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CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: I'd like to call to order the May 10 regular meeting of the Planning Commission.

Sri, can you call the roll, please.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Good evening.

Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Here.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Here.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Here.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Here.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Here.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Here.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Zuchlewski?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Absent, excused because he's not here. If we could stand for the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Pledge recited.)

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

MR. LYNCH: Motion to approve.

MR. ANTHONY: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a motion and a second. All those in favor say aye.

THE BOARD: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: None opposed. We have an agenda.

Comes to our first audience participation. We have four public hearings on tonight's agenda. If there is anyone in the audience that wishes to address the Planning Commission on some other matter, at this point, please step forward.
Seeing no one, we will close
the first audience participation.

I don't believe we have any
correspondence.

MR. GRECO: No correspondence
other than related to the public hearings.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Committee
reports? City planner reports? Sri. Good
evening.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Barbara is at a
planning conference in New York this week.
She will be back on Monday. We didn't have
anything.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.
That brings us to our first
public hearing, Princeton Park, JSP17-01,
zoning map amendment 18.717. It's a public
hearing at the request of Pulte Homes for the
Planning Commission's recommendation to City
Council for a planned rezoning overlay
associated with the zoning map amendment in
the OS1 office service to RM2 high density
multi-family residential. Subject property
is approximately 24 acres and is located west of Novi Road north of Ten Mile in Section 22. The applicant is proposing a development of 125 unit multi-family attached condominiums with frontage and access to Novi Road.

Kirsten, Sri?

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Thank you. I'm sorry. It didn't show up on the screen. There it is.

The applicant is requesting a zoning map amendment utilizing the planned rezoning overlay option to rezone the subject property to RM-2 in order to propose a 125 unit attached single family development.

The subject property is located west of Novi Road, north of Ten Mile in Section 22.

It is zoned OS-1, office service and is being used as vacant storage lot as a long-standing legal non-confirming use.

All properties east of Novi Road across the subject property are zoned
and developed as I1 and I2 industrial users. They are master planned for industrial uses as well. Properties to the north are zoned OS-1. The post office is located on the property directly north of the subject property.

The other property abutting on the north is owned by the city. The remaining property has an existing wireless tower located. The future uses of these properties are very unlikely to change.

The property on the south is currently vacant and can be developed with the existing allowed office uses, or may be rezoned to master plan commercial uses. The property to the west is zoned R4 and is currently developed as single family detached housing.

The property contains few regulated woodlands and a large portion of wetlands with an open body of water to the south, which is proposed to be preserved.

The plan was presented to
master planning and zoning committee on March 28 of 2017. The change from office to residential use received fairly good comments from the committee with a note to work with the staff on other plans. Plan review letters summarized the recommendations provided at the meeting.

The applicant is proposing 125 three-bedroom multi family units for sale residential development with frontage and access to Novi Road. The PRO concept plan shows two detention ponds on either side of the proposed entrance boulevard.

The detention ponds also serve as screening from Novi Road frontage. The concept plan also includes pocket parks and pedestrian walks spread throughout the development for active and passive recreation.

All proposed internal roads are private. This is not a gated community. The applicant is proposing to complete the construction in two phases. The concept
plan -- as part of the subject requirements, the applicant has provided a traffic impact study, a rezoning narrative and a land use narrative prepared by CIP Planning along with the site plans which are included in your packet.

The applicant is proposing a maximum density of 6.4 dwelling units per acre. The applicant initially proposed a zoning change to RN-1 with allowable maximum density of 5.4. Density deviations cannot be granted as part of PRO process, so the applicant has changed the request to RN-2, which allows the proposed density of (unintelligible).

Staff believes that RM1 will be more appropriate to the low rise housing style the applicant is proposing and will be more compatible with the surroundings. We think it would create a more logical transition between the non-residential district, the major thoroughfare and a single family development to the west. Staff
requests the applicant to reconsider and
revise the density to meet the RM1
requirements. The proposed use, even though
not supported by master plan, is partly
justified by the proximity to the Town
Center. As one of the public benefits, the
applicant is proposing pedestrian
enhancements along Novi Road to increase
pedestrian connectivity to the residential
development to Novi Town Center. Without a
proper visual and pedestrian connection to
Town Center, the development will be
compatible with surrounding existing using
along Novi Road. The applicant is suggested
to initiate discussions with Road Commission
of Oakland County who has jurisdiction over
Novi Road prior to PRO approval to estimate
the feasibility of that benefit.

Planning is not recommending
approval for many reasons listed in the
letter. Planning recommends the applicant to
reconsider the proposed public benefits to
serve the intent of the ordinance. Also
recommends some changes to the proposed
layout, which we believe will result in
slightly lower density and keep it within RM1
and eliminate a couple planning deviations.

The applicant is proposing
private drives, public water and sewer and
two above ground storm water detention ponds
on the site. The proposed density may
require additional contractual sewer capacity
down the street of Eight Mile Road, as the
density increases results in high sanitary
sewer discharge.

Engineering supports the two
deviations identified in the letter, one for
not providing a stub street to adjacent
properties and two to reduce the distance
between the sidewalk and the road.
Engineering recommends approval.

The conceptual landscape plans
have a number of landscape deviations
proposed, some of which are supported and
some are not. The applicant agreed to revise
the plans to eliminate two of those
deviations. The others include deviations to
street trees, berm requirements and sub
 canopy tree requirements as listed in the
 motion sheet.

The basic concept and layout
indicate that there is sufficient room
provided to meet some of the city
requirements. Landscape recommends approval
with comments we addressed at the time of
preliminary site plan.

A minimum 0.09 acre of wetland
impacts are proposed. Wetlands are
recommending approval, noting that a wetland
minor use permit and authorizations to
encroach into wetlands buffers would be
required at the time of preliminary site
plan.

There are 262 regulated trees
on the site, of which 54 trees, about
20 percent of the total, are proposed to be
removed. Woodlands are recommending approval
noting that a woodland permit would be
required at the time of preliminary site
The city's traffic consultant has reviewed the rezoning traffic impact study, and notes that additional information is required to determine the impacts of the proposed rezoning as compared to existing land use. Additional improvement along Novi Road are warranted. The review states that there were no background developments identified near the study area, which needs revising the study with the possible development within the radius of the future residential developments onto Novi Road. The applicant has agreed to revise the plan to meet the code and is not requesting the two deviations identified by traffic in the review letter. Traffic recommends approval.

Facade couldn't make a proper determination of compliance with facade ordinance, due to insufficient (unintelligible) but the applicant agreed to comply with requirements at the time of preliminary site plan. Scaled elevations are
typically required with PRO. If deviations are not identified at the time of PRO approval, the applicant has to comply with the requirements at the time of preliminary site plan. Facade notes that the applicant shall meet the minimum 30% brick on all facade and maximum asphalt requirements.

The site plan proposes secondary emergency access with turf pavers instead of the preferred asphalt paving. Fire requested the applicant to design the path with landscaping and/or signage and to mow and keep it clear at all times for the safety of the fire trucks. Fire requested original comments to be addressed with the revised submitted. Fire recommends approval.

Planning Commission is asked tonight to hold a public hearing and make recommendation on proposed PRO and concept plan to City Council. The applicant, Joe Skore, from Pulte Homes is here with his engineer, Bill Anderson, and they would like to make a small presentation on the project
and the public benefits.

We have a traffic consultant, Sterling Frazier, and wetland consultants Pete Hill and Matt Carmer, along with staff to answer any questions you may have for us.

Thank you for your time.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

Do you wish to address the Planning Commission. If we could, could we get the maps on the screen in front of us. We have got nothing.

MR. SKORE: Good evening. My name is Joe Skore. I am the director of land for Pulte Homes of Michigan.

We are very excited about this project. We feel that it will be a high quality, highly successful community, much like our latest grand opening in the City of Novi, our Overland community, which he opened probably two or three months ago. It was a fantastic grand opening. We are thrilled with the start.

Little bit of history on this
We have been working with staff on this proposal for probably six or seven months. We have revised the plan, you know, two or three times in accordance with staff's review, their comments, their suggestions. Changes have been positive overall. We do meet with the master plan zoning committee in late March. We got some great feedback. And overall, again, that was another positive meeting.

We met with -- I think this is important. We met with the residents of the neighboring subdivision, Churchill Crossing subdivision, which is the residential community just to the west. It's contiguous to this property. We initially met with the HOA board, and then subsequent to that we attended their annual meeting, did a presentation, got great feedback, a lot of great questions. And we feel -- I think there is a few members of the community here tonight. We feel that we walked away and we feel the residents overall liked the
development and supported the development.

With that, I am going let the project engineer get into, you know, the site details. Thank you.

MR. ANDERSON: Good evening. My name is Bill Anderson. I'm with Atwell. I kind of want to walk through our thought process on this. As you can tell, we have already renamed the project, Emerson Park. It was submitted as Princeton Park. There was a lot of discussion with your team and ours to change that and we have. Again, we are excited tonight. We are looking at a 125 unit townhome development on 24 acres.

To bring you in a little bit, there is our site on Novi Road, south of Grand River, about a half mile from your downtown core there. We have adjacent residential to the west, some industrial that is the CAT dealership is across the street from us on Novi, you know where that is. We are somewhere mid-point between Ten and Grand River there, our site.
Next screen, please. There is our parcel as it sits today. Again, it's vehicle RV storage. There is some tires. It's kind of a -- somewhat blighted. It's been there for quite sometime. We are excited about doing some redevelopment opportunity on that. You will note there is a pretty significant wetland pond on the complex along the south perimeter of the south third, has that steep slope and wetland there, so that's the parcel that we are talking about.

