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CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Call to order the April 19 regular meeting of the Planning Commission. Please call the roll, Sri.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Anthony?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Absent, excused.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Here.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Here.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Here.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Here.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Here.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Member Giacopetti is absent too as well.

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

(Pledge recited.)

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

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Motion to approve.

MR. GRECO: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a motion and a second. Any comments? All those in favor.

THE BOARD: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Anyone opposed say nay. We have an agenda.

We come to our first audience participation. If there is anyone in the audience that wishes to address the Planning Commission on something other than a couple of public hearings, please step forward at this time.

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

I don't believe we have any correspondence?
MR. GRECO: We don't have any correspondence other than related to one of the public hearings.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Any committee reports. City planner report, Ms. McBeth, good evening.

MS. MCBETH: Good evening. Nothing to report tonight.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Good for you. We come to our first public hearing, Griffin Funeral Home JSP17-13. It's a public hearing at the request of the Novi Funeral Home, LLC for special land use permit, preliminary site plan, storm water management plan approval.

Subject property is located in Section 20 at the southwest corner of Eleven Mile and Beck Road, and it is zoned RA residential acreage.

The applicant is proposing to construct a 13,000 square foot building, 98 parking spaces, 23 land bank parking spaces and associated site improvement for the use as a funeral home.
Special land use is required for a non-residential use in a residential zoned property.

Sri, good evening.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Good evening. I would like to mention the subject property is located in Section 20 at the southwest corner of Eleven Mile Road and Beck. It is zoned residential acreage with option for planned suburban low rise overlay.

The proposed use of a mortuary establishment is allowed as a special land use under RA zoning. The property to the south is vacant and is zoned RA with PSLR overlay as well. The properties to the north are vacant and zoned R3 with a PSLR overlay. The properties to the east are zoned RA and have few existing single family residences as well.

The property that wraps the subject parcel on the west and for the south is zoned RA and is owned by Novi Community School District.
There are no regulated woodlands on the property. It has few regulated wetlands which is essentially a minor part of the existing pond.

The applicant is proposing a lot split of an existing parcel and is developing the northern part with the current request. A letter of intent is provided which states that the southern property will be developed for non-residential using the PSLR option. Based on which staff has supported certain landscaping waivers.

The subject parcel currently contains a single family home, garage and a barn -- I'm sorry -- the single family home is on the certain parcel which will be developed later.

The applicant is working with the city and others to preferably find a new home for the existing barn as part of this project.

The applicant is proposing to construct about a 12,176 square foot building
with 98 parking spaces and associated site
improvements. In addition he is requesting
approval of 23 land bank parking spaces as
indicated in red on the plan, based on the
usage statistics from his current facilities.
The site plan also indicates 12 assembly
spaces indicated in blue. Planning supports
the request for land banking, a waiver for
noise impact statement and recommends
approval of the site plan. Engineering also
recommends approval with additional comments
to be addressed with final site plan.

City Council designed
construction standards, variance would be
required for absence of sidewalk along Eleven
Mile due to existing practical difficulty to
extend the sidewalk beyond the subject
property.

Landscape review indicates two
waivers -- three waivers for not meeting the
minimum height for the berm along western
property and absence of required berm and
buffer along southern property line and not
meeting the minimum requirements for street
trees along Beck Road to avoid conflicts with
corner clearance.

Landscape supports the request
for absence of berm along southern property
based on the letter provided by the
applicant.

If the property is developed
residential in future, the applicant agrees
to provide a berm at that time. Traffic
review estimated about 50 vehicles coming in
and out at a given time during a funeral
service. This is based on the estimate
provided by the applicant that there would be
approximately ten to 15 vehicles at a time of
a procession and maybe the funeral attendants
would be 30 to 70 based on the service. And
the county estimated based on one to two
occupants per vehicle. Because funeral
services are assumed to not occur during peak
traffic periods, there is not enough
estimated traffic to warrant a left turn lane
or left turn passing lane.
Traffic determined that the estimated traffic counts would have insignificant impact on current traffic on Beck. It wouldn't worsen the existing situation. Traffic recommends approval with additional comments to be addressed with final site plan.

The new outlet control structure has been proposed and would be installed in the northwestern corner of the existing pond in order to regulate the outflow of the site storm water. A minor wetland permit and a letter of authorization to work within the buffers are to be approved administratively for the proposed work. Wetlands recommended approval.

Facade noted that the design is in full compliance with the facade ordinance and will harmonize well with other buildings in the surrounding area. Facade recommends approval. The current slide displays the view of the building from different directions.
The applicant also submitted a material sample sheet indicating the type of materials.

Fire recommends approval with some recommendations to be addressed at the time of the final site plan.

The Planning Commission is asked tonight to hold the public hearing and approve the special land use, preliminary site plan and land bank parking and storm water management plan.

The Planning Commission is also asked to review the site plan based on the special land use considerations, listed in Section 6.1.2C and also make a finding for the adequacy of the proposed assembly spaces.

