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CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Call to order
the regular meeting of October 11th, 2017 Planning Commission.

Sri, can you call the roll, please.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Good evening.

Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Here.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: 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 Giacopetti?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Absent,

excused.

With that if we could rise for the Pledge of Allegiance. Member Anthony, can you lead us, please.
(Pledge recited.)

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, sir.

I'll look for a motion to approve the agenda or any modifications thereof.

MR. LYNCH: Motion to approve.

MR. ANTHONY: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: There's a motion and a second. All those in favor?

THE BOARD. Aye.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Any opposed?

We have an agenda.

Our first item on the agenda is audience participation. If there's anyone in the audience that wishes to address the Planning Commission on something other than the three public hearings that we have, please step forward at this time.

Seeing no one, we'll close the first audience participation.

Any correspondence?

MR. LYNCH: Just on the public hearings.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Committee reports?
City Planner report. Ms. McBeth.

MS. McBeth: Thank you. Nothing to report this evening.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: That was quick. Okay.

We come to our first public hearing tonight. Number 1 is the Novi Veterinary Clinic Expansion JSP 17-42. It's a public hearing at the request of Novi Veterinary Clinic, JSP 17-64 for Special Land Use approval to allow for the expansion of the existing Veterinary Clinic within the same building. The subject property is located in Section 23 at the southeast corner of Grand River Avenue and Novi Road in the TC-1, Town Center District. The applicant is proposing to expand the existing use from approximately 2000 square feet to approximately 3488 square feet. No exterior or site changes are proposed at this time.

MS. McBeth: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a brief presentation.

The applicant is proposing to expand the existing Novi Veterinary Clinic into the adjacent tenant space increasing the floor area from about 2,000 square feet to approximately 3500 square feet. The property is an existing retail building
located at the southeast corner of Novi Road and Grand River Avenue. The property is zoned TC-1, Town Center, with TC-1 zoning to the east, west and south. To the north across Grand River Avenue the property is zoned TC, Town Center. The applicant intends to incorporate the existing vacant tenant space at the west end of the retail building as an expansion to their existing veterinary clinic. The letter from the applicant indicates that the intent is to move the exam rooms into the new space. The zoning ordinance treats veterinary clinics as special land uses in TC-1 zoning districts. No exterior site work is proposed.

The applicant has generally met the conditions of the district as outlined in the planning review letter, and staff is recommending approval of the special land use permit. The applicant is requesting and the staff is recommending a waiver of the noise analysis as no noise-generating equipment is added to the site. Additionally the use is existing on the property and the expansion is at the end of the building and not adjacent to any of the other tenant spaces.

The planning commission should consider the factors listed in Section 6.2.C of the zoning ordinance regarding Special Land Use requests.
Present this evening is Dr. Ronald Mehler of the Novi Veterinary Clinic, the landlord, Mr. Pakray, and Mr. Bob Futrell, the applicant's representative and builder for this project.

   Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

   CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

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

   MR. FUTRELL: Sure.

   Hello, I'm Bob Futrell of Futrell & Futrell Builders. And anyway, I have worked on this building moving him into the second unit. So now he wishes to move his exams and to finally have some room to keep patients or the patients separated from where he's doing the clinical work. And I feel that it's a good move. He doesn't need as much real estate as he's taking there, but it's hard to divide it up. So we -- as you can see we have some irregular shapes, but we're trying to play into the building and not do anything to diminish the historic aspects of it. The beautiful thing about what we're doing there is he will only be available to clients from his primary suite right now. So you don't have to worry about kids and dogs and leashes walking down Novi Road on the exterior, it's all internal. So we hope that you
grant us this. That's all.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

MR. FUTURELL: This is Dr. Mehler if he wants to say anything.

MR. MEHLER: I think you've pretty much said it all. It's really -- we're just hoping to be able to, you know, kind of change the work flow so it works better for us.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Very good.

Have a seat, and if we have some questions we'll come back to you.

This is a public hearing. If there's anyone in the audience that wishes to address the Planning Commission at this time, please step forward.

Seeing no one, any correspondence?

MR. LYNCH: None.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We'll close the audience participation and turn it over to the Planning Commission for your consideration.

Member Anthony.

MR. ANTHONY: That particular corner has always grabbed my interest. To tell you how long I've been in Novi, that's the area where Irwin Farms when they had their orchard used to sell
their cider and donuts. I would pick them up before going to work, and raising my kid and going to the comic book shop that used to occupy that building. The veterinary clinic has been established, it's a staple in Novi, and though I've seen the corner building, many tenants go in and out, this I think is a really good use. I'm glad to see it grow. The improvements even though it's an old building that have been made to the facade over the years have been very positive to that corner and that intersection. I'm very positive on this, and would be prepared to make a motion.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Go for it. Carry on.

MR. ANTHONY: In the matter of the Novi Veterinary Clinic JSP 17-64, motion to approve the Special Land Use permit based on the following findings relative to other feasible uses of the site. The items are listed A through H.

This motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Article 3.1.5, Article 4, Article 5, and Article 6 of the Zoning Ordinance, and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance.

MR. AVDOULOS: Second.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: There's a motion by Member Anthony, second by Member Avdoulos.

Any other comments?

Sri, can you call the roll, please.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes 5 to 0.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: All set.

MR. FUTRELL: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: The next item is Beck North Unit 54 JSP 16-36. It's a public hearing at the request of Dembs Development, Inc. for Special Land Use, Preliminary Site Plan, Woodland Permit, and Storm Water Management Plan approval. The subject parcel is located in Section 4 east of Nadlan Drive and north of West Road. It is approximately
5.02 acres and zoned I-1 (Light Industrial). The applicant is proposing to build a 67,000 square foot speculative building in the Beck North Corporate Park with associated site improvements.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Thank you.

Planning Commission held a public hearing for the proposed development back on May 24, 2017. At the time a motion was made to postpone to give time for the applicant and city staff to work together to resolve the issue of a screening barrier, in terms of whether it is going to be a wall, berm, vegetation, trees, or some combination thereof between the closest point of the industrial property and the residential homes, as well as other issues that were mentioned at that time.

The applicant has since made some changes. He is still proposing to construct a 67,000 square foot speculative building along with associated site improvements. The site is estimated to be 5.02 acres and located in Section 4 east of Nadlan Drive and north of West Road.

It is currently zoned I-1, Light Industrial. The properties to the north, west, and south are also zoned I-1. The property to the east is
a 50 foot buffer owned by the City of Novi that is zoned I-1. The parcels to the east of this buffer are zoned R-2, One-Family Residential.

The future land use map indicates Industrial, Research, Development, and Technology for the subject property and for the properties to the north, west and south. The properties to the east are proposed as private park and single-family residential. For purpose of review, the property is considered residential.

The site contains woodlands along the east and south parcel lot lines. Of the total 66 trees surveyed on site, the proposed site plan indicates that 8 regulated trees are to be removed. This would require a total of 22 replacement credits. The plan is currently proposing to plant 7 of them on site and to pay into the City tree fund for the remaining.

The subject property has an existing conservation easement abutting the proposed 50 foot buffer along the eastern property boundary. It is part of a conservation easement that extends on this and other properties to the north and was approved by Council on January 28, 2010. The agreement requires planting of two rows of evergreen
trees within the easement. Staff has not identified the trees having been planted at that time based on the conditions that they would be planted at the time of development of this site. Staff intends to work with the applicant at the time of final site plan to identify the number of trees that need to be planted on the subject property and accordingly determine the replacement plantings that are required for the current proposed development.

The motion sheet has been accordingly update to include this as a condition.

The proposed property is within the Beck North Corporate Park. The loading/unloading docks are located northwest corner of the building to limit truck traffic on the east side of the building, moving the activity away from the residential area.

The applicant is currently seeking five waivers from the Planning Commission:

For lack of 10 to 15 landscaped berm between industrial and residential, which is not provided due to preservation of 50 feet woodland buffer along east property line and screening with masonry wall and additional evergreens.

Waiver for use of evergreen species for greater than 25 percent of perimeter parking lot
trees.

Reduction of required subcanopy trees for industrial subdivision frontage due to lack of space.

And another waiver for driveway spacing between proposed drives and the west driveway and Unit 53 driveway. Staff determined that two driveways were necessary for emergency access around the whole building and also the site has limited frontage on the cul-de-sac and low traffic at the end of the cul-de-sac.

In addition to the Planning Commission waiver, the applicant is also requesting a ZBA variance for height that exceeds 25 feet when abutting residential, which was approved yesterday at the ZBA meeting. Since last Planning Commission meeting, the applicant has provided a traffic impact assessment. Traffic agrees with the findings and requested an update at the time of final site plan submittal.

As discussed at the last meeting, Landscape and Woodland reviewers are in agreement that the 50 foot buffer is of high quality woodlands that would be destroyed if replaced by the required berm. In order to maintain the woodlands and to provide
additional screening for the existing residents, the applicant has removed five parking spaces along the east side of the development from the site plan in order to provide additional landscaping and to screen headlights shining east. The screening also includes a 6 foot tall screen wall across the parking lot, and a heavily screened landscape buffer with evergreen plantings at southeast corner of the site. A 50 foot conservation easement is proposed along east property line of the parcel as well.

