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CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: I'd like to call to order the regular meeting of the Planning Commission for September 28, 2016.

Sri, can you call the roll.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Thank you.

Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Here.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Member Baratta?

MR. BARATTA: Yes.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacopetti?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Absent, excused.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: I think he's going to be late.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Here.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Here.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Member

Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Here.

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

Member Anthony, if you could lead us.

(Pledge recited.)

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Look for a motion to approve the agenda or modify thereof.

MR. LYNCH: Motion to approve.

MR. ANTHONY: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: All those in favor.

THE BOARD: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: None opposed.

We have an agenda.

Any presentations, Ms. McBeth?

MS. MCBETH: No, there are not.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have our first audience participation. We have five public hearings tonight, so if there is anyone here that wishes to address the Planning Commission on something other than one of those items, please step forward at this time.

Seeing none, we will close the audience participation. Correspondence?

MR. LYNCH: No.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you. Any committee reports, city planner report, Ms. McBeth?

MS. MCBETH: Thank you. Good evening. Nothing to report this evening.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Awesome for you. Brings us then to the public hearing. The first item is Huntley Manor, JSP16-34. It's a public hearing at the request of GR Meadowbrook LLC. The Planning Commission's recommendation to City Council for consideration of a special development option concept plan.
The subject property is 26.62 in Section 23 of the City of Novi and located on the south side of Grand River Avenue, west of Meadowbrook Road in the GE Gateway East district. The applicant is proposing a 203 unit multi-family gated community. Kirsten.

MS. MELLEM: Good evening. So the applicant a proposing a 203 unit multiple family gated community on 26.62 acres located on the south side of Grand River Avenue, and west of Meadowbrook Road in Section 23.

To the north is existing multiple family and commercial uses, to the west are Fountain Park Apartments, and to the north is -- to the south is the existing Meadowbrook residential development and to the east is vacant land.

The subject property is currently zoned GE, Gateway East, to the north is NCC, non-central commercial, and B3 general commercial.

To the west is RM1, low density multiple family, and to the south is R4, one
family residential. To the east is NCC, non-center commercial and OS1 office service district.

The future land use map has the TC Gateway uses are planned for the subject property and properties to the north and east. To the west is planned for multi family uses and the south for single family uses.

The site previously contained a significant number of regulated natural features that were to be removed as part of a previous development plan. A small amount of regulated woodlands still remain along the border of the property and there is a significant wetland area along the property line as well.

The applicant is proposing a mix of two and three bedroom rental units with a density of 7.63 units per acre in the gated community setting. Landscape amenities are proposed along with a clubhouse and pool.

The previous approval and the
current proposal both utilize the special
development option of the Gateway East
district. This option is intended to allow
greater flexibility and ordinance standards
in order to meet the objectives noted in the
GE district.

The site was previously
approved for development and cleared.
Wetland mitigation has also been constructed.
The initial approval has expired although an
SDO agreement remains required for the
property.

A new owner has acquired the
property and received tentative approval from
the City Council on March 23rd, 2015, to a
revoke and/or revise the previous SDO
approval for the property.

Since that time the applicant
indicated there was significant changes to
the plan, so revised plans have been
submitted and processed for full review by
the Planning Commission and City Council.

The plan review recommends
approval of the plan, noting ordinance deviations are required for the deficient loading area and to allow for lighting fixtures that are not full 90 degree cutoffs.

The landscape review recommends approval also noting waivers are required to allow a decorative and removal of required berm along Grand River Avenue, for lack of parking lot perimeter, canopy trees due to the sufficient edge landscaping area, and the lack of large shrubs around the existing detention basin.

The facade review recommends approval and required section 90 facade waiver for the overage of asphalt shingles and underage of brick as the design meets the intent of the ordinance.

The traffic review recommends approval noting a deviation to allow the 2014 traffic impact study to stay in place of preparing the FCIS. Staff recommends all waivers and deviations be approved in the SDO agreement.
Engineering and fire reviews all recommend approval with items to be addressed in the final site plan submittal. The Planning Commission is asked to recommend approval to City Council of the special development option concept plan this evening.

The applicant and I are here to answer any questions you may have. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, Kirsten. Does the applicant wish to address the Planning Commission at this time?


Kirsten did a great explaining the project. Just a brief overview again. The project was approved in March of '15. We made changes to the unit type since reducing the density by about seven units. Landscaping is going to be consistent what we presented prior to the entranceways and the
exact location computed entryway, and the
clubhouse is going to stay the same. It's a
mix of two and three bedroom units,
essentially all we did was change it from a
back-to-back unit, recognizing the site has a
lot of natural features. We feel it's best
that every unit has a view of natural
features, as opposed to only have half of the
being.

That being said, I know you got
a full agenda, I'm more than happy to answer
any questions.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, sir. Appreciate that. This is a public
hearing. If there is anyone in the audience
who wishes to address the Planning Commission
at this time, please step forward.

Please state your name and
address.

MR. STAAB: My name is Charles
Staab. I live at 41887 Cherry Hill Road in
Novi, Meadowbrook Glens homeowner, own two
houses in the subdivision, lived in Novi for
30 plus years. I think it's an excellent looking project. My big concern, and I'm probably late to the party, maybe on it, is that amount of traffic, it's going to pour onto Grand River Avenue. 203 units, minimally 203 more cars. I travel up and down Grand River at least twice a day during the week, and it's totally congested, totally congested.

And I recognize we did that highway, avenue, a few years back, it's a county road. I don't understand why it holds -- expands and narrows down, but anyway, that's my biggest concern.

This is going to put a lot of stress on our infrastructure. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, sir. Anyone else? Seeing none, is there any written comments?

MR. LYNCH: Yes, thank you. There is two comments. One is from Jana Frame (ph), 25560 (inaudible) Novi, Michigan. Objects. High traffic on Grand River
overcrowded, in a mostly commercial area, presents safety issued.

Second one is from Richard Williams, 41728 Cherry Hill Road, objects.

On the paper, the expansion, like the last development, my house is the only house on Cherry Hill Road with no privacy, no buffer zone. I can't read the rest. Apparently this stretch will be impacted, as of right now, with the area cleared, I have a stream of people using my lot to access Grand River and the issue with the retention pond, the mosquito problem, can't sit out anymore.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: That's it. With that we will close the public hearing on this matter, turn it over to the Planning Commission for their consideration. Who would like to start? Member Baratta.

MR. BARATTA: Thank you. Kirsten. Question, the 2014 traffic study, we elected to waive that, why did we do that?

MS. MELLEM: The traffic consultants said that it's sufficient. It's
usually two years that they're good for and that the traffic review basically would find the same thing as it had in 2014.

MR. BARATTA: So it's consistent traffic then. Thank you. The petitioner, what was your name?

MR. KASSAB: Mark Kassab.

MR. BARATTA: Question, one of the comments related to the berm around the -- I guess it's the gentleman who is the resident of 41728, most likely it's closest to the detention pond, I see the elevation of his house, that elevation is 890 feet, and it's lower on your property, so it's going to have a view.

Is there a fence or a berm there separating this property from yours?

MR. KASSAB: I don't have a map in front of me, but he's on the subdivision directly behind us.

MR. BARATTA: That is correct.

MR. KASSAB: Part of the SDO, special development option agreement, as we
had in the prior SDO, as we will have in the current SDO, is that we have to have a zero capacity, so zero view between our property and adjacent property. And we will screen in certainly all areas on the southern border of our property, in the northern border of the property as well.

MR. BARATTA: There was a discussion regarding mature planting around the detention pond. I think -- enlighten me. We are going to put some plantings on --

MR. KASSAB: The landscape architect had a concern about the type of planning that was requested. I'm impartial to what the commission would like. Right now, as you can imagine, there is no planting. The mosquito question the gentleman had, we would probably like to put some sort of barrier within the pond to make it a feature, but typically with the developments that we have, Lennox Park was one that we completed in Novi, the landscaping is number one that comes back
with deficiencies.

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

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: You're welcome. Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: No other comments. I will go ahead and make a motion.

Thank you for working with the staff, certainly the adjacent homeowners. I appreciate you making this no pathway through as possible. It looks like a reasonable development in the area, according to the traffic study, it appears that Grand River should be able to handle additional traffic volumes. So thanks for hanging in there for a couple of years and I look forward to the development.

Let me make the motion, in the matter of the request with JR Meadowbrook LLC for Huntley Manor JSP16-34, motion to recommend approval to City Council for the special development concept plan. The recommendation shall include items A through
F listed on the motion sheet. If City Council approves the request, the Planning Commission recommends the applicant be required to comply with the conditions and items listed in the staff and consultant review letters as a requirement noted in the special development option agreement.

This motion is made based on the findings outlined in items A through O on the motion sheet.

MR. BARATTA: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a motion by Member Lynch and second by Member Baratta. Any other comments?

MR. BARATTA: I do have one comment, please, in area here, is that part of the approval in that detention pond, on that?

MR. MEADER: That's not a required thing. I didn't --

MR. KASSAB: It's not in the plan. You know, assuming that pond will stay wet, as I believe it's engineered to, we
didn't construct that pond or develop that pond. You know, typically with our developments, when there is a water feature, we look to utilize it, as opposed to stagnant water and mosquitoes, especially today with all the concerns about it, I would -- I think I know where you're heading with this, and what I'd like to do is continue to work with engineering staff, and that pond can continue to hold water and we can put an aerator, we certainly will look to.

MR. BARATTA: Okay. Thank you. Very good.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Kirsten, call the roll, please.

MS. MELLEM: Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Baratta?

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

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Motion carries.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

Next item is Hadley's Towing JSP16-33 with rezoning 18-715. It's a public hearing at the request of Hadley's Towing for the Planning Commission's recommendation to City Council for rezoning of 5.6 acres of the 17.7 acre property in Section 17 on the south side of Grand River between Wixom and Beck Road from I1 light industrial to I2 general industrial with planned rezoned overlay PRO. The subject property is approximately 17.7 acres and the applicant is proposing to rezone approximately 5.6 acres of the northerly portion of the property to accommodate vehicle towing business and storage yard. The rezoned area is proposed to be used as enclosed storage yard for public towed vehicles.

Sri.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Thank you. The
subject property is located in Section 17, south of Grand River Avenue and east of Wixom Road. It is currently zoned I1 light industrial. The applicant is requesting a zoning map amendment for 5.6 acres in the northerly portion of 17.76 acre property from I1 light industrial to I2, general industrial.

As you can see from the map in front of you, the proposed southerly limits of the split rezoning boundary aligns with the edges and southerly boundary line which is currently zoned I2.

The future land use map indicates the property as office research development and technology. The property to the south as suburban low rise. The property to the west and across Grand River as community commercial, and the one to the east office research development and technology.

The current proposal is not supported by the 2010 future land use map or the current 2016 draft for the land use
However, the planned rezoning overlay option creates a floating district, with the proposed conceptual plan attached to the rezoning of the parcel. With the proposal PRO option, rezoning to I2 would not create anymore high intensity uses than we would typically expect with I2 or the current zoning I1.

The rezoning reverts to underlying I1 when the use changes, if and when the use changes.

In 2013 the staff received an application for combining the subject parcel with the parcel on north for the trailer truck parking from the CZ cartage with a similar site plan. The Planning Commission approved the plan, but the council variance for absence of pavement and curbing was denied. The plan didn't move forward.

The current plan is proposing a parking lot with curb and asphalt to be used as outside storage to park towed vehicles.
The majority of the site is covered by regulated wetlands and woodlands, most of which the applicant will not be impacting with the current development plan for the northern portion of the site only. Four areas of wetland exist on the parcel. The plan proposed .59 acre of wetland impact with .59 acres of proposed mitigation. This is a replacement ratio of one to one. Mitigation for impacts to the emergent wetlands shall be mitigated for a duration of 1.5 to one within the City of Novi, which the applicant agreed to provide in the next submittal. The existing tree survey provided is not complete, and as such, it is not clear of how many trees are proposed for removal within the proposed wetland mitigation area and the proposed stormwater retention area.

The current concept plan also does not provide enough detail with regard to the require woodland replacements. The loss of woodland area on the property would present an esthetic change, but that would
happen with any development under current zoning.