Next slide. As we looked at the zoning, again it's currently it's an office zoning, with an eye towards community office, which is a little more smaller scale office with multiple uses. That is where your master plan wanted to go with this. We looked into it -- go to the next slide, please.

So we saw your master plan with the community office, and we looked at your master plan. Your master plan talks
about a couple things that was important, relevant to us. There is a real desire in the city for a full range of housing options, for all residents. That was pretty clear. There is an over-saturation of your office inventory currently in the city, that was interesting. I will talk a little bit more about that later. We talked about strategic residential locations. The ability to consider those. A unique location may be transitional parcel, an isolated site, may be proximity to downtown, so there was a real point to consider strategic residential locations. Promote economic development is important to the master plan. Preservation of natural features, that's a continued theme in the city here, of course. And then talk about pedestrian enhancement along Novi Road.

Our project team -- we actually consulted with a third-party planning consultant, who knows the city pretty well, CIB planning and talked about the viability for this townhouse development
in this area. And what we've concluded, kind of a couple of points, the proposal is really a small department from the community office. And we know your staff supports -- your staff supports the attached residential, and so does our team obviously as well. And it's a small departure from the community office designation in your master plan.

Again, there is competing office districts in this area. We actually -- after our first meeting with the city, we reached out to the retail development community and brokers to see if there was a mixed use component that might make sense on this site, maybe some retail up front.

Again, we are right next to the post office, so maybe something up front. We actually got no interest back on that. I think we have actually got some communications from some local brokers provided that to your staff, so we did explore the opportunity of an office retail
component on this project.

        This product actually
talked -- if you go back, please, for a
second. The missing middle housing. That's
really a gap that you guys have identified in
your master plan, for the millennials, the
young families, and our product here is
really going to speak to that. Proximity to
downtown, again, we are close there. I think
we do a great job, this project will do a
great job playing off that. Preservation and
natural features, I will talk about that. We
have support from your natural features
consultant for this. And it's really an
isolated, kind of a mid block office parcel,
and an isolated parcel, I will talk about
that.

        Then ultimately a transitional
piece. We got a lot of residential single
family homes to our west, and there is really
a low scale, but industrial retail use on
Novi Road. So this piece offers a little bit
of transition.
Going through again, there is competing office districts here. When you see our site there, the townhome center has office opportunities, you guys have city west opportunities that's on Grand River between Taft and Beck, and then there is office opportunities, quite honestly, better, less risky opportunities east along Grand River. And there is really identified -- your master plan said it, our market research has it, it's a little bit of oversaturation of office in the city, from an inventory perspective. And again, this is really an isolated mid block piece.

Next slide, please. There is our piece down there, our site. Again, looking further, we are less than a half mile from Main Street, which is about a six minute walk, which makes it an interesting residential opportunity. Again, strategic residential opportunities are something you specifically identified in your master plan that you guys would look at. And when I look
at where the downtown is, where I look at our residential neighbors, I think this hits the target of that particular identification there.

Next slide, please.

Preservation of natural features. A little bit more of the parcel. There is kind of a flat area in the blue there, a minimal slope change, but there is really 40 feet across this site. We got steep slopes, and a large wetland complex on the southern third of the site. Again, nice but challenging. We went out and qualified the trees and on those slopes in the south central and the southwest is our quality trees. There is not a lot of trees on the site, but the quality ones are located along that south ridge. And then there is quite a bit of topo even to our west. We really think the residential development allowed better flexibility to deal with the topography than an office use does. So even from the site itself, its narrow structure and what we are up against
with the trees and the slopes, we think the residential use addresses that better.

Next slide, please. Again, residential transition. And really I have called it an isolated office. When you look at it, there is our piece, again, the city owns -- our neighbor -- there is a small US post office right off Novi. But behind that, about two-thirds of our site, there is city property and also there is a flag lot, there is a cell tower. So there is a lot of greenery, about half of that is wetland, but a lot of natural features right there. We think it's probably going to be there for sometime to the north.

To the south of us is a large -- they share that beautiful wetland complex and pond, that wraps around the south, really impinges any significant development to the south. So it really isolates this 24-acre parcel, not good for office, real good for residential.

And again, we also have that
strong connection to the existing homes and residential to the west. So, you know, given what I have to the north and the south, and our neighbors to the west, we really think this is a decent housing opportunity, and again, the missing middle is kind of our product here. And being transitional to the industrial townhome, some density makes sense and certainly the proximity to the downtown makes sense.

So a little bit about the plan itself. I will dive in a little bit. Again, we are looking at an exclusive multi-family attached residential community. We have 125 units on 24 acres, about 5.2 units, though not a high density development. We have a grand boulevard entrance with our pond futures, coming off Novi Road, as you see there. We have a pedestrian connection, which will also provide emergency access along the southern pond, and a nice scenic outlook. We are looking at a nice gazebo over that pond feature that we are going to
dress up Novi Road. We got three pocket parks and play structure mingled into the plan, bicycle parking. Large buffers. We got some really large buffers. Our closest unit is 150 at least to the right-of-way on Novi Road, so we are really set off Novi Road with the layout of this development.

And then we have a great vegetation buffer to the west. The only real neighbors we have is the residents to the west. And we have a nice vegetation buffer, and we're going to put quite a bit of lush landscape along that west line as well. And then all of our units on this plan back up to open space.

There is a little illustration of kind of what our vision was originally, coming off Novi Road that wetland pond, a little gazebo up there on Novi Road really pulls attention to that feature.
far as the -- I will just touch on these a little, the PRO and community benefits.

Again, redevelopment potential of the property. We really think this is a great asset given it's location. And we want to put it to work and I think the residential use will do that.

We are increasing the buffers to the west. Your office service, the way it's zoned today, it's a 20-foot setback to the west really are the only neighbors to the west. We are proposing 82 feet minimum to our western residential neighbors. Strategic residential location. I think I have talked about that. I think that's a real benefit here.

Alternative housing, again, the townhouse product for that missing middle, that the city you guys have identified in your master plan, we agree, there is not enough of it. We really think this product hits that arc. We are going to talk about the product for a minute, shortly.
Site amenities. I have talked about it, we got three pocket parks, a play structure, a lot of pedestrian walkways throughout the development. It almost has a single family -- we got sidewalks both sides on our ring road, a lot of site amenities in the development. Adding residential to the downtown area, and we talked a lot about this, and I know you heard staff kind of talk about maybe a little bit less density. We really think the way to go is the density of this location. We meet all your building setbacks. The scale of our buildings are nice. It's only a two story product. We think this is the place to add density. You have a lot of economic investment in your core downtown area, the way to the successful downtown is getting bodies there. We are right down the street. We think this is a perfect add to your townhome area. And as part of our PRO, our benefit, we are talking about pedestrian enhancement on Novi Road. That was suggested during staff meetings as
well. We are proposing $90,000 investment of
different amenities along Novi Road.
Obviously it's subject to Road Commission
approval, but the next slide talks about a
couple things we will do, that we could
propose along Novi Road.

That's a Google shot of your
Main Street, which is again just a half mile
from our site. You got tree planter boxes.
You got tree plantings. And there is -- it's
kind of hard to see, you've got light
fixtures there. We look at a combination of
maybe extending those streetlight fixtures,
some tree planters along Novi Road, still
extending that pedestrian feel along Novi
Road from Main Street. And again, it's about
1,700 feet from Main Street, our site is.

Just a little bit about our
townhome product. It's a two story product,
which I think is a good scale. Again, it's
not a highrise. Certainly, I think it's a
good scale to what's out there, both the
industrial retail on Novi Road is lower scale
and certainly the residents. Our units are about 1,850 feet square feet units all three bedroom, that provide flexibility of use for the millennials and the young families that we really think we are going to attract here. Two and a half bathrooms, every unit has a two car garage and it's maintenance free living. We are going to have professional landscaping, snow removal, lawn care, all those things. That's kind of where we are at with the elevations.

Certainly as we come to the site plan, we will provide some more of that stuff, but that's the flavor of the townhomes. It's a great seller. I know Pulte does a lot of testing of their product and feedback. It's been successful in the midwest and the northeast, and we are excited for this location here.

Think that's it, and we are both available for any questions you or the public may have. Thank you.

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

State your name and address, please.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: My name (unintelligible) Arora. We are on the west side right behind you, where you're planning to build. We have recently had a lot of break-ins into our subdivision, Churchill Crossing. And I think that even though -- I mean, I like the residential more than the commercial but I think this definitely exposes us to more break-ins because we are getting more access to people. So how would you respond to the safety that you --

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Ma'am, we don't ask -- just ask us the questions. We will transpose.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: I think our biggest concern is the safety. There will be more exposure to our subdivision. So
how would you respond to that?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We will address that in our conversation.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: What about the traffic? Because I have seen lately, it used to take five minutes to make it to the highway, and over the years, I think it takes me about a half hour because it's just too many people and lot of congestion on the road. Just to get to the highway it's like an additional 15, 20 minutes, even though it's about a mile and a half from where we live, so that is another concern that I have. The number of people involved on the road.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Okay. Did you get her name?

THE REPORTER: No.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Can we have your name.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Last name Arora, A-r-o-r-a. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Please state your name and address.
AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Sure.

Good evening. My name is Chris Knoll. My address is 24492 Cavendish Avenue East. Like her, my property backs to what is currently, and what I believe to be long-term protected wetlands. My primary concern has to do with my property value declining as a result of the view being degraded. The primary reason we purchased the property we are in had to do with that view. So we looked at what we thought was protected wetlands, and we are attracted to Novi, based on that particular parcel, which is now granted, 82 feet, is -- you know, better than 20 feet, but right now I think those few cars and things that are parked back there, it's quiet, and it's very far in the distance. I can barely see it through the tree, now I am going to be looking at stacks of buildings. So, that's my concern.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

Anyone else?

