you would have to take down, the rerouting the mountain bike trails was going to be extremely disruptive, not to mention the utilities cost to put the building in a different area of the park.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Sure. What about a structure that was multiple levels as opposed to flat?

MR. MUCK: Well, we originally were planning a two-story building. As it's referenced, our capital needs assessment in 2014 indicated that, and we had a conceptual plan that we would place that
in the existing driveway. As we moved through the process and even went to City Council and talked about a two-story building, there was debate about whether one or two stories was appropriate. And as we got feedback from council and park commission and residents, it didn't appear that there was that type of desire for a two-story. So now we went down to a one story.

I could address the issue about a 4,800 square foot original building. That was before the election in November when we had some voting issues at our precincts, and that's what really necessitated some of that increase in size.

But mainly we were still looking at large rooms in that building, because we needed it for daycamp licensing. There are very strict rules regarding daycamp licensing as to the amount of square footage you can have per number of kids. So in order to get -- accommodate up to 100 kids in that large room, we would need it to go to that square footage.

MR. GIACOPETTI: That's very helpful. And I just want to say I appreciate the city's efforts to frugally use our tax dollars, but on the other hand, it's not my role here today at the table, which is to review these with the same
standards that we hold commercial developers to. So
like I said, I'm struggling with it, but I'm looking
forward to feedback of the other members of the
commission.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you,
Member Giacopetti.

Member Greco.

MR. GRECO: A question before I
speak to you, Jeff, for the consultant or the
architect or the engineer. You indicated that with
regard to the neighbor to the east, I believe that's
the gentleman right there, you indicated that we may
be able to work with the appropriate setbacks so a
variance is not necessary?

MR. RAY: Correct.

MR. GRECO: What is it going to be?

MR. RAY: Well, what we're looking
at is making the patio area a little smaller, and
we've been working at a redesign at the transition
from the under road pathway up to the building. And
there was a little bit of green space that we picked
up in that redesign, so we thought we'd move the
building over and accommodate that requirement.

MR. GRECO: What about the plans
for the trees? Looking at some of the -- I mean, the
photographs that we see aren't often the best because they're taken from the side, and I've been out there, but there is a tree line, right, between his property?  

MR. RAY: Yes.

MR. GRECO: Are we removing the trees, replanting them, leaving them there? What is the plan?

MR. RAY: There is no work happening in that area of the site other than the overhead line. We can talk about that a little bit.

MR. GRECO: Right.

MR. RAY: The plan is to leave those trees alone. There is nothing on the plans to touch any of those trees at all. And then we're going to enhance that area actually by walking the site and physically locating trees and bushes wherever we need to to screen that view to everyone's acceptable level. I mean, it's going to be -- the minimum is the 80/90 requirement for screening, and hopefully we'll make that better. But we're going to hand work that area. And there is no real construction happening right there.

MR. GRECO: Okay.

MR. RAY: And by moving the building a little more, you know, we're trying to be
as sensitive as we can, and we're working as hard as
we can, and we're pretty sure we'll be able to
accommodate that.

MR. GRECO: And what about the
power line issue that was raised by the resident? He
indicated it was 5 feet now and it should be 15.

MR. RAY: There is an existing
power pole that is on his property on the property
line that is where the service from this area that
we're relocating comes from. We have to tie into that
pole at some point. We have to work with DTE, okay,
so it's hard for us to stand and say this is what we
can commit to. So we have been going through the
process right now working with the service planners.
We've started that process. We want to get all those
options in front of us, and we're going to select an
option that satisfies everybody. So until we can work
with DTE and see what exactly the options are, it's a
little hard to commit either way.

MR. GRECO: Make a representation.

MR. RAY: I do know -- I can say
this from just past experience is that they will not
build a line 5 feet from his house. So there are --
he's right, there are setback and easement
requirements. We just can't be that close to a
structure. So when they do that planning, they
themselves will probably automatically move that line
over. But we won't know until we work with their
service planners, and that takes a specific process
and a specific amount of time. So we're working
through that process. It's their process, it's not
our process. We have to work with them.

MR. GRECO: Got it. Thank you.
I'd like to speak with Jeff again.

You know, looking at the project,
you described both the plans, and I think you
indicated that the size of the building has increased
for two reasons, number one, the daycamp issues; and
number two, some polling issues, polling place issues
that have come up. Is that the reason for the size of
the building moving from -- well, doubling in size?

MR. MUCK: Well, so the original
4,800 square feet, we didn't do any type of interior
planning for that. So as we move through this, I
think one of the things we mentioned is we now added
interior and exterior bathrooms to this. You don't
want to mix your beach goers with your activities
within the building both from a maintenance
standpoint, and then just from a functionality
standpoint. So we added two sets of bathrooms,
indoors and out, so that did increase the size of that
as well. We did add room for the library as well. So
there were multiple things other than just voting and
the camp space that added to increasing the size.

Again, I would reference that the
capital needs assessment, that is a conceptual plan.
I mean, that is very basic what you put on paper when
our consultant first recommended and took a look at
all of our parks in 2014.

MR. GRECO: So the plan for the
city, at least from your perspective, is to get this
built and construct it this way and to be utilizing it
almost immediately when it's ready?

MR. MUCK: Correct. In fact, we are at a
point that we want to get shovels in the ground
because we don't -- we would like to have this
ultimately up next summer so that we're not looking at
alternatives for our park users and for our camps.

MR. GRECO: Thank you. That's all
I have.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

Member Avedoulos.

MR. AVDOULOS: Thank you. I first
saw the plan at a Walkable Novi committee meeting, and
I thought the layout was done very nicely. I think
the positioning of the building looking at it
initially I had no issues with I think where it's
positioned and then having sidewalks leading to the
existing sidewalks so that beach goers can get to it
relatively easily. The way the parking lot is laid
out is my nicely done, too, because you do have some
handicap access and then you have a walk that cuts
through it.

Then as we start looking at
crains of those who are around this, especially the
neighbor to the east, and I'm looking at a site plan
here where I see a 75 foot setback, and it looks like
the building is encroaching into that setback by about
10 feet or so. And it was indicated that if we can
look at maybe reducing the size of that amphitheater
and pushing that building further west to give a
little bit more buffer, I think that would be
appreciated.

Is there any way that we can, you
know, reduce the building size at all by 10 percent?
The only reason I ask that is is the parking
associated with the square footage of the building, or
is the parking associated with the anticipated use of,
you know, maximizing for people to park at the park?

MR. RAY: I believe in planning's
analysis based on those standards the required parking is at 83. We provided 129. But we're spreading this parking out throughout the park, and in that -- in those two parking lanes, that second lane closer to the park services the park as well, and it services lake goers. So it's not 100 percent due to the building size. I don't know if we made the building a little smaller if we would reduce the parking. In order to have an effective potential for redesign, we would have to eliminate one whole row of parking. It's not two spaces, it would be the entire row.

So reducing the building 10 percent and overlaying ordinance requirements isn't necessarily going to help us. You know, there is a lot going on here, there's an overlap of uses, and we tried to overlay all the uses, and there’s a lot of nuances. So that was part of the challenge that we had and why ultimately we decided to ask for a variance.

MR. AVDOULOS: And the reason I ask is because if we can move the building to the west, then I'd also like to see if we can move the parking a bit, almost for the parking, edge of parking to align with the edge of the building so that the parking is not sort of overhanging into the setback, and then
light pollution going into the neighbor's lot.

MR. RAY: Yeah, I understand the concept. Our -- when you look at the plan, and if you overlay the grading, that driveway approach into that parking is already close to a maximum standard. If we move that parking closer -- and if we eliminate parking, we eliminate four rows each 9 foot you move it, you can make the parking lot smaller east and west and ultimately gain it, but we'd lose a significant amount of parking. Now we're doing a pretty good amount of screening on the east end of that parking lot.