The applicant indicated that as part of their current agreement with the City of Novi, the tow yard has to be within the city limits. The subject property fits their needs. The applicant is proposing to connect to the property on the north to use the building for their operational uses.

The applicant states the rezoning request is necessary to possible use of the rezoned portion of the property as an enclosed outdoor storage yard. The applicant is proposing to develop the property in two phases. The first phase includes construction of 155 parking spaces, which is highlighted in gray, to store vehicles, and the future phase would include 288 spaces all in the northerly portion. The timeline for the second phase is not indicated at this point.

The site plan proposes wetland mitigation and stormwater detention on the
southerly portion, which is to remain as I1.

An outdoor storage yard is typically considered a parking lot, verify for conformance with the zoning code. However, the use of the subject lot is not a typical parking lot. This resulted in multiple deviations for parking lot landscaping and traffic requirements such as end islands. The applicant is requesting those deviations as they would create extensive challenges to the driver's maneuverability of tow trucks and towed vehicle. The applicant is also requesting a deviation for not requiring a traffic impact study, as the proposed use would not generate additional traffic, which the staff supports.

Outdoor storage yard requires adequate screening on all sides from surrounding properties, while an attempt is made to screen with a black chain link fence and some indicative landscaping, staff is unable to determine whether this is adequate, as more detail about the proposed landscaping
Development under the current I1 zoning would result into construction of light industrial facility or office up to 67,000 square feet that would result in higher trip generation rates to and from the site onto Grand River Avenue. A similar project in I1 exceeded the maximum city threshold and required traffic study. In comparison the current use of outdoor storage yard is considerably less intense. The probability of an office use is less for the subject property considering the insignificant visibility to the site, due to its flat shape.

For PRO applications, City Council must determine that the proposed rezoning would be in public interest, and the public benefits of the proposed PRO rezoning would clearly outweigh the detriments. The benefits offered by the applicant in his response letter do not meet the minimum requirements. The applicant mentioned that
the proposed use will provide the following benefits. The location is in close proximity to I-96 and Wixom, which allows a reduced distance for which towed vehicles along local streets. The site provides a local location for which residents can retrieve their stored vehicles. The site will allow Hadley Towing to meet its contractual obligations for towing services with the City of Novi. All reviews are in general agreements with the concept, but believe required additional information to determine the viability of the proposed rezoning request from light industrial to heavy industrial.

Planning in particular requests the applicant to revisit the public benefits that are being offered and to improve screening from adjacent properties.

Woodlands and wetlands review recommend approval and they also recommend considering alternate layouts for parking lots to minimize impacts for the regulated woodlands and wetlands. Our wetland
consultant Matt Carmer is here if you have any questions in that regard.

The applicant has indicated in his response letter to work with the staff to provide more information with the next submittal.

The Planning Commission is asked tonight to hold the public hearing and receive public comments.

If the Commission agrees with the staff, that additional information is needed, the Commission can choose to postpone the recommendation to council for a later meeting.

The applicant, Kipp LeMarbe is here with his engineer, Dan LeClair, to answer any question you may have and staff will be glad to answer any questions you have for us.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

Is the applicant here and wish to address the Planning Commission at this time?
MR. LECLAIR: Good evening, Mr. chairman. dan LeClair from Green Tech Engineering. I'm here tonight with Kipp Hadley from Hadley Towing, he is the applicant.

Just wanted to confirm a couple of things. Sri had done a very good job of explaining our project. A couple of things I just wanted to make mention. What we are doing is we are requesting a rezoning for the northerly portion of the property. The southerly portion of our rezoning would be aligned, it's consistent in I2 with the properties to the east. So that would be kind of a consistent line all the way across the rear of the properties.

The rear portion of our property, we are intending at this point to leave that within the I1 zoning as it's currently zoned. Our intention is not to do anything back there other than possibly mitigating wetlands.

The plan you have before you is...
a conceptual plan in nature. It's required as part of the PRO. Obviously would be much more detail that would come along as part of the preliminary site plan submittal package that would come following the rezoning portion.

With that in mind, we do have a couple things that we do want to clarify and respond back to the planning department with some further responses, information with the request.

So what we would like to do is we would like get through the public hearing, take any comments from the public and definitely want to hear comments from you folks and answer any questions with respect to the site, that we are aware of at this time, with Mr. Hadley and his operations, we would like to request a postponement following the public hearing. With that we can answer any questions.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, Mr. LeClair.
This is a public hearing. If there is anyone in the audience who wishes to address the Planning Commission at this time, please step forward.

MR. JONNA: Good evening. My name is Gary Jonna, president of (unintelligible) Real Estate, 39525 Thirteen Mile Road, Novi, Michigan.

As you may or may not know, we are -- I represent Westpark Investors, LLC, which is the property that is to the east of this property.

And I did have an opportunity to meet with Mr. Hadley earlier. You know, I do have a number of concerns and he graciously agreed to take -- you know, I guess, postpone this and give us time to have further discus about, you know, some of the issues that, you know, that I have concerns about.

So I appreciate their cooperation, and during that postponement period we look forward to getting together
with them and discussing our concerns relative to the adjacent property.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, sir. Anyone else in the audience?

(No audible responses.)

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Seeing none, any written correspondence?

MR. LYNCH: Yes, we do have one. It's from Dan Valentine, 48755 Grand River, Novi, he supports the proposal.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you. With that, we will close the public hearing or public portion, public comment, turn it over to the Planning Commission for their consideration. Member Anthony.

MR. ANTHONY: Rick, couple of things that I looked at. So the part of the conceptual plan that they have submitted, shows at least on their graphic, trees that line the perimeter of the parking lot itself. Can you expand a bit on the deficiencies on the landscaping that's proposed or of the information you have so far.
MR. MEADER: Sure. My main concern is just the lack of the interior island, which I understand is because of the operations, but that's my main objection to the plan.

We don't have any section in the ordinance that allows for that, that would have been a variance, because just like we did with another project, if there is no interior islands -- there is no section of the landscaping code that allows that.

MR. ANTHONY: In the parking lot, with the interior islands, that would require a waiver in order to remove that requirement, is that correct?

MR. MEADER: It's my understanding that should be a variance. In this case, it would be a landscaping waiver, my understanding.

MS. MCBETH: Through the Chair, because it's a planned rezoning overlay, it's a deviation from the ordinance standards that would be included as part of the PRO
agreement.

MR. ANTHONY: So any development to the east side, which we are just hearing, parking lot, they would be required to have those islands, or is that too premature to even ask?

MR. MEADER: Any parking lot would be required to have the islands.

MR. ANTHONY: So that would be consistent then from one to the next, which is one thing that we are looking for, good.

The next question I have, it talked about wetlands and wetlands modification. I know that the diagram underneath -- that showed that there was a section of wetland material that would need to be -- area that would need to be mitigated, what was the modification that --

MR. MEADER: I'm going to let Matt Carmer take that one, our expert.

MR. CARMER: Matt Carmer with ETC, the city's woodland consultant. Could you restate the question.
MR. ANTHONY: Within our notes, there is a recommendation for modification to avoid wetland impacts, yet when I look at the schematic for the -- or that's proposed for the parking lot, there is an area of wetland that would be removed. But then the next part talks about the need for wetland mitigation.

So I was curious on what the modification is that we would be looking for, and one, is the reference of mitigation in reference to the area of wetland that would be underneath the parking lot?

MR. CARMER: So the impact area at 0.59, there is two small wetlands. Two small wetlands up near the parking lot that honestly we are not too concerned about, pretty low quality emergent wetlands.

MR. ANTHONY: As these wetlands are defined by the city or defined by the state and city, you know, the city has structure deficits on wetlands, than the state.
MR. CARMER: A, B and C, are, I assume, city owned. We haven't heard anything from the DEQ as to what they might want to take jurisdiction on. But standard procedure, wetland D would be state regulated and city. A, B and C would be most likely just city, but -- until we hear from them, I wouldn't completely make that assumption.

MR. ANTHONY: So it's up in C, where you can see in C in the lower left-hand corner, that white area, that correlates with an area in this plan, showing wetland area that would be filled?

MR. CARMER: Correct.

MR. ANTHONY: So what would the mitigation -- would there be mitigation required for filling that, if so, what would it be?

MR. CARMER: Yes. So currently, their plan is basically to take out or fill and put parking lot on top of all of wetland A, B and C. And the mitigation for that is proposed down adjacent to wetland D. Our
concern that we mentioned in the letter
especially is that the area down near where
wetland D is regulated woodland. It's a
pretty decent woodland, it's a nice
composition. It's sandy soils, and it
doesn't seem to be an appropriate place to
mitigate in general. Usually we wouldn't
encourage an applicant to go cut down
regulating trees in order to mitigate
wetlands in that spot.

So I think our two ways we are
hoping to work with the applicant on this, if
they could lower their impact in wetland A,
to get it beneath the quarter acre threshold,
then no mitigation is required. And then we
don't have to go back by wetland D, cut down
all the trees, grade it, kind of impact that
area as well.

MR. ANTHONY: It would seem some,
I guess, in theory, we wouldn't be gaining
any benefit to our natural preservation, if
we're losing woodland to replace wetland.

MR. CARMER: I agree, yes. I
mean, an alternative would be to potentially find another site nearby within the city that they could do the mitigation on that didn't require removing trees and disturbing a regulated woodland. I know those spots are becoming harder to find in the city, but there may be other locations that would be more appropriate to build the wetland mitigation. So it's either reduce the impact to the level, where the mitigation becomes smaller and it's not as big of a issue, or find another site, it would be my guess, because 0.59, you're approaching an acre of wetland mitigation in them. In the steep areas with sandy soils like that, you're going -- to mitigate you're going to have excavate a significant amount of material, and that creates slopes. So they will have much more than one acre impacted down by wetland D if you build a mitigation area there.

MR. ANTHONY: So we have talked that this will be postponed anyway, and so
perhaps, I don't know if we can add at some point in our postponement that we work in there -- at least the user work with the city to consider that wetland mitigation because losing a protected woodland to mitigate a smaller poor quality wetland may not improve our overall environmental condition of our city.

I hate to lose a protected woodland. Those are as valuable as the wetlands. I think we are giving up one area that may be of quality for an area that is of lower quality, from an environmental view. So when we do get to that point of postponement, if there -- these are being added to the record right now, so they would be considered. Anything else?

MR. CARMER: One other item that I might mention is that there are conservation easements on the east and west side currently, on adjoining parcels. At least the southern half of the property, it sounds like the applicant is planning to put
an easement or to not disturb that area, but it is providing a nice corridor across a number of properties, all the way from Providence Hospital over to Sam's Club right now. So the south end of that site is provided a number of functions for wetland and wildlife both. That would be part of the reason we're hoping not to go in there and do a lot of disturbance.

MR. ANTHONY: So leaving the current woodland preserves that corridor?

MR. CARMER: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you. Member Zuchlewski.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes, I have a question. Is it possible, I guess I'm just throwing this out there, as kind of a brain light comes on. Is it possible to take in the new parking that's going in there to make it a forest type of parking lot so we don't get -- we get absorption of the water into the local area rather than sending it all down to the wetland area? I mean, it's going
to get there eventually, but it would take longer. Would that be a possibility that
would help out what we are talking about?

MR. CARMER: I think that's a great idea. One thing, where you see where
the parking lot is going to end on the figures, currently, it looks like there is --
there might have been a revision since the last plan I reviewed a number of days ago.

But a detention basin going in south of the parking lot, and so I'm not an engineer, but I imagine their detention basin could be resized or made smaller if you had less -- if you had porous pavement and there might be some alternatives that can work in there and help minimize the size of the detention basin, therefore, less area needs to be impacted, less trees need to come down, overall less impact.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Member Baratta.

MR. BARATTA: To the staff, is
there any ordinance against that pervious payment or that asphalt? I have used that in Maryland. I just don't know if we have that ordinance here.

MR. MILLER: The ordinance does not mention it. It hasn't been updated to take that into account. We have approved that in the past. We do allow it for in parking areas, but not the drive aisles. It's for stormwater detention. It's treated the same as turf lawn. So it would greatly reduce the size of the pond required.

MR. BARATTA: To the petitioner, just one question. You have heard Member Anthony's comments regarding the wetland and the woodland mitigation issues. Would you be opposed to reducing that area? It looks like it's right in your -- kind of in your driveway, for less than the quarter acres that we were discussing?