MR. ANDERSON: My name is Daljee
Arora. I have a few concerns. I am excited
to see a new subdivision is coming, but at
the same time my concerns are, one, the value
of the house, that my friend said, because of
the -- and losing the privacy of our -- the
condos coming in will impact the house value
that's there. As you know, as a real estate
agent, if you don't find a house that's
solely (unintelligible) you go one mile
around the area, some comparison can be done.
I don't know how it's going to impact the
value. So that's the one thing.

Privacy, I think the opening
of the housing security, we don't know -- now
we go freely and play out there, kids play
out there. What going to happen, worry about
somebody watching us, and what they will be
doing. Traffic on the road, on Novi Road,
getting congested right now, it's beautiful,
you go out, talking about 125 new houses and
condos there, husband and wife, kids, three
people per house, you know, 475 cars extra on
Novi Road.
What happens to the pollution, what happened to the green that we are thinking of. Even though we are expecting if something happened there, we are hoping at least on the other side a lot of trees will be planted, to make it more dense and right now, looks like once this is built, things will be clean, but then they will be exposed to that area. So that's another concern. Pollution, of course, there will be more, 475 cars, the pollution will be there.

Preservation, I think preservation is already there, it's already declared as a wetland. So I don't see that as a concern. Yeah. The value is most important. Somebody would come and say 100K or something, whatnot, but I think that values is the concern and the privacy and the pollution. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, sir. Anyone else?

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Good evening. I am Soma Suryadevara, 24656
Patrick (ph) Drive. I also live on the west subdivision neighboring to the (unintelligible). The concerns I have our homes are valued right now at 500K plus. Now we are going to get a subdivision next to us which is 340K. So our value is going to come down. That's one concern. The second one was when Pulte Homes came to our homeowners association annual meeting, there was a proposal to connect with the back of our park to our south, northeast side of the subdivision. So I don't know if that is still on or if it's not. If it's on, then that's going to invade our privacy. Because that's not really connecting the (unintelligible). That is a commercial zoning right now, and the city wants those last. Those are my concerns. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, sir. Anyone else? Seeing no one in the audience, I think we have some correspondence.

MR. GRECO: We do have some
correspondence. The first is from a Dr. G, I'm not sure, Khan, 24468 Cavendish Avenue. Objects to the project because of the privacy, and anticipates lower values of his or her home. Would encourage planting of trees to provide privacy to the existing homes.

The next correspondence we have is another objection. This is from Adam Erickson and Elaine Palvos. Concerned with the property values, due to the elimination of natural view in the back and concern with security and noise with the neighbors, proposed neighbors.

And then another objection by (unintelligible), also objects. Because the residents of Churchill Crossing will lose privacy, loss of vegetation, diminished home values, increased traffic, loss of security, due to direct access from behind homes from Novi Road to Churchill Crossing. That concludes the correspondence.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.
With that information, 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 Anthony.

MR. ANTHONY: Great. First I want to start with staff. In the letter from Atwell to city staff. At one point when they're talking about public benefits, public benefits for rezoning, their item two. Increased buffers to the west.

The development proposes an approximately 160 feet setback to the nearest residential unit to the west, and natural wetlands and trees along the property line are being preserved to the greatest possible extent. So let's examine that for a moment. So when they're saying the 160 feet, is that simply an argument of from the back of someone's home building to building, as opposed to the setback?

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Yes.

MR. ANTHONY: For this, our
property setbacks are traditionally 75 feet?

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Yes. On all sides.

MR. ANTHONY: Currently what is proposed for those setbacks?

MS. KOMARAGIRI: They are in compliance with setbacks on the west on the south and in the front, but they're asking for a deviation for setbacks on the north. They're proposing 35 when 75 is required.

MR. ANTHONY: Let's set the north aside. I will come back to the north. Let's finish with the argument with the west and the buffer, the connection to Churchill Crossing.

So let's first look at the wetlands. One concern was that the size of the wetlands and would this development reduce the size of the wetlands. And if I recall in the past being back there myself, they're actually posted by the DEQ. So perhaps if we have our wetland consultant, I can direct questions some on that.
MR. HILL: I'm Pete Hill with ETC.

MR. ANTHONY: Thanks Pete. So when we talk about wetlands, let's make a distinction between the state designated wetland and the city designated wetland.

Just for my benefit we can go through later in a detailed explanation of what the difference is there.

The wetland behind Churchill Crossing or between this property. I believe correctly I thought it was a state hosted wetland size, is that correct or incorrect?

MR. HILL: That is correct.

There is also -- on the Churchill Crossing property, there are areas of wetland mitigation that would, I believe, have signage in terms of, you know, a sign saying this is a wetland conservation easement and it was constructed. I think one of the residents talked about he may back up to one of those areas, which are adjacent to a wetland that runs, you know, north/south,
along the western edge of the subject property.

MR. ANTHONY: Since that was an abatement for a state regulated wetland, it would still fall underneath being a state regulated wetland necessary for the abatement -- (inaudible).

MR. HILL: That's correct.

MR. ANTHONY: So the distance, when we look at the Churchill Crossing back property line, and the beginning property line of the proposed development, what's the dimension of that wetland, how far does it go over, for instance, into the new proposed property boundary?

MR. HILL: I don't have a good answer standing here. One of the figures that was previously -- I think that one -- if we can find a scale -- well, is that an 80-foot setback?

MR. SKORE: It's 20 to 25 feet.

MR. ANTHONY: Here I'll tell you really where my line of questioning is going
now that we have the picture up there.

So often when we draw those lines, we can sit in front of the computer with a cad program, that does measurements, and kind of eyeball where that wetland line is. But it really requires a wetland survey to go and flag and to survey that line in order to know precisely where it is.

Is that line depicted accurately or is that line further to the west, which, if so, would provide the residents with an even greater buffer.

MR. HILL: As part of our current review of the plan, the wetland was flagged by the applicant's wetland consultant and part of our review included seeing whether or not we agreed with that line on the ground and we did.

MR. ANTHONY: You do, okay. Now, is there a requirement with the distance that the building can be or is it that landscaping can be from the wetland line in order that the activity does not damage the wetland?
MR. HILL: The city does have a 25-foot wetland and water course setback ordinance -- setback requirement.

And the applicant is meeting that by protecting the 25-foot setback from the wetland in question.

But in terms of -- yeah, I will leave it at that. The 25-foot setback --

MR. ANTHONY: So in meeting their 75 foot setback requirement, they also end up meeting their 25-foot wetland setback requirement, is that -- am I understanding that correctly?

MR. HILL: I believe so. Yes, no construction is proposed within the 25-foot wetland setback.

MR. ANTHONY: Okay. That's good on the wetland. Thank you.

Now I am going to come back to the landscape. Of the problems with the landscaping, it's really nice in the spring and summer when all those bushes are full
with those leaves. But when the trees drop
their leaves and when the bushes drop their
leaves, you see right through it, you feel
those buildings right in your backyard.

Is there a way to modify that
landscaping that becomes more four season
landscaping or some of the features that
maintains privacy and indirectly security?

MR. MEADER: I am quite sure
there was a good mix of evergreens as well as
deciduous trees along -- also there is a
pretty tall berm that they're leaving, so,
you know, it's not going to be like a forest
there, but they do have it pretty densely
landscaped along that edge with a mix of
trees.

So I was comfortable with what
they were providing.

MR. ANTHONY: All right. Let me
move over to the northern boundary, where
they want to reduce that setback.

So the property to the north,
is that owned by the city other than
obviously the post office isn't.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Not exactly. The front part is owned by the post office, the back is owned by property which has a wireless tower on it. And like this one --

MR. ANTHONY: The part that's back towards Churchill Crossing, the portion that is owned by the city.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: That's owned by the wireless.

MR. ANTHONY: By the wireless, okay.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: This is the one that's owned by the city.

MR. ANTHONY: So the wireless, they're using it for the tower, it's unlikely that other uses would come in there.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: That's our understanding.

MR. ANTHONY: And the city, what's the plan the city has with that portion? Are they going to leave that green space?
MS. KOMARAGIRI: As of now, the city doesn't have any plans. We checked with our parks department to see if they had any. As of now, I think the city has the property to protect the buffers and nature features. We can't speak of future.

MR. ANTHONY: All right. Let me go to another item now that -- we will look at screening and landscaping.

This is for the developer. So in hiring CBI, planning, which I like that you hired them to take a look at this. If we also look at the city's argument, and why this could be residential, you might actually want to go to the podium. I will ask you direct questions, they will want it all on the record.

So, when initially looking at this property, we are looking at rezoning an area that's commercial or that's targeted for office space, dead smack right in the middle, a line right through it is coming in high density residential. Initially when you look
at it, intuitively asks the question why. So now when we dig into asking the question why, the argument becomes that the reason why, is your proximity limit to the downtown and that we are further facilitating a walkable community and integrating the community.

And, you know, even have your consultant say one of the key benefits of your development is the neighborhood connector path to the sidewalks. It goes onto how you will connect this with the downtown.

We look at what the city put together, addressing their non-motorized improvements and we have a mention of 90,000. Then we also go into the woodlands and trying to preserve the woodlands. The problem I have then is if I go along with the logic of the reason you can rezone this office space to residential is that it creates connective lines that are walkable, consistent with our non-motorized master plan, to the downtown.
area, you should see that. Yet when I look at the basic plan, I don't see anything. I saw some pictures today.