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes, I see that by the landscape plan.

MR. RAY: And the elevation is up quite a bit higher as well. We feel pretty confident we're not going to have any hardships to the neighbor, and we'll work with them to do whatever we can to make sure that that's not going to happen. But space is so critical and the grades are so critical to this area, and you'd lose program in order to make it happen.

MR. AVDOULOS: The 9,400, is that the square footage of the usable space? Does that include the --

MR. RAY: That's gross outside,
MR. AVDOULOS: So where the columns are and the overhang?

MR. RAY: It's the footprint of the perimeter walls of the building. It does not include the patio areas where those columns are and the overhangs that are generated there.

MR. AVDOULOS: So then the footprint is a little bit bigger, so probably 12,000 square feet?

MR. RAY: From a -- if you take into consideration the overhangs, roof overhangs, it's a bigger footprint, yes.

MR. AVDOULOS: Okay. In all honesty I have no issue with the look of the building. I think it parallels the design of looking at, you know, more park buildings, national park buildings. So that wasn't as big of a concern. And I can't remember if I did see this before or not. But I think taking into consideration those that are around there and then trying to understand the program and seeing if there is anything that could be, you know, reduced out of that project to sort of help with the size of the building and make sure that it's right sized. I mean, I'm looking at it to see if there was an
opportunity to rotate it 90 degrees so that you can, you know, maybe maximize some of that setback. But then again I think it looks better in this orientation. I don't mind it being up close to the -- so I don't mind the front setback as much as the side setback. I think being respectful of the neighbors are the most important issues.

And then the electrical line that was being discussed, is that an overhead line from the new building to the power pole?

MR. RAY: There is an existing overhead line that basically bisects the building, comes onto the site to a pole, and then goes over east behind the building. It's like an L-shaped configuration. It's right in the middle of the building.

MR. AVDOULOS: Okay. Only because if there's any opportunities that I work on on different projects, we try as much as we can to bury the lines. So that, one, I think it's a safer situation, especially with any kind of inclement weather, you're not worried about that landing on the building. But whatever we can do to work with DTE and whatever utilities.

MR. RAY: When we get the options
from DTE, we'll present it to the city and maybe the building moving over more will give an opportunity. We do not want to bury a line in that tree line. So that was the other concern, not to effect that tree line in any way. It's hard to control DTE once you start them.

MR. AVDOULOS: But I think if we can really work to push that over and sort of mitigate some of the concerns on the east side, that would be appreciated. For the citizens who spoke, you know, that's greatly appreciated.

The site and the project itself, you know, addresses all the concerns with AD accessibility and all code-related items, and looking at how traffic is in and out, I like the fact that it was all pushed to the west and it comes in nice and clean. The added parking along the drive is a great amenity also. But again looking at maybe what was thought to come to this location and then what has been presented might be a little bit of a concern that the citizens had with transparency and understanding where this project was headed and where it came from, and, you know, for us, too, there are times a lot of the projects, we see them for the first time, so we're just looking at the information and reacting to it and
trying to make the best decision, you know, for
everybody all the way around.

MR. RAY: I would like to clarify
actually two things. The location of the building
is -- it's a real tight dimension north and south, and
the other concern we had with that positioning is the
grades drop off pretty severely as you move south, and
positioning that finished floor so that it had the
correct relationship to the road, because if we move
that building, as we move it south it goes down, and
driving by and looking at the roof of the building is
just not attractive to us. That's one of the --

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes, I think the
north/south I have no issue. It's more the east and
west.

MR. RAY: The other comment related
to the past, what was shared and transparency.
Because we did the concept design for the vote last
year, and that concept design was a two-story 10,000
square foot building, it was not 4,800 square feet.
That was the original needs assessment the year or two
before. And I want to just add that time line and
correct that time line in terms of what was presented
to the voters with the bond vote, okay. Because the
4,800 was the needs assessment, but when they came to
us and asked us to do a concept design to see what
could fit on the site and work with this bond program,
we designed -- we did a quick little study based on
the current needs that the rec department had and
ended up with a two-story building that was about
4,800 square feet each floor. So I want to make sure
we're clear on how that all came to fruition with the
city.

MR. AVDOULOS: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you,
Member Avdoulos.

Member Zuchlewski.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Just two comments
I guess. Edison, wonderful people Edison people. You
know, I feel like Trump here talking about Edison.
Anyways.

MR. RAY: They're one of our
clients, too.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: I had thought
about the idea of putting in another pole and they can
run their service over to that pole and then run under
ground to where we need it to be and come up with a
transformer or whatever near that building. So I know
that's very doable, you've just got to get them in
real early.
MR. RAY: Right.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: So Edison I think will work with us. I like the idea very much of not touching the landscaping to the east, not taking any of that down, and then working on site for individual blockage and whatever to maintain those elevations. I think the plan is beautiful.

The only question I have about the interior of the plan, if we were looking to cut a little bit of square footage maybe, is it necessary that we have those family restrooms? What dictates that I guess? You know, each building dictates certain function and whatever restrooms and whatever, whether it's a restaurant or hospital. What dictates the family restrooms, because that would cut out half the restroom space.

MR. RAY: There's code considerations, building code considerations here, but also you have to consider the usage of the building. This building services the youngest to the oldest. It's not a commercial office building where we can make an argument that a family restroom wouldn't be logical. We make design decisions based on usage, not minimum code or not to save square footage. So family restrooms in this type of facility as a camp building
is absolutely the right thing to do. There is a lot of families that are going to be using this facility, parents picking up children, and, you know, our vision throughout the park, the analogy we always use was that parent with a stroller with a newborn picking up a five-year-old, you know, how do they accommodate the families going through that process, and that was really the logic behind that.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI:  And the existing restroom facilities that are there now, they're going to remain, correct?

MR. RAY:  No.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI:  They're coming out?

MR. RAY:  They're coming down.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI:  Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON:  Member Lynch.

MR. LYNCH:  Just my two cents worth. I agree with the comments of my commissioners, but the only thing that I have heartburn about is on the east side, and my position is either shrink the building or somehow find a way to make that setback the way it should be. The north doesn't bother me, but I put myself in the homeowner's position over there, and think about it, if you were there, that
won't be fair. And you think that you can do the setback?

MR. RAY: We're pretty sure.

MR. LYNCH: Okay. But just so you know my position, if you can't do the setback, I won't approve it just on that side, because I don't think it makes sense.

MR. RAY: We would welcome that condition.

MR. LYNCH: Okay. But other than that, I think you guys did a great job with the space that you had to work with. And with the task you were given, I do like what you've done, but I am cognizant if I put myself in that individual's situation, you know, and we should do that as a city representative, and I think it can be done, but if it can't, then we've got to change the building.

MR. RAY: Right.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you. Members or if I might just for two seconds.

Ms. McBeth or Mr. Muck, walk through for me what the city did relative to community awareness of the overall project going forward from maybe this time and going backwards? Where did we start and how did we get to this?
MR. MUCK: I can start at the very start. Before we had the CIP vote, there was a CIP informational meeting held at Lake Shore Park to discuss this project with the entire CIP. I can tell you that one resident attended that. That moved then into the --

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Notification for that kind of meeting occurs how?

MR. MUCK: That was all on social media. That was through all the city's regular communication avenues as part of the CIP vote.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Okay.

MR. MUCK: We move then into July 2016. We did have a Parks Commission meeting where our finance director did a presentation on the CIP. This was a top focus of discussion at that.

In October of 2016 I actually presented at the Lakes Area Homeowners Association annual meeting on this. Got a lot of feedback at that meeting.

January 9th, 2017 we had a City Council meeting presentation. That's where a lot of the discussion came in about rentals and size of the building, everything along that line.

The next meeting after that Council
did actually get more citizen input. We had quite a few residents put their comments on record.

In May we had -- and then continuing throughout that it was spoken about at Park Commission meetings.