MR. LECLAIR: As part of our revisions that we are planning on doing, we are going to be looking at alternatives for
stormwater management. Being in Michigan and being an engineer, one of the things that really scares me is porous pavement because of the maintenance over time, especially with a use like this when they may be bringing in vehicles of many different sizes and weights. So those are some of the things that we have to take into consideration.

But at this point in time, we're early enough on in the process that once we get out and make a determination of where all the regulated trees are, get a better feel for the back portion of the property that we are probably going to look at other alternatives, rain gardens, bio swales, infiltration to look at the soils. We are going to look at other alternatives.

I have done projects where we have actually done -- in sandy soils where we have done infiltration underneath the parking lot, so we have a normal parking lot, the water goes in the drainage structures and goes into the ground under that. So we will
be looking at other alternatives, yes.

MR. BARATTA: I think one of the pushbacks you're going to be looking at, with the feedback today, would be in lieu of developing a detention pond, a regulated woodland area, that woodland area, I think that kind of destroys the natural water course that you have there, so whatever we can do to help mitigate that, preserve that wetland feature, in any way it is proposed for getting a pond, that would give you a benefit.

MR. LECLAIR: One other thing that should be noted, I did not go back and look at the historical -- the aerial photographs of this area, but on the property immediately to the east of us, obviously, that's an existing storage yard for their equipment, that wetland C, actually comes to an abrupt halt right there.

So I suspect at one time that wetland may have extended off to the east, but it's kind of chocked off right now, so --
you know, I'm interested to get a little bit farther into this property and see exactly what was going on with that and, you know, where that -- where that wetland should be. But we are very cognizant of the woodlands, and we are going to do everything we can to try to preserve them.

MR. BARATTA: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: I think just maybe before Mr. Lynch would consider a motion, I think there's also the comments that were made about the additional PRO information, as far as the public benefits that still need to be ferreted out.

The screening in total for the storage yard, so as you take into account what you're planning on, I think what we would like to see come back is a lot less of these deviations and changes for recommendations to the plan itself, so what you can do -- whatever you can do to address those issues in the comment section of the plan itself would help us as well. So I
appreciate that. And thank you for talking to go Mr. Jonna and taking another look at this.

I would support a postponement at this time. Member Lynch.

MR. LYNCH: With that, in the matter of Hadley's Towing, JSP16-33, zoning amendment 18.715, motion to postpone, making recommendation of the proposed PRO and concept plan to allow the applicant time to address concerns and consider making further modifications to the concept plan, this recommendation is made because additional discussion is needed regarding the offer to public benefits and conditions of approval and other issues listed in the staff and consultant review letters and further information is needed to quantify and engage potential woodland and wetland impacts and presentation of alternative plans to reduce impacts.

MR. BARATTA: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Motion by
Member Lynch, second by Member Baratta. Any
other comments?

(No audible responses.)

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

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Member Baratta?

MR. BARATTA: Yes.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Member

Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes
five to zero.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

Appreciate it.

Next on the agenda is Beacon
Hill, JSP15-08, it's a public hearing at the
request of Ivanhoe Companies for the Planning
Commission's approval of the preliminary site plan, site condominium, phasing plan, wetland permit, woodland permit, and stormwater management plan.

The subject property is currently R4, one family residential, and B3, general business, with a planned rezoning overlay agreement.

Subject property is approximately 21.13 acres and is located in the northeastern corner of Twelve Mile and Meadowbrook Road, Section 12. The applicant is proposing a 39 unit single family residential development 10,500 square foot of commercial space and an open park space.

Sri.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: The rezoning and concept plan for this property first appeared for public hearing in the Planning Commission on September 9, 2015.

The plan went through two additional public hearings, since then prior to Planning Commission's recommendation to
On August 8, 2016, the Council approved the plan rezoned overlay concept plan and the agreement. No major changes were made to the concept plan, the Commission recommended back in April. The number of lots are reduced from 41 to 39, thus reducing the density to 3.08 building units per acre to 2.86. Potential commercial building area has been reduced from 11,550 square feet to 10,500. The open space remains same at 8.8 acres, approximately 40 percent of the total site area. The ten foot bike path is proposed along Meadowbrook Road as per Council motion.

All previous deviations from zoning ordinance have been approved by the Council, and are included as part of the PRO agreement.

The subject property is approximately 21 acres and is located on the northeast corner of Twelve Mile Meadowbrook in Section 10. It is zoned R1, one family
residential and B3 general business district
with a planned rezoning overly associated
with the zoning map amendment from RA
residential acreage. It is surrounded by RA
on all sides except OST, office service
technology on the south.

    The future land use map
indicates single family uses for the subject
property and the surrounding properties with
office, research and development and
technology on the south.

    There are regulated wetlands on
the property and a considerable amount of
regulated woodlands.

    The applicant is proposing a 39
unit single family residential development
with frontage on and access to Meadowbrook,
10,500 square foot of commercial space with
frontage on Twelve Mile and open space park
area at the corner of the intersection. The
applicant proposes to dedicate the open space
park area and commits to building vehicle and
bicycle parking for a trailhead. The site is
proposed to develop the property in two phases. The first phase will include complete construction of residential stream relocation, wetland restoration and site work for commercial phase, and the trailhead.

The second phase will complete the construction for commercial building and the trailhead amenities.

The current site plan is proposing a 12 feet of -- sorry -- 12 feet of parking setback along the eastern property line, while the required setback is 20. The landscape has identified deviations with regard to parking lot landscaping and the building foundation landscaping within commercial development. Facade also has identified multiple deviations with the proposed elevations for commercial development. PRO agreements required full compliance with the facade ordinance.

The applicant is asked to revise the plans to address the planning, landscape and facade deviations for
commercial development to conform to at the
time of final site plan, phase two, or seek
approval to amend the approved planned
rezoning overlay agreement prior to the phase
two final site plan submittal.

The subject property is subject
to conditions of the planned rezoning overlay
agreement. The current site plan requires
further clarification with regard to agreed
public benefits as part of the PRO. With
regard to enhanced design for landscape
retention pond and providing a 10-foot buffer
along the commercial development.

Currently the plan proposes
impacts to 0.24 acres of total of 1.54 on
site wetlands, on the proposed impact of 0.99
acres of total of 1.98 acres of on-site
wetland buffers. It should be noted,
however, that the applicant proposes a total
of 0.66 acres of restoration within these
areas. Therefore, the majority of wetland
buffer is essentially temporary in nature.
These impacts remain unchanged from the
previously reviewed concept plan.

A total of 577 trees are surveyed on the property, which include some non-regulated trees as well. A total of 402 regulated trees are removed, which would require 718 total replacement credits. The applicant is proposing to provide 721 replacement credits on-site.

The property has 19 potential specimen trees, two of these trees, about 11 percent, will be saved, and 17, about 89 percent, are proposed for removal. An authorization to encroach into wetland buffers is approved for the site plan. Wetlands and woodlands are recommending approval to City of Novi, non-minor wetland permit and woodland permit. Fire, engineering and traffic are recommending approval with additional comments to be addressed with the final site plan. The Planning Commission is asked tonight to approve the preliminary site plan, site condominium phasing wetland permit, woodland
permit and stormwater management plan. The applicant, Gary Shapiro, from Ivanhoe Companies is here with his engineer, Andy Wozniak, to answer any questions you have, and staff is here as well. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, sir. Does the applicant wish to address the Planning Commission at this time?

MR. SHAPIRO: I'm available for any questions.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, sir. This is a public hearing. If there anyone in the audience who wishes to address the Planning Commission at this time, please step forward.

You have to come to the podium, sir.

MR. APIGIAN: I am not a resident, so I prefer residents to speak before me. That's why I was hesitant.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: You're it.

MR. APIGIAN: My name is Ned Apigian. I am a licensed architect in the
State of Michigan and professional community planner.

As an elected official, and representing my community, we had a meeting at SEMCOG here in Novi. And the interesting thing was, there was this reputation about Novi that this is a tough place for people like me to present plans and designs, as you guys are really tough. And the mayor got up at that meeting of SEMCOG and proclaimed of how important the City of Novi regarded its open land, and not only gave us all the lecture about Novi, No. 7 and the train stop, and I found that very impressive.

Now, this particular site, I am familiar with, because I have been working on it personally for the last four years.

Now, I understand this is not a -- I understand -- excuse me. I'm due for an open heart operation tomorrow morning, I wanted to come here today, I wish I was better prepared. I cannot believe that you have a 10-acre site of woodlands, and you
have a tree preserve ordinance and you let a
developer walk in here and tear that all up.
I wanted to study your master plan. I can't
believe, if I studied your master plan,
you're 37 houses short of meeting your plan,
your goal.

The other day I went through
the Emagine show here with my wife, I didn't
even know about that Fountain development. I
am familiar with all the stuff on Grand
River. I have been there many times for many
functions. I cannot believe you need a
little bit more commercial over there on the
corner of Middlebelt and Twelve Mile.

You have more commercial than I
could list ten other cities put together
have. You don't need to do this. You should
have left that RA, and so you're not tough
apparently, you're really easy. To take a
hill that's solid woods and you're going to
put 37 houses on it. I'd like to know what
you're going to do with the runoff. It's the
tsilliest thing in the world, to take the
corner of Meadowbrook and Twelve Mile, and
that's what's scares everybody, put a
retention pond on it.

So I spoke to Sri,
unfortunately, I didn't get a chance to study
your master plan, I got a couple other
problems just lately. And this is supposed
to be a hearing, as I understood it, in order
for you to decide whether you're going to
throw your wetlands and your tree preserve
ordinance to the wind.

I don't see how you can make a
development like that, up this hill. What
are you going -- then what happened to a
wetland ordinance? If I was developing this
property, I would not touch that, wouldn't do
a darn thing with that. I would keep it. If
I had a developer that said, fine, that's a
wonderful thing, let's see what we can do
with part of that bottom ten has about eight
acres that is developable with the mitigation
rules, which I have met your consultants in
Ann Arbor and I can't believe they allowed
this to happen, with mitigation you could
move that wetland around so it works with the
screen, and so I don't know what I have got
to say. In your ordinance, your amount of
commercial you have in the housing that --
other places you have for those housing, you
need 37 more houses.

Now, I can understand 37 more
homes times who knows an average of ten or
$12,000, will -- it wasn't bringing you much
at -- there is about a total about $20,000
taxes with that property doing nothing.

So I don't want to keep
rambling, it's just a thing, you didn't need
to do it and I think you shouldn't accept
this and I would like to see -- you should
want to see engineering studies as to what --
you can't introduce more water into that
drain than is presently being held in order
to cross Twelve Mile at the far end.

So I don't know if this works.
I would have to see the engineering of it.
But that's my appeal. You guys are supposed
to be tough. I guess you're not too tough,
if you can let somebody come in here and wipe
out a ten acre forest up a hill. You have
any of questions of me, I would be glad to
answer. I need to be in bed by 9:00.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you,
sir. Good luck tomorrow.

Anyone else? Any
correspondence?

MR. LYNCH: No correspondence.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Close the
public hearing portion, turn it over to the
Planning Commission at this time. Who would
like to start. Member Anthony.

MR. ANTHONY: Rick, I get to come
back to you again.

Just so it's clear, the portion
of the property that -- the subject property
that's a single family home, that's not a
protected woodland, is it, or is it a
protected woodland?

MR. MEADER: I believe there is a
good amount of protected woodland on it.
MR. ANTHONY: So when that development comes through, what's the offset that the city receives with that protected woodland being developed?

MR. MEADER: We get -- well, they are they required to replace trees either on site or add to the tree fund $400 per credit, which is determined by the tree size and how much are approved.

MR. ANTHONY: Has that agreement been finished yet?

MR. MEADER: I don't know if the permit is complete, but it's -- we have gone through the negotiations. They have come up with calculations for the number of trees that have been removed, will be replaced and will be put in the tree fund. That's the plans for currently.

MR. ANTHONY: So pretty much close, that development, both sides agreeing with how to resolve the trees and replenishing trees overall for the balance of trees in the City of Novi. Good.
Just as all our other properties that are developed that run into protected woodland, we are looking at enforcing that ordinance and making sure we get that balance in return.