So, I don't really know what the development would bring to help that connection other than what we talked about today, just didn't see it in the actual material that we looked at today.

MR. ANDERSON: Again, our intent is to make an investment of that Novi Road corridor there, between the Main Street and our development. And some of the elements we are talking about is maybe extending that Main Street streetlight element on Novi Road, maybe some planter boxes consistent the Main Street, some of that hard scape that kind of extends that Main Street down to our property. That's something we will be working on as we dwell into the detail on that, and we are committing a dollar value of doing that. It's really enhancing -- there is already nice sidewalks there. If we did nothing, there is great pedestrian capability
from the site to your corridor, sidewalks both sides. We are going to enhance that pedestrian experience and look to visually pull that Main Street down either by streetlights, some planters, those types of elements within the right-of-way down to our site.

And again, you guys own -- the city owns the property adjacent to us and quite a bit of property just to the north of us. Maybe some of that enhancement could go towards right -- your entryway as well.

MR. ANTHONY: Good. Thank you. And with -- you know, with this development, so it's getting on board with the rezoning for me, for the residential. The argument being that it's going to connect with our downtown, which I like that argument. I just don't have enough stuff here to look at to say in certainty that it's not going to change, you know, after I express the votes. I feel like I don't have enough.

And the other part is I
remember when I was looking by my own house in Novi, being a Novi resident, looking at Churchill Crossing, and I remember looking at the zoning and looking at those homes, and those lots that were along that wetland, which is why I know that the signs are there. I looked at the zoning and I saw that the zoning was office and I thought, well, you know, that won't be too bad because office will be like the type of like physical therapy, small medical office when you look, what's right through there. So not nearly that density.

So I could relate with the feeling. So with that, that's where I would also feel like I need more certainty on the vegetation really providing a four season screening. I am just trying to look at what's in front of me and what's concrete, so that when I give a vote that I am confident that what's concrete would go through, and we have had good discussion, I just don't see the concreteness. I don't know if I made up
a word.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: I think you did.

MR. ANDERSON: To the neighbors, this is a two-scale townhome development. It's not the mid rise. It's really not a high density. It's 5.25.4. I hear what might be allowed, but you guys are approving this density, and it's 5.2. It's really the two scale unit is really consistent, so that you have that smaller scale backing up to the single family home from upscale one. There is existing vegetation. We are going to supplement significantly more vegetation there, and whatever we can do to augment that even beyond what we have, we are willing to do that. Because we really only have six or seven neighbors and they're probably all here tonight that are immediately impacted.

Again, I guess to the point of you want to see it, all I can say is, if you sit back, it's the site of the proximity to the Main Street. Your downtown core is right
there. It's a great Novi Road, it ties right there. It's physically less than a half a mile away. That's what's going to make this a successful use for that. And given what I have on each side of me, it really is not a good office use. It is a great strategic residential use.

MR. ANTHONY: I like the concept of supporting our downtown, it needs the density. I almost bought one of the lots you guys lived in, so I know exactly the view that you're looking at and the expectation to change it. So that's why I want to make sure that with this change, that -- you know, that those citizens, those homes are well taken care of. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, Member Anthony. Anyone else? Member Greco.

MR. GRECO: Through the Chair, Sri, was there additional information -- I notice the thing is not making a recommendation. Is there additional information that we would be waiting for from
the applicant or some questions to be answered?

MS. KOMARAGIRI: There was a few clarifications. I think we are on board, we support the use to be changed to residential. We just -- the kind of housing they're proposing, low rise, low residential meets well with the RM1 requirements. The RM2 is mostly for high rise, high density, tall apartment style buildings.

So to keep with our -- so we think RM1 would be a better fit, so for them to achieve that, they have to bring the density from 6.425.4, which is the maximum allowed for the RM1.

They are also asking for a deviation for a number of rooms. The maximum allowed is 4.3, they're proposing 500.

So I think a few -- there is some concerns within the property with regard to the placement of houses, like the variance for houses according to the storm water retention pond, we think they are too close,
it may not be safe for people on the patio. And when we asked, they revised the plan a little bit to meet the requirements for the distance between the buildings, which made the central courtyard smaller, and there was proposed from east to west in the center courtyard, which is no longer being proposed now, so we just think that if they can reduce the density a little bit, the deviations can be reduced a little bit and it will fit well with the zoning map as well.

When you look at the zoning map, we recently approved the (unintelligible), which we chose to rezone from OS1 to RM1 as well, similar concepts, similar style. Going in that line, we think that RM1 would look -- better transition on the zoning map, next to OS1 and (inaudible).

MR. GRECO: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: If I might, compliments what Member Anthony said. I appreciate the dollar value that you threw out there to add the hard scape for whatever
amenities along Novi Road. I would like to see a little bit more detail of that. I don't know what $90,000 buys you as far as trees, planters, lights. I would like to see some more detail relative to that as well.

Member Greco.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Before you make a motion, I'm struggling with understanding what the city's plans are for the adjoining real estate, and would influence my decision. There is a post office, but what I would call a postage stamp parcel that's completely blocked by other properties or for -- it's more like a pan handle. But to me, what -- I am warming to this development. I think it looks like a great plan, but it works when I think we have more comfort knowing what's going to be -- what the potential is for what's going to be surrounding it. And I'm frustrated with the city's lack of -- I guess, lack of plan for this property if there is one. If there isn't, should it be sold. I mean, is it property that should be
sold, is it property that should be developed
into a park. Again, I feel awful for the
developer because it's not -- they're kind of
captured between a rock and a hard place, you
know, parcels that we don't know what we are
going to do with.

So, I mean, I don't know who
the best individual would be to address those
concerns. If it's someone from the parks
department, or maybe we can make a
recommendation. I mean, it seems -- there is
some really changed parcels there. And
what's going to happen to them. And there is
a traffic light in front of the post office,
it would be nice if that tied into the
development, frankly, so we wouldn't need
another entrance. That to me would make it
feel like it didn't come up on Novi Road, if
this development was set further back, it
would feel like much, much, much more of a
transition from the Church Crossing into this
development.

But I like where this project
is heading. I like that it's adding some
dense housing options closer to the downtown.
I think the developer may have a lot -- a few
adjustments since we first saw this plan.

But I do agree with the other
members, I think there is some more work to
be done. I want to see some more tangible
plans from my case, the city, but also in
terms of what $90,000 buys us in terms of
creating a pedestrian corridor, preferably
not something that, you know, is good for
five years, but, you know --

MR. SCHULTZ: I was going to --
Sri was talking, but she didn't have a chance
to look it up, but I was able to look it up
on the city map, so that post office area,
it's obviously not owned by the city, but the
blue next to that, that is city owned. The
other flag. So Novi with the skinny flag
pole, that is owned by the cell wireless
company, then the piece up above is city
property.

So certainly if you're looking
for information at the next meeting, what the
city has planned for that -- there may not be
anything, matter of fault for the city, just
maybe -- I think it was acquired as part of
some right-of-way project or something.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: At least we
could have knowledge of what it is.

Member Greco.

MR. GRECO: In the matter of
Princeton Park, JSP17-10, and zoning map
amendment 18.707 motion to postpone making a
recommendation on the proposed PRO and
concept plan to allow the applicant time to
consider further modifications to the concept
plan as discussed in the review letters, or
provide additional use of open space on the
site, prior to consideration by the City
Council to rezone subject property from OS1,
office service to RM2, high density
multi-family residential, with the planned
re zoning overlay, and for the city to
consider the information that's been
requested by the commission and mentioned and
address the issues by Member Anthony, Chair Pehrson and Member Giacopetti and for the reasons set forth in the motion sheet.

MR. LYNCH: Second.

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

MR. AVDOULOS: To the applicant, what is -- what is the density now that you have on the site? The RM1 is 5.4, is that correct, Sri? RM1 is 5.4?

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Yes.

MR. AVDOULOS: Then currently --

MS. KOMARAGIRI: They are proposing 6.4 now.

MR. ANDERSON: 6.4 on that. It's 5.2. Part of the problem -- we have a three and a half acre wetland and you guys use net density for your calculation, so on a net basis, we are over your RM1. We actually -- initially, the first three submittals were looking at RM1 and we talked to Sri probably three weeks ago, and kind of at the
suggestion of staff went to RM2, which
allowed the higher density, never really
changing our plan.

    MR. AVDOULOS: So keeping the
same amount of units?

    MR. ANDERSON: Yes. Our building
setbacks are all right there. We are not
trying to jam buildings close. We meet all
your building setbacks. It's pretty low
scale building, so from a density
perspective, you guys have a pretty complex
room count issue. That's really it. We are
looking at a three room unit for each of the
units, so --

    MR. AVDOULOS: If you followed
that, what would it reduce your unit count
to?

    MR. ANDERSON: I honestly don't
know because I'm 60 bedrooms off from your
chart. I think I have 423 rooms.

    MR. AVDOULOS: About 20 units.

    MR. ANDERSON: It's a significant
problem. And again, we have talked that the
density -- I mean, does that feel right. I think it feels right, given the location for it. I have too many rooms in this development. I can't just eliminate closets because you guys determine a bedroom is a room is a room. Our buyers like these rooms, again, they're 1,850 square feet, but there is a lot rooms in there -- you guys have a room chart, that sets the density. I am really stuck in a box here on how to get that issue. I really am.

MR. AVDOULOS: Okay. Then the -- I know a number was thrown out there. Are these ranging in the 340 range?

MR. SKORE: Yes, in terms of a price point, you know, it's a little difficult to say because we offer upgrades and options and premiums. But if I had to guess sitting here today, this is obviously, you know, well into the future. If I had to guess, at that time, these will most likely sell for a range, between again, all end, options premium, 350 to $400,000. I could be
conservative with that number though, too.