The applicant David Griffin is here tonight with his engineer Rick Hofsess and the landscape architect Steve Deak to answer any questions you may have. Staff is here as well.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, Sri. I appreciate that.
Does the applicant wish to address the Planning Commission at this time.

MR. GRIFFIN: Good evening. My name is David Griffin. Thank you for allowing us to come to the meeting tonight.

My family currently has four funeral homes, one in Westland, Canton, Livonia, and the Northville community. It's going to be a great honor to be able to develop this parcel and to the Novi city.

Today I brought Rick, along with Steve to answer any further questions regarding design on the engineering along with landscape. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, appreciate that.

This is a public hearing. If there is anyone that wishes to address the Planning Commission on this particular topic, please step forward, at which time you have three minutes to make your statement.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Good evening. My name is Mike McHugh. I live in
Novi, I have for 20 years. I not sure I agree with Novi -- the road of Novi will not be impacted. I drive it every day. I have two parcels actually right across the street from your proposed area. My daughter just built a home right on the corner directly across from Boscos.

Concerns we have is there is only two ways in and out of that subdivision. There is seven cemeteries north of where this is proposed, if they're taking off north to block it both ways of this intersection of the road, no way in, no way out, then it's blocked. If there is an emergency in this subdivision, there is no way in no way, no way out while this is going through there.

I just don't understand with all the commercial properties that are available, why we would take residential. We purchased there to be in residential, it's a commercial building. You can call it what you want for special use, but you're taking residential, turning it into commercial. We just -- we
don't like it, nothing against you guys, funeral homes, but this doesn't make sense to us. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, sir. Anyone else?

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Good evening. My name is Mark DeMichael. We just built a house at 47289 Sierra, right across the street. I have two children, one of the reasons we did build a house there is the beautiful landscaping right across the street from Beck Road. We love looking at the farm, the animals, the barn, the sunsets, it's beautiful. I think that will all be taken away from my family, with this structure being built. There is a preschool being built right next to it. Just, in my eyes doesn't seem like it would be a perfect fit. I understand there is an old folks home, there is a hospital, it kind of lines up, but for someone who lives right across the street it absolutely would be a no for me. I hope this does not go through, and thank you for
your time.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Anyone else?

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Good evening. I'm Mike Wang. I live at Eleven Mile. I've been a resident of Novi at that location for 32 years. And I don't support the change from RA to the special use, even though I know we will all have to use the facility at some point in time, but the issue is, that I think that there is better use to maintaining it, as RA, and as the other gentleman mentioned, there is other land that would be available, for example, along the Grand River corridor right at Beck Road, there is an open area that the funeral home can go in.

So I would request that we not accept this and look at the relocation of it. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Anyone else?

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: My name is Kelly DeMichael (ph). I live across the street. My husband spoke earlier. I just
also wanted to add onto what he said. The school buses are also parked and held off of
Eleven Mile, and in between Beck Road and Taft Road and get to the middle school, they have to cross that intersection. If there is a funeral going on, a procession, that's 15 to 30 minutes long, however long it is, the school buses aren't going to be able to get to the middle school if the procession is headed north. If they do, they have to go all the way around miles out of the way. So that's a huge factor and that intersection is already so congested, as it is, and having a funeral home there is just -- it should be out of the question for anybody. I have small children. We can't even get approved for a fence, a four foot fence in our yard, but these folks may get approved to put a commercial building in a residential area. It's seemingly preposterous. I have lost my train of thought, but I hope that you folks could take this into consideration if you lived across the street from this area.
Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

Anyone else?

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: My name is Charlene. I'm sorry if I'm tired. I just got off work, you have to ask yourself, what is the asset to putting this special something in this spot when you have other spots you could put it. And the only outcome of you putting it there, it's going to decrease property values, increase traffic, and there is no value to Novi. How is putting this funeral home in this particular location an asset to Novi? It's really not. Increases traffic, decreases property values. There is other places you could put it, so why would you want to put it here? I just understand it's like a special needs location whatever it is, that you could do it, but I really don't think it's an asset to Novi to put it there. Put it someplace in the commercial area. All the property values around there are going to drop. The traffic
is going to increase and nobody wins, not
even Novi. There is really no benefit to
putting it there. And I really want you guys
to search your souls and say, if you lived
across the street in that value -- or in that
property, you bought that property, assuming
it was residential, how would you feel if out
of the blue a funeral home says, we are going
to pop a funeral home here. How would you
feel about that? Thank you for your time.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: I'm Rick
Winert. I am a resident of Pioneer Meadows,
and I object to the plan of a special use of
this RA zoned property. I think it's a
terrible use of the property. It's a
beautiful piece of property, zoned RA for a
reason. You have wetlands there. You have
emergency EMS right across the street. You
have schools at both ends of Eleven Mile and
Taft and Eleven Mile and Wixom Road. A lot
of school traffic. You have another school,
I guess, day-care, whatever you to call it,
that's just opening there on the corner also
across. Beck Road right now can't handle the traffic that it has and this will just be congestion and terrible use of that piece of property. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, sir.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Good evening. My name is Michael Darvosic (ph). I'm a three and a half year homeowner on Denzer (ph) Road. I have the fortunate ability to live in a house that's zoned RA. I think we should have more RA housing in Novi. It's kind of rare in a city now to have a large property, for single family homes. I hate to see one of those opportunities destroyed by rezoning this to a special use. I think the quadrant between Beck and Eleven Mile all the way from Taft, that whole area should be kept for just residential and school functions only. I think having -- bringing in commercial outside in that area, it just ruins the whole effect of the city on that side. When you're
in that area, it just feels like you're in a
different place of Novi. There is nothing
else around that really conflicts other than
homes and schools. It's just great living
over there. So I would vote against this. I
thank you for your time.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Anyone else?