The combined percentage of Concrete Masonry Units exceeds the maximum amount allowed by the Ordinance on the east and north facades. A Section 9 waiver is required and is requested for deviation.

All reviewers are recommending approval with additional items to be addressed with final site plan submittal. The Planning Commission is asked tonight to hold a public hearing for the Special Land Use Permit, and to approve the Special Land Use Permit, Preliminary Site Plan, Woodland Permit, and the Stormwater Management Plan. The applicant Glenn Jones from Dembs Development is here tonight with his Engineer here tonight if you have any questions, and staff and consultants are here as always.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

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

MR. LANDRY: Good evening, Mr. Chairman and the rest of the Planning Commission.

I'm Dave Landry, and I represent Dembs Development, who is the applicant with respect to this project. We are before you this evening requesting Special land Use approval, Preliminary Site Plan and Stormwater Management.

I'm here tonight to address the adjacency issues. We first of all want to highlight the fact that with respect to the planning reviews, every single consultant recommends approval of this, every single one of them. The applicant was before you in May, and at that time there was some questions, the audience raised some questions about adjacency, and this commission tasked us to get with the city staff, work together to address the screening concerns at the southeast corner, which is the closest portion of where this development abuts residential. We have met with staff, with have added screening, and we have obtained the staff's approval.

Adjacency arises because this is an I-1 next to an R-2 immediately to the east. And first of
all, I think where we should start is with the Ordinance. Whenever you deal with adjacency issues, often times residents will come in and they will implore you, please uphold your Ordinance. I agree. We have to decide what does the Ordinance say.

When we look at the Ordinance in this case, we see that first of all with respect to intent, Section 5.5 says the intent with respect to berms is to preserve and enhance existing woodlands. There are no less than four sections of your Ordinance that allow for waivers of a landscape berm. 5.5.3 (a) or 3.14 (e) says that the Planning Commission may waive or modify the requirements for an earth berm or obscuring wall when adjacent to a woodland area. Another section says that the Planning Commission may reduce the height of the berm or eliminate berm and may approve an alternate plan provided it provides adequate noise attenuation and screening. Another section indicates that where an existing or proposed parking or vehicular use area abuts an existing berm wall or durable landscape buffer on the abutting property, the existing landscape may be used to satisfy the requirement. Finally, waiver of landscape berm or wall for preservation of a woodland area.

So there are four particular
sections of the Ordinance that allow for waiver of a berm to protect a woodland. That is exactly what is before you tonight. Between the I-1 and the R-2 is a dense, mature, good quality woodland. I'd just like to show you a couple of photographs here. This is from the Planning Department's review. This shows exactly what is at issue here this evening. We have the site, which is in red, the residential area which is closest to the single cul-de-sac to the southeast, and you can see the mature woodlands in between. I took some photographs from this cul-de-sac right here looking at the woodlands. This is the woodlands, from the cul-de-sac. You can see this is mature, dense woodlands.

One of the residents -- well, if we look at some of the residential areas at issue, we see there is a single cul-de-sac here, and this house up here, it's kind of dark, along Bristol Circle is 484 feet away. The closest house, which I believe is owned by a Ms. Halloran, ran from her house to the closest point in the woods is 263 feet. From Mrs. Halloran's backyard to the closest point of the woods is 204 feet. So we are between 200 and 500 feet of dense woodlands.

And when you address the adjacency
issues, especially when we come to preserving woodlands, I suggest that any municipality should look for reasonableness. That's what the Ordinance says. If the woodland provides the necessary screening, both sides should be reasonable. So in this situation I think it's important because this is a corporate park, I would suggest you can't look at this just by looking at Unit 54, because Unit 54 comes in a continuum of developing this park.

First of all, I think we should recognize this area was all originally zoned industrial. This is the corporate park, this is the residential park. It was rezoned residential, but the industrial was there first. So when we talk about expectations, anybody who purchased lots knew this was an industrial area. They knew they were purchasing next to an industrial area. They could see the woods, they could read the Ordinance, they could see the waiver provisions.

When Beck North began developing this property, what we did originally was they deeded a 50 foot strip to the city, but Beck North agreed we would maintain it. It's a wildlife habitat corridor, we agreed to maintain that area.

Second, we took this 50 feet to the
west and made it a tree preservation easement. Also
we agreed to a woodland conservation easement. So in
addition to the woods which exist to the east, there
is 125 feet which we agreed to maintain in
conservation easements.

In addition to that, Nadlan Drive
was originally designed to come all the way to the
back. We agreed to pull Nadlan Drive 150 feet to the
west. That was when the development was going in
before anybody did anything with any particular lots.

With respect to this particular
site plan, there were several aspects of it
specifically designed to deal with the adjacency
issues. First of all as you can see, the loading dock
is in the northwest corner, it's away from any of the
residential. The other thing I'd like to point out is
there are only two loading dock spaces. This is an
I-1 district. Uses include warehouses, wholesale
establishments, manufacturing. This is not being
designed as a warehouse or a manufacturing facility.
It would have many more loading docks. There would be
many more semis coming in and out of this. We are
targeting hi-tech research and development, low
intensity industrial uses. We put the dumpster as far
away as humanly possible from the residential in the
extreme northwest corner. The building entry is on
the west corner. You can see the circular road which
the fire department requires. We have specifically
included notes, you can't read it, but it specifically
says that it's not to be used by any of the semis for
loading. There is only a man door here, not a loading
door. It is prohibited for use by trucks. All
lighting requirements in the Ordinance are met.

And we specifically took to heart
what the Planning Commission said in May, we met with
the city, and we came up with additional measures to
the southeast corner. The first thing we are going to
do is build a 6 foot masonry wall at the extreme
southeast corner. This blocks all headlights coming
in from Nadlan Court, it blocks the headlights from
the traffic around here, and it attenuates sound from
the parking lot. We've also agreed to a solid wall of
33 evergreen trees. Naturally when we talk about the
mature woodlands, the question is going to arise are
they deciduous, what happens in the winter. That's
exactly why we proposed a solid wall of evergreen
trees. So actually with respect to the southeast
corner there is two walls, there is a masonry wall,
and also this evergreen tree wall. All of that in
addition to the mature woodlands.
So when we look at what has the applicant done to address adjacency, we created a 125 foot buffer with easements, we moved Nadlan Drive back 150 feet, we designed the site so all the activity is on the west side, we limited use of the east side, we created a solid wall of evergreens, and we're constructing a 6 foot masonry wall, all in addition to the mature woodlands.

Now, the woodland consultant with respect to the woodlands said in his report, this wooded area does appear to provide a significant level of environmental benefits. In terms of a scenic asset, wind block, noise buffer or other environment asset, the woodland areas proposed for impact are considered to be of good quality. That's the woodland consultant comments.

The use of the building, there was some questions about use, hi-tech research and development. Last night we were before the ZBA. We obtained a height variance to go to 30 feet. And again, the design of this building is the key to ensuring that it would be a low intensity industrial use. They want research and development, laboratories on the first floor, office on the second floor, but the office is only one-third of the entire square
The size of the building, that was also addressed at the last Planning Commission meeting. 67,000 square feet. When we built Mando, it was 80,000 square feet. When we built Unit 56 to the north, which also abuts residential, and which also obtained from the Planning Commission Special Land Use and Preliminary site Plan, it was 75,000 square feet. We've already reduced the size of this building. We didn't come before you with 80,000 or 75,000 square foot building. We've already reduced the size.

All consultants recommend approval. It's low impact. The applicant has taken cumulative and consistent measures to address adjacency, and I'd ask the Planning Commission to grant the Special Land Use and Preliminary site Plan approval.

I'm happy to stand by for any questions. I would like to reserve the ability to rebut if there are any comments from the public. With that, I'll close my presentation.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, Mr. Landry.

This is a public hearing. If there's anyone in the audience this wishes to address the Planning Commission in this particular matter,
step forward. Start a line over on that side. You'll have three minutes to present your arguments or discussion points.

MS. ROBERTS: We have signatures. Should we turn those in first? It was from our neighbors.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Just go ahead with your comments, please.

MS. ROBERTS: So we have 38 signatures from our neighbors.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Can you please state your name and address, please.

MS. ROBERTS: Linda Roberts, and I'm at 30377 Balfour Drive. Tell me when to start.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Go.

MS. ROBERTS: Okay. Number one, the large building that was approved by you was 700 feet away, and Kelly is more like 150 feet away, so I think it's a big difference. We're worried about not only the wall, but the height of the building because of the lighting issues. We already have lights coming in our windows at night, and this one is going to be so much closer than all the others. A 10 foot berm is required for the 25 maximum height, which of course it's going to be 30 feet with 6 feet additional on top
of the air conditioners, but that's done. So we're hoping that you're not going to think a 6 foot wall is adequate when a 10 foot berm is required with trees on top.

The building obviously is too large for that lot because they can't put the berm without taking out the trees. So they're inching out every square inch, which I understand, but we have to live there. We, you know, pay taxes, and although the industrial park was there first, was it really? Because when they ripped out all the trees that were on this lot and the lot next to it, they said they were farming, put down winter wheat, took out the trees, and the City Council really didn't do anything at that time. So we're begging and hoping that you're going to protect us this time.