MR. AVDOULOS: That's all I have.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Member Giacopetti.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Concerning the motion to postpone, I had a question for the applicant.

In terms of the discussions with the Oakland County Road Commission and putting some meat around this -- the walkways, how long will that take you to put together? I mean, we need to postpone this like until the next meeting?

MR. ANDERSON: I was going to say probably within the next 30 days we ought to get their attention and take a look at things and see what we can do and certainly talk to your staff about it.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Sri, can you call the roll.

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

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON Pehrson: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes six to zero.

CHAIRPERSON Pehrson: Thank you, gentlemen, appreciate it.

Next on the agenda is Hino Motors, USA FKA, JSP 17-02. This is a public hearing at the request of D & G Investment, preliminary site lane, land bank parking, non-minor wetland permit, woodland permit, storm water management plan approval.

The subject property is
located in Section 16, southwest corner of Twelve Mile Road and Taft Road and is zoned OST, office service technology. The subject property, the parcel is approximately 15.56 acres. The applicant is proposing to build a 124,418 square foot building along with associated site improvements, along with parking, and utilities. The proposed site plan is also proposed to land bank 77 parking spaces of 398.

MS. KOMARAGIRI:  Sri.

Thank you. The subject property is 30.5 acres and is located in the southwest corner of Twelve Mile and Taft Road. It was recently rezoned from RA residential acreage to OST, office, service technology, on March 13, 2017.

It is surrounded by OST on the west and residential acreage on the east and south, and I1 on the north across Twelve Mile Road. Future land use map indicates office research development technology for this one and surrounding properties on the east, west
and south. The properties to the north are identified as industrial research development and technology. The property has some regulated wetlands and woodlands.

The applicant is proposing to build about 124,418 square foot two story building to serve as headquarters for Hino Motors. The proposed site plan also includes associated site improvements, including parking and utilities.

The proposed site plan also proposes to land bank up to 77 parking spaces of the 398 required spaces. Approval of land banking of parking lot construction shall be granted only upon Planning Commission findings as listed in Section 5.2.13.E, also included in the motion sheet. Planning recommends approval.

Site access is proposed by a new curb cut in Twelve Mile Road and secondary access by a new curb cut in Taft Road. Taft Road may be potentially realigned due to its current alignment with the
existing railroad adjacent to the
intersection of Taft and Twelve. The
realignment has the potential to affect
several site elements.

City council and the applicant
has agreed upon a memo of understanding which
allows the applicant of the certain
flexibilities to the requirements to revise
the site plan in order to accommodate for
potential future realignment of Taft. The
memo is included in the packet as well.

Storm water would be collected
by a single storm sewer collection system and
detained on site. Engineering initially
wasn't recommending approval due to absence
of storm water management plan, however, the
applicant submitted a revised site plan and
engineering is currently recommending
approval. I apologize. The latest review
letter was left out of the packet. All the
comments with regard to water and sewer still
apply. The memo of understanding has
approved the extent of the proposed water
main and its location as shown on the plan.

Engineering has required some additional
information upgrades of the size of the water
line and easements to allow for future
extension of the water main as required
providing -- to provide service for
surrounding properties.

The applicant has also
requested to waive their requirement of the
sidewalk along Taft as it may be demolished
when Taft Road is realigned. Staff supports
the waiver, provided the applicant pays the
city the current construction cost of the
pathway into the city sidewalk fund as
approved by the city engineer.

Engineering recommends
approval with additional details to be
submitted at the time of final site plan
submittal.

The site plan is in general
conformance with the zoning ordinance except
few deviations identified in the landscape
review letter. Staff supports the waiver for
absence of the berm along entire Twelve Mile frontage, for not providing berm along a small potion along Taft Road frontage, reduction in required greenbelt trees and reduction of interior parking lot trees.

Staff would support the waiver for reduction of parking lot perimeter trees if proposed trees along the perimeter are not counted towards woodland replacement. Landscape recommends approval.

The site plan would require non-minor wetland permit for the proposed impacts, and letter of authorization for impacts to the buffers. No additional direct impacts the wetlands and wetland buffer appear to be proposed for the land bank parking. However, as per the memo, the impacts are not assessed at this time. The site plan impacts for the review (inaudible).

The site plan is proposing to remove 116 of 273 regulated trees on the site, about 42 percent, which would require a woodland permit. The removals require 191 replacement
tree credits. The applicant has provided all replacement credits on site. However, the applicant is requested to either relocate or pay into the tree fund for the replacement trees provided in the potential Taft Road realignment area and along parking lot perimeter. Wetlands and woodlands are recommending approval with additional comments to be provided at the time of final site plan.

The applicant submitted a traffic impact study as required. A right turn taper is required at the proposed driveway. Traffic recommends approval of the study and the site plan with additional information to further clarify the findings of the study.

The proposed design is in full compliance with the facade ordinance. Facade recommends approval. A sample board is submitted.

Fire recommends approval with additional comments to be addressed at the
time of final site submittal.

Planning Commission is asked tonight to approve the preliminary site plan with land bank parking, wetland permit, woodland permit, for the rest of the site except the land bank parking and storm water management plan. Bruce Brickman and Teresa Bruce from General Development with representatives form Hino Motors, if you have any questions for them. Staff and consultants are on stand by for any questions for them. Thank you again.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, Sri. Appreciate that.

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

MR. BRICKMAN: Bruce Brickman, General Development Company. Any questions?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: If you want to make a presentation -- otherwise --

MR. BRICKMAN: We are proposing here to put the new Hino North American headquarters facility. Hino is currently in
Novi and Farmington Hills. And they're
relocating out of Farmington Hills and
aggregating their space into this new 125,000
facility that will serve as their North
American headquarters and R and D center.

We tried very hard on this
site, as you can see from some of the
information shown up there, to work around a
variety of wetland areas and squeeze the
project in there without affecting those
wetland pods and then also working with the
city at a late date to adjust the site in
order to allow for what could be the
potential future Taft Road realignment. So,
we have worked very closely with the city on
this to try to make it work for everybody.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Okay. Is
that it?

MR. BRICKMAN: That's it.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: If we have
any questions, we will ask you up. This is a
public hearing. If there is anyone in the
audience that wishes to address the Planning
Commission on this particular public hearing, please step forward.

Seeing no one, I don't believe we have any correspondence.

MR. GRECO: We do not have any correspondence for this public hearing.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: With that, we will close the public hearing at this point, turn it over to the Planning Commission. Member Anthony.

MR. ANTHONY: Quick question for you, this will be much quicker than my last set of questions.

So, with the Taft Road realignment, when I look at the engineering drawings, and talking about the storm water management plan, it looks like you have a retention basin up in the front northwest side of the property and also on the south, in both areas.

MS. REICHITEN: The detention basin is just to the south. I think that's just -- is that bermed up actually.
MR. ANTHONY: Oh, that's going up as opposed to going down?

MR. MEADER: The upper right that's just where the -- where Taft Road might be.

MR. ANTHONY: Good. That clears it up. I just want to make sure how we were handling roof drains and where they tied in, they wouldn't tie into a basin that we are then going to remove and have a problem with that. Okay. Good.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you. Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Through the chair, question. Counsel, can you tell us a little bit more about the memo of understanding with City Council.

MR. SCHULTZ: So as Mr. Brickman pointed out, the initial plan, which I think is the packet, was brought to the city in connection with the rezoning, which was also fairly recently approved or recommended by the Planning Commission, approved by the City
Council. The question of the alignment came up in the context of that sort of conceptual plan to develop all the way up to the existing -- so conversation with community development, the city manager's office, basically the proponent, you know, accepted the comments that this might be a future alignment, and yet it was proposed where some of the required approvals were parking primarily, but, you know, it affected the potential location of the -- city administration negotiated essentially this letter of understanding that under which the applicant moved or changed the proposed layout of the improvements, but did so with the expectation that in exchange for doing that, some of the other benefits were hopefully going to accrue, you know, if you go through the memorandum, basically, it has to do with well, land bank parking is going to be treated in this particular way, and moving the water main, we will deal with that, in this way, benefit to the developer,
essentially, I want to say negotiate, we will do this for the city, you consider doing -- now, the City Council couldn't agree to do all those things, City Council doesn't approve this site plan, but the memorandum basically says if you alter your plan, and you get through the approval process with these conditions that you want to develop -- or property owner, you know, then we will have this future configuration for essential changes.

So it's kind of intended to be we will do this, if you do that, but we recognize the Planning Commission, maybe somebody else will have to make the final decision.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Because we didn't see this plan before, that's why I am confused as to how -- because not so long we approved the rezoning. I specifically asked the developer, plans were available for the site, and they were not, but apparently they were because they were being negotiated
secretly with City Council -- or --

MR. SCHULTZ: No secret.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Strike that from the record. Through the chair, we had asked to see the plans and they were not provided and very little information was provided at that meeting. But everything existed -- and the applicant wasn't able to answer any plans concerning why they chose the site or why they were moving forward because it was tight lipped.

MR. SCHULTZ: Timing wise, I guess, just to be clear, I don't know when the actual plan for this area -- the initial plan was provided to the city, it could well have been after the rezoning was approved.

I mean, when you do a rezoning, you don't look at a site plan?

MR. GIACOPETTI: No, not unless it's like the PRO.

MR. SCHULTZ: You know, you made a recommendation on the rezoning. The issue or realignment of Taft Road came up. The
memorandum, no discussion on what to do with
the potential impact of the realignment on
their initial plan came up, to my knowledge,
until after the property was presented to
City Council for potential rezoning and the
issue was raised there about the alignment.