MR. MEADER: Right.

MR. ANTHONY: Jeremy, this is for you on the engineering.

The stormwater runoff, and compared with the multiple, looks like in the wetland areas and the basins that are there, how did the engineering report look for stormwater?

MR. MILLER: They are currently meeting all our standards, so there will be more detail on the final site plan, we have it detained for the 100 year storm event, they can't exceed runoff that is currently there now, so it shouldn't change too much.

MR. ANTHONY: So your analysis meets all industry standard and the standards that you have used on all other sites in Novi?
MR. MILLER: Yes.

MR. ANTHONY: I am glad to see --

the developer, I just have a couple of

questions for you.

MR. SHAPIRO: My name is Gary

Shapiro. I'm here with Andy Wozniak. This

has been an ongoing process. I'm sure you're

very familiar with us. We have been working

on this for -- it's getting close to three

years now.

Just a quick summary, for, you

know, the various meetings, we've met with

everybody, all the neighbors, all the people

around and it's a very, very comprehensive

plan. Which it started out at 250 units and

started out a commercial center with 80
townhouses.

The finished product, as you

may recall, and I can go through it in more
detail to refresh you, you should have our

big compressive book. It is on this 20 acres

at the corner of Twelve and Meadowbrook, we

worked with Tollgate, we protected 90-foot,
minimum of 50 foot average of 90 foot
greenbelt all the way along a quarter mile.
We left all the wetlands. We are only
impacting on this entire site, 0.024, not
even a percent of wetland.

We worked very collaboratively
with Tollgate Farms, our wetlands
consultants, your wetland consultants, the
planners, Rod Arroyo, Barb McBeth and her
staff, in improving the stormwater. The
water is coming on our site from Tollgate,
and we will be cleansing it, because we have
got a very comprehensive plan, now we have a
bifurcated stream, the stream is going to be
combined in a very environmentally sensitive
plan, and it took a long time -- to me, I'm
very passionate about the plan. And it's an
award winning plan. It's not what I
anticipated. I thought it was going to be
close to 200 units on a major intersection
and corner, but it was collaboratively done
and, you know, of the 20 acres, 42 percent of
it is open.
MR. ANTHONY: Mr. Shapiro, thank you for working with our staff. I was one of those, when this first came up, I really wasn't too excited about the development either. But I am glad that you have worked with the staff and come up with the development that you have now. I really did like the park trailhead, the wetland protection, how that's all integrated. That was nicely done. So thank you.

So in that continued cooperation, I just wanted make sure that as I hear from staff, that you are on path and willing to work with the city in their tree ordinance in meeting those requirements.

MR. SHAPIRO: We worked with their woodland staff and ours, theirs is over 700 credits, which will be planted. There is somewhere over 500 replanted trees, more than I have seen just about anywhere, yes, we are. No variances in the ordinance.

MR. ANTHONY: So those trees that are replanted, are they all on this property
or are they in other areas of the city?

MR. SHAPIRO: Planting them all on this property and good amount of them we are planting on the park. You know, the park with the wetlands will remain on that corner, and we're donating to the City of Novi 2.3 acres of land, deeding it to you. We worked with parks and rec over the last year and a half, it's going to be a passing park. When the small boutique shops are built, there will be a parking lot and bike racks. So the trees are all going on-site, all along on Meadowbrook, the development is tucked back 140 feet, in all those communities, so there is a wall of trees on Meadowbrook and all the way down Twelve Mile.

MR. ANTHONY: I know it's been a difficult path, but thank you for working with our staff.

MR. SHAPIRO: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, Member Anthony. Member Zuchlewski.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: I have a couple
questions for Jeremy. We had talked about
the trees separating the commercial property
from the residential, and a large greenbelt
and some wetlands or some ponds.

I'm looking, is that a masonry
screen, will there be a masonry screen built
there or is it going to be a landscaping
buffer, so to speak?

MR. MEADER: It's going to be
mostly trees. There is no masonry between
the residential and the commercial. It's
going to be a lot of trees and a lot of
topography in between.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: And the business
types that are going in, I heard boutique
shops, is that correct?

MR. SHAPIRO: The building will
have fast, casual restaurants, so we have
limited it, so no gas stations. I think at
this meeting, there was no smoke shops, no
hard uses that will be going on that corner.

So, we are now -- we are going
to be very picky for who goes there in Novi.
We are picky, who we want to get there. We want to have more coffee shops.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: So it might be a restaurant of sorts?

MR. SHAPIRO: Yes, there may be a bank or -- we are talking with one of the community banks who wants to come on the site, those type of uses. But no gas stations.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: No fast food restaurants?

MR. SHAPIRO: No fast food restaurants.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Then the retention ponds. I tried to look at the depth and figure out what the depth of these things are. It looks like they're a one-on-one kind of slope going down. I couldn't count the rings, my eyes aren't too good today. What is the depth of the ponds? What are they going to be?

MR. MILLER: I would have to go back and look at the plans, see the exact
depth of these. A one on four slope, that we require.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Okay. So what are we thinking, are we thinking seven feet, eight feet?

MR. MILLER: Depending on if they have standing water, that the three feet of standing water and then another three or four feet of volume --

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: For potential. So it could be seven feet, six, seven feet. Are these fenced, will they be fenced?

MR. MILLER: We don't require fencing. Usually have landscaping around them.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: And those are my questions. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Member Baratta.

MR. BARATTA: Just one question for you. We are talking about the 19 trees that were going to be eliminated, were protected trees of some sort.
MR. MEADER: Say it again.

MR. BARATTA: There were 19 trees that were going to be eliminated, were they protected? Did I understand that correctly?

MR. KOMARAGIRI: They are specimen trees.

MR. BARATTA: What is a specimen tree?

MR. MEADER: It's a tree based on the species, at a certain size, it's in the woodland protection ordinance. So a cedar might be eight inches versus a red oak might be 24 inches.

MR. BARATTA: One of those trees you shouldn't cut down?

MR. MEADER: Yes.

MR. BARATTA: How many are we losing of those? I'm suspecting they are mature trees would be my simple definition.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Total 19 trees, and we are losing 17.

MR. BARATTA: Is there any way to preserve a portion of those 17? I mean, are
they -- any idea where they are there at?

MR. MEADER: I don't know off the top of my head. I think they are sporadic, across -- weren't they -- do you remember?

MR. MILLER: In the center of the development, residential section.

MR. BARATTA: So it's something that would have to come down based on this plan.

MR. MEADER: I would think so.

MR. SHAPIRO: For the efficiency of the plan, they came down and we looked at it like we are replacing them on the perimeter where people can experience them, but in the practicality of the plan, it didn't work, it was a trade off throughout -- at the council meeting and planning commission early on.

MR. BARATTA: Different size of trees?

MR. SHAPIRO: Basically bigger trees.

MR. BARATTA: I guess the way I
analyze it, you've got a mature tree that's been run off a long time, we are cutting that down, we are putting even money in the tree fund or we are planting a smaller caliber of tree to compensate, fair statement?

MR. MEADER: That's fair.

MR. BARATTA: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Member Lynch.

MR. LYNCH: I do have a few comments. I appreciate -- I think I was here three or four years, you have been working on this thing --

MR. SHAPIRO: Several times.

MR. LYNCH: I remember how dense the initial proposal was. I appreciate the fact that over the years, I mean, this has been several years that we have been modifying this plan.

I appreciate the fact that -- understanding that the developer has a right to develop their land, and also working with the city, I think we have come up with --
mean, we have been through how many
variations, how many times we sent you back?

MR. SHAPIRO: I've revised this
15, 20 times.

MR. LYNCH: I do recall being the
one to stand up, if the trees get removed,
they go back on that property, right, so we
are not taking them.

MR. SHAPIRO: We are putting more
line --

MR. LYNCH: I'm not a big
proponent of this tree fund. I'd rather, if
the trees are there, and they got to be
removed, at least replacement trees should go
back somewhere in an open space. I
appreciate you doing that. I also appreciate
the work that you did along the Tollgate
property, along Meadowbrook Road, because --
wasn't this the beauty road, and that was not
a trivial exercise getting the easement. I
appreciate you doing that.

Overall, from I have seen, from
where we started, understanding your right to
develop the property, I think this is the best that we could possibly come up with at this time.

I am in absolute support of this particular program. I think we've -- or this particular project. I think we've been through this through infinitum -- I mean, the revisions and the -- a lot of the considerations that many people -- a lot of the development of this PRO property is not public, has been done between developer and staff with the Planning Commission.

I am satisfied that all the changes that you have made will improve the City of Novi, where it is right now. This particular plan I believe, in my heart, this will improve the City of Novi. So I am in full support of what you have done.

I appreciate the three years of -- I know we have been a pain in the butt for you, but I appreciate your efforts in this particular property.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Is that a
motion?

MR. LYNCH: I will make a motion.

In the matter of Beacon Hill JSP15-08, motion to approve the preliminary site plan with site condominium based on and subject to following, A, the applicant revised the plans for commercial development to conform to the code at the time of the final site plan for phase two, and seek approval for any approved planning rezoning overlay agreement to include the additional deviations identified with this review. B, the plan is in compliance with ordinance standards and the staff and consultant review letters and conditions and items listed in those letters as well, as all those items and conditions of the PRO agreement as approved, with these items being addressed on the final site plan.

And finally, this motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Article 3, Article 4, Article and of the zoning ordinance and all other applicable provisions of the ordinance.
MR. ANTHONY: Second.

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

Any additional comments?

MR. SHAPIRO: Just one. I will say that, you know, from personal experience, I'm sure the petitioner can also attest to this, the City of Novi is not an easy place to work to get approval. I truly say that from personal experience.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Sri, can you call the roll.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Member Baratta?

MR. BARATTA: Yes.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.
MR. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes five to zero.

MR. LYNCH: In the matter of Beacon Hill JSP15-08, motion to approve the phasing plan based on and subject to the following, the findings of compliance with the ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters and conditions and items listed in those letters, being addressed on the final site plan.

This motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Article 3, Article 4 and Article 5 of the zoning ordinance and all other applicable provisions of the ordinance.

MR. ANTHONY: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Motion by Member Lynch, second by Member Anthony. Any other discussions?

Sri, please.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Member Baratta?

MR. BARATTA: Yes.

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

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes five to zero.

MR. LYNCH: In the matter of Beacon Hill JSP15-08, motion to approve the wetland permit based on and subject to the findings in compliance with the ordinance in the staff and consultant review letters, and the conditions and items listed on those letters being addressed in the final site plan. So this motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Chapter 12, Article 5 of the Code of Ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the ordinance.

MR. ANTHONY: Second.
Motion by Member Lynch, second by Member Anthony. Any other discussions?

Sri, please.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Member Baratta?

MR. BARATTA: Yes.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes five to zero.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: This is the last -- two more. In the matter of Beacon Hill JSP16-05, motion to approve the woodland permit based on and subject to the findings of compliance with the ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters, the
conditions and items listed in those letters being addressed on the final site plan. This motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Chapter 37 of the Code of Ordinances and all other provisions of the ordinance.

MR. ANTHONY: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Motion by Member Lynch, second by Member Anthony, other discussions? Sri, please.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Member Baratta?

MR. BARATTA: Yes.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

MR. LYNCH: Finally, in the matter of Beacon Hill JSP15-08, motion to
approve the stormwater management plan, based
on the findings in 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.

This motion is made because
it's 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 Lynch, second by Anthony. Any other
comments? Sri.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Member
Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Member Baratta?

MR. BARATTA: Yes.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.
MR. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes five to zero.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Next on the agenda is the Master Plan for Land Use adoption.

It's a public hearing for the Planning Commission's adoption of the 2016 Master Plan for Land Use in order to fill the requirements of the Michigan Planning Enabling Act and provide a plan for future development in the City of Novi.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: We are very excited about this. After many months of work, the Planning Commission is now in position to take the last step in the Master Plan review in their option process, holding a final public hearing on the proposed 2016 Master Plan For Land Use.

Previously the Planning Commission received and approved the Master Plan dated June 16, 2016, for distribution.
The review summarized the research and development of the 2016 Master Plan for Land Use by City of Novi Community Development staff, the Planning Commission's master planning and zoning committee and Clear Zoning consultants and GMA.