Seeing no one else, do we have
any correspondence?

MR. GRECO: Yes, we do have some
correspondence.

We received a correspondence
form, first one that I have received here, I
apologize for mispronouncing -- Michael
Tahalder at 25827 Strathhaven, objects, Beck
Road is already terrible with regard to
traffic, and Grand River has many other
locations or better locations.

Next from Steven Kaiser at 49269
Sierra Drive, also objects to the special
land use request because it's the wrong
location for this purpose, traffic problems
created by residential, school bus,
elementary, middle, high school combined with morning and afternoon traffic, and believes it would not be a good fit, being a funeral home. There are many other places on Grand River that may be better suited for the area.

Next we have Julia Agol, also objects because there are six schools in the area, two EMT stations at the corner of the intersection, multiple subdivisions and believes that funeral processions will hold up traffic causing delays, could cause depression in kids and adults as well having this type of facility.

Next correspondence is from Sandra Height, at 22677 Indianwood Drive, believes that it should remain -- the area should remain residential.

That concludes the correspondence that we received.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you. With that we will close the public hearing on this particular matter, turn it over to the Planning Commission for their consideration.
Who would like to start. Member Lynch.

MR. LYNCH: I guess the question I have is, you know, where does this stop. This seems like a spot zoning to me, personally. We have -- I don't mind that this thing would go to residential somewhere, even to increase the density. I think it kind of makes sense in this area. But it seems like Grand River, a major business corridor, and then south and north of Grand River, we have zoned as residential, it's been kind of strategy of the city. Then we also put in a low rise type development along Eleven Mile, that may be a better fit. I mean, the building looks nice. I agree the building looks nice and the landscaping, all that. But I just wonder where is this going to stop, and are we setting any kind of precedent by jumping from a residential to what -- I mean, what basically is a business or commercial use. And if we do this, what are we going to do in the future when a similar request comes in front of the
Planning Commission in a residential area to put in a commercial plan. I think that we should share some experience. I remember there was a decision made on -- what was it -- Ten Mile and Beck, I believe that there was talk about putting a commercial business in there. And we said, no, we want to leave it as a residential area, and we ended up approving those two residential subdivisions -- we increased the density because you have to give the property owner an opportunity to develop the property. I guess my question for the Commission is, you know, are we setting ourselves up for something in the future. Is this something that some other developer could use to say, wait a minute, you did it for them, you know, are we obligated to do it for someone else in a residential area.

So I am a little -- I will listen to the dialogue of my fellow commissioners. But I am a little concerned jumping from a residential -- whether it's RA, you know,
that can be debated, whether it should be an
RA, R2 or R3, but jumping from a residential
to a -- with all intents and purposes are
commercial. I am not comfortable with that.
That's my comments.

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

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: First off, I would
like to tag onto what Mike said. I feel the
same way. I think the property on the north
side of Eleven Mile is already -- has
multiple, has some commercial on it, what
have you. And I always felt that Eleven Mile
was the line, you know that Eleven Mile north
of Eleven Mile. So that was my one thought.

The second comment I have is,
Barb, what goes directly -- what's the plan
for directly south of this site that has the
home on it? And I mean, what are we looking
for in the future, would there then be an
extension of commercial going south? I am
just trying to figure out, you know, what's
the ultimate plan here that we are looking
MS. MCBETH: That's a good thought. That was something we had discussed with the applicant on the occasions when we had meetings and talked about this. The land is -- in our future land use plan planned for suburban low rise uses. You might recall there are more intense uses closer to Grand River, and as you move south, the idea would be to have a transition to single family residential types of uses. There are a lot of standards in this suburban low rise ordinance.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: So this would be our first transitional piece, going south of Eleven?

MS. MCBETH: A couple of other ones have actually used suburban low rise. The day-care that just is recently completing construction on Beck north of Eleven Mile. I am trying to think if there was another one at that location. But actually this is sort of unique that the underlying zoning that are
residential zoning also allows funeral homes
as a special land use. So anywhere in the
city somebody could come and propose a
funeral home as a special land use.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: This would be in
the same ballpark as a day-care center?

MS. MCBETH: It would. It would.
It could be considered similar to that. But
actually anywhere in the community that's
zoned residential, somebody could come and
apply for special land use consideration,
which has, as you know, additional factors
that the Planning Commission can consider, as
to whether to approve it or not approve it at
a specific location.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: I mean, I love the
plan. I love the architecture. I love the
landscaping. I like the pond remaining. I
like the fact that that intersection of that
corner is not going to be blocked and, you
know, the visibility, the sunsets. That sort
of thing. That's not going to go away from
the neighbors. This is going to be a
beautiful facility.