And then June of 2017 our Park Commission, we reinforced that this was not a banquet center.

June 19th the city manager did a report to Council.

June 23rd we did some more web updates, city web pages, because throughout this whole process we were in design and having these discussions about size-ability and placement and pathways and everything.

I've done additional presentations in July at our Rotary Club to update people on that. And the City has continued to put things out on their social media including a couple recent videos by Mayor Gatt, myself, and the City Manager Auger updating the status of this program or this project.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Is that a fair summary, Ms. McBeth?

MS. McBETH: That's an excellent summary.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: So the point of that is that while I can appreciate people's discussion of this from the public standpoint, ample opportunities -- I just want it to be known that this was not done in a vacuum, this was not done behind closed doors. This was done with every intent of being transparent to the general public, the community at large, and I heard social media, I heard meetings, I heard presentations. So I don't know what other means or methodologies could be employed. But I applaud the City for the effort that they've gone through in going through and making this and communicating it to the citizens. I don't want it to be understood by anybody as they leave this meeting or if they're watching that this was done last week and here we are with a plan and we're going to look at it going forward. So I applaud what you've done to promote and educate the community.

The other item that I would like to address is the traffic on South Lake. So coming from the east to the west you're coming uphill over a curve. And I read the traffic study. I will say that I agree with the study, but I've also seen every study that has come in front of us. There seems to be a lack between what is written in paper and what you
often see at an intersection when you're trying to get
from Point A to Point B at rush hour. And knowing
that traffic is the number one concern, I think just
about every topic that we talk about in the city,
programmatically when you're having mom and dad drop
off Billy and Sue and whoever and trying to get back
in and out of the building back onto South Lake, is
there the potential for egress further west to
alleviate some of the traffic?

And then I guess I'm concerned
about somebody making a left-hand turn going west out
onto South Lake, and it's a 25 mile an hour road at
that point, and having someone coming from east going
west and looking at someone in a bathing suit on the
lake, and -- you know, so I'm troubled by the fact
that the traffic consultant did his job, but there
just always seems to be a difference or a delta
between the paper study and actually what we see. Is
there any relief that we can provide with a turning
lane or anything like that on South Lake?

MR. MUCK:  I would have to take
that back to our consultants.

If I could make one comment,
though, on the traffic flow. When we're looking at
programming that building and you're talking about the
main heavy uses are during the summer 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., that is just -- that is not 7:00 a.m. 100 cars coming in. It is flow of traffic, ones and twos in and out throughout the day. You're not going to see a heavy, steady flow of 50 cars trying to get in that building at any one time, so that helps.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: So we just went through with the funeral home proposal at Eleven Mile and Beck, we went through that same discussion with them relative to concerns of the citizens with a funeral that is going to happen concurrently with busses meandering through that intersection. They made the offer, and I think we accepted and made it part of the motion that they were going to work with and try to alleviate as many of those conditions, nightmare conditions as possible given the road condition at Eleven and Beck. So is it your intention that that same kind of thinking can happen with this space?

MR. MUCK: Absolutely. When we look at recreation programming, we're not programming in peak traffic times. People don't want to come to a yoga class, they don't want to come to a senior program at 5:00 p.m. Our programs are going to be 6:00, 7:00, not 7:00 a.m., 8:00 a.m. We try to
program outside of that, because working parents can't
hit those heavy -- they're stuck in traffic.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: And lastly I
agree, I want to see us maintain the setback on the
east side to at least the city minimum. I'm not too
worried about the north and south. I agree with
Member Avdoulos that if there is a way -- if it has to
be moved or if the building has to shrink by 10
percent, I think that's a benefit.

Overall I think you did a wonderful
job in trying to assess the needs of what the city
wants to try to provide for the north end. There is
always that little bit of a dichotomy between the 96
split and what happens on the north end and what
happens on the south end or the south side of the
city. I think this is the city reaching out and
saying here is what we're trying to do to provide
amenities that to this point hadn't ever been
considered. So for the citizens that agreed for the
CIP budget, good on you, I think you're seeing the
results of this good work going forward, and I think
this building addresses a lot of the needs that if I
lived in that area I would want to see rather than
having to make the move down to the public library
down here at Ten Mile. It looks like you have another
comment, Mr. Ray?

MR. RAY: I would like to just clarify. With regard to the east setback, we feel very confident that we can do that. So if you want to conditionalize the approval, we would be -- I just want to make sure it's clear we do feel pretty good about it. It's a good thing.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: I was going to ask Mr. Petty about wi-fi, but I'll assume that's going to be part of the programming.

Other than that, those are my only comments. Any other comments?

Member Greco.

MR. GRECO: Yes. I would like to make a motion. In the matter of Lake Shore Park Building JSP17-43, a motion to approve the preliminary site plan based on and subject to the matters listed in the motion sheet A through G with the exception of taking out Item F which is requesting recommendation for a variance on the side yard, so removing that. And also with the traffic issues to be addressed on the final site plan. And this motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Article 3, Article 4 and Article 5 of the Zoning Ordinance and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance.
MR. AVDOULOS: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a motion by Member Greco, second by Member Avdoulos.

Any other comments?

Kirsten, can you call the roll, please.

MS. MELLEM: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: No.

MS. MELLEM: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: The motion passes 5 to 1.

MR. GRECO: I would like to make another motion in the matter of Lake Shore Park Building JSP17-43. Motion to approve the Stormwater Management Plan based on and subject to the findings of compliance with the Ordinance standards in the
staff and consultant review letters, and the
conditions and items listed in those letters being
addressed on the Electronic Stamping Set; and because
it is otherwise in compliance with Chapter 11 of the
Code of Ordinances and all other applicable provisions
of the Ordinance.

MR. AVDOULOS: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a
motion by Member Greco, second by Member Avdoulos.

Any other comments?

Kirsten, please.

MS. MELLEM: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Motion passes 6 to 0.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you,
gentlemen.

Next item on the Agenda is Emerson Park JSP17-10, and it's a Zoning Map Amendment 18.717. It's a consideration at the request of Pulte Homes of Michigan, L.L.C. for Planning Commission's recommendation to City Council for a Planned Rezoning Overlay Concept Plan associated with a zoning map amendment from OS-1 (Office Service) to RM-2 (High Density Multi-Family Residential). The subject property is approximately 24 acres and is located on the west side of Novi Road and north of Ten Mile in Section 22. The applicant is proposing development of 120 multi-family attached condominiums with frontage and access to Novi Road.

Sri, good evening.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Good evening.

The subject property was formerly referred to as Princeton Park. They changed the name to Emerson Park since you last saw it. The Planning Commission held a public hearing on May 10th and postponed their decision to a later time. It is located west of Novi Road and north of Ten Mile in Section 22. It is currently zoned OS-1 --

MR. LYNCH: Sri, can we hold on just for a second just so -- I can't hear that.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: No problem. I can wait if you want to take a small break or stretch.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: No, that's okay.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: The subject property is located west of Novi Road and north of Ten Mile in Section 22. It is currently zoned OS-1 and is being used as a vehicle storage lot and is a long-standing legal non-conforming use. All properties east of Novi Road are zoned and developed as I-1 and I-2, industrial uses. They are all master planned for industrial as well. Properties to the north are zoned OS-1. The future uses for these properties are very unlikely to change. The property on the south is currently vacant and can be developed with existing allowed office uses or rezoned to master planned commercial uses. The property to the west is zoned R-4 and is developed as a single-family detached housing development. The property contains few regulated woodlands and a large portion of wetlands with an open body of water to the south which is proposed to be preserved.

The applicant is proposing a 120 3-bedroom multi-family unit for sale residential development with frontage and access to Novi Road.
The PRO Concept shows two detention ponds on either side of the proposed entrance boulevard. The applicant is proposing private drives, public water and sewer, and emergency access off of Novi Road. Pocket parks and pedestrian walks spread throughout the development for active and passive recreation. This is not a gated community. The applicant is proposing to complete the construction in two phases.