It included a draft that was recommended for distribution by the Planning Commission on June 16, 2016, and the City Council on July 11, 2016.

The Michigan Planning Enabling Act requires a public hearing to take place after the close of the required 63 day common period allowing for neighboring communities, community railroads and public utilities to review the document. During the comment period, the city received comments from Oakland County and private property owners which is included in your packet. There are no unfavorable comments.

A public hearing is scheduled for September 28, which is today, Planning Commission meeting. After holding the public
hearing and evaluating the public comments, the Planning Commission may adopt by resolution the proposed 2016 Master Plan for Land Use with or without any changes the commission deems appropriate. A draft of the resolution is included in your packet and we have it available.

Alternatively, the Planning Commission may postpone on the matter and seek additional information or review from staff or the Master Plan and Zoning Committee.

The State Planning Enabling Act requires an affirmative vote of not less than two-thirds of the members to approve a resolution to adopt a set of Master Plan amendments.

After approval, the State Act also requires the Planning Commission chair or secretary to sign a copy of the resolution and the resolution is placed inside the front or back cover of the Master Plan.

Following approval, the Master
Plan will be distributed to the City Council and published for the public.

Our consultants from Giffels Webster, Rod Arroyo, Jill Baum and Ali Pearson from GMA are here along with the staff if you have any questions. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you so much. This is a public hearing. If there is anyone in the audience that wishes to -- do we want Rod to say anything?

MS. MCBETH: I believe Rod was going to stand by for questions.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Sorry, didn't mean to cut you off, Rod. I know how you like to talk.

If there is anyone in the audience who wishes to address the Planning Commission on this particular matter, please come forward.

MR. QUINN: Good evening, gentlemen, appearing on behalf of Dan Weiss.

Mr. Weiss, through his planner and development consultant, Martin Smith, has
submitted a previous letter to this panel and to the department concerning the Master Plan as it pertains to two specific corners in the city. I'm just going to comment briefly on those.

Officially, I would say we would like you to include these proposed changes in the Master Plan, having been gone through these things for the last 30 years, I know that's not going to happen, but I would like the comments to be preserved for the record when, in fact, future rezonings for these parcels come in, and therefore, our comments will have been made as part of the Master Plan.

The first corner I would like to show you is the corner of Meadowbrook and Grand River. Mr. Weiss owns all of the property from Meadowbrook all the way to Glenda's along Grand River. Currently, the corner parcel is Master Planned Town Center gateway, we would propose that that be Master Planned Community Commercial, so that
a B2 rezoning at a later date would be supported. Commercial, small commercial there, matches the car dealership right across the street, the Cadillac dealership and it could support people from the subdivision to the south walking to the corner, which is part of the city's Master Plan to allow people to walk to local commercial. Also your Master Plan specifically says that increased commercial -- additional commercial along Grand River Avenue is one of your goals.

The other parcel is again, adjacent to Glenda's, Glenda's is in effect a retail center, and we are requesting that that would be Master Planned as community commercial, once again, to support in the future a B2 use. Currently it's an industrial proposed area on the Master Plan.

The other corner is at the corner of Novi Road and Ten Mile. This, of course, is a corner that some of you and I have been involved with for about the last 15
Previously the owner came forward with a commercial development with a PRO that was turned down, then he came back on the rear here for residential along Nick Lidstrom Drive, which is being constructed today.

The proposed changes that we would like to see in the Master Plan would be along the frontage to have community commercial, frontage of Ten Mile, community commercial that would allow again a B2 light zoning use in the future, and to the rear of that B2, an area that would allow high density, multiple family, the RM2 is the type of rezoning that he would be looking for there.

The residential use here would become compatible with the residential use that's just been approved across the creek. This dividing line through here is the creek line. So it's a drop of about 30 feet from the north side, to the south side, so having
additional town homes there would be satisfactory and adjacent to the other.

    So those are the two areas that the letter of September 16th addressed. Again, officially, we would like to see those as part of the Master Plan, but we would also like the comment preserved and the letter preserved for future reference. Thank you.

    CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, sir. Appreciate that. Anyone else. Correspondence?

    We will close the public hearing portion of this, turn it over to the Planning Commission --

    MS. MCBETH: I apologize. There is correspondence. Mr. Quinn was just referring to a couple of the letters, then there is a third letter.

    MR. LYNCH: It was so long, I didn't see. We just add that into the public record. There is a letter from Mr. Quinn on behalf Dan Weiss. We will add this into the public record. You want me to go through?
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: No.

MR. LYNCH: He did a better job than I can.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Is there another one?

MR. LYNCH: There is two of them.

MS. MCBETH: Through the Chair, there is a third letter, too, from somebody who is not --

MR. LYNCH: I am not a good secretary. I'm sorry.

Want me to read this one.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MR. LYNCH: This is from Jeffrey Hein, managing member of Grand River Beck, LLC, he's writing a letter, he's got some parcel listed here. We are in full support of the Master Plan, regarding site two, proposal Clearzoning. Provides great opportunity. They like the mixed use zoning operation, zoning operates successfully in similar commercial transition zones.

They want to commend the City
of Novi Planning Department and Clearzoning
for their vision and very important -- this
is why you're having me read this. That was
an approval.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Probably
written by Rod.

With that, we will close the
public hearing now. Officially. Turn it
over to the Planning Commission for
recommendation.

MR. ANTHONY: Question to the
staff. So in having these letters put
into -- you know, into the record, does that
somehow diminish the strength of our zoning
ordinance?

MS. MCBETH: Through the Chair, I
don't think it does. I think it's part of
the public comment that we hope for and we
wish to receive as part of the Master Plan
process. A couple of them were coming in a
little bit late, as Mr. Quinn alluded to, and
certainly take those into consideration if a
project comes forward. I'd like to take a
look at those and study those in a little bit more detail. But I don't think it diminishes the work that's been done. I think it enhances it actually.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Member Baratta?

MR. BARATTA: I have a couple of questions for the staff.

On the pavilion section, do we still have a retail component attached to that? I think that was -- a thought that was still part of it.

MS. MCBETH: Yes, it is, still included.

MR. BARATTA: I guess my comment with respect to that, that we are not that far from the mall area, and I know that trade area, I think I brought this up before, it's pretty limited there with the cross streets and the lake there. And I just didn't think that that was a good use for that particular area. And I will restate that. I think it's very good for residential, but I have serious
concerns, particularly after driving that area, that there is going to be enough population there to sustain it. I don't think we need retail there.

The second question that I had was, with respect to the city west, and maybe you can help me with this, what is the maximum height of the -- how many stories -- what is the maximum amount of stories the building can have in that area?

MS. MCBETH: You know, I think it might be a good opportunity to bring Rod and his team forward to talk about those in a little bit more detail.

MR. BARATTA: You did the research, you made a recommendation, we have a retail component, the restaurants, et cetera. Have you looked at the viability, the economic viability of those uses there as part of your program for your recommendation?

MR. ARROYO: Yes. Program and the recommendation for land use perspective is for a mixed use area. And the uses that
are anticipated include residential, including cottage type residential, some limited goods and services, particularly those that are related to taking advantage of the fact that you've got the lake there, you have the activities associated with it, healthy food and dining, fitness related clothing, those types of things. So it's kind of niche retail and local service type retail that would likely be there, restaurants potentially, too, as well. Those are all the type of retail that would likely develop on the ground floor, if you ended up with a two-story building, for example.

MR. BARATTA: How far is that from the Twelve Mile and Novi intersection, do you remember offhand?

MR. ARROYO: Yes, it's a mile. You're looking at -- we are talking, roughly, Thirteen Mile, maybe a little bit less, depending upon what portion you're on, but it's somewhere in the neighborhood. But it's a totally different type of market than
what's down at Twelve Mile. What's down at Twelve Mile and Twelve Oaks Mall area is regional commercial. This is more, like I said, oriented towards that local market and also oriented towards the lake and what might be associated with it. It's not there to compete with what is down by the mall.

MR. BARATTA: My perspective, being a retailer for many, many years, I just don't think there is enough market there, being a mile away from a major center of retail. This doesn't particularly -- to have a trade area just north of it that's basically a lake. But that's a disagreement that we would have. From an economic standpoint, I think that makes it very challenged to have an ongoing business succeed there.

As for the moving it over to the city west, what is the maximum number of floors, that I could have in the building in there, is it one floor, two floors, ten floors?
MR. ARROYO: North of Grand River, the anticipation is that it's primarily going to be three to five, possibly, two, three, four, five, but there is a potential to have up to ten stories.

MR. BARATTA: I guess when I look at that, I look at Novi, I look at Novi as being one city in the entire metropolitan area, and includes the Wixom, et cetera, Southfield and you know, I guess from my perspective, I just don't think that living in Novi all these years, not too far from -- I just don't think this fits into our vision of what Novi really is today. We are not Southfield. I look at 10 stories at being something that -- you know, I just don't see how that fits into what we are talking about.

And one thing I have always looked at when we developed things is I'm looking to create concentrated areas. I look at Novi Road and the highway just as an example. We really want that, at least in opinion, to be vibrant. You got the mall,
you have the centers across on the north side, you have got retail on the south side, you have got some future development going on there.

And if you really want to concentrate on this and make that a viable area, you know, unlike Washington DC, I know you have got a few examples in your presentation, I thought it was very good, by the way. We are not Washington. Rockville, I think that is one of them, schedule project, I have gone to that project. We are not that. We don't have the growth.

So from my perspective, I think we will be diminishing really a major intersection in Novi, if we consider that, and at least, getting that high, and basically, putting something in that area, just doesn't fit. That's my opinion. What am I to say. What do you see that I'm not anticipating here?

MR. ARROYO: One thing is we saw a couple of things. One, the property
between Grand River and 96 is obviously along the freeway. It has access to interchanges, actually two interchanges or three, depending on how far you want to go. Certainly it's between two interchanges. It has direct proximity to a regional attraction, Suburban Collection Showplace, it has the ability to provide for unique type of development that's not currently found within the city.

One of the things that the analysis that we did as part of this showed that there is a lot of entertainment dollars. In fact, the majority of the entertainment dollars with Novi residents is going outside of the City of Novi. So there is an opportunity to capture that, and to something of an entertainment district, and along with that, you would want some density of population, you would want the opportunity for possibly a hotel.

If the ten story building even happens, you know, it may never happen. It allows for the potential for that to happen.
But that could end up being a hotel. It could end up being a mixed use building that's partially hotel, partially office, partially retail, partially restaurant, we don't know. But it opens the door for creativity for an entertainment and mixed use district directly west of the Suburban Collection Showplace so you can build upon the investment that's already been made in this community, and the attraction that's already occurring to this part of town, you have made transportation improvements, Grand River has been widened, the interchanges have been improved. This is an opportunity to capture that investment, get additional tax base and get additional synergy and turn this into something even better than it is now and allow for it to grow and really just be flexible to see where the market goes and what opportunities might present itself.

MR. BARATTA: Well, thank you.

But from my perspective, I think -- I'm not in favor of that plan with those caveats. I
think we are diminishing the intersection. I think there is a hotel under construction in Wixom, just across the highway. I don't think that the character of that area supports what we are talking about. Rockville Center, if you go to Washington DC, you will see it's in the middle of that metropolitan area with a lot of growth, spreading out in rings, and it's not -- it's almost an (unintelligible) and are at the end of the market. I just think it's wrong for us with those features in it, but that's my opinion.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, sir. Any other comments?

I suggest just the opposite because in the discussions we had in the Master Plan and zoning committees and the different feedback mechanisms we have had and some of the discussion we have had with Rod and the team, I think what this does is exactly what Rod interjects is that it does open up the possibility for the potential
that doesn't exist right now, to turn this
into something with mixed use to bring -- we
talked along Grand River is density
population, bringing people in, so that
dollars are spent in Novi as opposed to
elsewhere.

I think this is the exact kind
of modeling clay that you would want in the
area where you're not going to be -- worrying
people, you've got the flexibility to create
something that doesn't exist anywhere else in
this particular region, as far as going to
Southfield.

But I will see people migrating
between Southfield and Novi. So in the
general area, I think this is the ideal
location for something like this to exist, to
further the whole showcase element up and
along and create the entertainment district
that is lacking right now, where those --
what I see if the dollars are leaving Novi,
going elsewhere.