So there was a first reading
of the rezoning, the question was raised, the
rezoning actually occurred before we started
writing this memorandum of understanding.

So nothing actually got
negotiated, talked about until after the
rezoning went through, but before the
developers submitted to you here this
particular site plan.

So this alternative plan
wasn't created until after the rezoning was
done by the City Council.

Sri makes the note -- in part
that's because the pre-application process,
that after rezoning, sort of clarified and
focused on this issue. So it wouldn't have
been clarified and focused for you, until
after -- until now.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Until now. Then I do have a question.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: So there was no Russian involvement?

MR. SCHULTZ: I don't know about that.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, counsel.

MR. GIACOPETTI: I do have a question for the applicant. I asked previously, and I will ask now, since we actually have a plan.

Why was this site chosen for this facility given the number of natural features, given the challenges with developing on this site, why did you choose this site for the building, for your headquarters?

MR. BRICKMAN: I am the developer. Bruce Brickman from General Development.

Hino chose this site amongst
probably half a dozen that they looked at.
Frankly because they liked the site relative
to its natural features and knowing that
those natural features were going to be
staying there, we were able to find the way
to make the building work within those
natural features, preserve those, and, you
know, keep a good corporate headquarters type
of facility there with those nature features
as buffers around it.

MR. GIACOPETTI: I understand
that. I am struggling as a Planning
Commissioner who is looking forward -- you
know, this is not your problem, but an hour
ago we had someone come in -- developer come
in and say, there is no space for
residential, we need residential here and now
we are hearing the opposite. Oh, there is a
demand for commercial, although it's not --
it's in an area where we need to make all
these modifications because of landscape
challenges.

So, I guess I'm still
struggling.

MR. BRICKMAN: Let me help you a little bit. You have to understand that whole area there is master planned OST.

MR. GIACOPETTI: No, no, no. Its future use is OST, it's the future use. Before the rezoning it was residential acreage.

MR. BRICKMAN: No, I understand, but your master plan, your published master plan calls for all of that area there and on the other side of Taft and to the west of this for OST.

So this just happens to be the first development coming in here of what hopefully will be in the five, 10, 15 years that area getting redeveloped to your master plan for OST.

MR. GIACOPETTI: My question, why this, that you needed to make so many changes. I think you answered the question, just that it's an attractive site.

MR. BRICKMAN: Absolutely.
MR. GIACOPETTI: No more questions. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Anyone else? Member Avdoulos.

MR. AVDOULOS: I just have one quick question. On the site plan, where we show the -- I think it's SP5. Where is that in proximity to the site?

MS. KOMARAGIRI: It's over here.

MR. AVDOULOS: Down --

MS. KOMARAGIRI: South of the proposed storm water detention pond.

MR. AVDOULOS: Is it south -- if you go onto SP4, is it south of the match line?

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Here, yes.

MR. AVDOULOS: Below that, okay. I was getting lost.

Yes, I have so -- so as long as the parking that's on this site meets the occupancy load that's going to be there, I know sometimes when you use square footage, you might end up with way more than what you
need. I am fine with that. I think with all
the reviews and everything in the city
planning department and engineering and
landscaping and everybody has looked at it.
I think it's something that I have pictured
on this site anyway when they came into
rezoning of this and using it -- the property
for the future use, I think is appropriate.
So I am in support of this project.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Member

Mr. Greco.

MR. GRECO: Thank you, sir. Yes,
I'd like to make a motion.

In the matter of Hino Motors
USA, Commerce Park, JAP17-02, motion to
approve the preliminary site plan with land
bank parking based on and subject to the
conditions listed in A through L on the
motion sheet, and the findings of compliance
with ordinance standards in the staff and
consultant review letters and the conditions
and items listed in those letters being
addressed on the final site plan. And
because the plan is otherwise in compliance
with Article 3, Article 4 and Article 5 of
the zoning ordinance, all other applicable
provisions of the ordinance.

MR. LYNCH: Second.

MR. ANTHONY: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a
tie. So since Lynch got the last one,
Anthony gets this one. Motion by Member
Greco, second by Member Anthony.

Any other comments? Sri, can
you call the roll.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Anthony?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes six to zero.

MR. GRECO: I would like to make another motion in the matter of Hino Motors USA, formerly Commerce Park, JSP17-02 motion to approve the wetland permit based on and subject to the findings of compliance with ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters, and the conditions and items listed in those letters being addressed on the final site plan, and because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Chapter 12, Article 5 of the code of ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the ordinance.

MR. ANTHONY: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Motion by Member Greco, second by Member Anthony. Any other comments? Sri, can you call the roll, please.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member
Giaco	etti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes six to zero.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Like to make another motion in the matter of Hino Motors USA, formerly known as Commerce 6Park, JSP17-02 to approve the woodland permit, based on and subject to the findings of compliance with ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters and the conditions and items listed in those letters, being addressed on the final site plan. And
because the plan is otherwise in compliance
with Chapter 37 of the code of ordinances and
all other applicable provisions of the
ordinance.

MR. ANTHONY: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Motion by
Member Greco, second by Anthony, any other
comments?

Sri, please.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes
six to zero.

MR. GRECO: I'd like to make another motion, in the matter of Hino Motors USA, formerly known as Commerce Park, JSP17-02, motion to approve the storm water management plan based on and subject to the findings of compliance with ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters, and the conditions and items listed in those letters being addressed on the final site plan and because it is otherwise in compliance with Chapter 11 of the code of ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the ordinance.

MR. ANTHONY: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Motion by Member Greco, second by Anthony. Any other comments? Sri, please.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

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

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes six to zero.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: All set.

Thank you.

Next on the agenda is item number three, CAV Tooling, JSP17-17. It's a public hearing at the request of CAV Tool for special land use permit, preliminary site plan, storm water management plan approval. The subject property is located in Section 26, north of Nine Mile Road and west of Heslip Drive and is zoned I1 light industrial.

The applicant is proposing to construct an 1,800 square foot addition to an
existing industrial building with associated
site improvements. A special land use is
required for uses adjacent to residential
zoned property.

Kirsten, good evening.

MS. MELLEM: So the applicant is
proposing to construct an 1,800 square foot
addition to an existing building along Heslip
Drive, north of Nine Mile Road, east of Novi
Road. The proposed addition will provide
additional storage units for the business.
The project is located is on 1.336 acres and
the current use requires special land use
approval.

The subject property is
currently zoned I1, light industrial. The
property is surrounded on the northeast and
south by I1, light industrial, and on the
west by RM1, low density, multiple-family.

The future land use map
indicates industrial research development and
technology for this property and those on the
northeast and the south and multiple-family
to the west.

The site contains some woodlands that straddle the parcel lot line at the rear, as a buffer between the industrial and residential uses. The proposed site plan does not impact these woodlands.

The site plan shows the proposed addition of 1,800 square feet, addition of an ADA space near the front door and additional evergreen screening behind the rear row parking to provide screening of the parking and of the loading, unloading area from the residential use to the west.

The parking minimums have been met for the current use and the applicant is seeking two waivers from the Planning Commission. A waiver for not providing bicycle parking due to current employees will not ride their bikes to the site as a means of transportation and that this addition in minor in nature.

The second waiver is not
providing a noise impact analysis because of the proposed addition as a storage space for an existing building with no equipment or machinery contained within.

The reviewers are all recommending approval. Engineering has reviewed the plans for storm water management and recommends approval. Landscape has a few minor changes requested regarding the species of the trees for the screening, which can be accommodated on the next submittal. Facade is in full compliance with the ordinance and fire also recommends approval.

The Planning Commission is asked tonight to hold the required public hearing for the special land use, provide a decision, then if favorable, to approve the preliminary site plan and storm water management plan. The applicant and our staff are all here to answer any questions you may have regarding this.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, Kirsten. Appreciate that. Does the
applicant wish to address the Planning
Commission?

MR. MILLER: Good evening, Robert
Miller, architect. I represent the owner.

As stated, we did ask for two
waivers and the applicant would actually like
to ask for a third. So I don't know exactly
when to bring that up during discussion, but
let us know when the right time is for that
and we can talk about that, so let us know.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Go right
ahead.

MR. MILLER: As stated, the
landscape buffer for the parking area. We
had some really good conversation with staff
during the process. It was discussed about
adding in the evergreen trees on the back
side of the existing parking area, and then
we went through and the request is to add in
more potentially 13 or plus evergreen trees.
As stated in the introduction to the project,
the project actually already has some
existing screen on the property line itself,
between the existing residential, and the
building shown there on the green stripe.

And we didn't bring this up
during the staff review, as the applicant was
just thinking about this last week and was
walking out on the site and was thinking why
am I adding in evergreen trees when I already
have existing trees along my property line
that are screening the property from -- again
from that residential area.

So as part of this discussion,
we were hoping to make -- we could see some
of the reason behind that and perhaps see if
we can't get some additional relief from that
requirement as well.

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

Seeing no one, do we have
correspondence?

MR. GRECO: We do have one letter
on a City of Novi response form, from Robert Forsythe, at 22635 Heslip Drive, supports the request.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

With that we will close the public hearing on this matter, turn it over to the Planning Commission. Who would like to start. Member Avdoulos.

MR. AVDOULOS: I guess the only question I had came about just now with the third request. What do we think. Have you had a chance to look at the property and --

MR. MEADER: Yes, I was out there. The landscaping along the property line that they're speaking of is basically volunteer shrubbery which in the winter does not (unintelligible). Right now it does, it's buck thorn and such, it comes out and adds a lot of fence. But in the winter there is no significant screening from there, that's why I asked for more.