The plan was presented to Master Planning and Zoning Committee on March 28 of 2017. Planning Commission held a public hearing on May 10th of 2017. The applicant has been working with staff since then to modify the plan to address staff's concerns. The revisions did not result in significant reduction in density. It was reduced from 6.6 dwelling units per acre to 6.2 by eliminating about nine units. However, the applicant has agreed to include the proposed maximum density, maximum building height, and the total number of units as conditions of the PRO agreement. Changes include providing additional screening from residents to the west and post office to the north, changes to the alignment of the private drive, addition of common parking spaces, and increasing the distance between driveways near the buildings.
In the past staff has expressed concerns about the density and the compatibility of the proposed development with the surrounding planned and development uses. Some of the concerns still remain, but staff notes that the applicant has made significant progress, made some changes to the layout which have alleviated most of those concerns.

A minimum of .09 acre of wetland impacts are proposed. About 20 percent of the total regulated trees on site are being preserved. The traffic review study finds that a reduction of 1,402 trips per day is estimated based on the proposed zoning change from office to residential.

The conceptual elevations provided appear to deviate significantly from the requirements of the Facade Ordinance. In the response letter the applicant agreed to meet the minimum requirements at the time of site plan approval.

The proposed concept plan would require other multiple deviations from planning, engineering and landscape requirements which are listed in the motion sheet which are supported by the staff. The list of deviations did not change since the Planning Commission last reviewed the plans on May 10 except for a few minor modifications. All reviews
are currently recommending approval of concept with additional comments to be addressed at the time of Preliminary Site Plan review.

One item of concern, as part of the public benefits, the applicant has proposed to donate $90,000 for pedestrian enhancements along Novi Road to encourage pedestrian connectivity from the development to Main Street and the Novi Town Center. The provided conceptual plan illustrating potential improvements along Novi Road along with an estimate. The applicant has contacted Scott Sinikowski, a Permit Engineer from RCOC for preliminary input and have received favorable response. Staff has expressed concerns about soft costs for design and permitting and maintenance costs after construction. In the response letter, the applicant agreed to donate an additional $14,000 towards design and permitting and to include the appropriate funding towards future maintenance in the HOA master deed. Staff still anticipates that there may be some resistance to the improvements once details such as corner clearance, existing topography offset from the road are proposed from RCOC. In the event that the proposed improvements are not approved by RCOC or any other unforeseen circumstances, the applicant has indicated that the city may redirect the
funds for another appropriate public infrastructure improvement project in the project vicinity. The City may wish to consider other alternative benefits to the public land, such as the historic city cemetery north of the subject site or other public land in the area.

The Planning Commission is asked tonight to make a recommendation on the proposed PRO, Planned Rezoning Overlay, and the Concept Plan to City Council. The applicant Joe Skore from Pulte Homes is here with his Engineer Bill Anderson. Staff is available to answer any questions you have for us.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, Sri.

Does the applicant wish to address the Commission?

MR. ANDERSON: Good evening. Thank you. My name is Bill Anderson. I'm with Atwell. We're the engineers and planners for the project. And as Sri said, Joe Skore with Pulte Homes is here as well.

Again, we are proposing a 120 town homes off Novi Road as she indicated. The plan is sitting there. We were in front of you about three months ago, and we've gone through quite a bit of
changes working with your staff getting to the position where we have a full recommendation for approval from your staff.

Briefly, that is just the location there on Novi. We have residential to the south. We have a nice wetland immediately to our south, and wetland city property to our north next to the post office across from Michigan CAT if you're familiar with the property. Again, that's the existing property as it sits. It's about a third wetland on the south side. It's used for storage of recreational vehicles and such currently. So we're looking at a nice redevelopment use.

Just briefly to recap, since we were before the commission in May, we've reduced the unit count from 125 to 120 town homes. We've added about 40 additional four season plantings along that western buffer that will give a better screening year round for that buffer area. And we've shared -- we've been to the site, shared those plans with the adjacent community. We've added a wood fence. We've added benches to the playscape and really expanded that area adjacent to the pond. So we think we've got a really, really nice play area and vista off to our wetland complex to the south.
We've added more parking throughout since there seems to be a shortage through this type of use in the community, and we've made driveway improvements, modified the emergency access way into the site, secondary access, working with your fire chief, and we've modified the road geometry quite bit, that north east-west line to improve the vista and drive through there. We've also offered to upgrade our garage doors. We're proposing to have windows throughout our garage doors and will really improve that internal circulation and view throughout the community. Again we're proposing a PRO RM-2 underlay.

As far as the Novi Road enhancements, we've talked to the county about what could be acceptable. You saw a sample of the plan we could propose and do out there. As long as there is improvements on the Novi Road which is identified in your Master Plan, something we're interested in the project, again we're proposing to make a $104,000 contribution, that's a $90,000 contribution, and to cover the design costs, an additional 15 percent, so a $104,000 contribution to the Novi Road enhancements. And again, we did a design and budget to show what you could illustrate. Everyone wanted to kind of see what would we get for that money, and it really illustrated
that. We've talked to the Road Commission. It seemed
to be something acceptable.

If the city wants to do something
different on that Novi Road corridor, you own property
immediately north of our site. Maybe there is an
amenity you want to do there. Or there's a city
cemetery just downtown, between our property and town.
If there's an art piece or something you want to do
there, we're fine with that donation, that that money
be used for that use improving the Novi Road corridor.
So that's what we're proposing, and I just wanted to
be clear, I know you just wanted to confirm what is an
appropriate option and what that money might cover.

Again, from our perspective, just
to recap quickly, when we started we were at 140 units
in our original concept plan. When we went to
pre-application and the Master Plan Zoning Committee,
we looked at all the natural features and all those
setbacks and everything, we had very positive
feedback, but we went down to about 129 town homes.

When we were in front of you in
May, we thought we had a pretty favorable feedback
from you. We had the building separation, and one of
the big things we negotiated with the city was finding
the balance of what that corridor through the town
home development is, how much green space in front
between sidewalks and the road or between -- behind
the buildings, and that really impacted us, but that's
what we brought to you in May, 125 units and kind of
defined what that road corridor was going to be.

And then for the last three months
we've been really fine tuning the amenities on site
and again tweaking that northern road geometry, and
that's taken us down to where we are today at 120 town
homes.

I have all the slides from May if
you want to hear it, but we're open for questions as
well.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you,
appreciate that.

With that I'll turn it over to the
Planning Commission for their consideration. Who
would like it start?

Member Lynch.

MR. LYNCH: Yes, thank you. That's
what I wanted to see. So we started at 140, just kind
of shoe-horning stuff in there. We got down a little
bit, you know, ten units. This last design though, I
do kind of like this one. You changed the orientation
of the buildings it looks like?
MR. ANDERSON: Since May?

MR. LYNCH: It just looks different. It looks like it's more open, although we're only losing five units, right?

MR. ANDERSON: Yes, we've lost five units. And on the southern road where we had the playscape, we lost a couple of units, we opened that up, added a couple parking spaces right there and some additional benches. So you have really nice vista off to the south. And then on the north we put some more dramatic curvature into that road so as you go through the community, it would feel better.

MR. LYNCH: Yes, I like that.

MR. ANDERSON: Then we offered the upgraded garage door, and that was again working with your staff just fine tuning the details. But, you know, every detail has a unit impact as well.

MR. LYNCH: No, I understand, I understand. And hopefully you took that as constructive feedback, but right now we've got a bunch of RVs parked out there, and this is certainly more attractive than that. And at the same point, we want to make sure that what we do here, we're not going to do anything that we wouldn't do anywhere else in the city. I think it's an appropriate use for that land.
The traffic I think really is governed by that light
that's in front of the post office. There is a light
right there in front of the post office on Novi Road.
So the ingress and egress into that subdivision
shouldn't be --

MR. ANDERSON: We don't anticipate
a problem. It will be significantly less than what it
is zoned for.