Since, let's see, the forest only provides a buffer because we're in Michigan, and it's like one season of full buffer, and the rest of the time the leaves are either coming in or falling off or they're gone entirely. So most of time we see right through to those buildings. All winter I see all the buildings that are there already and at night we see all the lights.

As I collected signatures from my
neighbors, everyone complained about the noise coming from the industrial park. We hear it all hours of the day and night. It starts at 5:30 in the morning and sometimes it's into the night time, too. It wakes up people who are close by. So we definitely need whatever the equivalent is of that 10 foot berm that is required, we need that. A 6 foot wall is not going to do it. And so I don't know how that is going to be addressed, but I don't think it can be addressed tonight, and I'm hoping that you table it and require that they meet that ordinance.

When you make your decision, please remember that our homes were here first, and the residents deserve to be protected by the Planning Commission, and we hope that you uphold the Ordinance. And also last but not least -- I think I'm already over, right? All I'm begging for is, you know, this is going to be completely hidden from view every direction behind the building, in between forest but next to us. If there is some way to have a gate or something after hours so that all the kids can't park their cars in there and drink and do whatever, that would be awesome. Okay. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you. Anyone else?
MR. DAMAN: Hello. My name is Laith Daman. I live at 30369 Balfour Drive. I'm directly southeast of -- my property is directly southeast of the building. Again, you know, I just want to say, you know, I've talking to many residents. They already complain about the noise, and they're much further south, you know, west, southeast and northeast of the properties, and they're always complaining about the noise and the lights, and I've collected -- we have collected about 38 signatures from all the residents, and it didn't take more than two sentences telling them this is what is going on, they grab pen, and they start signing. So that's one.

Second of all, you know, there is already a problem right now that is not being addressed. You know, as you can see it seems like there is wild parties out there, and as my neighbor Linda mentioned, you know, I mean, I took these pictures after hearing tires screeching on a Sunday, and I went and drove in there and I saw all these tire marks, and this happens often, it's not an isolated incident.

You know, having more activity will only increase the noise level. In addition to if you notice from the picture that you are showing, even
from the picture that Dembs showing, this area is sitting at a higher elevation. Having a 30 foot building on a higher elevation, and most buildings have the air conditioner on the top, that will even generate even more noise. And now you're sitting at the top level where the noise can travel. There is no tall trees enough to block that noise. Nothing is going to block that noise.

So what I'm asking, what I'm asking is basically what I wrote here, you know, we rely on the city, you know, to uphold the Ordinance. It doesn't matter what it was 20 years ago or 100 years ago, it is what it is today. We have ordinances in the books based on today's decisions that was made at sometime. It is what it is today, and the berm is important. We need the berm to protect us.

Two things, once we have run off, how we -- the water is not going to guarantee the run off that is coming from the parking lot. Those trees are not going to block, and eventually all the trees in that area will die off, then we'll be, well, there is nothing else to do about it.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: If you can summarize, sir, please.

MR. DAMAN: I would like to
conclude with a final note. I know it's not -- before
I make this, this is the picture from my driveway, and
you can see the lights already. Here I am at my
height, and you can see the lights already, and it's
not even -- the leaves have not even fallen from the
trees.

And I would like to conclude with
this. I know it's not October 31st yet, but we the
residents, the 38 residents are scared, are scared
when we see these approvals being given as if it was
Halloween candy, with all due respect, you know, and
not a single ordinance that you requested for has been
upheld. We're not asking for anything more than what
is written in the books, you know, what is fair.
Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

Anyone else?

MS. HALLORAN: Yes. Hi, I'm Kelly
Halloran, 30361 Balfour Drive, and I do have another
question. Since my Mr. Landry asked if he can rebut,
are we allowed to also --

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: No one said
that he's going to be rebutting, ma'am.

MS. HALLORAN: Or making another
reply. Okay. Sounds great.
So let me start off with a picture from today. This is from today. This is on Nadlan Court. It's not exactly the right angle -- someone took that picture for me -- but instead of it being at the tip of the cul-de-sac, it's looking out to the north portion. So right there those nice woodlands are already different. Maybe it's because the leaves are gone. I don't know when the picture was taken that Mr. Landry showed, but that is today.

This is from my yard or my front yard, and in between my front yard and my neighbor Laith, who just spoke, this is looking through -- we are at the tip of the cul-de-sac. This is on the other side of Nadlan Court. That is a couple of days ago.

There is another one from the front yard again, so that we can see that much visibility now.

This is Laith's where it is abutting the industrial. You can see how much light is coming through.

This I happened to find, a little deer in there for your entertainment. This is from this last winter, and that is looking through my kitchen window, which is up -- my deck is high is as
6 feet. That is how much we can see. There are no lights there right now because it's daytime.

And another one from the same day.

You can see all of that. That's our visibility.

Those are my pine trees I planted when this happened in 2003 that are now 40 feet high. A couple of them have died. If those were not there, you can totally see straight through, just to give you an idea of the actual visibility that is going on there.

I was glad that Laith brought this up, because I was going to, too. And my main point is I would like to not be here today, and I'm sure no one else would either in the subdivision. The reason I am is because there are ordinances that are there to protect us. I would not be here if the ordinances were being upheld. The ordinances are to be upheld for a reason, which is to protect the residential lands next to light industrial. So had there been no ordinances, I'm certain that myself and none of our neighbors would have chosen to purchase that property.

So we're simply asking that the ordinances that were there when we purchased, and we were residential at that point with that protection, and they were even refined in 2003 after all of that...
happened initially, that those be upheld because they are to be upheld. If they were going to be upheld, if none of this showed up this way, I would not be here tonight. So I'm really putting on a statement that can you please as a Planning Commission really investigate why all of a sudden all ordinances that were asked to be waived are just allowed to be waived and what are the reasons.

Some of my specific concerns --

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: If you can wrap up, please, ma'am.

MS. HALLORAN: Our berm is one of the Ordinances. We need the berm 10 to 15 feet minimum with the evergreens on top. The brick wall is fine, but it's not enough. So if you want to do the brick wall, that sounds great, but we need the berm for that coverage.

And also I'm concerned about the stormwater plan, which I was before in 2003, because we've had so many trees die from being flooded or whatever is going on with the water. Has that really been looked at? Has the woodlands really been looked at? When the woodland consultants and all these consultants say approved, why are you approving something that was set up by the city a long time ago
that they needed.

So, please, I'm asking you to look at the facts versus what other people want. We're asking for the minimum, we're not asking for something beyond. We're not asking for things to be changed for us. We're asking for the basics. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

Anyone else?

MS. ROBERTS: Should I drop these off now? Is that okay?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: With that I see no one else.

Do we have some correspondence?

MR. LYNCH: Yes, we do. I'm going to summarize them. Okay. The first one is Jeffrey Pitt, I support, 29855 Hudson Drive.

Another Jeffrey Pitt, 46629 Ryan Court, supports.

Ryan Dembs, 46850 Cartier Drive, supports.

And this looks like the -- okay, another one, Ryan Dembs, 30275 Hudson Drive, supports.

The objections, Edward Gerhardt, 45691 Marlborough Place, object.

And I'm going to -- this is all
going to be a matter of public record. You can read the comments when you go into the record.

Next one is an objection, David Johnson, 30256 Sterling Drive.

Another objection, Patricia Grant, 30232 Pennington Court.

Another objection, Mark Byrne, 45649 Bristol Circle.

An objection, James Snow, 30328 Pennington Lane.

And I was just handed some more. Kelly Halloran, 30361 Balfour Drive object.

And another objection, Scott Kamen, 45613 South Lake Drive.

This doesn't have a box checked, but I'm assuming it's an objection, Lisa (?), 45756 Bristol Circle.

Another objection, there is no name. There is an address 30512 Bristol Circle.

Objection from Richard Ganas, 30303 Pennington Lane.

An objection from Denise Brandt, 30433 Norwich Drive.

Objection from Craig Kellogg, 45612 Bristol Circle. I believe I already said that
Another objection, Frank Murphy, 45694 Balfour Court.

Objection from Laura Barron and Tim Barron 45776 Bristol Circle.

Objection from Dan Rabish, 45724 Bristol Circle.

Objection from Greg, can't read the last name, Langhorne, 30450 Bristol Lane.

Objection from Kendall Halloran, 30361 Balfour Drive.

Objection from Patricia Grant, 30323 Pennington Court.

Objection -- okay, this has got several signatures on it, Jason Roger, 30377 Balfour Drive.

45701 Balfour Court, Rosenberg.

45799 Bristol Circle.

Macy, I can't read that, Spielman (?) 45907 Bristol Court.

Kevin Piotrowski, 45716 Bristol Circle. Another -- yes, two Piotrowskis.

Janice Roble, 45686 Marlborough.

Rick Roehn (ph), 45686 Marlborough.

Brenda Lonowski, 45557 Bristol
Circle.