MR. AVDOULOS: And I think I am in support of the project, but not looking at
the third requested waiver. So I would like
to see the evergreens.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, sir. Member Anthony.

MR. ANTHONY: Well, first, I agree with the evergreen. You can even see
in the aerial photos a little, all the leaves are of the trees, you can see straight
through to the ground. So it's a very logical assumption that you are going to be
able to see right through it good part of the year. So I wouldn't support the third
request either.

This is a quick question for the builder. Well, just simply because I am familiar with a few buildings back on Heslip Road, and also in looking at the aerial photo, you can see the building to your north, looks like it has some surface runoff problems that they need to probably work on.

So, my question, when you look at the border between your property and the property to the north, what is that? Is that
a short retaining wall or is that just a
natural slope?

MR. MILLER: It's a slope.

MR. CAVRELLA: Mike Cavarella. I
am the owner CAV Tool. Going to the south,
you look at that building there, that parking
lot, it goes straight to the apartments.
There is no buffer zone at all. And the same
with the other one next to it.

I at least have something
there. I don't understand the concern
that --

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: If you come
to us and ask for some kind of change to
their property, they will be effected with
the same ordinance --

MR. CAVRELLA: My question was
when the City of Novi approved for the
apartments to be built there and the
industrial park was already there, why
weren't they --

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: No, can't
answer that.
MR. CAVRELLA: Thanks.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Any other comments? Member Lynch.

MR. LYNCH: As far as the landscaping buffer, you know, I tend to agree with the gentleman here. It's been like that for how many years. There is nothing else that can be developed there. The improvements that they're making to the property really don't effect that. You know, just because there is a new ordinance in place, but wasn't at the time that the property was -- you know, I just see a waste of money. I like the project. I certainly would consider and agree with the gentleman that just came up asking for -- asking for the waiver, I personally would agree with the waiver. I guess that's my only comment.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Through the chair, I would support that amendment that Member Lynch had recommended just for whoever is considering making a motion. Seems
unnecessary to add more screening, given the
nature of what's already there. I don't
think this addition to the building makes a
requirement for any other screening.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Speaking of
motions, anyone? Member Greco.

MR. GRECO: All right. I would
like to make a motion in the matter of CAV
Tool, JSP17-17, motion to approve the special
land use permit based on and subject to items
A through G listed in the motion sheet and
because the plan is otherwise in compliance
with Article 3, Article 4, Article 5 and
Article 6 of the zoning ordinance and all
other applicable provisions of the ordinance.

MR. AVDOULOS: Second.

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

Kirsten, please.

MS. MELLEM: Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

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

MS. MELLEM: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Motion passes six to zero.

MR. GRECO: Next in the matter of CAV Tool JSP17-17 motion to approve the preliminary plan based on and subject to the following waiver of Planning Commission from requirement for noise impact analysis because the proposed addition is a storage space on an existing building with no equipment or machinery contained within. The waiver from the Planning Commission from a requirement to provide bicycle parking on site, and the findings of compliance with ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review
letters and the conditions and the items
listed in those letters, being addressed on
the final site plan. And because the plan is
otherwise in compliance with Article 3,
Article 4, Article 5 of the zoning ordinance
and all other provisions of the ordinance.

MR. AVDOULOS: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Motion by
Member Greco, second by Member Avdoulos. Any
other comments?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Through the
chair, I would like to make a friendly
amendment to add a third waiver that reduces
the amount of screening but for the landscape
review.

MR. LYNCH: Can I second that
amendment, is that how that works?

MR. SCHULTZ: It wouldn't be a
friendly amendment. That would need to be a
motion to amend the motion that's on the
table. That would need a second.

MR. GIACOPETTI: So I am making a
motion --
MR. LYNCH: So basically the amendment is we are not going to require the guy to put additional money into the landscaping, to put the evergreen trees. I would agree with that.

MR. GIACOPETTI: That's my motion.

MR. LYNCH: I agree with that. I will second that motion.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Does the maker of the motion agree?

MR. GRECO: No. Wait. So we have to vote on the --

MR. SCHULTZ: The proposed amendment.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Kirsten, call the roll.

MS. MELLEM: Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: On the proposed amendment, no.

MS. MELLEM: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

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

MS. MELLEM: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPEITI: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: No.

MS. MELLEM: Motion passes four to two.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: No.

MR. SCHULTZ: On the amended motion, yes.

MS. MELLEM: On the amended motion.

Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

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

MS. MELLEM: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Motion passes six to three.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: One more.

MR. GRECO: In the matter of CAV Tool JSP17-17, motion to approve the storm water management plan, based on and subject to the findings of compliance with ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters, and the conditions and items listed in those letters, being addressed on the final site plan. And because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Chapter 11 of the code of ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the ordinance.

MR. LYNCH: Second.

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

MS. MELLEM: Member Giacopetti?

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

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

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

MS. MELLEM: Member Anthony?
MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

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

MS. MELLEM: Motion passes six to zero.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: All set.

MR. CAVRELLA: We here for preliminary and final?
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: That's just preliminary.

MS. MELLEM: They only approval is preliminary. Final is administrative.

MR. MILLER: Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Item number four is HCCP NEG SPEC, JSP17-30. This is a public hearing at the request of HCCP Land,
LLC for preliminary site plan, woodland permit, storm water management plan approval. The subject parcel is located in Section One and in the Haggerty Corridor Corporate Park, west of Cabot Drive, north of Thirteen Mile, and west of Haggerty Road. It's approximately 14.06 acres and is zoned OST, office, service, technology. The applicant is proposing to build a 210,000 square foot four story office building along with associated site improvements, including parking and utilities. The plan also includes an extension of Cabot Drive north to the parcel. Kirsten.

MS. MELLEM: Good evening. The applicant is proposing to construct a 210,000 square foot four story building, along with associated site improvements, including parking and utilities. The site plan also includes extension of Cabot Drive, the parcel in question. The site is estimated to be 14.06 acres and located north of Thirteen Mile Road between Haggerty Road and M5.
The subject property is currently zoned OST, office, service, technology. The properties to the north, east and south are also OST office, service, technology.

The property to the west across M5 is zoned R2, one family residential.

The future land use map indicates office, research, development and technology for this property, and those in the northeast and south and single family to the west.

The site contains wetlands and woodlands as well as the proposed road crosses existing wetlands and wetland buffers. The applicant does not propose any conservation easements for the existing wetlands or woodland replacement trees.

The proposed project is within the Haggerty Corridor Corporate Park. It is proposed at the northwest corner of the park.

The site plan shows a 210,000 square foot
building, 1,143 parking spaces, 57 bicycle parking spaces, building and unloading docks and dumpsters. Planning has some concerns about the proposed plan to provide 56 percent more parking spaces than the required minimum. We are also concerned about the impacts of the 25-foot wetland buffers near the south edge of the property and impacts the wetlands to create the Cabot Drive extension. Modification of the site plan to lessen the impact and to provide conservation easement to present future impacts are requested.

The final item is the traffic impact study that is required for site plan development manual standards. The applicant does not want to provide a study, saying that the study commissioned in 1999 is sufficient. However, as it is stated in the study, it is anticipated the project will be built-out in a seven year time frame. Now despite any postponements due to the recession, the study is still outside of that two-year time frame.
Traffic is willing to compromise on the requirement by asking for an abbreviated study that analyzes whether or not the 1999 study was accurate as predictions of the future and future needs and takes into consideration all the developments that have occurred outside of Haggerty Corridor Corporate Park.

The applicant is seeking four waivers from Planning Commission that are supported by staff. The first waiver is from the zoning ordinance for not providing covered bicycle parking spaces for the 25 percent of the required bicycle parking spaces, for maneuvering lane spacing of three feet where four feet are required, and for use of the loop rack design where the U design is required.

A landscape waiver from the landscape design manual, for less interior street trees along Cabot Drive because of the proposed frontage landscaping is attractive and in keeping with the spirit of the
A landscape waiver from the zoning ordinance for less parking lot landscaping due to the ITC corridor and landscaping restrictions. A landscape waiver from the zoning ordinance for less parking lot perimeter canopy trees if landscaping is sufficiently provided as determined by the landscape architect.

In addition to the four waivers, the applicant is also seeking two waivers from the Zoning Board of Appeals. The location of the dumpster and the rear yard setback and for the location of the unloading/loading area on the exterior side yard, due to the double frontage lot. And a DCS variance from the City Council for the lack of sidewalks along both sides of Cabot Drive, along the extension where no development is proposed at this time.

The reviewers are all recommending approval, some with modifications to be met with the next
submittal. Engineering has reviewed the plan for preliminary site plan and storm water management, and has identified the DCS variance for lack of sidewalks. Landscape has reviewed the plans and identified the landscape waivers as well as additional calculations that are needed to meet to landscape ordinance requirements.

Wetlands has reviewed the plans and determined that the plan requires minor wetland permit, wetland buffer authorization and wetland conservation easement. Woodlands has reviewed the plans and noted that the 97 trees are proposed for removal and 91 replacement trees are required. However, the site plan only shows 54 being planted on site, so clarification for which trees will be planted on site and those that will need to be determined in order to issue the woodland permit. The consultant determined that a woodland permit, woodland fence and conservation easement are also required.
Traffic has reviewed the plans and noted the applicant's request for a traffic impact study waiver, but does not support this waiver as the previous study is over the two year time frame and the development of the sites around this area have drastically changed. Facade is in full compliance with the ordinance and fire also recommends approval with the conditions of relocating a hydrant.

The Planning Commission is asked tonight to hold the required public hearing for the woodland permit and to consider a preliminary site plan and storm water management plan. The applicant, staff consultants are here to answer any questions you may have.