MR. LYNCH: Yes. I guess overall I
like what you've done. I appreciate your working with
us. I know it's been a long, arduous process, but I
think that this latest design I think I can certainly
support based on what I've known about since the
beginning of this project. So thank you very much for
bringing this. I appreciate what you've done.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

Anyone else?

Member Greco.

MR. GRECO: Yes, thank you, through
the chair. With such experienced applicants,
including Pulte Homes, which does a great conceptual,
great product, great plans, everything does look
great. My only problem is is that I don't think a
condo complex belongs there on Novi Road. I don't
think -- I appreciate the enhancements, I appreciate
all the work that has been done. When I saw this in May I believe for me it may have been about the first time that I saw it, I believe I expressed I didn't think that it fit there. It is close to the Panera Bread and the downtown area. I don't think it's a walkable type of situation. I mean, yes, there are sidewalks on Novi Road and you can walk out the entrance and walk north on Novi Road, but it's not a downtown type area, you've got to cross that bridge over the train tracks.

So while it's as usual a beautiful product, it's over the bridge. I mean, you know, it's a beautiful product, beautiful plan, but with respect to the rezoning of the area and basically a commercial area on that Novi Road, I don't think it fits. Those are my comments.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

Anyone else?

Member Giacopetti.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes. I just want to say that I think this -- I'm going to support -- I initially felt that way. I think this project has come a long way, and I appreciate your hard work for working with us to do that. It did strike me at first as being out of place, but I can't see really any
other use immediately or even in the near term going
into this location, and it's a dramatic improvement
over the sort of blighted property that is there now,
and the offset from Novi Road seems to be enough. I
wish the sub to the west had a connection, but there's
nothing we can do about that now because there is
nothing there. I hope that the city which owns the
property to the north takes advantage of an
opportunity to create some sort of transitional
development, and so that's on I guess us. So thank
you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Member
Avdoulos.

MR. AVDOULOS: I, too, struggled
when I first saw this, and continued to go up and down
Novi Road just to see what makes sense or if this
makes sense. And, you know, looking at what is -- you
know, trying to look at what is across the street,
what is going to happen in the future, but I think in
all honesty the work that has been done and what could
end up being there, this might be the appropriate
development, and then hopefully this will spur on a
different type of chain reaction to something. And
I'm hoping that the city does take advantage of this,
and then dovetails off of it. So I appreciate it.
The one thing I am struggling with is also the road -- Novi Road enhancements that were presented, and is that something that is going to really work or do we need to further develop so that these enhancements can also sustain themselves or be sustained, because you're not going to I believe have as many people walking up and down here initially. If it gets developed further, that might be the point. So what I was also trying to do is I went to Twelve Mile between Novi Road and West Road where we have Dick's Sports on one side and then we have condominiums on the other side, and then we have office building and a little medical clinic and then a bank building and then some more condos. So I could see where if we can start establishing that kind of a rhythm, then this might be the genesis of beginning that type of development along Novi Road.

I had some concern with the traffic, but I do think that it will be less than what is currently zoned, so that's helping me with my decision. So just like Commissioner Greco, I'm teetering, but I think for what has been presented and how they worked with the city in reducing it down to something that is a little bit more manageable and more palatable, I think that I can support the
project.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

Mr. Zuchlewski, any comments?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: I think it's -- I think I commend the applicant in the way you've worked with us and cut down 20 units. That's substantial in capital on the outlay of this. I know there is always a little fluff in there, so I don't feel too bad about it.

And I think like John had mentioned, I think it's going to be a start, and I think we need this. We're trying to get more people to be downtown and walk downtown and everything, and I know it's not the exact spot that we want, but, you know, if you start here or start here, I don't know what the difference is as long as it in-fills. I think this is a real opportunity and it's much better than what is there.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, sir.

Member Giacopetti.

MR. GIACOPETTI: With that I'd like to make a motion. In the matter of Emerson Park JSP17-10 and Zoning Map Amendment 18.717, motion to recommend approval to the City Council to rezone the
subject property OS-1, Office Service, to RM-2, high density multi-family residential, with a planned rezoning overlay concept plan.

The recommendation shall include the following ordinance deviations for consideration by the City Council as outlined in the motion sheet Items A through L.

Two, applicant complying with the conditions listed in the staff and consultant review letters.

Three, if the City Council approves the rezoning, the Planning Commission recommends the following conditions be required of the Planning Rezoning Overlay agreement listed in the motion sheet Items A to C.

Four, while the applicant has offered a public benefit for improvements along Novi Road, details of the actual improvements being offered need to be further evaluated and resolved through discussion with the Planning Commission and the City Council with regard to the types of improvements and the overall costs of any easements, installation and maintenance of such improvements.

This motion is made because, A, the applicant has presented a reasonable alternative to
the Master Plan for Land Use recommendation of Community Office for the parcel as indicated in the applicant's letter dated March 20th, 2017, noting the appropriateness of a residential use for the site given the close proximity to Main Street and Town Center, and the ability for additional nearby residents to add vibrancy and support for local businesses.

B, the proposed plan meets several objectives of the Master Plan, as noted later in this review letter, including Items i through iii in the motion sheet.

C, proposed density of 6.2 units to the acre in attached town house format provides a reasonable transition between the existing recommended density of no more than 3.3 units to the acre on single-family detached residential property to the west and the non-residential uses proposed and existing along Novi Road.

D, the development plan will remove a long-standing nonconforming outdoor storage yard use on the property.

E, the city's traffic engineering consultant has reviewed the rezoning impact study and found that a reduction of 1,402 trips per day, 264 for
the a.m. peak hour and 225 trips for the p.m. peak hour is estimated based on the zone change from office to residential.

And F, submittal of a concept plan and any resulting PRO agreement provides assurance to the Planning Commission and to the City Council of the manner in which the property will be developed and offers benefits that would not be likely to be offered under standard development options.

MR. AVDOULOS: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a motion by Member Giacopetti and a second by Member Avdoulos.

Any other comments?

Sri, can you call the roll, please.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Thank you.

Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: No.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?
MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes 5 to 1.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: All set.

Thank you.

MR. ANDERSON: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Item Number 3 on the agenda is Taft Knolls III JSP16-67. It's a consideration request of 25150 Taft Road, L.L.C. for Preliminary Site Plan with Open Space Preservation Option, Site Condominium, Wetland Permit, Woodland Permit and Stormwater Management Plan Approval. The subject property is located in Section 22 South of Eleven Mile Road and East of Taft Road and is zoned R-4, (One-Family Residential). The applicant is proposing to construct up to a 15 unit single-family residential development (site condominium) utilizing the Open Space Preservation Option.

Sri.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Thank you.

The subject property is located on the east side of Taft Road north of Ten Mile Road in Section 22. The property totals about 9.6 acres.
The current zoning of the property is R-4, (One-Family Residential), on north, east and south as well. The properties on west across Taft Road are zoned Residential Acreage. The future land use designation for the property and surrounding properties on north, east and south is single family as well. Educational facility is indicated on west. The site has substantial portions of regulated wetlands along the front and rear property lines. It also has a considerable amount of woodlands along the east boundary.

The applicant is proposing a 15 unit single family residential development utilizing the Open Space Preservation Option with entrance off of Taft Road. Staff identified two existing easements which were not included in the site plan at that time. The Planning Commission held a public hearing on May 10, but postponed their decision to a later meeting so that the applicant can work with the staff to identify the actual location of the two easements in relation to the site plan and evaluate its potential impacts.