Mark Pachla, 45788 Bristol Circle.
Joe Gluck, 30385 Balfour Drive.
Rachel Gluck, 30385 Balfour Drive.
Linda Roberts, 30377 Balfour Drive.
I think I read this one because it looks like the same printing. First name is Greg,
30450 Bristol Drive.

Michael Solomon, 45652 Bristol Circle.

Craig Kellogg, I read him twice.
Denise Brandt, 30433 Norwich. I think I read that one.

Jeffrey Rust, 30409 Norwich.
Laith Daman, 30369 Balfour.
And we've got several others.

These are all objections by the way. Casey -- I can't read the last name, 45007 Bristol Circle.

Amanda Craig, 30378 Balfour Drive.
Leo Pertnick (ph), 45768 Bristol Circle.

Carrie Pachla, 45788 Bristol Circle.

Robert Hill, 45796 Bristol Circle.
Steve Klein, 30402 Balfour Drive.
And Michael Barry, 45815 Bristol Circle.

Sorry if I butchered some of the names. And that's I believe the entirety.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, sir. With that we'll close the public hearing on this matter.

Mr. Schultz.

MR. SCHULTZ: Just a comment. I understood you to say earlier that there would be no rebuttal. I just want to make sure, the proponent under your rules typically gets a rebuttal if they request it, and I think you don't want to deviate from that.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

MS. McBETH: And Mr. Chair, too, I believe that Mr. Lynch has the only copies of those, so if you don't mind hanging onto those.

MR. LYNCH: I'm not going to throw them in the trash. I've got them right here and I'm going to put a paperclip on them so they can go into the public record.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

With that we'll close the public hearing and turn it over to the Planning Commission for your
consideration.

Member Anthony.

MR. ANTHONY: Thank you.

MR. SCHULTZ: Mr. Chair, if

Mr. Landry waives his right to rebuttal, that would be
fine, but I think you need to give him that
opportunity.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Mr. Landry.

MR. LANDRY: I just have a -- very
quick, I'm not going to be very long. I just want to
address the so-called petitioner or whatever that was.
The adjacency issue is between this unit and the folks
on Balfour. There's eight houses on Balfour. The
majority of these people are on Bristol Circle or
other places which are thousands of feet if not more
away from this. In my mind that's not an adjacency
issue. That's all I have to say.

MS. ROBERTS: Can we rebut a
rebuttal?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Member
Anthony.

MR. ANTHONY: So this is -- I think
what makes this difficult is that, you know, it's one
of those rare locations where we end up going from
industrial right to single-family residential. So I
think we all look at this a little bit more closely. And, you know, I agree with one of the commenters, the ordinances, master plan, future land use plans are all intended to guide our development, protect the citizens, and the landowners as well. And I also agree we do have rules where we can modify, and I look at those rules of modifying from the ordinances are when the intent is in order to create as good or a better scenario for this transition from an industrial site into a residential site. Which brings me to our ordinance being a 10 foot berm, and where the area is of greatest concern is in the southeast corner. I think we've all looked and saw that as being closest to the residential property. When we sent this back before, that was the area we were concerned about. We were looking at how do we -- what can the city, what can the developer do to best help in that transition. Is there something that we can do that is even better than the 10 foot berm. I think the city early on in creating the 50 foot easement, that 50 foot easement came from property that was owned. So before the easement there could have been the ability to develop that. So we have the 50 foot easement that is in there as well. And I look at the --

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Are you
MR. ANTHONY: It is. And I don't know how to turn the dinging off yet. I need the picture for my argument. So I apologize for that.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We'll teach you next time.

MR. ANTHONY: Yes. So as soon as I'm done, I'll just shut the whole thing off.

So when I look at this, you know, we sent everybody back, we said, hey, let's look at what we can do. There were concerns that the 10 foot berm could put strain on the woodland. There was talk about the topography. The topography is rising, and in some areas it declines to where moisture gathers, so we have to rely on our woodlands expert on what is the best way to always preserve that woodland and best protect it. And then we rely on our landscape architect working with the city in order to create the best type of barrier that we can have. And we were concerned -- we had talked about the seasons. We are concerned about in the winter when the leaves drop. So one of the things that we had mentioned in going back and looking at were could we have evergreens that come in there and that fill that. A 10 foot berm against a 30 feet building, the berm even at 10 foot
still doesn't get it. So we're looking -- what we have now is we have the proposal of a concrete barrier in that corner, and I look at that as being able to deflect ground sound that comes from the roadway, and then with the wall of evergreens.

So the one thing, and Rick this is for you, and when I looked at the wall of evergreens in that plan, we had one of our commenters that had talked about evergreens that she had planted on her own that were able to grow to 40 feet in height. So when I looked at the plan -- and frankly that's the kind of thing I was envisioning when we sent this back before, I wanted there to be this four season visual barrier. To try to deflect sound from 30 feet up is -- you can't really do it, but to be able to deflect sound from the ground surface you could. So when I'm looking at what has come back and I'm looking at the plan, it's L1 on the plan that shows the vegetation and landscaping, and I was trying to read the key so I could look at what type of trees, what type of vegetation was going on. So now I'm looking at the southwest corner, and I'm looking at the vegetation that is just outside of the concrete barrier or the corner fence. Is that area intended to be just shrubbery, or is that area also an area that would
have that continuous wall of evergreen trees that would have the opportunity to grow in height?

MR. MEADER: Those right there are white spruces. So they're evergreen trees that will get to probably 30, 40 feet high, not right away. They're projected to be planted 8 to 10 feet tall, so they'll be about four feet above the wall when they're planted, and then they'll grow and fill in as they get taller.

MR. ANTHONY: Sure, right. And the best way to get height in a barrier is really through natural vegetation. There's really not anything that we've constructed in the past for that. And so that's where I look at the long term, the protection of the visual aesthetics from the residential area, because when the leaves fall, you can see through that. I look for the visual aesthetics. I look for that extra so that we can have a transition, and this is what I envisioned that we could do there.

And so there is a lot of work that is put in here and it is not -- it truly is not an easy corner or transition to work with, but there has been some good work here in order to both create a visual barrier over time that would extend up even the height of the building as well as a sound barrier at
road level, in addition to the fact that they're not
going to allow trucks on that side of the building and
they've moved loading to the other side as well for
sound.

I guess my next and final question
is for the developer.

MR. LANDRY: Yes, sir.

MR. ANTHONY: So the sound that
we -- that could come from the interior of the
building itself, when you say hi-tech, so hi-tech,
that does not include a stamping operation?

MR. LANDRY: It does not.

MR. ANTHONY: It doesn't include
heat treating?

MR. LANDRY: No.

MR. ANTHONY: It doesn't include
heavy --

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Extrusion?

MR. ANTHONY: Well, it may be
extrusion, but it's not going to involve that heavy
manufacturing where sound is projected, and you
generally get this from stamping and operations and
heat treating, those are the worst with sounds in
those all the time.

MR. LANDRY: It's not
manufacturing.

MR. ANTHONY: So we're looking at things that are hi-tech that are research and development and tend to be quieter than development?

MR. LANDRY: Exactly.

MR. ANTHONY: Okay. That's my last question there.

As far as all the traffic and the nuisance, and this is just probably a general comment, that's up for the city and our enforcement in order to really to enforce our city ordinances and law, and perhaps just like they park a car in my neighborhood to slow down the people driving down the street too fast, it might be an area that they're alerted to so that they can patrol that more and deter that.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you Member Anthony.

Member Greco.

MR. GRECO: Yes, thank you, Chair Pehrson.

A question for the staff also. If we were to require the berm on the property line, that would push it into the trees and into the tree line, right?

MR. MEADER: Yes.
MR. GRECO: So it would be removing the trees to put in the 10 foot berm without really necessarily any other requirements that the applicant is putting in, you know, as an option, correct, with regard to when they're working with the city?

MR. MEADER: Yes.

MR. GRECO: My comments with regard to that is or this, concerning our zoning ordinance, what we are tasked to do when looking at these projects, this is a project that actually fits within the zoning ordinance, this is a building that is going into an area that is zoned for this. The building clearly meets the setback requirements, there is no issue there. The ZBA has already granted the height variance, that's not for our consideration tonight. And the issue for us tonight is berm versus the plan that is in front of us, which is maintaining the trees and some other things aesthetically there with the evergreens. And looking at this from when we discussed it before, I mean, this clearly seems like a far superior plan.

From the pictures that have been sent to us, or a lot of the residents that have sent those pictures, that 10 foot berm is not going to do anything about the site line that is going through
there, and this area is zoned for this type of building. It's not, you know, optimal to be having any kind of construction whether it's industrial or residential near your residential house, but as far as the ordinances that we have here, we don't have really much of a deviation at all other than dealing with the berm issue, which is for us to decide whether or not what is being proposed tonight versus the berm is the best for the site. And in my view it looks like maintaining the trees, some additional screening, and the additional wall is the better option because I don't think the berm would do anything to assuage the situation that is there given it's zoned and it fits within the setback requirements.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, Member Greco.

Member Lynch.