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

MR. SOSIN: Good evening. I'm Matthew Sosin, 39000 Country Club Drive, Farmington Hills, Michigan.
Good evening. It's been a while since I have been up here, but we are excited about this project. I don't know how many of have you driven through the park. But we are at 99 percent occupancy, our structural vacancy is around 1 percent.

So this is a building that we are excited about. I guess I would -- I think it's worthwhile for me to address at least two of the waivers. The first is the waiver for the traffic study, which we have addressed before, we received that waiver for the previous two buildings that we did for Harmon and Magna both received that waiver.

So I just wanted to point that out that we have received that waiver before. And when the traffic study was done, it was for the whole park, as it was built out.

On the covered bike path, I believe that's a waiver that we also have been granted before. I think there are a variety of reasons that we would ask not to put those in, mostly on this site, they would
cover windows, you know, we have used them before, in another building and, you know, they don't get used, they add to the operating expenses of the building, and our tenants just don't want them.

As far as the looped bike racks, that's what we have used throughout the park. We used them at Harmon and Magna, to the extent that they're used at all, I don't think we would have a problem with that, we have different colors, they seem to fit into the esthetics of the park.

So those are the two waivers, I think I should address. I'm here to answer any others questions.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, sir. This is a public hearing. Anyone like to speak to us?

Any correspondence?

MR. GRECO: There is no correspondence.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: With that, we will close the public hearing on this
particular matter and turn it over to the Planning Commission. Member Lynch.

MR. LYNCH: Yeah, I don't have an issue with the covered bike rack or whatever. My assumption if someone rides their bike into work they are going to take it up to their office, that doesn't seem like a big deal.

The traffic study, is it correct that a complete traffic study was done when the whole property was approved?

MS. MELLEM: The study was in 1999, when the (inaudible) seven years from that point. That's what's in the traffic study that's been provided.

MR. LYNCH: Let me see if I can understand this. Because I don't want to get stuck on this. It seems to me when the whole park was approved, they did the whole build out and they did a full blown detailed traffic study, right?

MS. MELLEM: Yes.

MR. LYNCH: So we are asking them
to do it again?

    MS. MELLEM: Per the site plan manual and the traffic consultants, yes, that's what was warranted, since it's over the two year time frame. Their argument is that the development surrounding this corridor has changed a lot since 1999.

    MR. LYNCH: I guess I have no issue waiving the traffic study. I have been to this property. I have no issue.

    CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you. Anyone else?

    MR. AVDOULOS: I have a question, I guess, on the parking. So you have maxed out the site basically.

    MR. SOSIN: First of all, I can address -- I will answer your question. I guess the answer is, yes, I am sure we could fit more spots if we really tried. I think I would not build a building with less parking than this, just the market demands this level of parking.

    I think it was really proven
when we did the Columbus building and we ran
into the same comments from Planning
Commission about why do we have so much
parking, and we had that level of parking
because we knew the market demanded, that was
the only reason that we brought Henry Ford to
Novi because we were able to meet their
parking requirements.

So to add flexibility to the
building, and it's just that's the parking
that you required for any occupant in that
building.

MR. AVDOULOS: The only reason I
ask is because the buildings have -- the
parking is figured out via square footage of
your building, and then, you know, I want
them -- you know, this is the building
department having to look at this to make
sure that the occupant load of the building
and the exiting of the building and
everything that's -- you know, the stairs all
of that is reflective of the building. And
if there is too much parking, meaning too
many occupants, then will the building be safe.

MR. SOSIN: So obviously the building schedule. There is entrances on all four sides of the building, we try to center the building as much as possible within the parking fields so that, you know, walking distances are reduced to the greatest extent possible. There will be stairs, probably, however many stairs were required by code, you know, we will have to meet those.

MR. AVDOULOS: That's all I have.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Member Giacopetti.

MR. GIACOPETTI: I have a similar question on the parking, which is 56 percent higher than the minimum requirement. How do you calculate the number of parking spots that are needed for a building this size?

MR. SOSIN: Our starting point, our minimum is, you know, usually five or six per thousand is how real estate developers
and real estate brokers and tenants talk.

That's the metric that we use, so per 1,000 square feet. So we want, you know, as close to six, and we have even had proposals that we have had to make seven and eight per thousand. Just to get, you know, an office tenant. That's just what's required are five or six per thousand. So this is around six.

MR. GIACOPETTI: That's a lot of people in one building.

MR. SOSIN: I don't think -- I think that's probably -- you know, look at all the buildings. All my buildings are about the same.

MR. GIACOPETTI: I do appreciate the effort to make sure there is adequate parking. I think my concern though is, in the same plan asking the Commission to waive a number of landscape features and interior trees, and it's just like there is so much space here that's just paved.

MR. SOSIN: I don't think -- I guess I would say that the waivers, some of
them have nothing to do with how much parking is there. We still have to, you know, meet the requirement of -- we have met the requirements on the island spacing. I think that we have provided a site plan that meets at least the spirit of the ordinance. As you get on these bigger sites, those kind of issues happen. We have had them on the lot, the bigger sites where we have needed some of these waivers on the parking lot, landscaping. I think it's a function of how some of the landscaping requirements are calculated, they change as the site gets bigger. But I can't reduce the amount of parking spaces there, just from a market perspective.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Seems like a lot.

MR. SOSIN: I guess, you know, I don't know how else to answer it just the market -- I mean, without even judging whether I think it's right or wrong, the market dictates that we need this many spots.
MR. GIACOPETTI: I appreciate the insight very much.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Member Anthony.

MR. ANTHONY: I like this development. I am okay with the waivers. When you look at the location of the building it's consistent with that area, and I am prepared to make a motion.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Go for it.

MR. ANTHONY: Figure I'd give you a break.

In the matter of HCCP NEG SPEC JSP17-30, motion to approve the preliminary site plan based on and subject to the following. Items A through I listed on our form. This motion -- can I say it that way?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MR. ANTHONY: 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. LYNCH: Second.

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

MR. GIACOPETTI: I would like to make a motion to amend the motion. I motion to strike Article H concerning the traffic impact study waiver. The existing study was done -- Bill Clinton was still president.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Is that a friendly amendment?

MR. GIACOPETTI: That's a motion to amend because I am striking that. I believe.

MR. SCHULTZ: Unless the maker of the motion agrees to the --

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Friendly amendment.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Let me ask this question though because how I read H, is that the applicant will provide a traffic impact study. So they provided one, so the issue is you want an updated one?
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: So if you want --

MR. GIACOPETTI: I can support that.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Seconder accept the motion?

MR. LYNCH: The friendly amendment -- to make him have another traffic study?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MR. LYNCH: No, I don't accept that.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Anyone else wish to second?

MR. GIACOPETTI: I would second it.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: You made it.

MR. SCHULTZ: Did the maker of the original motion --

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: He accepted it.

MR. SCHULTZ: He agreed to add
the --

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Updated traffic study.

MR. SCHULTZ: Seconder withdrew his second?

MR. GIACOPETTI: He never made a second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: He made the second to the original one.

MR. GIACOPETTI: No one has made the second yet.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Hold on. He made the second to the original motion.

MR. SCHULTZ: He's not accepting --

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: He is not accepting the friendly amendment.

MR. LYNCH: I misspoke.

MR. SCHULTZ: Then I think Member Giacopetti should make a motion to amend the motion that's on the table.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Through the chair I would like to make a motion to amend
the motion that's on the table to strike --
to amend Article H concerning the provision
of a traffic impact study -- update to the
traffic impact study.

MR. GRECO: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a
second. So the original motion --

MR. SCHULTZ: On the amendment on
the original motion, would be the first one.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Greco was
the second.

MS. MELLEM: Member Anthony?
MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

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

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

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

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

MS. MELLEM: Member Greco?
MR. GRECO: Yes.
MS. MELLEM: Motion passes six to zero.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Now the amendment?

MR. SCHULTZ: Now a motion on the motion as amended.

MS. MELLEM: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Motion passes six to zero.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Next.

MR. ANTHONY: In the matter of HCCP NEG SPEC building JSP17-30, motion to
approve the woodland permit based on and
subject to the following. The findings of
compliance with ordinance standards in the
staff and consultant review letters, and the
conditions and the 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 applicable provisions of the ordinance.

MR. LYNCH: Second.

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

MS. MELLEM: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Anthony?

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

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Motion passes six to zero.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: And in the matter of HCCP NEG SPEC building JSP17-30, motion to approve the storm water management plan based on and subject to the following. The findings of compliance with ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters, and the conditions and items listed in those letters, being addressed on the final site plan. This motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Chapter 11 of the code of ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the ordinance.

MR. LYNCH: Second.

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

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

MS. MELLEM: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Motion passes six to zero.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: All.

MR. SOSIN: Now I have to get an updated traffic study?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MR. SOSIN: There was no discussion? I mean, the Planning Commission waived the requirement.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: You will update the traffic. Thank you.

Next on the agenda is matters
for consideration. Are there any? Matters for discussion? Did we have issues downloading things this week?

MR. GIACOPETTI: It wasn't loaded.

MS. MELLEM: The packet was really big. We do ask our applicants to provide something that's less than ten megabytes. They don't always provide that. We have to reduce it and we can't.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Even when I tried downloading the individual elements today, element number two, it would download but it would never show as PDF on my device.

MR. ANTHONY: I go right to the agenda on the web page.

MS. MELLEM: We can work on it.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Any supplement issues? Last audience participation. No one.

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: That's what I said.

MR. GRECO: Second.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: All those

in favor.

THE BOARD: Aye.

(The meeting was adjourned at 9:03 p.m.)
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