The existing drainage easement is 1.53 acres and the preservation easement is 1.51 acres. A twelve foot wide strip of land was excluded
from the easement to allow for driveway access from Taft Road to the existing home. The applicant is now proposing to dedicate a total of 5.2 acres of land into open space preservation option and is also requesting a 60-foot right-of-way through the easement. In other words, if the submitted plan is approved with the proposed easements, the applicant is proposing to dedicate an additional 2.16 acres to the city be preserved.

A bonafide plan was provided with the application which identifies how the property will be developed under conventional development standards. It is included in the plan which indicates 16 lots that can be developed under conventional standards. Staff determined that a maximum of 15 lots can be proposed eliminating Lot 11 or Lot 10 which is not feasible.

The feasibility of both the bonafide plan and the proposed Open Space Preservation Plan is dependent on Council's inclination to modify the easements. Staff has shared a memo with the City Council explaining the issues with the easements. Staff had not received any comments at that time, and has proceeded to review the plans based on the assumption that Council will be willing to consider
the modifications following Planning Commissions
review of the plan. However, we received one comment
from one Council member this morning expressing some
concern about the proposed modification. Staff's
current recommendation for Planning Commissions's
approval is contingent on Council's approval to the
easement modifications.

The applicant is requesting a
reduction of the minimum site area from 10,000 square
feet to 8,000, a minimum lot width reduction from 80
feet to 70, and a minimum side yard reduction from
25 feet total two sides to 20 feet total two sides, as
the proposed site plan utilizes Open Space
Preservation option as preserving approximately 54
percent of open space on site.

The current site plan proposes an
extension of existing Danyas Way to provide a through
connection to Taft Road. Engineering review
identified a couple of variances that are required for
lack of sidewalk on one side of the street for a
portion of Danyas Way near the wetlands, one for not
meeting the minimum stormwater detention buffers, and
another one for not providing a stub street at 1300
feet intervals. While staff supports the stub street
variance, staff is not in support of the sidewalk
waiver as the proposed impacts indicated by the applicant to the wetlands are not significant enough. Staff is not also in support of the vegetated buffer requirement as there is no precedent for the deviation and the proposed buffers do not serve the intent of the requirement. Landscape review identified two waivers for absence of required berm and five required street trees along Taft Road due to presence of existing wetlands. Staff is in support of those two.

The distance between Danyas Way and the Novi Meadows school entrance on the opposite side of Taft Road do not meet the driveway spacing requirements. Due to the estimated low volume of vehicles expected from the development, staff supports the waiver.

There are seven areas of wetlands on site. The site plan proposes about .13 acres of fill to five of these wetlands. The amount of fill does not require any mitigation measures. The site plan proposes to include wetland buffers on the back of the properties on the north side of Danyas Way.

About 66.4 percent of the regulated woodlands are being preserved. The proposed removal would require about 27 replacements, all of them will be provided on site. The removals are proposed for
development of lots and the proposed detention around the Danyas Way towards the east span.

                All reviews are recommending approval contingent on City Council approval of the variances and engineering deviations and easement modifications with additional information required at the time of the Preliminary Site Plan. The Planning Commission is asked today to consider the site plan with Open Space Preservation option, site condominium, wetland and woodland permits, and stormwater management plan. We have received some public correspondence regarding this project which was included in the packet.

                The applicant is here tonight with his engineer Mike Powell to address any concerns you have. Thank you.

                CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Does the applicant wish to address the Planning Commission at this time?

                MR. POWELL: Hello, Planning Commission. My name is Mike Powell. I'm the design engineer for the project. And I think the planning staff did an excellent job in presenting the details of this particular project, and as what was said, we were before you on May 10th in our first presentation.
Since then we've been working very carefully with staff to mitigate any of their concerns.

There are a couple of items I wanted to address before the commission tonight. First of all, the developer, Trowbridge Land Development, is very concerned about their presentation here in the city and in their relationship with the neighbors. They absolutely understand the neighbors' concern regarding the construction that might occur through the development. They are here to commit that all construction traffic will come in off of Taft Road and there will be a temporary buffer, and we'll coordinate that very carefully with the planning and with the fire department to prevent any construction traffic at all from coming through the existing development to the north.

There also seemed to be stated in a couple of the letters that there was concern of the previous developers of Taft I and Taft II. This is not the same developer. That development was done under a different developer, and by means of coordinating with a bank because of some foreclosure issues, and so this developer was not part of any of the development in Taft I and Taft II. To set the
record perfectly clear, they did purchase a couple of lots in there, but they were not responsible for any of the development requirements, and the bank was actually required to complete those improvements in Taft II.

That being said, there are a couple of requests for variations or for easement modifications. As was said, we have a request before the City Council for a slight modification in the conservation easement just to provide access into the site. Otherwise, the only access in here is through Danyas Way, and we all believe as traffic and planning, that the best access off of this site is off of Taft Road, which requires a 60 foot easement, and the city's minimum width roadway with the access through Danyas Way as an emergency access really only for the secondary access to the site.

The bigger issue is the sidewalk along the wetland area. As can be seen from the hand there along the wetlands entering Taft there on the north side of the access drive, it was just strictly my professional opinion that people have access out to Taft Road down one side of the roadway. I tried to minimize the disruption of the wetlands in that area by making the sidewalk all on the south side of the
drive so there would be a crossing on the Danyas Drive at the end of the homes there, just west of the homes, and they would cross to the south side of Danyas Way out to Taft Road, and then they could either way because there is another crossing out there at Taft Road. So they could turn south or go north on Taft Road. So it's just a -- or it was just a recommendation from a crazy engineer to try to minimize the disruption of the wetlands, but we opened that discussion up to the Planning Commission.

The other item that is a little more subjective is none of the lots encroach into any of the wetlands on this site. However, there are a number of lots that encroach the rear yards and one of the side yards, encroach into the buffer yard of the wetlands, and the request from the developer is to allow him to put signs along the rear yards and right along that buffer line notifying those homeowners, and of course it's in their Master Deed and Bylaws identifying that that is a permanent buffer easement for those wetlands letting them know that no fertilizing, no mowing, no cutting of any kind is to go beyond that 25 foot buffer line. And that probably needs additional discussion with the Planning Commission as well.
Otherwise we're asking for your approval for this open space plan. As Sri pointed out, the standard development can be done with that 15 lots. We believe the open space development substantially improves the preservation of the wetlands and fits the design of this lot or this parcel a great deal more than the standard development does. Therefore we're before you tonight to ask for the open space approval as well as recommendation to the City Council for the various modifications and the easement requirements.

And I'm here certainly to answer any questions and not belabor the design. I think the staff did an excellent job in presenting it. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, sir. One question for Barb or Sri, what would this development conceptually look like without the open space relative to where we would be encroaching?

MS. KOMARAGIRI: The one on your the screen is the bonafide plan that is submitted, which would be the alternate if they didn't go with the open space preservation option.

MS. McBETH: Just to clarify, we don't believe that they would be able to get that lot
that Sri is pointing out right there because of the
difficulty of accessing that.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Okay. Thank
you.

MS. McBETH: We would point out,
too, a couple of the homes are slightly unusual in
terms of the shape, but they would still meet the
minimum size that would be required for that district.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Very good.

Thank you, appreciate that.

We'll turn it over to the
Planning Commission. Member Lynch.

MR. LYNCH: How are you. It looks
like, you know, just listening to the comments of
homeowners and reading the letters, there's three
basic concerns, the construction traffic.

MR. POWELL: Yes.

MR. LYNCH: And they could pretty
much address that. What guarantee do they have that
the construction isn't going to be going through their
neighborhood?

MR. POWELL: The owner is certainly
willing to as I said put up a buffer there to not
allow the physical entrance to traffic. We'd have to
coordinate that with the fire department very
carefully to make sure that emergency access was in
there, but we would be able to build a permanent or a
physical buffer there.

MR. LYNCH: So no construction is
going to be going through the existing thoroughfares
that are in the existing neighbor, is that right?