So I characterize it as a good
idea to be determined, based upon the economic conditions and where we go and how this is developed going into the future, whether it's ten stories of stories.

Ms. McBeth?

Ms. McBeth: I think that's a good point. Just because the ten stories is being offered maybe for a limited portion of the properties that we are talking about along the freeway, doesn't mean a developer is going to take that. They might like the idea of two stories, three stories, four stories, maybe even five stories, but the ten stories would not be something that would be required, that's something that's being offered. I think it's -- I think you're right it's the synergy of the entire area, trying to come together with a little bit of additional density.

Chairperson Pehrson: Thanks.

Member Lynch.

Mr. Lynch: I guess I would like to weigh in on this, too. We are not locked
into a ten story building.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: No.

MR. LYNCH: I think we are -- I understand both sides of the argument. I just want us to be cautious. We really want to change the character of Novi, but at the same time I don't like to see the retail dollars go out of the city. I guess since this will be public record to City Council, I just like them to be very cautious on making too dramatic of a change, granted if it fits, it fits, because changing the city -- because I was here when Southfield was just farmland, and I saw what happened there. It started small. It got bigger, bigger and bigger. So we have something in the metro Detroit area that has these types of things. Novi, from the time I have been on the Planning Commission is a semi rural community. Now, granted the corridor, I agree, is kind of a retail area. I don't like to see those retail dollars leave the city, but at the same time, I would caution City Council, I
don't even know -- right now I don't think we have fire trucks that go up ten stories do we. There is a lot of ancillary things that go along with it. Before something gets approved, I think the concept, I do agree, I think it makes sense, the way you have laid it out, it does make sense, but I just want us to move slow and think about what we are doing, maybe as part of a bigger project that may be appropriate, but one off -- I just want us to be careful on how we proceed with something that is so dissimilar to what we have in the city right now.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Mr. Arroyo?

MR. ARROYO: Just to respond, I can make a good point, keep in mind, this is a long range plan. Keep in mind, also that this may not happen for five years, it might not happen for ten years, it may never happen in terms of the ten story building.

You will have to -- if the opportunity presents itself, you will have to either amend or create a new zoning district
to facilitate this. At that point, you will be able to specify the standards and the conditions that you think are appropriate. This isn't the final word you're going to have on this.

You're setting the potential to be able to evaluate an opportunity to make this happen in the future. It doesn't mean it's going to happen. But you're setting the basic frame for the evaluation of that, so that if you choose that it's appropriate to amend the zoning ordinance and recommend that to council, that the ordinance be amended, you will have a foundation upon which you can make that recommendation. It doesn't necessarily obligate you to do that or you may severely limit it. You don't know until you get to that point and you're not even sure when that point is going to be. You're establishing a long term framework.

MR. LYNCH: I understand. You know, since it is a long range plan -- you know, it's going to take -- there is going to
be a lot of debate with anything that goes in there anyway. I'm comfortable with that.

   Just for the record, I just want us to be cautious on how we proceed with something that may appear to be dissimilar. What I don't want to get into is something that is so dissimilar to what Novi is, it's sticking out like a sore thumb. Obviously if it fits into a overall development, yes, that may be something -- I do appreciate you giving us the opportunity to look at it in the overall plan.

   But for the record, I just wanted us to make sure we are cautious on how we proceed.

   CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Are you going to make a motion?

   MR. LYNCH: I will make a motion to approve or not -- we are approving the Master Plan with comments. Is that all I got to do -- to City Council? Or do we just approve --

   MS. MCBETH: Through the Chair,
there is a resolution in the packet, so you will be approving the resolution.

MR. LYNCH: Okay, I am making a motion to approve the resolution that's included in the packet.

MR. ANTHONY: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Motion by Member Lynch, second by Member Anthony, any other discussion? Sri, call the roll, please.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Member Baratta?

MR. BARATTA: No.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Motion fails.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Next on the
agenda is the Thoroughfare Master Plan adoption. It's a public hearing for Planning Commission's adoption of the 2016 Thoroughfare Master Plan, in order to provide the Master Plan future roads and pathways for the City of Novi.

MS. MCBETH: Kirsten is going to take this one to introduce the topic.

MS. MELLEM: Good evening. Last item on the agenda.

So after almost a year of work, the Planning Commission is now in the position today with the last document in Thoroughfare Master Plan adoption, the Master Plan for Land Use.

We are holding a final public hearing today on the proposed 2016 Thoroughfare Master Plan. Previously the Planning Commission received and approved the Thoroughfare Master Plan dated June 2016 for distribution.

The reports summarized the research and development of the 2016
Thoroughfare Master Plan by the City of Novi Planning Commission. The city's planning engineering staff and the transportation consultants, (unintelligible) included a final draft that was recommended for distribution by Planning Commission on June 16, and by City Council on July 11 of this year.

A public hearing is scheduled for this evening. After holding a public hearing and evaluating the public comments, the Planning Commission may adopt by resolution the Proposed 2016 Thoroughfare Master Plan, with or without any changes the Commission deems appropriate.

A draft resolution is included in the packet, alternately the Planning Commission may postpone the action matters, seek additional information or review from staff or from the Master Plan Zoning Committee, following approval, the Master Plan will be distributed to the City Council and published for the public.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

This is a public hearing. If there is anyone in the audience that wishes to address the Planning Commission on this topic, please step forward.

MS. WILKINS-GOODEARZ: My name is Christine Wilkins-Goodearz and I'm a resident of Willowbrook Community Association of Novi for 52 years.

This whole Master Plan for the thoroughfare down Ten Mile slipped by me. It seems that this plan was also -- or a similar plan was presented a number of years ago, and it would greatly impact to the detriment of our homes between Haggerty and Meadowbrook Road and also Meadowbrook and -- to the railroad tracks.

I am here to say to you that I am very disappointed, that I understand that things are put on a website, but not published necessarily on paper. If it was, it slipped by me entirely.

There are other folks on our
subdivision Facebook page that are also in agreement with me, that we don't wish Ten Mile to be five lane. We are concerned about the setback from the front door of our homes that face Ten Mile, the values on our homes as a result of that, and how that value will decrease our homes.

I understand that traffic, 52 years ago, I have walked down Ten Mile, down the middle of it, and I did frequently with friends and brothers and sisters, and I understand that there are many more people here in Novi than at that time. But I also understand that I lived on Ripple Creek and now I live on Mallott. And when I lived on Ripple Creek, I could get out on Ripple Creek and turn left, turn to the west, people would stop, let me in. Now, I had to sit in the turn lane, which is against the law, to get out, to turn left, at certain times of the day. I can't even begin to imagine what it would be like to get out of my subdivision with five lanes of traffic. It just is
unfathomable to me to imagine trying to get out, even if it's the same amount of traffic, people politeness and how you would get out without a traffic signal, when you don't have -- we have one entrance in, one entrance out, and in sub two, we have one going out onto Ten Mile, one onto Meadowbrook. And we have fought the traffic with 275, but people have let us out because there were two lanes of traffic, five lanes, we wouldn't be able to get out of our subdivision. And I am very concerned about where that five lanes is, at the front door of the people that are on Ten Mile. So I am very much against it. I appreciate you're giving me this time to tell you that.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

Anyone else?

MR. JOCZ: Good evening, thank you for the opportunity to speak to you. My name is Warren Jocz. I have a couple of facts for you. I am a Novi resident of 27 years. I am an automotive engineer. I am
also the author of an engineering assessment on Ten Mile that was given to the city in 1995, when the topic of Ten Mile came up. It was used and highlighted a lot of the shortcomings of the Master Plan at that time, and the effects of Ten Mile, that the previous person spoke about. I will touch on it a little bit.

What I want to do is talk to you. The plan in front of you, I want to say that I read all 71 pages, digested it. I understand -- I got a passion for this. But I find there is five key areas that every good plan should have that we're kind of deficient here. That I would recommend respectfully that we defer approval, so we can vet these things out.

I'm going to give you five areas, I'm going to try to supplement that with some facts.

So first of all, there is lack of consistency in the analysis. I will give you some details in a second.
There is lack of quantifiable benefits given the proposed recommendations in there.

Thirdly, we haven't addressed or identified what the current state is. I understand what the benefits will be, you need to know and identify currently what the state of conditions are today.

There is some lacking information regarding the effects of quality of life, as the previous speaker spoke to, and lastly, we are missing some elements about future of new technologies of how those would impact on this proposal.

Let me give you some examples of inconsistency and detail. There is two main road thoroughfares that are being proposed for major improvements, the Beck Road and Ten Mile.

Now, if you go into the Master Plan in the back of it, there are seven graphs or seven charts that talk to you, a detailed example of what is happening to Beck
Road, segment by segment, before and the after. There is not a single page what's happening to Ten Mile. There is no -- is this a two lane widening, a five lane widening, there is no detail, but there is $19 million set aside of that. So I think we are inferring that it's a five lane thoroughfare, but there is no detail in it, which is a flaw of the Master Plan. What are we spending for and how did that become --

What are the benefits. Okay. So, when you do a plan, you make a proposal, we run the computer models, what is the effect or the level of improvement that we expect from that work.

Now, you ask the question, do we even think that the level of improvement is going to be felt on Ten Mile, or is the other roads around Ten Mile that will actually experience the improvement.

There is a there think tank called Brookings Institute, they were both stuck in traffic, catchy name, very specific
to our topic here. And the philosophy behind that book and that think tank, says if you widen a road, build it, they will come. If you widen a road to five lanes, you will get relief for about nine months, and then what people will do, they will use that, they will fill to capacity that road, until they meet where it exceeds the capacity of that road, it's the path of least resistance until it gets congested. So what you have done is you have created a five lane road that has equal congestion, though it's taken a lot more real estate.

Thirdly, what is the current state of which we think we have a problem. So I went to the Oakland County Road Commission website and I looked at the traffic (unintelligible) that were published in 2015 for Ten Mile, for instance. On average, about 13,900 on Ten Mile as of last year.

In 1995, when we had the same discussion, the average traffic was almost
19,000 vehicles. We have actually reduced traffic flow on Ten Mile by 26 percent since 1995. Again, kind of omitted from the plan, we didn't talk about the baseline.

Another side note, the amount that was used for this Master Plan, I'm an engineer, so I use computer models all the time, I understand the strengths and weaknesses of it, but always for a computer model, you want to make sure that the prediction is going to be accurate.

So I looked at the accuracy of the SEMCOG model done in 1995, and the same model being kind of based on the potentials here. In 1995, that model anticipated 37,000 vehicles on Ten Mile this year. We have 13. 162 percent overstatement of projected reality in the future.

We are missing blueprint No. 4, quality of life. There is a table in the Master Plan Thoroughfare that talks about the elements of the impact of maybe taking one house, but we miss a lot of things that our
neighbor just talked about.

First of all, noise volumes,
when we did the study in 1995, not only did
we take noise meters out onto Ten Mile, but
we looked at what it would do if you did five
lanes, you brought that traffic closer to the
house. Any increase in the width of Ten Mile
would increase the noise level above HUD
standards for those people that live along
Ten Mile, making it unacceptable for them to
be living in their homes with any windows or
doors open, if you like living in a machine
shop, that's the equivalent noise level of
DB.

The other thing that was kind
of referenced was the number of curb cuts
along this section of road. If this road was
being designed today, from a clean sheet of
paper, there is that number of curb cuts that
you currently have along Ten Mile. What I
mean by curb cuts, I'm talking about
driveways in subdivision entrances. The
recommended -- by the engineering standards,
the recommended speed limit, because of those curb cuts, to allow people to safely ingress and egress, the recommended speed along Ten Mile would be 25 miles an hour. It's 45 now and you imagine if it's 55 -- five lanes or whatever the magic number, how many lanes they are proposing if it's five lanes, people will not do 45, they will do what the road will bear, making it impossible for people to safely ingress and egress around their communities or around the driveways.

Lastly, lack of futuring.

Coming from the automotive industry, I'm going to talk to you about autonomous vehicles.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: If you could please summarize.