If we look at former facilities that the applicant has, they're all well-maintained and what have you. I really don't see that there is an issue of traffic. You know, anybody who has lived around one of these things, attended a funeral, no matter where it is, funeral parlors do not back up traffic. And they always work around times and what have you, with people. So I don't see any of the congestion really that's talked about. There is a lot of other things that are going to create a lot more congestion, and just the fact that they can stage later times so that, you know, nobody -- there is never funerals when the roads are busy. It's not an issue. So I don't see that.

What I am concerned about is the facility going south of Eleven Mile, and I know it's allowed there. But it is a commercial -- you know, if it could go further, go on the other side of Eleven Mile.
And I know that Griffin has spent an awful lot of money and effort trying to -- I mean, they have spent a lot of money for this presentation, as far as they have gone, but I think they could pick that up and move it to another site, too.

Drainage might be different and sewers, whatever, but I mean, the building, the facility and that, I mean, there is a lot salvagable here. I don't think we are throwing them to the woods. So for that, I would vote against it.

MR. GRIFFIN: Can I say something?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Hold on a second. You have to be asked directly, then you can respond. Member Avdoulos.

MR. AVDOULOS: Thank you, Chair. I guess I had the similar concerns that, you know, a lot of the residents came up and presented. The first concern that -- as I was reading the information was, you know, related to traffic, but I think knowing how funeral homes are run, a lot of the funerals
really don't start until about 10:00 or 10:30 in the morning. And a lot of the processions really are generated through the churches and the funeral homes.

But it's an interesting issue because this piece of property is really a landmark piece of property in the City of Novi. A lot of people use that barn as an indicator of, you know, where they have entered the big wreath that's up there at the Christmas holidays, that's really an important part of this area.

Funeral homes within a residential area is not unusual either. Special land use is known for funeral homes, but it's also for churches and churches are residential areas.

As I was reading this, I actually drove in through Northville, Casterline funeral home is an old residence that was changed into a funeral home. It's right in the neighborhood. I believe it's Lynch in Milford, you know, right in a neighborhood.
So I don't think it's a big detriment.

I think the issue that we're having is that it's one, it's a beautiful piece of property, the owner of the property, you know, obviously sold it, and the current owner is looking to do something with it, and trying to work with the city to see if this is something that would be approved and would be applicable in this location.

The size of it is something I think that concerns some folks because it's like 12,000 square feet, so it's big, it has a residential character though, and, you know, it's a low rise, the prairie style, so it's fitting in with, you know, a residential feel.

But I think the prominence of where it's at, and Beck Road does get crazy, you know, I live west of Beck Road off Nine Mile, and yes, there is times where it's really busy, that's during the morning and afternoon.

The big question that I have or
the concern is that just like the two members
before me, utilizing in my mind Eleven Mile
as sort of a demarcation point where you want
to maintain commercial north of that, and
then have the residents feel south of that,
the school that they have created is done
really well. The development that they have
done around the hospital is really well.
This sort of -- this kind of development here
mimics the rehabilitation center further down
on Eleven Mile, so we have got that
residential feel. But in this particular
location, that was my concern, too, creating
a precedent that may trickle down and, you
know, have other issues.

The issue of the funeral home,
you know, Griffin has -- you know, they have
great facilities and they keep them up, so I
don't really think that, you know, this is
going to be let go in any disarray, but I
think that you have to take some of the
concerns of the residents. I think I had
some of those also. So I will just wait to
hear some more before I decide on anything.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Member Greco.

MR. GRECO: Thank you, Chair Pehrson.

When I initially reviewed this plan, I did not -- well, the location caused me some concern, not necessarily thinking in my mind as Eleven Mile being a demarcation line. Now that you guys bring it up, I think it does make sense, but because of its location, and the issues that we had on the Planning Commission, even when Member Avdoulos was with us the first time about that Ten Mile and Beck Road that we have all dealt with, so many times, which was a little bit of a different issue because individuals and developers were coming in to rezone the property, which is definitely a different issue than this special land use, which Ms. McBeth pointed out is a permittable use under certain circumstances in the residential area.

However, we are -- we have
discussed so many times before this Commission regarding the southwest quadrant. This is a little north of what we are starting to get closer to it, and we are talking about the low rise suburban and developing off of Grand River coming down south, it's on the south side of Eleven Mile, and it is something that I think, particularly when we have the input of the residents, which we have to consider, makes me question whether or not this is appropriate for this site.

Now, that being said, just addressing some of the residents that are here, you know, it is zoned residential, all right. Beck Road at this point in time with the way just the county has developed, the way Novi has developed, even with all the residential around there, has become a significant thoroughfare. So it is not just a traditional residential area tucked away, and the traffic issues are traffic issues, there is no doubt about it.
But with regard to these properties, and it is unfortunate that all of these things are going to change over time. If this property isn't developed this way, it is going to be developed at a certain point in time and it may be developed residential, and it may be developed residential in a way that the individuals around the residential are not happy because it becomes more dense, based upon what's going on there.