MR. POWELL: Zero construction, correct.

MR. LYNCH: Okay. The second thing
was, let's see here, was timely completion of the
project. I'm looking at -- that's not what is being
proposed what is on the screen, is it?

MR. POWELL: No. That's the
standard development plan. I think the letter is
stating that the development to the north, Taft II,
took a long time, and as Planning Commission
remembers, that was during the down turn in the
economy, and so it was lost from the developer to the
bank, and another bank bought it out.

MR. LYNCH: So that was kind of the
reason that --

MR. POWELL: Yes.

MR. LYNCH: And I understand their
concern is like, God, I'm going to have to have
construction going on here for 15 years.
MR. POWELL: Right.

MR. LYNCH: But if this project is approved, odds are it's going to get developed relatively quickly.

MR. POWELL: The owner has told me it will be a six-month buildable build out.

MR. LYNCH: Then basically that's the two major concerns. The tree thing, I didn't look that you're going to violate any ordinances?

MR. POWELL: We aren't, and we're replacing trees that have to come out due to the construction, that is correct.

MR. LYNCH: Okay. The conservation easement that separates I think it's Knolls II and Knolls III, you just talked about a sign. I'm familiar with conservation easements. Who enforces those conservation easements? Does the city enforce it? I mean, yes, you can put it in the bylaws, but trust me, there's not a board in the world that's going to go tell one of their homeowners that they can't do something.

MR. POWELL: And I understand the concern. The reality is the owner has been contemplating what to do. Certainly we don't want to put chain-link fence up through the development.
MR. LYNCH: No, no. I'm more looking at an enforcement. Because what happens with these things is all of a sudden this wetland area, which is supposed to be this, all of sudden somebody starts mowing in and mowing in and mowing in, and pretty soon you've got these two places -- I mean, they're right next to each other.

MR. POWELL: Correct.

MR. LYNCH: Does the city under the wetland ordinance, would they have the authority -- so in other words, if somebody from Knolls II although -- let me back up just one second. Is this all part of one condominium association?

MR. POWELL: It is not. Knolls III will be its own independent condominium association.

MR. LYNCH: Okay. So that makes it even more interesting. Then if those Knolls II sees an infringement into the conservation easement from Knolls III, the city, they can contact the ordinance, right, contact the ordinance officer, and they can come out there and resolve that, is that how it works?

MR. SCHULTZ: Through the chair. That is how that works. It's on a complaint basis. The city doesn't have an inspection program.

MR. LYNCH: I'm doing this for a
point, because that it doesn't have it.

MR. SCHULTZ: Sure. But absolutely, if the city -- if we're the owner of a conservation easement or the benefiting party.

MR. LYNCH: Well, we are the benefiting party.

MR. SCHULTZ: Right. And we hear of a violation, absolutely, we inspect and take appropriate action.

MR. LYNCH: Okay. So the Knolls II people understand that if all of sudden this stuff starts to migrate, they have the right to contact the city to say, look, stop cutting down this conservation so we can maintain that buffer. Okay.

So the construction traffic, the primary concern, there is not going to be anything going through that neighborhood. The time of the stuff, odds are now since now it's out of foreclosure, odds are if they can start moving on this thing, within one year it's going to be done?

MR. POWELL: Correct.

MR. LYNCH: Then as far as the trees go, you guys are meeting most of our ordinances on the buffer plantings and all that other stuff?

MR. POWELL: That's correct.
MR. LYNCH: All right. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, Member Lynch.

Any other comments?

Member Avdoulos.

MR. AVDOULOS: Thank you. The question of the sidewalk on the north side, does the city have a recommendation? The only reason I ask is because I know there was a concern not to disrupt any wetland or anything that would sort of impede like the natural flow on that side, but I don't know, if there is a concern and we think it's a good idea, then I would like to see it implemented. If it's something that would be of benefit to the natural resource there, then I'm fine with the way it's been presented.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: As part of the DCS variance request, the applicant has provided the numbers, like how much wetlands would have to be impacted if they proposed a sidewalk, and they expressed a concern that if those impacts were approved, then they may hit the threshold, the mitigation threshold requirement, but staff looked at the numbers, and we don't agree that they would still be under mitigation requirement threshold, and the impacts are very minor, under .1 acre. So if city
would still -- I mean, there is a conflict between impacting wetlands and providing connectivity. Sidewalk is a preference because maintenance-wise it is easy for the city to maintain concrete sidewalks. Boardwalk is another alternative but not highly preferred because it comes with its own set of challenges.

MR. AVDOULOS: Right, which I'm learning on the Walkable Novi Committee. So then I would like to see the sidewalk continue across.

MR. POWELL: No problem then, Commissioner.

MR. AVDOULOS: And then the -- yeah, as we talked, if there is signage for the buffer line, that that would work out great. I've seen it in other developments, and people are pretty respectful with it.

MR. LYNCH: Depends on the people.

MR. AVDOULOS: Exactly. Everything depends on the people. I like the idea that we're developing this piece, because now it will make this a more contiguous -- it's not a contiguous development, but just the traffic flow and everything through that makes it a lot safer, and having that dead end there really doesn't make sense. And then I like the fact
that we've got a large amount of open space for the property to the east of this. So I appreciate that, and, you know, I'm in support of the project.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

Member Greco.

MR. GRECO: Yes, I would like to make a motion and just a brief comment. I think the development looks fine. It is zoned for what it is zoned, so although I'm looking at the correspondence and some of the comments that we heard from the members of the community, you know, it is a school time drop off traffic issue in this area, but given it's zoned appropriately for this development, and the way the set up it.

So with that, I would like to make a motion. In the matter of Taft Knolls III JSP16-67, motion to approve the preliminary site plan, open preservation, and site condominium based upon and subject to the items listed A through J in the motion sheet with Member Avdoulos' addition of the signage that he talked to and the continuation of the sidewalk. And this motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Article 3, Article 4, and Article 5 of the Zoning Ordinance and all other applicable provision of the Ordinance.
MR. AVDOULOS: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a motion by Member Greco, a second by Member Avdoulos.

Member Giacopetti.

MR. GIACOPETTI: If I may through the chair ask counsel for some clarification of the motion as drafted.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Sure.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Item E, there is an "or" in Item E. Which one is staff recommending?

MS. KOMARAGIRI: We revised the motion, and there's an "or" for Item E and Item F. Do I understand correctly for Item F the Planning Commission is recommending to go with the first one, and so we strike after the or?

MR. GRECO: Correct.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: For Item E, staff's recommendation is to revise the plan to provide the buffers because the minimum required buffers around the stormwater retention is 25. The applicant is asking for a reduction of up to seven feet. We don't have a precedent for such a request, and we'd like to -- we would request the applicant to revise plan to meet the buffer requirement.

MR. GIACOPETTI: So a friendly
amendment that it stops after the or?

MR. GRECO: Yes, accepted.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Does the seconder accept?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MR. GIACOPETTI: I have one last question.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Please, yes.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Are we able in a recommendation to include language concerning traffic control requirements, or is that outside of our --

MS. KOMARAGIRI: The construction entrance off of Taft?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Correct. Are we allowed to add -- is it appropriate for us to add language in here that clarifies or just solidifies what the applicant said?

MR. SCHULTZ: Through the chair, I think the applicant has actually affirmatively said that he would do that, and I think under those circumstances I think it's appropriate. I would make it subject to review by your building department and engineering department to make sure they're in agreement with it, but assuming they are, I think we can add that.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: I think we can say that at the time of soil erosion control permit review.

MR. SCHULTZ: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Does the maker of the motion accept that friendly amendment?

MR. GRECO: Accepted.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Seconder?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MR. GIACOPETTI: It's a motion to restrict traffic on is it Danyas Road?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes, Danyas off of Taft.

MR. GIACOPETTI: That the applicant would --

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: He's got it.