MR. LYNCH: He kind of beat me to it. That was my only question. And the only outlier is the berm. And you have a 15-foot berm, right? Then you have the -- you're probably talking about wiping out 30 or 40 feet, maybe 50 feet of woodlands to put a 10 feet berm up. I think that would be detrimental to not only the wildlife, but also by the time the trees would grow, it just doesn't make sense
to me to take 30, 40, 50 feet of that densely wooded area just to meet the I guess the terms of whatever you call the specific requirement. It just don't make sense in this particular case to wipe out 40 or 50 feet of densely populated woodland with mature trees, and these are high quality trees I understand. Is that your -- I think that car -- one of those cars in that picture may have been mine if it was taken today, but --

MR. MEADER: I felt it was a very nice, healthy woodland that it would be a shame to lose.

MR. LYNCH: It looked good to me. I was thinking, yeah, okay, 10 feet, 15 feet doesn't sound like much, but then you figure, well, it can't go straight up, it has to have --

MR. MEADER: One to three slope.

MR. LYNCH: A one to three slope.

So we're looking at wiping out a good portion of that woodland that took decades to grow. I guess my opinion if that's the only issue we're concerned with, my opinion is I really don't think it would be a good idea to wipe out that mature growth of trees. I think that the long-term negative effect it would have on that area would just be foolish to do something like
that.

I do sympathize, you know, with the adjacent homeowners. As my colleagues stated, this is within the Ordinance. It's better than -- I was thinking of Continental Aluminum over there in South Lyon extruding aluminum things which is really loud, and this isn't anything like that. This is more of an office, R and D as far the noise goes.

As far as I did take note of the donut pictures of people speeding and whatever they're doing in the parking lot. That really is a police matter. I certainly where I live experience the same thing, and police have been fast to respond. Usually a couple of responses and they don't come back.

But if the berm is the primary issue that we're debating, my vote would be to not wipe out those trees and not put in that berm, leaving the densely wooded area and just put the evergreens and the wall along that south border. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Member Avdoulos.

MR. AVDOULOS: Thank you, Chair Pehrson. I echo the concerns of the other planning commissioners, and I, you know, feel for the residents and their concerns. This being an I-1 district, the
noise levels are being met per your Ordinance, and I believe our photometrics are indicating that the light levels are being met per Ordinance. The berm I think is the one that we've been talking about and we discussed at the last meeting, and the applicant has gone back and addressed that southeastern corner. A 10 foot berm would take away a 60 foot wide swath. A 15 foot berm would take away a 90 foot swath. You're also looking at drainage that has to be managed. So it is kind of difficult to take a look, and I did the same thing as Member Meijer --

MR. LYNCH: Lynch. That's okay. I've been called worse.

MR. AVDOULOS: And visited that site and looked at it and agree with our landscape consultant that it is a mature piece of woodland that unfortunately we have deciduous trees, so we have to go through their process, but I think that the best thing to do is to look at what has been proposed with the brick wall or the block wall and the evergreens, and that the applicant has worked with the staff, and the staff supports what has been presented. So I think I'm in line with the rest of the Planning Commissioners.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you,
sir.

Member Greco.

MR. GRECO: Yes. With that I would like to make a motion in the matter of Beck North Unit 54 JSP 16-36, motion to approve the Special Land Use Permit based on and subject to the following set forth in A through J on the motion sheet, and because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Article 3, Article 4, Article 5 and Article 6 of the Zoning Ordinance and all other applicable provisions of the ordinance.

MR. ANTHONY: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a motion by Member Greco, second by Member Anthony. Any other comments?

Sri, can you call the roll?

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: 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 Anthony?
MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes 5 to 0.

MR. GRECO: I would like to make another motion in the matter of Beck North Unit 54 JSP 16-36. Motion to approve the preliminary site plan based on and subject to the following Items A through F on the motion sheet, and 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. ANTHONY: Second.

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

Any other discussions?

Sri, please.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

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

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes 5 to 0.

MR. GRECO: All right. In the matter of Beck North 54 JSP 16-36, 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. ANTHONY: Second.

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

Any other discussions?

Sri, please call roll.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: 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 Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes 5 to 0.

MR. GRECO: The final motion is in the matter of Beck North Unit 54 JSP 16-36, 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 final site plan, and because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Chapter 11 of the Code of Ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance.

MR. ANTHONY: Second.

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

Any other discussions?

Sri, please?

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

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

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes 5 to 0.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

Next on the agenda is Item Number 3, the Armenian Church and Cultural Center JSP 17-37. It's a public hearing at the request of the Armenian Cultural Center for Special Land Use, Preliminary Site Plan with Land Bank Parking, Phasing Plan, Shared Parking Agreement, Wetland Permit, Woodland Permit, and Stormwater Management plan approval. The subject property is located in Section 12 on the north side of Twelve Mile Road and east of Meadowbrook Road, in residential acreage RA zoning district. The applicant is proposing a church and a cultural center with accessory uses such as daycare center, multipurpose hall, cafe, religious educational rooms, Armenian genocide memorial and recreational facility. The applicant is proposing to construct in three phases. The project are comprising of four parcels is approximately 19.30 ares. A Special Land
Use Permit is required to permit Places of Worship and a daycare in residential districts.

Sri.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Thank you. As mentioned, the applicant is proposing to develop the subject property to build a church and a cultural center. The property is located on the north side of Twelve Mile Road and east of Meadowbrook. The site is zoned Residential Acreage and is surrounded by an existing single-family development on east and north sides. It is zoned R-4 on the west and a single-family development is currently under construction in that location. Part of the property adjoining west is zoned B-3, General Business. Properties on the south are zoned Office Service and Technology and are currently vacant. All properties are indicated as similar uses as currently zoned on future land use map as well. The property has considerable regulated woodlands and wetlands on site.

The applicant is currently proposing to build the church and cultural center and some other accessory uses in three phases. The first phase includes a temporary church with 350 seats and some accessory uses such as kitchen, cafe, multipurpose halls and a daycare to serve a maximum of
50 kids. An Armenian genocide memorial is also proposed to be built with the first phase. All parking will be built in Phase 1. A permanent church will be built in Phase 2 with 400 seats and some additional meeting rooms. Phase 3 proposes a recreational facility with 272 seats and some administrative office space.

The applicant has worked closely with staff and our traffic consultants in determining the minimum required parking for the proposed uses. Given the nature of uses, staff agreed with the applicant's findings for shared parking. Staff determined that a total of 262 spaces would be required at minimum. The applicant proposes to land bank 45 spaces of the required 262. There was an error in the parking layout for land banking that was submitted initially. The applicant has since then provided a revised layout via email which addresses the discrepancy satisfactorily. Staff also recommended that the applicant revise the pedestrian connectivity from the site to property on south and to the public sidewalk along Twelve Mile Road. The applicant has agreed to provide the required access in areas along secondary emergency access to the south.

The applicant has been very proactive in
gathering public input from neighbors regarding this project. They've held three community open houses to address neighbors concerns. In response to the comments received from those meetings, the applicant has submitted a traffic impact statement. Traffic is in agreement with the findings. Planning Commission's approval is required for the proposed Special Land Use request for the proposed church which is a Place of Worship, and the daycare in a residential district. And it's also required to approve the phasing plan proposed, the shared parking agreement, and the land bank parking. The applicant is also seeking a minor waiver to allow all required 10 bike racks in one location instead of multiple locations.

The landscape plan mostly conforms to the code and requires a couple of landscape waivers as listed in the motion sheet. Landscape review supports all the waivers provided the applicant makes an attempt to reduce the extent of deviations as suggested in the review letter.

Site access would be provided by a new driveway entrance off of Twelve Mile Road with secondary emergency only access off of Twelve Mile Road towards the south. Stormwater would be collected by a single storm sewer collection and detained in a
new on-site detention pond. The plans may require a City Council variance for undetained run-off directed to Twelve Mile if determined by staff at the time of the final site plan review.

A total of 980 trees are surveyed on site, of which a total of 461 trees, about 47 percent, are proposed to be removed. The Woodland Impact Plan notes that 146 credits are to be provided on site and 382 credits would be paid to the City fund.

The Townline Drain is located along the southern section of the project site and flows from west to east. There are surveyed wetlands along either side of the existing drain totaling approximately 0.66 acres in size. The current proposed wetland total impact is .09 acres. In addition to the wetland impacts, the Plan proposes disturbance to .35 acres of on-site 25-foot buffer area.

The applicant is proposing a right turn taper at the driveway on Twelve Mile. Based on the trip generation estimate provided, traffic determined that the trip generation estimates do not exceed the City's threshold.

The applicant was initially
requesting three deviations from Zoning Board of Appeals, one for the height of the church, which is to be constructed in Phase 2, one for the height of the genocide memorial which is supposed to be constructed in Phase 1, and one for proposing an uplight for the memorial, and another one for proposing dumpster in the side yard. Our facade consultant reviewed the detailed elevation provided for Phase 1 and conceptual for Phase 2. Staff was in full support for the deviations requested for the memorial height and had some minor concerns about lighting. However, upon internal discussion, the applicant has deferred the height variance requested for church at the time of Phase 2 approval process, and decided not to pursue the deviations related to the memorial at this time. Revised elevations that conform to the code will be submitted at the time of final site plan review for the genocide memorial. The applicant is currently not seeking any Section 9 waivers for Phase 1 building construction.