And so you are kind of a damned if you do, damned if you do sometimes with all these and what you are looking for.

But given the circumstances, given the elements and the factors that we need to consider, and given the input of the residents, which I think we need to take into account, I don't believe that this is a plan that I can support.

And I mean, like the other commissioners indicated, I think Member Zuchlewski pointed out significantly, particularly for the residents looking west,
I mean, this is a plan that keeps your site plan lines with respect to sunsets available, which may change significantly if another plan goes in there, even if it's residential, like we have had other issues further south down the road.

But that being said, it is a commercial building, it does require us to meet, I will say meet or exceed certain factors to be in a residential neighborhood just because it's a permitted use, doesn't mean that these are easily just met, these factors, and because it's again, commercial, south of Eleven Mile. I don't believe it's a plan that I can support at this point. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

Mr. Griffin, did you want to address the commission, give you the opportunity.

MR. GRIFFIN: I was just informed perhaps we should table this vote for right now so the staff can talk. You know, I do have a concern also.
Mr. Lynch, on a side bar, are you any relationship to anybody from the Lynch funeral home?

MR. LYNCH: No, I am from the poor side of the Lynch family.

MR. GRIFFIN: No relationship?

MR. LYNCH: No relationship.

MR. GRIFFIN: Gentlemen, our family has been in business since 1954. I grew up above the funeral home. My mom and my dad are both licensed funeral directors. My mom is 88 years old, she is a licensed funeral director. She still lives above the funeral home in Westland. Every property in every community that we have gone into, we have been an enhancement. We just purchased two and a half years ago the Northman Sassman funeral home. It was in complete disarray. That's in Northville. We won the beautification award last year. We are now the largest provider of funeral service in the Northville community.

We have a funeral home in Canton,
we built that funeral home in 1992, and the only thing I can say is every community that we have gone to, we have given great respect, service, and class of all the communities.

The concerns that you bring up -- and I do respect some of the comments that were made by the residents. I went into this property by the zoning, by the location, by recommendation of what we can do, to build the funeral home on this corner.

We are trying to work with Paul Bosco, the current owner, regarding the barn. I traveled up and down Beck Road myself with my children. Everybody loves the barn. But unfortunately, one day the barn is going to be gone. One day unfortunately your view is going to be gone. I can tell you the enhancement that we would bring to the community as a service, as a pride, as a structure, I am not up here as a developer, who is going to walk away at the end of the day. My name is on the sign. My brother is a licensed funeral director. I happen to be
one, of course.

We have the honor of having the largest family owned funeral home on the west side of Detroit. You don't do that by accident.

I just know that the proposed building at its location, on numerous travels that I can -- I don't know how often I have talked with Barbara regarding other locations, whether it's Grand River, whether it's the north side of Eleven Mile Road, that all the property happens to be extremely wet, rather than dealing on Eleven Mile Road and Beck with the woman who owns not only that property, but also on the property on Beck Road and Grand River.

The concerns that are brought up are going to be nominal concerns regarding the structure and what we are going to be providing to the community.

I guess, foremost, I am not walking away from his project as it's going up and I am going else elsewhere. I am
there. I am there as I am every morning, 7:30, 8:00 between four funeral homes with my family, giving that type of service for what we do. I am not building this project and going someplace else. My name is on the sign. I believe in guidance. That makes a big difference of what's going to go on this morning. It's not going to be a day-care, it's not going to be any other type of commercial facility, it's going to family run and family operated. You don't get that very often these days. With the amount of pride and dedication that we bring to the community. That's the reason we love to be part of the Novi city.

MR. DEAK: Good evening. My name is Steve Deak. I am the landscape architect on the project. I just have a question for Ms. McBeth. I was obviously in the process, I've handled all the landscaping, and Andy Wozniak, who handled a lot of the planning application questions isn't here, Rick Hofsess from his office is here. I have
dealt with a lot of land planning, rezoning issues.

So I have a question for Ms. McBeth based. On the comments we are hearing from the Commission, with the special land use, with one scenario that could play out here, if we are denied, David, as the applicant, does this end here, does it go to City Council for their vote on it as well? What's the process under that scenario?

MS. MCBETH: So in this district the Planning Commission is responsible for making the decision under the residential zoning.

MR. DEAK: So it starts and ends at the Planning Commission?

MS. MCBETH: Because of the residential zoning. If you chose to go with the plan suburban low rise, then that is a different process, that would go onto City Council.

MR. DEAK: Okay.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: I would like to
make a comment. Again, I indicated that the architectural, the landscaping, everything in this presentation is fantastic. It's absolutely fantastic. I don't think we are struggling with the idea of a funeral home. I think we are struggling with the idea if we are trying to maintain, that's why I brought it up. I would be tickled pink if we could pick this up and move it someplace else. I think it was an indication that you had talked to Barb about other locations and they had high water tables. All right. But I think that's something that we have throughout Novi, you know, most of our residential areas have high water tables, sump pumps are running all night long.