MR. SCHULTZ: Construction traffic limited to Taft Road subject to confirmation with city staff at first building permit review.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Thank you. You crystalized my thoughts.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Good catch. Thank you.

With that, any other discussions? Sri, can you call the roll, please.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Thank you. And I apologize, I couldn't follow --

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: It was Member Greco, and Avdoulos was the second.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?
MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Zuchlewski?
MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?
MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacopetti?
MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?
MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes 6 to 0.

MR. POWELL: Thank you, Council, very much.

MR. GRECO: Next I would like to make another motion. In the matter of Taft Knolls III, JSP16-67, motion to approve the wetland permit based on and subject to the applicant should consider demarcation of the wetland buffers on-site behind lots
4, 5, 6, 7, 14 and 15 through the use of proposed easement signage and potentially other means such as boulders and decorative fencing along the setback boundaries; the findings of compliance with Ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters; and the conditions and items listed in those letters being addressed on the Final Site Plan; and because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Chapter 12, Article V of the Code of Ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance.

MR. AVDOULOS: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a motion by Member Greco, second by Member Avdoulos.

Any other comments?

Sri, please.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes 6 to 0.

MR. GRECO: Next I'd like to make a motion, another one. In the matter of Taft Knolls III JSP16-67, motion to approve the woodland permit based on and subject to the findings of compliance with ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters, and the conditions and items listed in those letters being addressed on the Final Site Plan, and because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Chapter 37 of the Code of Ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance.

MR. AVDOULOS: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a motion by Greco, second by Avdoulos.

Any other comments?

Sri, please.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Thank you. Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacopetti?
MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes 6 to 0.

MR. GRECO: Finally I'd like to make another motion. In the matter of Taft Knolls III JSP16-67, motion to approve the stormwater management plan based on and subject to the findings of compliance with ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters and the conditions and items listed in those letters being addressed on the Final Site Plan, and because it is otherwise in compliance with Chapter 11 of the Code of Ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance.

MR. AVDOULOS: Second.

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

Any other comments?

Sri, please.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacopetti?
MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?
MR. GRECO: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?
MR. LYNCH: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Zuchlewski?
MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?
MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Most passes 6 to 0.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Now you're all set.
MR. POWELL: Thank you again, Commission.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Item Number 4 is the approval of the June 14, 2017 Planning Commission Minutes.
MR. LYNCH: Motion to approve.
MR. AVDOULOS: Second.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: There's a motion and a second. And I have a correction if I might. Page 51, Line Item 20, where it refers to
Chair Pehrson making the motion, that should be Member Anthony. Then on Page 53, Line Item 2, it refers to Chair Pehrson making the motion. That should also be Member Anthony. With those modifications?

MR. LYNCH: Okay. Accepted.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: All right.

With that if we can call the roll, please.

MS. MELLEM: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Motion passes 6 to 0.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Item Number 5, the approval of the June 28th, 2017 Planning Commission minutes.

MR. LYNCH: Motion to approve.

MR. AVDOULOS: Second.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a motion from Member Lynch, second by Avdoulos.

Any other comments? Kirsten, please.

MS. MELLEM: Member Greco?
MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Lynch?
MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Chair Pehrson?
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Zuchlewski?
MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Avdoulos?
MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Giacopetti?
MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Motion passes 6 to 0.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Item Number 6, approval of the June 26, 2017 Planning Commission minutes.

MR. LYNCH: Motion to approve.
MR. AVDOULOS: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a motion by Member Lynch, second by Avdoulos.

Any other comments?
Kirsten.

MS. MELLEM: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Motion passes 6 to 0.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We come to matters for discussion. Does anyone have any matters they'd like to discuss? Good.

Supplemental issues? I don't think any.

And last chance for audience participation. Is there anyone in the audience that wishes to address the Planning Commission, please step forward and state your name.

MR. ZACK: Yes. Sorry to come up here again, but I just want to make a few comments.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: That's okay, we're here all night.

MR. ZACK: My name is Gary Zack at 359 South Lake Drive, and I have to say I understand the challenges that are faced in putting ten pounds in a five pound sack, and that's essentially what NSA has tried to do to meet the city requirements, and I applaud their effort. I mean, it is a nice design given what they have to work with.

However, I respectfully disagree with Mr. Ray's statement that the July 2016 concept plan was 10,000 square feet. Perhaps he was privy to plans like that, but if you look on the city's own Lake Shore website, Lake Shore Park website today, you will see a 2016 July conceptual plan, and it is clearly two-stories, 2,400 square feet per floor for a total of 4,800 square feet. And I don't know what -- you know, people see different things, so I don't know.

In regards to the transparency, I heard a lot of comments about all the social media in this. I'd like to know why we don't just use the good old-fashioned sign in the park that says this is coming and we'd like your input. That I think would get maybe more response. People are pretty busy. I
encourage you if you're Novi residents to ask your
fellow neighbors if they're aware of this. I think
you'll find very few or none of them are.

    I'd also like to state that I've
been at many of the city presentations and reviews on
this, and the response has been overwhelmingly
negative to this plan. There's been a few people that
maybe said a positive thing or two trying to say you
did a nice job given what it is, but we wish we didn't
have it, that kind of thing. I think everybody wants
the kids' camp to have space, but this is a very big
building with a lot of parking on a very small part of
the park. Thank you.

    CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, sir. Appreciate it.

Anyone else?

    MR. DUNESKE: John Duneske,
357 South Lake. Just a couple quick comments again.
The building is beautiful. I'm just not sure if it's
the right building at the right spot. And I
appreciate you taking into consideration the setbacks
especially on the east side of the park. I know that
questions were asked today about what was the
purpose -- you know, the cost seems to be driving the
size of the building here, where it was two stories
and now it's one, and two stories cost more. Again
the question was polling, library and camp lake shore,
and when you're using the park eight weeks out of the
year, Camp Lake Shore is eight weeks out of the year,
that's 7 percent of the time, to justify that big
building is hard to understand and no one has
clarified that. I know Director Muck says that -- he
has said it's not going to be used for a banquet
facility, but if you go back to the minutes and the
video of January 19th, 2017 of this year, the mayor
has said this is for weddings, this is for big events,
it's for rental, we need it. And I don't know who
would be in violation of the charter which says no
development of Novi property for -- inside of parks
for banquet facilities. So please take that into
consideration.

I know there is going to be --
there is lots of trees that were not on the planning
of the maps that were shown today, yet where the
park -- where the new shelter is going to be located,
and there's openness going into our lots, the plans
aren't very clear, not sufficient as far as what the
barriers go, but they said also there was going to be
fence -- retaining wall and fences, and the city says
we don't need that in one of the sections in your
packet that you have there.

    I think finally the amphitheater that you're going put there on the west side of the building is going to -- there is no sound barriers there for that when they have their concerts there, and there will be concerts. You're going to have -- concerts will be at the park there, they'll move them first from the pavilion and they'll be over there, and it's going to be very loud over there in the evenings like that.

    And again I know you're looking at the lighting and everything else in a park like this, but the park closes, and who is going to be maintaining the security of it, the kiosk, the security of building, who is going to be maintaining those. These are the cost factors that I don't even know if it's been addressed yet. And again, I don't know who is responsible for putting the brakes on it, the idea of having this building built as the majority of it is going to be rental for most of the time for events, large events. Call it what you want, parties, weddings, graduation parties, whatever you want to call it, still that's what it's going to be used for, it's been said by the mayor himself and other Council members.
Thank you for your time. I appreciate it.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, sir. Good luck with the hip.

MR. DUNESKE: September 25th won't come fast enough.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: With that, if there's no one else in the audience, we'll close the audience participation and look for a motion to adjourn.

MR. LYNCH: Motion to adjourn.

MR. AVDOULOS: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: All those in favor?

THE BOARD: Aye.

(Meeting adjourned at 9:33 p.m.)
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