The applicant has submitted the required community impact statement and noise impact statement. The noise impact statement states that there will be six picnics with an estimated attendance of 200 to 400 people that will be held between 1:00
p.m. to 7:00 p.m., and a three-day festival every year
with an estimated attendance of 1,000 to 1,500 people
per day that will be held from noon to 11:00 p.m.
There will be music played at all events. The
applicant has submitted a tentative event location and
noted that the noise levels shall not exceed maximum
decibel levels allowed.

All reviews are recommending
approval with additional comments to be addressed with
final site plan.

The Planning Commission is asked
tonight to approve the Special Land Use, Preliminary
Site Plan with Land Bank Parking, Phasing Plan, Shared
Parking Agreement, Wetland Permit, Woodland permit,
and Stormwater Management Plan. It's also asked to
review the site plan based on the Special Land Use
considerations and make a finding with regard to the
noise impact statement provided.

The applicant Rafii Ourlian is here
tonight with his architects Constantine Gus Pappas and
Evans Caruso, and Engineer Julian Wargo and Landscape
Architect Steve Deak.

We have our consultants Sterling
Fraser from Traffic and Doug Necci for Facade, along
with the staff to answer any questions you have for
us. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, Sri.

Does the applicant wish to address the Commission?

MR. PAPPAS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Constantine Pappas, Architect for the Armenian Community Center. Sri, thank you very much for the wonderful presentation.

Again, I'd just like to introduce our design team. Evans Caruso from our office and Andy Wozniak from Zeimet Wozniak Civil Engineers, Steve Deak from Deak Planning and Landscape Consultants. As mentioned, Mr. Rafii Ourlian is here. He is the chairman of the Armenian Community Center, and treasurer of the Armenian Apostolic Church of America in New York City. And Hayg Oshagan is here, and he's the chairman of the Armenian Cultural Association of America, the eastern region, and is also co-chair of this entire project. They are here and they can answer any question that you have.

So we wanted to also mention we do have members of our community here as well. We wanted to indicate that we have at last count at least 90 families that live in the City of Novi. We didn't ask
them to all be out here today. We said let's maybe
limit who is out here, but many of them are here.

Let me just go through a few little
of the items Sri had mentioned that I did want to
mention. We tried to limit the amount of access along
Twelve Mile Road as you can see. One way in. The
second drive, which is on the southern area is
primarily for fire as you see.

We wanted to maintain that
landscape area that was to our parcel to the immediate
west, we'll call it the Shapiro parcel. And we wanted
to extend what was being planned in the Shapiro parcel
all along our front. So therefore the drain would
stay in its position. We don't want to disrupt that.
There is a small little wetland area. We didn't want
to disrupt that. We wanted to enhance anything along
Twelve Mile Road.

A stormwater detention area is
located just a little bit north of the drain, which is
in that area, and will be used as a little bit of a --
well, not a little bit, but a reflecting pond that
reflects the whole complex as you're looking at it.

The whole complex is considerably placed far
away from Twelve Mile Road. If I remember it's close
to 400 some feet away. So therefore when you're
driving I think along Twelve Mile Road, you'll get the 
impact of what was created in the Shapiro parcel all 
along that whole front area. 

The building and the parking area 
have been placed as close to the middle of the site as 
possible. That's that one big open area that is 
there. There is quite a few wetlands and tremendous 
amount of topography on the site. In order to get 
everything to fit in, there is going to be some small 
topography changes, but I think Andy's office has done 
a great job trying to get everything to level itself 
out per se. But we tried to place the complex in the 
middle to be -- to minimize the impact along the 
residents who are located on the east and the west of 
the parcel. The ones that are located to the north of 
the parcel are quite a bit away. All that area in the 
back is quite solid dense woodland areas, and the 
topography is such that they are considerably higher, 
and the high point of the site is on the west end -- 
excuse me, on the north end, and it slopes itself all 
the way down essentially to the drain. So by trying 
to minimize the impacts of where the buildings are at, 
the idea is try to minimize the amount of impact on 
the woodlands as well as the natural features. 

I did want to mention that even
before we submitted for site plan approval, we conducted three meetings with the residents. So the first meeting was on the 26th of July, and the secondary meeting on August the 3rd. Then we also had a third meeting on September 13th. That meeting was used to explain to the residents everything that was submitted. So when we came into this project, it was extremely important for us to open up our arms and to explain to everybody who this building is going to impact. Let me tell you a few of the concerns that the residents had, and we listened I think pretty well. We tried as much as possible to try to attempt every one of these issues.

Traffic was of a major concern, and I have to tell you, at all these meetings we probably had less impacts about what we were going to do, but major impacts on what was approved at the corner of Meadowbrook and Twelve Mile Road. And in fact, just about all the residents who were there turned around and said, well, listen, we really don't have that much problem with yours, but we have a lot of problems with what was approved at Twelve Mile and Meadowbrook Road. Again, not our issue, but we're here to listen.

So traffic was a problem. Although the city had their own traffic study done, we went and
hired another traffic consultant, HRC. HRC has done quite a few traffic studies in Novi. They also did the traffic study for the Shapiro property right next door. They basically came up with the same findings that the city traffic engineer came up with. So therefore we wanted to make sure to tell the residents that we're not just going to take what the city says, we're more than willing to go out and spend that extra money to have an independent consultant come in and to verify or to make sure that whatever the traffic engineer said from Novi, they're basically saying the same thing.

Screening. Another thing was both screening of the parking and the entry drives. And because of the existing wetland and the actual existing topography, we provided extensive additional landscape screening primarily along the main entry drives, all along parking areas, all along the northern area, whatever is there, there is a tremendous amount of landscaping on this site. And even though our landscape architects tell us that we actually could put more, we've put a lot. And from what I can see, I think it's well, well screened, and I think it serves very, very well for the adjoining residents.
The height of the building as was discussed or presented by Sri, we are not seeking any variances right now in Phase 1 with the exception of one item, and that item is moving the dumpster location from the rear yard into the eastern setback. Again, it's quite screened extensively all along that eastern side with not only a screen wall, but also at the same time landscaping. We are on the agenda in November for the ZBA relative to that item.

Lastly, the question from the residents, they had a concern about people who would be on this particular property actually walking onto their particular property, and one resident had asked, well, why don't we just put a screen or a fence completely around the property. But then again when you do that, because of the grades you're probably tearing out an incredible amount of trees, not only on the north, also on the east side in order to put in the fence. So we had mentioned to the residents that that really isn't really in our ability to do, but rather than the Planning Commission to hear out if you want to do that. We would recommend against it, but that's something that we thought we would bring to you.

The phasing, Sri had done a great
job talking about it. I wanted everybody to realize that the concept of having Phase 1, which is we call it the fellowship hall or community room, that will be used as our temporary church until we have the ability to sell the church which they're currently located in Dearborn right now. The area is changing tremendously in Dearborn. Many of our people live in Novi, and what happens is less and less people are coming down into Dearborn. And once that gets sold, the church would be built in the second phase accordingly.

We are asking for a child care center of 50 people. That again is not just for our people, that's for the whole community, and that would be located as is shown in that little yellow area which is pointed on the drawings.

The last phase is the recreation center which would be in the right-hand corner right there. That's in blue. That would be in our third area.

And then one important feature is the Armenian Genocide Memorial right at this particular point. We're looking at possibly redesigning it, because of the height variance. It's extremely important for this cultural community to understand the atrocities that happened over 100 years
ago. So while everybody can understand the Nazi and the Holocaust tragedy that took place, everyone has to understand in 1914 to 1924 there were 1.5 million Armenians killed during that time, 250,000 Greeks killed at that time. So this is something that we're not hiding, we want everybody to know about it, and it's being placed in the middle of courtyard so it's the first thing that you see as you come in, and literally walk around one side, which is the educational recreational area, and then the educational areas and the church on the left-hand side.

I don't have anything else at this particular point. I'm here to answer any questions along with our design team. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, sir.

This is a public hearing. If there's anyone in the audience that wishes to address the Planning Commission at this time, please step forward.

MS. BODA: Martina Boda, 28375 Summit Drive. My three primary concerns are the height of the church roof, the height of the memorial. My position is that those would be more aesthetic than
necessary for memorializing or worshipping, so I would like it to be kept to ordinance heights. The traffic continues to be a concern. We recognize we have all the specialists in looking at it, but that continues to be something that is very worrisome coming off of Summit Drive. It's busy now, it's busy during the holidays. With everything else, the other activities that are being built at Meadowbrook and Twelve Mile aren't going to be helping, and then to have a large congregation that we'll be seeing next door, especially during events again becomes worrisome for those of us who come and go with one way in, one way out off of Summit Drive.

And the third is a ground water concern. We are -- on Summit Court and Summit Drive we are on well water. We have lost about 20 acres of ground water seepage from the Meadowbrook and Twelve Mile. We'll be losing about 20 acres of ground water seepage with the new one. And so this again, not that it's the church's concern, but the city's concern around what is the impact potentially around that ground water. We recognize that there will be ground -- their ground water will go into drainage which will not make it into the ground water that ends up in our wells. So that would be a concern as well.
Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

Anyone else?