So, I don't think it's the water table issue or, you know, I don't think it's the design, the architectural design, the landscaping or the business. I mean, all that -- I'm elated that you want to come here. I think it's wonderful. So, I don't think it's any of those issues. I think it's
the idea of Eleven Mile, south of Eleven Mile and it is, we all know it is zoned permissible.

This special -- so I think it's more, if we can move it north of Eleven Mile, you know, I think there is a lot that can be salvaged here, maybe engineering, site engineering can't, but a lot of it can.

And if there is any possible way we can find another sight, we would be happy to approve this presentation. And I think that goes, you know, I am listening to the people that live there, and, you know, when I think of funeral homes, I think they're mostly on main streets, Seven Mile, Nine Mile, Five Mile, Middlebelt Merriman, they're on streets that aren't residential, but they're also, you know, State Farm next to them and AAA's next to them. So there is that mix.

MR. GRIFFIN: Beck Road is a different animal. Beck Road is one of the major through roads with highway
AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: It's only a two-way road then though.

MR. GRIFFIN: You have development north of Eleven Mile Road, whether it's the hospital, the retirement center, Beck Road is what it is. Whether it's two lanes, it is a road that's going to be developed. This is an opportunity to have the right development on this corner. This is a cross between commercial and the residential mixture, with very low traffic and very low visibility through the day.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: I can add to that. We know what we are going to get. So it's something to consider. You know we do know what we are going to get.

Barb, what are the options on that site? If somebody else comes in here and it gets rezoned special land use, what are other options, that the neighbors could be facing just so we know.

MS. MCBETH: On a parcel of this
size, in a residential district, you can have single family homes, you could have a church, you could have a fairly small day-care, with that planned suburban low rise overlay, that we have, you could have any of the uses that are allowed in the residential, that's the application that they filed under. Or as a special land use, you can have low rise multiple family buildings, congregate care, assisted living, day-care center, professional offices, medical offices, places of worship, elementary primary schools and also you can have the mortuary establishment.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Barb, what would the maximum height -- what would be the maximum that they could look at, say a church, or you said medical or something, what's the limit of height allowable for those type of facilities.

MS. MCBETH: In the planned suburban low rise it would 35 feet or two stories maximum.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: So 35 feet we
could end up give --

MR. GRIFFIN: We are at one.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: I just wanted to mention this for the residents. So they know what they have, they will still be able to see the pond, they will still be able to see the sunsets and their visibility won't be blocked.

MR. GRIFFIN: We plan to put a fountain in the pond. We plan to enhance that corner.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Excuse me. Can I ask a question?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: No, not right now.

MR. GRIFFIN: We plan to bring value to the community.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Are you done? Let me put my contrarian comments on the record.

This property is going to be developed. It's been sold. It's going to be developed. It can be a 35-foot tall medical
office building. Beck Road is going to
become a five lane highway roadway at some
point time in the not too distant future.

This is Ten Mile and Beck
revisited because we don't like what we don't
like. This Eleven Mile is one of those
arbitrary roads that we have chosen to
hopefully keep everything north of for the
application for the special land use, I don't
think you could find a better fit than what's
being suggested. I think the building is too
large for the area. I have concerns about
the traffic that I think need to be
addressed. I think it was brought to the
Planning Commission under the wrong special
land use. I think it should have come under
the PSLR, which would have given a little bit
more flexibility.

Whether the barn is there or not,
the barn is going to be gone. I hate to see
the barn go. I live less than a mile away
from this area, but if we are going to have a
transition, I'd rather have something like
this with the commitment of the people that
own the building that are going to be there,
more than a medical office building that's going
to have vacancy signs hanging out every six,
eight, ten months.

I can appreciate the input from
the residents that live nearby. But I am
going to tell you that if this gentleman
wasn't here and it was going to be a two or
three story office building, there would be a
lot more of you in this audience with a lot
more vigor and a lot more anger probably
built up in you than what's being proposed
here. That's not to say we can't find the
perfect fit. I don't know what that is yet.
But I am in support of the idea for the
special land use, given the criteria of the
special land use which we have to judge this
on. It's not spot zoning. It does meet the
criteria, in my mind, for special land use.
I think there are things that could be done
to help the site to make everyone a little
bit more happy with what's going to go on
there. Those are my comments. Anyone wish to make a motion?

    MR. AVDOULOS: I have a question.

From Mr. Griffin, there is a letter that you provided to the city indicating that -- how much of the property do you own? Do you own like --

    MR. GRIFFIN: I bought it all.

    MR. AVDOULOS: So the letter indicates that the intention is to sell the south parcel of development for non-residential use?

    MR. GRIFFIN: Right now there hasn't been a discussion either residential or for other use.

Regarding the value of this property, if it is going to be residential use and stay it, I would hope what Paul Bosco would change his mind and stay on the property we are going to put the berm on. Paul is in his 80s right now. He wants to get out. This property was going to be sold numerous times, but I don't have any plans
right now for the south parcel.