MR. JOCZ: Autonomous vehicles were mentioned as part of the impact of government revenue, but there is no consideration about how autonomous vehicles will impact traffic flow. So in a letter from SEMCOG, when they talk about the maximum
road capacity, really means that traffic will
either divert away, or it gets stuck in
gridlock during peak hours, that's what a
traffic jam is. Autonomous vehicles give you
the smart way of diverting traffic.
Autonomous just doesn't talk to other
vehicles, they are going to be talking to the
communities at large. They will be talking
to the City of Novi, figuring out where the
road traffic is and adjusting their path
accordingly. Taking the automatic diversion
step, reducing the likelihood of concentrated
traffic.

So again, I think for those
five elements, and they can go on, I can go
through the whole analysis that we did 20
years ago, I think we are still premature in
approving this plan.

So I appreciate your time and
your consideration. If you have any
questions, I will be happy to answer.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, sir. Anyone else?
MR. BARRONS: My name is Ginger Barrons. I'm a lifelong resident of Novi. I'm not going to tell you my age, but just say I'm over 40. I own a home on Glenda Street. I'm also a real estate broker of over 30 years. My real estate company is here in Novi and has been for 30 years. I own two Willowbrook properties as well. So I am here tonight to talk about Ten Mile. The impact of widening Ten Mile, for me on Glenda Street, which is my personal residence, is really noted in what we did when we moved the library driveway west. When we moved the library driveway west, we only moved it, I don't know, maybe 50 feet. But it made getting out Glenda Street impossible. Today, you cannot get out Glenda Street. Now, we didn't widen -- move that library that long ago. But trying to turn left out of Glenda, puts a person in a position of having to turn into the center lane and you are turning directly into a car coming out of the library trying to head west. Most of the cars that
come out of the library turn into the center lane and stop directly in front of Glenda Street. I have never seen anyone ticketed for that. But it means that a resident coming out of Glenda cannot turn left at all because there is a car in front of them.

The cars heading west out of the library often will congregate one after another after another and stop right in front of Glenda Street leaving no opening when there is a red light for the Glenda Street residents to turn left out of Glenda Street. It is a major traffic accident waiting to happen.

Widening Ten Mile to five lanes would be a nightmare.

Now I want to switch down the road a bit and go back to Willowbrook. For those residents who live on Ten Mile, the noise impact he explained much better than I could, so let's just leave it at that.

What no one has talked about is the value of the properties behind the homes
that are on Ten Mile because they will also have an increased noise impact. They will also lose property value and they tell you that as a professional, 30 years selling in the city, they will lose value as well.

So the impact of widening Ten Mile, I looked at this map, I thought, okay, I don't want to be that person in Novi that's resistant to change. But I looked at it, and I thought it's going stop at Taft Road, where is it going to go. Because Beck is being widened, it's not even going down to Beck. It's not even going to the edge of the city limits past Wixom. The increase of traffic going to the hospital alone towards Beck Road is going stop at Taft Road because then they're going to have to try and figure out how to go from a five lane road back down to what we currently have. And that's going to dump a lot of traffic right there in front of our library, our civic center, and of course, the street I live on, Glenda. Also Wixom Road has been improved, we have new schools
on Wixom Road at the corner of Grand River there, we have a Target and Meijer, and new commercial buildings there, that a lot of our Novi residents travel Ten Mile because they live off Ten Mile down to it to get to. But now that road is going to stop at a five way, so I guess I'm looking at for the same reason he is, what is the reason, what is the result, how is it going to improve our traffic flow in Novi. Is it improving our traffic flow or is it just moving it down the road west a little bit. I think that's really what we have got to think about. If we can't widen that road to the edge of our city limit, we are not doing anybody any favors. We are just moving our problem down the road. I am so happy to hear the traffic study showing that traffic is actually decreased from the first time we talked about this years ago.

But at this point, I would ask you to please really consider that this may not be the proposal and I don't want to hear,
oh, it's five years down the road, because you're still approving it. It's still going to happen. That almost makes it worse. So I am asking you to reconsider this plan for Ten Mile Road. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Anyone else?

MS. PRINGLE: My name is Jackie Pringle. I'm also a Novi resident, part of the Willowbrook community association. I too am opposed to the widening of Ten Mile Road. I don't believe that Ten Mile is truly our problem. Ten Mile does have traffic congestion and it backs up primarily during rush hour. It's been increased recently due to all the excessive construction surrounding our city. Twenty-three hours of the day Ten Mile is not the main issue. That equates to only four percent of the day. Another issue is the train that comes through town. If that comes through around rush hour, that is to back everything up on the Ten Mile side. It's going back to up both eastbound and
westbound. There are plenty of alternative routes right now, for those who don't live in our city. Two miles to the north, two miles to the south of Ten Mile Road, there are three main throughfares, you have got Eight Mile, you have got Twelve Mile, and you've got Grand River.

None of these have road -- none of these roads house residents of the City of Novi. Expanding Twelve Mile will attract more traffic from people who don't live here, more congestion and much higher speeds. Consider the issue also that eastbound Ten Mile traffic, increasing eastbound traffic will have. The intersection at Grand River and Ten Mile right now is an absolute nightmare and it's a mess at rush hour. Increasing eastbound traffic into an intersection, is going to cause even more trouble.

Novi is a big city, but as it was stated earlier, it is still semi rural. It attracts people for the small town,
hometown atmosphere that we do have here. It's actually what appeals to a lot of the people. As stated earlier, we are not Southfield, nor do we want to be. Please proceed with this with caution, or take some more time to consider this. Our city needs to consider and support our neighbors and the children that live along Ten Mile Road. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

Anyone else?

MR. HURWITCH: Mike Hurwitch, three year resident of Novi currently on Cranbook, three houses south of Ten Mile. As Warren alluded to, 20 years ago, it's like deja vu all over again. We went through this and we were a well organized group led by Warren, showed the city that widening Ten Mile to five lanes was not the solution. The solution was intersection improvements which have happened, not as much as could, and the goal was to get the traffic away from the residential area, in other words, Eight Mile,
Grand River, Twelve Mile.

I didn't prepare anything for tonight, but I just wanted to voice another opinion opposing any kind of five lane improvement. Improvement is not the right word. A five lane widening to Ten Mile.

I guess we have to get the band back together. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, sir. Anyone else?

MR. SUPERFISKE: Phil Superfiske, resident of Novi for 45 years, been selling real estate like Ginger in town for a little bit longer than her, 42 or 43 years.

I came tonight to thank you, first of all, for this plan and how it shows the pathways being connected. I think it's great that we're focusing on that. We use the pathways quite a bit and I think it's good to see those being part of the focus.

I also came tonight to talk initially about Ten Mile Road, Haggerty to Taft, because I see we are just going to dump
traffic at Taft Road and I think it's going
to create some problems. I think if we are
going to do anything to Ten Mile Road, we
have to consider the whole piece of Ten Mile,
Ten Mile from Haggerty Road to Napier Road.

When the people before me spoke
about the problems we had 21 or 22 years ago,
when, at that time, there were two proposals
up, one to five lanes and one to three lanes
on the piece that you are talking about right
now, the Willowbrook communities banded
together, and convinced the city not to do
anything, but redirected the city to put the
money and to put the focus with Oakland
County on improving Eight Mile Road.

Because prior to that time,
Eight Mile Road wasn't the five lanes that it
is today. And so, the improvements happened
on Eight Mile. And when the improvements
happened on Eight Mile, it took the traffic
burden off of Ten Mile. That's why your
traffic studies today show less traffic than
what they were in 1995. After hearing the
people talk again tonight, I'm not sure what
the solution on Ten Mile is, but I think part
of it needs to be, you need to look at the
whole piece, you need to look all the way out
to Napier Road and dump it all onto the
traffic circle that Oakland County is going
to put it over there.

I'm on the roads in this town
all day long. That's where I did work for
many, many years. And I see today there is
more congestion, with Novi Road to Napier
than there is Novi Road to Haggerty Road.
It's more west and east. I don't know why we
picked that section. I apologize for coming
to the game late when you have been studying
this for a year. I too didn't know anything
about this until I happened to see the paper
last week.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you,
sir. Anyone else?

MS. ARRILA: Hi. My name Carol
Arrila. I'm a 21 year resident. I live
right across the street here in Jamestown
Green. My house actually backs up to the
house that's at the light at the high school.
I also want to make the statement, you know,
we talked about the additional noise level,
coming in, you know, when I bought here in
1995, I wasn't planning on living on a five
lane highway, right to my back door. We also
have a lot of trouble turning right and
turning left out of our subdivision because
the high school light is right there. So the
cars all stop at the high school light, they
back up, they won't let you out. I don't
know a solution, necessarily, but it will be
nearly impossible. It's almost impossible
now to legally turn left out of Jamestown
Green. If there is a five lane highway, I'm
calling it a highway, that's what it's going
to seem like to me, it's going to be like
Grand River. You know, there is lot more
residents, a lot more, you know, ingress,
egress that are directly on the road. And if
you do go forward with this plan, I would
certainly like to see what the solution is
for people coming out of all these subdivisions and how they're going to cross over three lanes of traffic and get out of their subdivisions.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

Anyone else?

MR. DOREMUS: Hi, my name is John Doremus. I'll keep it brief. I've been a resident of Novi for a little under a year with my wife. We live right here on Ten Mile, Orchard Ridge Estates. I will echo the complaints that have been heard already. But the one I have not heard mentioned was of green space lining Ten Mile, specifically in our area, there is quite a bit of very mature 30 to 40 year-old trees, that would be, I assume, completely removed by this plan, due to the proximity to the current road, so I would ask that if any further progress is made on this plan, that that becomes a part of it. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, sir. Anyone else?
MS. PAULK: My name is Laura Paulk. I have been a resident of Novi for a long time. My family is very unique in that we have fit into the Novi Master Plan quite a bit. My husband and I have lived in Novi 20 years, we just sold our home to our son. We have currently stayed in Novi.

My son's question, as he lives on Glenda, is what about his high school son crossing Ten Mile. Has anything been thought about the students crossing Ten Mile that walk to the high school? About safety for them.

I can also tell you that when I myself lived on Glenda, our daughter was hit by a car pulling out of the library and she was injured. She was trying go east and the car coming out of the library was going west and she was hit. Fortunately she is okay. But it is a bad, bad intersection, and needs to really be seriously looked at before someone is injured fatally. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.
Anyone else? Seeing no one else, any written correspondence?

MR. LYNCH: Actually my Ipad just locked up.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: That will close the public hearing on this matter. Turn it over to the Planning Commission for their consideration. Who would like to start?

MR. LYNCH: Let me take a crack at this. Who owns Ten Mile Road, is that the city that controls that or is that the county that does that? Beck Road I understand because I think when I first came to the Planning Commission, it was like a decade ago, that was the first thing I said, we really got to widen Beck Road because it's the only attachment between M14 and 96. I think we are planning on doing that. But the City of Novi controls that. Who controls Ten Mile?

MS. MCBETH: That's the Road Commission for Oakland County.
MR. LYNCH: Oakland County. Let me ask, I remember having a discussion about the influx of vehicles coming from South Lyon because of all the build-up there. We were talking about Oakland County is going to pave Napier and our hope was to offload some of those -- some of that demand, take it from Ten Mile coming east down Napier onto Eight Mile, then with Beck Road, we were hoping to offload that demand Beck Road also going down to M-14.

The area that seemed of greatest concern to me is the Ten Mile thing. These aren't anything -- I don't recall reading anywhere that these are something the city somehow controls?

MS. MCBETH: Well, this was part of the plan, was to take a look at all of the major thoroughfares throughout the city and our consultant looked at all of those and identified the areas where, you know, some kind of biggest bang for the buck areas, where the best improvements could be made for
the long-term for the City of Novi.

As you said, the Beck Road corridor was one of the areas recommended for significant improvements and the Ten Mile Road corridor was another area that was recommended for significant improvements. All of the details, of course, have not been worked out. This is much like the Master Plan for Land Use and, you know, if it's approved, and it's funded and it goes ahead, a lot of the details in terms of the cross section and the crossings and the improvements would need to be included as well. As you know, these two are just one component of this thoroughfare Master Plan, there is also the intersection improvements, 13 intersections were identified, and there is smaller cost areas as well, but significantly improve the flow of the traffic. Two dozen segments of the sidewalks that the walkable Novi committee has worked carefully on as well, as well as the transit, three suggestions for transit options
throughout the community. So the one component that seems like there is a lot of discussion tonight is the Ten Mile Road corridor recommendation for improvements.