Seeing no one, we'll close that part of the public hearing. I understand we have some other correspondence?

MR. LYNCH: Yes, we do. The first one was an objection. I believe you just listened to Martina. I'm not going to detail it, you did a much better job, although it is a well-written letter.

And then there's probably about 30 supporters, and I'm just going to read the names and the addresses, and if you want to go into the record, you can read the detail.

The first support was Madhavi Gandham, 44995 Lightsway Drive, Novi.

Gary Vartanian, 22196 Antler Drive.

Sylvia, I can't read the last name, 40952 Kingsley Lane, Novi.

I'm not even going to attempt to read the next name. It's 29307 Douglas Drive, Novi.

I can't read this one either, 32665 Summit Lane, Novi. These are all in support by the way.

Richa Pandy, 44567 Guinnett Loop,
Novi. Thank you.

Susan Mardoyan, 22665 Summer Lane.
Sabina Ahmed, 22689 Summer Lane.
Adriana Mardigian, 22665 Summer Lane. I apologize for butchering these names.
Sousa Palandjian, 23340 Mystic Forest.
Steve Thallman, 25337 Mystic Forest.
Sandra, I can't read the last name, 22520 Summer.
I can't read this name, 45568 and it's Novi, it starts with an I. I can't read it.
23340 Mystic Forest, Novi.
I think I already read this one.
Rudolph Spain, 23364 Mystic Forest.
23340 Mystic Forest.
Wei, 22641 Summer Lane.
Timothy Singel, 45559 Irvine Drive.
Konstantina Phillips, 45455 Irvine Court.
Carla Thomas, 22774 Summer Lane.
Fran Guttman, 28765 Summit Drive.
Nayiri Misirliyan, 22385 Worcester Drive.
This is too light, Roy Misirliyan, 22355 -- oh, it's the same. It must be the spouse.

Ani Kasparian, 24180 Wintergreen.

Same thing, duplicate.

Edward Guttman, 28765 Summit Drive.
Fran Guttman, 28765 Summit Drive.

That's it.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

With that we'll close the public hearing on this matter and turn it over to the Planning Commission for their consideration. Who would like to start?

Member Avdoulos.

MR. AVDOULOS: Thank you, Chair Pehrson.

Well, this is an exciting project.

It's exciting to be able to have the Armenian community reside in the City of Novi, create an access to compliment all the diverse demographics that exist in Novi. These religious and social community centers, they typically undergo the special land use process and are typically located in residential areas, so that's why when we look at our package, we have waivers that are requested, but that's because it's set up that way so that we can work with the community and with the neighborhood and with the city
to make sure that all the processes are followed.

This site is a high-profile area, and therefore there needs to be some exercise to design the facility correctly, and to also take into account concerns as Ms. Boda has presented to us, traffic and water concerns and other things that everybody takes into account when they live in and around a facility that may be a little bit more active than a typical residential facility is. The scale of the facility will also need to compliment the surrounding area in the neighborhood.

I think the applicant Gus Pappas and his team and also the community have done a nice job in that they engaged the neighbors to look at their concerns and assure that questions are answered and things are looked at with a little bit more sensitivity. So that's very much appreciated.

The architect, Gus Pappas, that the Armenian community has selected is actually a perfect fit for this type of project. I know Gus and Evans and the work that they do, and they are very sensitive not only to what the building is going to look like but how it's going to work, how it's going to fit in, where it's going to sit on the site. We can see that it's pulled off of Twelve Mile so that it's not
fronting the street and not creating a billboard per se. It's set back nicely. I think the scale of the project and the way it's broken up is done appropriately.

Many ethnic communities deal with these type of projects in phases, and particularly as Gus indicated the first phase is usually a fellowship hall. This one will have a kitchen. And it's no different than I think some of the Greek communities that I know where you have a fellowship hall, and maybe when you are ready to build the church and get the funding and realize the actual size of your community, then you proceed with Phase 2. So I personally don't have an issue with the phasing part of it. I think that's something that is appropriate, and I think it was a question that was asked here by the city.

The other question that was brought up was related to the festivals and the type of events that would go on there. I appreciate having a layout that showed how it may be set up, so that's helpful. The big thing with that is, and I don't know if the community has thought about it, and that will be when the time comes, is the big thing for that is the three-day event typically and where parking is going
to be an issue or if the community is going to work with somebody close by that has an area where people can park and then you shuttle people back and forth so you can mitigate some of the potential problems along Twelve Mile, and especially where it's located it might be a little bit congested for that. But that's something that can be ironed out, but at least it's being addressed right now so that the city has an understanding of what is going to be going on.

The one question I had, and I think Gus had indicated that the memorial is going to be looked at again. So Gus or Evans, just if you could explain, you know, what is going to be looked at. I don't know if it's a redesign or just --

MR. PAPPAS: It's the main tower. It's the main tower, and you have some like amazingly -- you have an amazingly stringent ordinance, and you have an equally stringent Zoning Board of Appeals. So we were looking at it do we think that the tower is appropriate for the complex? Absolutely. Do we think, you know, does it need to be 60, well maybe it's not 60, it's 55. Does it need the lighting? The only thing we had, I think we had something in our packet that had very, you know, small little lights that go through the middle. If
everybody can remember when 911 happened, you remember there were two lights that kind of went up. It's something that is subtle. We would love to see it in there. But now that we look and we say to ourselves, well, what is the exact reason from a Zoning Board of Appeals standpoint. And that's pretty tough for us to come up with other than saying it's part of what the memorial is. We think it's important, but we need time to come up with the reasons.

So I think at this point we just wanted to yank it off the table at this point. We may go back to relook at the whole thing, do something different. Or if we think that we can come up with some appropriate reasons. I know we've talked to planning. We know how planning feels about it and we know your -- how Doug feels about it. It's a really cool item relative to the whole thing. We wish it could go in, but I think we just need a little time to see how it's going to get in there.

MR. AVDOULOS: And again I have no issue with a memorial and what it is. I think you could work with the city and the community to decide what that is going to be.

MR. PAPPAS: Exactly.

MR. AVDOULOS: And then also have
sensitivity to the neighbors.

MR. PAPPAS: Exactly.

MR. AVDOULOS: And its location and figuring out what is appropriate. But I thought the concept I like. It's just, yes, how it fits in.

MR. PAPPAS: Exactly.

MR. AVDOULOS: Okay. Again, I appreciate the work that you and the community have done with the city and working with the residents.

MR. PAPPAS: Thank you.

MR. AVDOULOS: And bringing in a community in an area that I think is going to benefit from a center like this. It's not just going to be one building, it's going to be a community. And then also having the daycare center there and available for everybody to use, that's another positive asset for the city. So those are my comments.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, sir.

Member Anthony.

MR. ANTHONY: I also think -- I look forward to the community coming in and the development. I wanted to just address a couple of the concerns that were expressed. When I look at the structure height, I'm very glad to hear that you're
open to it. I believe there's another church that we recently were able to accommodate when they came for a variance on their height.

MR. PAPPAS: We worked on that one, too.

MR. ANTHONY: The traffic flow. We have a study. What I liked about this is the entrance onto Summit is closest to Twelve Mile Road. This seems like a very appropriate location from what you're proposing. The concern about ground water for the ground water wells, I just did a quick look at the surface water drainage of the area, and your site for shallow aquifers would be considered hydraulically down gradient, so it wouldn't have an effect on shallow wells. And if the wells are deeper, then definitely there would be no hydraulic communication. So this particular site is not one that would threaten or cause any harm to that ground water concern. It happens to be my professional expertise. So that one is fine.

And what I really love about this is here is an example of how Novi as we build out and we follow the plans that we put together work, because I can see myself who lives in the neighborhood where the majority of the residents celebrate Diwali I think
is the right word, that when you have your three-day festival, that my wife and I will be walking along our nonmotorized path up to the church to partake in the festival. That's what we're trying to create in Novi, and I think this is a nice piece that fits that feeling.

MR. PAPPAS: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

Member Lynch or Member Greco.

MR. GRECO: With that --

MR. SCHULTZ: Mr. Chair. So just a couple of things that I want to sort of ask you to take into consideration. One is a request. The other is just sort of a suggestion. Both have to do with the fact that the first motion you're looking to make is the Special Land Use approval, which is your greatest time to exercise discretion and make any conditions.

So the first one is pretty easy.

Mr. Greco, if you see Item A under site plan, the second motion, where it says primary use of church will be established prior to any other accessory use. That really should be, the more that I think about it now, in your first motion, your Special Land Use motion, because it's a condition. And just to
explain, the cultural center, the memorial and all that stuff, those are accessory to the main issue or, you know, the main use of the church or the place of worship. So, Mr. Greco, if you could add after church or place of worship. So that's the first one, just to make sure we're getting a church as the primary use and the rest is accessory.