MR. AVDOULOS: I think that this came up because of the berm issue.

MR. GRIFFIN: Absolutely.

MR. AVDOULOS: Then I guess the question is, could this owner sell the property for non-residential use even though it's zoned RA.

MS. MCBETH: Yes, they could. As we were talking about, the various uses that would be permitted with the planned suburban low rise.

MR. AVDOULOS: It would be with that particular overlay or whatever is in the master plan.

MR. DEAK: Can I ask one more question before you put a motion forth.

I guess I will direct it to the Commission, but it's also one maybe procedurally to Ms. McBeth.

Is it possible to consider tabling our request this evening to reconsider after the comments we heard, or I
guess procedurally if the vote is a denial this evening, what does that affect in the process if we come back again with a special land use, but modifying whatever aspects of it, working with staff procedurally is there a difference, is one better for us to work with the staff and accommodate some of these concerns, the or other?

MS. MCBETH: Through the Chair, I think we have all heard some of the Planning Commission's comments and concerns as well as the nearby residents, concerns if we would like to continue the dialogue with us, we can talk about the different options that have been done.

It might be better for you to request that the matter be postponed or tabled as a means for you to continue the conversation with staff potentially bringing it back to the Planning Commission.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Any other questions?

Member Greco.
MR. GRECO: I would like to make a motion to table the matter for further consideration and discussion between the applicant and the staff, given all the comments of the commissioners and the input of the residents and what's presented.

MR. LYNCH: Second.

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

Sri, can you call the roll, please.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion to table
passes five to zero.

        CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, gentlemen.

        MR. DEAK: Thank you. We appreciate your input and comments this evening.


        It's a public hearing at the request of the staff to modify Article 55, site standards, Section 5.15 exterior building wall facade material for clarification of intent of the ordinance, updates to the schedule for regulatory facade materials and changes to reduce the number of Section 9 waiver facade waiver requests.

        Kirsten.

        MS. MELLEM: Good evening. The proposed ordinance amendment addresses the section commonly referred to as the facade ordinance under Article 5, Site Standards, Section 5.15, Exterior Building Wall Facade
Materials.

As stated earlier, over the years it has come to the attention of staff and consultants that there are several areas where further clarifications are needed as well as updates to include new materials available to applicants.

As you see in the packet, there is the proposed changes, the marked up changes and the cleaned up version. Also included in the packet is a list of 2015/2016 section facade waivers that were proposed. And the language for those motions and types of materials.

The Planning Commission is asked tonight to hold the required public hearing and make a recommendation to City Council who will ultimately approve or deny the amendment and may propose alterations as well. Staff and our facade consultant Doug Necci are available to answer any questions you may have regarding the proposed amendment.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.
With that, this is a public hearing, if there is anyone in the audience that wishes to address the Planning Commission at this time on this matter, please step forward.

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

MR. GRECO: No correspondence.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

Close the public hearing. Turn it over to the Planning Commission for their consideration. Who would like to start.

Let's get the consultant to consult for a moment.

MR. NECCI: Good evening.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: So what's been done relative to yourselves and planning staff, how you feel that this addresses the -- what we typically go through with the number of Section 9 facade waivers, does this lessen the amount that we hopefully will see, does this kind of future proof the ordinance kind of going forward for what you know, building materials would look like when we
reach everybody having hover cars and such.

MR. NECCI: Yeah, I think those are the two basic items that we wanted to address is new materials that have been frequently seen lately, some (unintelligible) fiber cement paneling is one, for example, that has become popular and widely used, which was not specifically listed in the ordinance.

And the other is really just -- I will call it glitches in the ordinance such as asphalt shingles where the percentage was just not the appropriate percentage. So we are constantly giving waivers for the overage of asphalt shingles, a lot of the waivers given, maybe a third of them are just of that item. So the new percentage should not eliminate, but virtually eliminate the waivers for asphalt shingles. We have addressed that both by the way we define the slope of the roof and by changing the allowable percentage of that material.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Very good.

Thank you. Any other comments, questions?
Motion?

MR. GRECO: I would like to make a motion to recommend approval of the amendments to the ordinance to submit for consideration to City Council. I think it looks great.

MR. LYNCH: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

Motion by Member Greco, second by Member Lynch. Any other comments? Kirsten, can you call the roll, please.

MS. MELLEM: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Motion passes five to zero.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, sir. Appreciate it. Thank you.

Next is matters for consideration Item No. 1 Town Center Building A1 JSP17-24. It's an approval at the request of Novi Town Center Investors, LLC, for preliminary site plan and a Section 9 facade waiver. What? How did happen.

The subject property is located in Section 14 north of Grand River Avenue and east of Novi Road. The subject property is approximately 47.77 acres in the TC Town Center District. The applicant is proposing to update the facade by removing the existing store front canopy and construct a new facade on the one story retail building. Kirsten.

MS. MELLEM: As you stated, the project is located in the Town Center development, south of Crescent Boulevard and east of Town Center in Section 14. It's currently zoned TC and surrounded by TC on all sides.