MR. LYNCH: Okay. I do recall being part of the discussions. I look at this more of a theory of constraints type of thing. I do agree with the one gentleman up here with the -- you know, we're going to find the path of least resistance, I thought that's what we were focusing on, immediate attention. I guess I was confused. I didn't -- I was confused about the extension. I knew they were going to do Ten Mile, but that was more because of the increased growth west, we were trying to manage that traffic because that increased growth west, seems to be putting large demand on our -- in the City of Novi thoroughfares. I thought Oakland County was working on -- you know, I know that they're tearing down a hill by Napier to put in an intersection of some sort, a traffic light.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON:

Round-a-about.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Oh. That was my only question. I just wanted to make sure that we are responsible for the even number -- or the odd number roads, City of Novi and Oakland County is responsible for the even numbers, is that how it works?

MS. MCBETH: For the most part. There are a few exceptions to that. I don't have all of those memorized right now, but Ten Mile and Beck Road are the Road Commission's responsibility.

So of course, this is a City of Novi plan and recommendation. The funding is not there. As with anything, the recommendation would be to take a look at a plan, see where the areas could be improved that would be the best areas for the city for the long run, and then the design and the funding would need to come into place. So it would have to be obviously a joint effort to do something like that.
MR. LYNCH: Well, by approving the Thoroughfare Master Plan, basically we are saying conceptually we agree with the majority of what they have outlined for us, with the consultant outline.

MS. MCBETH: I would say so, yes.

MR. LYNCH: But there is nothing really cast in stone?

MS. MCBETH: No. Recommendations all had costs associated with them. And as you know, the Master Plan doesn't include any of the funding mechanisms or the cost. That would need to be part of a capital improvement plan, that would need to be something where the agencies get together, engineering department is so good at determining what all of the cost sharing could be, and it would need to be a cooperative effort to do something like that.

MR. LYNCH: Basically by approving the Thoroughfare Master Plan we are basically saying that conceptually we agree with the findings, is that --
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MR. LYNCH: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Barb, I have a couple of questions for you.

Will some -- if this road gets widened, do we contribute, does the City of Novi contribute to funding for this or is this all by the county? Is this all within the county?

MS. MCBETH: I'm not sure ifJeremy wants to address that.

My understanding is that frequently there is at least two parties that would contribute and sometimes a third party as well.

MR. MILLER: Yes, typically with major road projects, a lot of the funding is from the State and that's divvied up every year, based on multiple criteria from the State of how much money they have. And then for this one, depending on how it went
forward, it could be between us, the state
and the county or just the county and the
state.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Jeremy, for
traffic control, if this thing gets approved
and we take all the traffic off of Grand
River, or a good portion of it, we take a
portion off Eight Mile, and we increase the
traffic on Ten Mile, I know the backups, I
tried to get over here this evening. So I
think we are all familiar with it. And even
when we go further to Grand River and the
expressway, Grand River, Ten Mile expressway
corridor trying to get on, we see those
backups.

So in your professional
opinion, are we really doing anything that's
going to eliminate traffic or are we just
going to add more traffic onto what we have
now and Grand River will max out and Eight
Mile will max out then we will have Ten Mile
that will max out. I mean, is that -- I
mean, that seems to be the trend, that's the
engineering study that I heard, decibel levels, property values, people try to get in and out of their property. I mean, you think this is a good thing for Novi?

MR. MILLER: Potentially. That's one of the reasons the consultant identified this as one of the areas that now or in the future is going to need to be widened, just with all the development going on, as those other roads max out, we have to expand another one because we have more traffic to deal with.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Let me ask you another question. Would you like to live on Ten Mile while this is going on?

MR. MILLER: No, nobody wants to live on that --

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Usually we get into development projects of sorts, you know, and we look at things and we say, well, you know, they're going to put a C store here, they're going to put a couple of houses over here, they're going to take out some trees.
I think we really need to look at this. I think this is going to affect 1,000, at least, in the neighborhoods surrounding retaining walls, noise walls, loss of property, et cetera, et cetera. I just looked at it, I think what are we doing -- what are we doing to people. Is this so important that somebody has got to go 50, 60 miles an hour to get to a stoplight.

Then one more question. Do we have any say about lights, additional lights on half mile roads or anything like. So we can control back traffic and people can get in and out.

The other thing is, do we need to take -- do we need five lanes? Can we have a center lane that, you know, morning, it goes east, traffic goes east, in the evening it turns around, you got two lanes going the other way. I mean, there is so many questions that are involved in this. I just can't see going in there, I can't sit here and listen to studies that were done,
the recommendations that were -- that say
this is not going to be a good thing. I see
no value in this and just getting more people
on the bus. But the bus isn't going any
faster and you got a bunch of armpits that
you're smelling. It's just how you look at
this, I'm sorry. That's the closest
scenario.

MR. ANTHONY: Does the plan
specifically say Ten Mile be five lanes?

MS. PRINGLE: Yes.

MR. ANTHONY: I have happened to
live in this area for 20 years, I've been in
two different neighborhoods. There are at
least eight different subdivisions there that
are all integrated into a community. The
children ride their bikes to each other's
homes and they cross Ten Mile, they cross
Meadowbrook, doing homework projects.
Orchard Hills, an elementary school, takes
children both from the north side and the
south side of Ten Mile Road. You have the
ice cream place that's on the corner, that's
the gathering spot for those eight
neighborhoods, that people come in with
bikes.

When someone pointed out that
it would look like Eight Mile, can you
imagine a child trying to cross that.

So I originally saw this,
not -- completely missed the five lane, an
investment in the infrastructure. Do you
remember when we spent the money to have a
planner look at how to redo the corner of Ten
Mile and Meadowbrook and upgrade that. So
that became a better gathering place for
these eight neighborhoods. That's how you
fight blight. If you want to bring blight
very quickly into Novi, put a major road that
divides eight communities, eight
neighborhoods. You will blight them. You
will blight them quick.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Member

Baratta.

MR. BARATTA: I think everything
has been pretty much said. I thought that
the presentations from the folks in the audience were very articulate and you brought up a lot of points. I would think that at this point there is just a lot of problems on Ten Mile, from noise to lack of sidewalks to trees to the traffic patterns and the issue on blight that was just brought up, it's a tight area, and I guess just to echo Mr. Zuchlewski here, I travel Ten Mile, you know, coming off Haggerty, I don't see five lanes improving it. You have a choke point at the railroad tracks, it's got that elevational difference. I don't see this improving traffic, to be honest with you, from what we have looked at in the engineering study. So if the goal is to make traffic move faster, I don't think we have achieved that objective, at a significant cost, as what was indicated here today.

Beck Road is a separate issue. I think Beck Road you're capable of doing that, on Beck Road. I think that's an improvement, but I don't think we have a
solution on Ten Mile yet.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Anybody want to make a motion?

MS. MCBETH: Mr. Chair, may I make another comment. This evening we were not able to bring the consultant who has worked so hard on this project forward. As one alternative we could have the consultant come to a subsequent meeting to further describe this portion of the plan.

There are a number of other really good aspects to the plan, that include those recommendations for the intersection improvements, the sidewalks and the transit as well as the Beck Road.

So if the Planning Commission wishes, we could either postpone and bring this back with the consultant here, or if the Planning Commission wishes, you could approve a portion of the plan, and not the recommendations for the Ten Mile Road until further study is done. Just putting that out there. I think that would be the same as
before, would need five votes affirmatively.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Member Baratta?

MR. BARATTA: I would be prepared to make a motion to move forward with the Beck Road portion of the plan and to take out the Ten Mile portion of the plan at this time.

MR. LYNCH: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Motion by Member Baratta, second my Member Lynch. Any other comments?

MR. LYNCH: I still want to see the consultant again. But I do agree there is a lot of good things in this plan, Beck Road, you know, we kind of are offloading the high development coming east, from the west from South Lyon. I don't want to stop that, but this portion here though, I agree that we really need to probably take a closer look at this particular area right here. I would like to understand his thoughts, as we come to a resolution of this particular area, but
the sidewalks and all that other stuff, I
don't want to get the intersections and the
sidewalks and, you know, Beck Road, which is
major changes. We are just doing that piece
of the plan, right?

MR. BARATTA: That was my motion.

MS. MCBETH: Mr. Chair, I think
that might be a reasonable request to bring
the consultant back to further discuss that
because a lot of work had gone into the
review of that. The Ten Mile Road
improvements as well were not proposed by the
consultant to be included in the budget for
another five years at a minimum.

So it might be worth while to
step back on that and have another discussion
with the consultant.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a
motion. Sri, can you call the roll.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Member

Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Member Anthony?
MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Member Baratta?

MR. BARATTA: Yes.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Next is matters for consideration. The approval of the July 27, 2016 Planning Commission minutes. Any changes, modifications?

MR. LYNCH: Motion to approve.

MR. ANTHONY: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a motion and a second, Lynch and Anthony. Any other discussion? Sri, can you call the roll.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Member Baratta?

MR. BARATTA: Yes.

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

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Next on the agenda is matters for discussion. Relative to the Master Plan, Barb, next steps?

MS. MCBETH: Yes, I think we would like to bring it back. There has been quite a bit of work that's gone into the rest of that plan as well, so we would like to bring it back maybe with a couple of alternatives, see what the Planning Commission thinks of the alternatives at a subsequent meeting. It probably will not be the meeting next week as the packets go out on Friday for that, but maybe the next meeting we can bring something back.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

MS. MCBETH: I think we would
like to make sure we have a full panel at
that time as well.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Appreciate
that. Any supplemental issues?

Last chance for audience
participation. Anyone else in the audience
wishes to address the Planning Commission at
this time?

MR. JOCZ: I just would like to
ask clarification. I got kind of lost in the
motion of what you did with the Thoroughfare
Plan versus the Master Plan. The
Thoroughfare Plan was approved with --

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: With the
exception of Ten Mile.

MR. JOCZ: The consultant is
coming back for the Master Plan or for the
Thoroughfare Plan?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON:
Thoroughfare Plan.

MR. JOCZ: I'm just trying to
figure out. You approved the plan with the
exception, that goes forward, you are
bringing the consultant in -- I'm trying to
figure out what bringing the consultant in
would be on an approved -- with an
exception --

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We are
trying to understand, since he's not here,
rather than surmise, we are going to ask him
specifically what his intentions were in
addressing Ten Mile Road, only half way, five
lanes, get some more information so that if
there is any modification or a change to the
plan, we have that information in total.

MR. JOCZ: I was just looking at
a deferred plan versus an approved plan with
a removal of an element.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have an
approved plan, less Ten Mile.

MR. JONES: Thank you.

MR. BARRONS: There was something
I forgot when I was talking to you earlier.
I wanted to mention, that being a resident of
Glenda Street for over 30 years, I can tell
you that I have -- now we have the first park
and a very active library and a very active city center. We now have a park behind the civic center that wasn't as well developed as when I first moved onto Glenda Street. We have a lot of high school students crossing Ten Mile all the time. They go there for sports, they go there to play tennis. We have a lot of young mothers that are crossing to go to the library.

If you look at Ten Mile during the day, there is a lot of people crossing that street, so moving that to a five lane road can really be a problem. I don't think you're going to be able to consider that without putting in a bridge because probably 50 have percent of the high school students that live on the north side of Ten Mile walk to high school. I'm not sure if you're aware of that, there is no bus available to them, they are all walkers. So that's something that if you're going to make a five lane thoroughfare, you're going to need to get with the school district, you're going to
need to provide busing for all those students
on the north side of Ten Mile or you're going
to have a fatality there. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Anyone
else?

MR. HURWITCH: Thank you for what
you did tonight. I would also like to
request when the consultant does come back
in, not only get more details on what his
thoughts were on the Ten Mile section, but
why not improve Grand River, in terms of
traffic flow. That was something that was
brought up 20 years ago and has never been
addressed since. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Anyone
else? With that, close the audience
participation.

Look for a motion to adjourn.

MR. LYNCH: Motion to adjourn.

MR. ANTHONY: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: All those
in favor.

THE BOARD: Aye.
(The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.)
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