And the second thing is just really I guess just occurring to me listening to the proponent comments that they may want to come back — you know, right now they're proposing buildings that meet height and a memorial that meets height requirements. If they come back to the city, you know, if you move on from this and you grant a Special Land Use and Site Plan approval, the board they're going to be in front of may just be the Zoning Board of Appeals, maybe you for site plan. Again, focusing back on Special Land Use, your ability to say, okay, we want to look at this, you might want to consider a condition in the Special Land Use approval that says the memorial and the building heights will be as shown on the plans, which means if they want to come back, they would come back to you for a Special Land Use amendment and to the Zoning Board of Appeals for height variance or whatever. It's a consideration,
it's not something you have to do. I'm just throwing it out there. If it's a 100 foot memorial you might think, wow, why did we do a Special Land Use approval. Just a thought, not a requirement.

MR. GRECO: Okay. Thank you, Counselor. Just a little discussion of that before I make a motion. My understanding -- I understand the point made by our attorney as far as putting the primary use as a church or place of worship into our Special Land Use permit, but I would like to present for discussion the idea that counsel has presented with respect to putting the memorial and building heights as a condition in the Special Land Use permit motion. Just to reclarify, what he indicated is he indicated if we approve it as is without any condition there, it may very well be that it just goes to the ZBA and we don't see it again, right?

MR. SCHULTZ: Yes.

MR. GRECO: So if the height that is going to be revisited by the applicant is something that we want to look at as well, it is something that we can put as a condition in the motion. I just want to see what everyone thinks.

MR. AVDOULOS: I would like to see that. I would like to see it come back to the
Planning Commission. I think having these projects start the way they're starting and then being able to see them through whatever phase, I think it's important that it comes in here and maintains, you know, it's history. And then if something has to go to ZBA, that's fine, but I would like that.

MR. GRECO: And I think I tend to agree given that we are the ones that are the board that specifically look at the Special Land Use with respect to places of worship in residential areas, so I think it makes sense.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: I would agree, I concur. And Mr. Schultz, the idea of what is on the plan right now --

MR. SCHULTZ: That the buildings and memorial be as shown on the plans currently, and amendments come back to the Planning Commission.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Does the memorial right now and the church dome height, does it meet our standard?

MS. KOMARAGIRI: The plan as submitted right now, the memorial is indicated as 65, and the church is shown as 55 feet, but they have requested after submittal that they would like to defer the height variance for the church to Phase 2
review and not seek the variance for the memorial at this time.

MR. SCHULTZ: So based on that, so at a minimum you want to say the memorial will meet ordinance requirements.

MR. GRECO: Exactly, that's what I was driving to, right.

MR. SCHULTZ: As to the building height, the church height, I guess you can do the same thing, and then that would come back as well.

MR. GRECO: Okay. All right. Fair enough.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: That would be my preference.

MR. GRECO: That makes sense.

MR. ANTHONY: I feel that way to the tower, I just -- and I guess we could pick it up when it comes back, but there are cultural traditions and reasons why the church has a particular shape or architect.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: But if it's coming back to us in the second phase, then we have the ability to discuss it at that time.

MR. GRECO: Right. Because I think that is what the applicant is saying that he wants to
pull it back and they want to come up with or discuss with us a little more fully why they're doing it. We welcome that of course.

MR. PAPPAS: We need time to fully design it and when we discuss it, it may be less than what it is. We're okay with all of those.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: So we'll watch our words as we go forward.

MR. GRECO: I'm ready. I'd like to make a motion in the matter of Armenian Church and Cultural Center, JSP 17-37. Motion to approve the Special Land Use permit to allow a place of worship and daycare based on and subject to the items listed in A through G on the motion sheet with the addition of the site or the project being -- the primary use being a church or place of worship be established prior to any other accessories proposed, and adding the condition that the memorial and building heights either meet ordinance standards or be constructed as shown in the plans.

MR. SCHULTZ: Not as shown, just meet.

MR. GRECO: Meet the ordinance standards, and because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Article 3, Article 3, Article 5 and
Article 6 of the Zoning Ordinance and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance.

MR. AVDOULOS:  Second.

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

Sri, please.

MS. KOMARAGIRI:  Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON:  Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI:  Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY:  Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI:  Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS:  Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI:  Member Greco?

MR. GRECO:  Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI:  Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH:  Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI:  Motion passes 5 to 0.

MR. GRECO:  I would like to make another motion in the matter of Armenian Church and Cultural Center JSP 17-37, motion to approve the Preliminary SITE Plan based on and subject to the items listed in the motion sheet B through L, and 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: Motion by Member Greco, second by Member Avdoulos.

Any other comments?

Sri, please.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: 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 5 to 0.

MR. GRECO: Next, in the matter of Armenian Church and Cultural Center JSP 17-37, motion to approve the phasing 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 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: Motion by Member Greco, second by Member Avdoulos.

Any other comments?

Sri, please.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes 5 to 0.

MR. GRECO: Next motion, in the matter of Armenian Church and Cultural Center JSP 17-37, motion to approve the wetland permit based on and subject to the finding 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: Motion by Member Greco, second by Mr. Avdoulos.

Any other comments?

Sri, please.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: 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 5 to 0.

MR. GRECO: For the next motion, in the matter of Armenian Church and Cultural Center JSP
17-37, 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: Motion by Member Greco, second by Mr. Avdoulos.

Any other comments?

Sri, please.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos.

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes 5 to 0.
MR. GRECO: Finally, in the matter of Armenian Church and Cultural Center JSP 17-37, 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 the plan 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 Mr. Avdoulos.

Any other comments?

Sri, please.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes, yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes 5 to 0.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: You're all set. Thank you.

MR. PAPPAS: Mr. Chairman, just quickly. I just wanted to let everybody know, this is a great day for the Armenian Community especially coming to your city. First and foremost we want to thank very much the residents. I know there is a number of them here. Had we not had them, we know this project would have been difficult. They helped out tremendously. We will still be in contact with them all the time and they are our members. We want to make sure everybody knows that.

Lastly, your whole department from Barbara to Sri to Rick and Darcy to Doug, they're incredible. We would never have been able to get through your Ordinance without them, I can tell you that for a fact. So thank you very, very much. We really appreciate it.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Welcome to the Community. Thank you.

Next is matters for consideration.
Planning Commission Committee vacancies.

MS. McBETH: As you recall, one of our members of the Planning Commission, Rob Giacopetti, recently resigned, and there are two committees that he served on that we will probably need assistance on in the coming months, the Environmental/Walkable Novi Committee, and the Master Plan and Zoning Committee, and also potentially the CIP and Budget Committee as the alternate member.

So I've given the spread sheet again, and if you'd like to reassign or assign yourselves to those three positions, that would be helpful to the staff.

MR. ANTHONY: I'll take the Walkable Community.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: I'll take Master Plan.

MR. AVDOULOS: Does anyone want CIP?

MR. GRECO: I can do it.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Greco CIP?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. McBETH: So Member Greco on CIP, Member Pehrson on Master Plan and Zoning, and Member Anthony on Environmental. Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Do we need to vote on that or just --

MS. McBETH: No, I think that's fine.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thumbs up.

MS. McBETH: I'll send you a new spread sheet tomorrow, and if I make any mistakes, let me know.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Next is the approval of the August 23, 2017 Planning Commission Minutes. Any modifications, changes or approval?

MS. McBETH: Mr. Chair, we did get an email this evening from somebody who read the minutes and requested one minor change to the August 23rd meeting, Page 25, Line 9, changing the reference that was made in the commentary from Mr. Adams to Mr. Bell.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: That's the one I picked up on, too. So with that, we can make the motion to approve.

MR. AVDOULOS: Motion to approve.

MR. ANTHONY: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Sri, can you call roll, please.

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

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes 5 to 0.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Third is the approval of the September 13, 2017 Planning Commission Minutes. Motion to approve or modify?

MR. LYNCH: Motion to approve.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a motion.

MR. ANTHONY: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Sri, can you call the roll, please.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos.

MR. AVDOULOS: 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 Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes 5 to 0.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Any matters for discussion?

Supplemental issues?

Last chance for audience participation. If there's anyone in the audience who wishes to address the Planning Commission, please step forward now.

MR. AVDOULOS: Quick question. On the meeting dates, is there a Planning Commission meeting 10/26?

MS. McBETH: There is one on the calendar, and we will be in touch shortly to let you know whether that meeting will be scheduled or not.

MR. AVDOULOS: If it is, I have a conflict.

MR. ANTHONY: Did you say October 26th which is a Thursday?

MR. AVDOULOS: 10/25 Is Tuesday,
10/26 would be a Wednesday.

MR. ANTHONY: Why is my calendar off.

MR. AVDOULOS: I'm just going by the dates here so.

MR. GRECO: 10/25 is a Wednesday.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: That must be a typo.

MR. GRECO: Because I saw the Zoning Board of Appeals on the 25th.

MS. McBETH: So, yes, we do have one for that Wednesday. I apologize it didn't make it on this calendar, but we'll be in touch shortly.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: So we'll close the audience participation -- I didn't see anybody, so we'll close the last audience participation.

MR. LYNCH: Motion to adjourn?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Sure, go right ahead.

MR. LYNCH: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Do we have a second?

MR. AVDOULOS: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: All those in
favor.

THE BOARD: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Anyone opposed?

Thanks everyone.

(The meeting was adjourned at 8:56 p.m.)
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