Future land use map states TC
commercial for the subject property and properties on all sides. There are no wetlands or woodlands. The applicant is proposing to update the facade on former Golfsmith retail store by demolishing the canopy and columns, adding new store front facades and canopy features. Also to remove 960 square feet of concrete sidewalk and add six parking spaces where the concrete was removed. The applicant isn't proposing any changes in landscaping, loading service areas, building areas or site lighting.

The applicant is requesting a Section 9 facade waiver for the overage of wood trim and flat metal panels. The required maximum currently is zero percent. The applicant is providing 2 percent wood trim and 19 percent flat metal panels.

The use of the proposed materials within the context of the proposed alteration is consistent with the intent and purpose of the facade ordinance. Amendments to the facade ordinance currently under
consideration would allow for 10 percent of this material in the TC district. Staff supports the waiver based on the reasons stated. The updates to the facade ordinance would have it at 10 percent, it's currently at zero percent and the applicant is asking for 19 percent of the flat metal panels.

So the Planning Commission is asked tonight to consider the Section 9 waiver for the proposed development in the Town Center.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you. Seeing the applicant at the podium already.

MR. QUINN: Just briefly, of course. Good evening. Good to see all of you again.

I'm Matt Quinn, representing Novi Town Center. Matt Niles, the architect is here tonight if there is any questions regarding the paneling. We acknowledge Professor Necci's support of our request, in that this type of material is already being used in Novi. The design will be similar to
the T. J. Maxx new design that's going in.

This material is already being used at
Nordstrom Rack over at West Oaks mall,
Mr. Necci's firm has evidently done that. So this fits in.

And like was stated in the new ordinance, this material, sounds like it will be allowed, and therefore, we would appreciate the granting of the Section 9 waiver. This building, as you see, is a reuse. It's going to another business that's owned by T. J. Maxx, I think it's going to be outdoor clothing retail type sales and so it will fit right in with the Novi Town Center mall. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, sir. Turn it over to the Planning Commission for their consideration or a motion. Anyone? Member Lynch.

MR. LYNCH: I just have one question. Did I hear you say that you are going to use real wood or you are going to use synthetic wood?
MR. QUINN: It's right up on the material sheet there.

MR. LYNCH: So it's synthetic, it's not wood-wood.

MR. NILES: I'm Matt Niles with Y.E. Associates Architects. The only place you see it is under the white metal panel area. There is 14-inch wide horizontal V. That's part of the tenant's prototype, that is actually wood clad material. The finish material will actually be wood, stained wood.

MR. LYNCH: Will be stained wood. All right.

MR. NILES: We are talking about 14 inch --

MR. LYNCH: I was surprised that you wouldn't use synthetic material.

MR. NILES: We are considering using synthetic, but the tenant has pushed the wood.

MR. LYNCH: As long as they maintain it, there is no issue. It looks nice. I am just surprised that you would use
a living --

MR. QUINN: It goes with the outdoor motif.

MR. NILES: Which is part of their corporate image.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Member Greco.

MR. GRECO: I would like to make a motion. In the matter of Town Center Building A.1 JSP17-24, motion to approve the preliminary site plan and Section 9 facade waiver based on subject to the following, to allow the overage of wood trim material, zero percent allowed, 2 percent proposed. And the overage of flat metal panel material, zero percent minimum, 9 percent proposed, because the proposed alteration is consistent with the intent and purpose of the facade ordinance and the proposed amendment to the facade ordinance would allow up to 10 percent of the flat metal panels, which is hereby granted, and the finding of compliance with ordinance standards in the staff review letter and the conditions and items listed in
that letter being addressed, and because the
plan is otherwise in compliance with Article
3, Article 4 and Article 5, Article 6 of the
zoning ordinance and all other applicable
provisions of the ordinance.

MR. LYNCH: Second.

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

Kirsten, can you call the roll, please.

MS. MELLEM: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Motion passes five to
zero.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Second on the matters for consideration is the approval of the February 22nd, 2017 Planning Commission minutes. Any changes, modifications?

MR. LYNCH: Motion to approve.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Second.

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

Any other comments? Sri, Kirsten, please.

MS. MELLEM: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Motion passes five to zero.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Next is the approval for the March 8, 2017 Planning
Commission minutes. Any changes, modifications, motion?

    MR. LYNCH: Motion to approve.

    MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Second.

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

    Any other comments? Please call the roll.

    MS. MELLEM: Member Greco?

    MR. GRECO: Yes.

    MS. MELLEM: Chair Pehrson?

    CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

    MS. MELLEM: Member Avdoulos?

    MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

    MS. MELLEM: Member Lynch?

    MR. LYNCH: Yes.

    MS. MELLEM: Member Zuchlewski?

    MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

    MS. MELLEM: Motion passes five to zero.

    CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Any other matters for discussion? Supplemental issues?

    Last audience participation? Anyone in the audience wish to address the Planning
Commission?

Seeing none, we will close the audience participation. Look for a motion to adjourn.

MR. LYNCH: Motion to adjourn.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: All those in favor.

THE BOARD: Aye.

(The meeting was adjourned at 8:05 p.m.)
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