

REGULAR MEETING - PLANNING COMMISSION

CITY OF NOVI

August 23, 2017

Proceedings taken in the matter of the PLANNING COMMISSION, at City of Novi, 45175 West Ten Mile Road, Novi, Michigan, on Wednesday, August 23, 2017.

BOARD MEMBERS

Mark Pehrson, Chairperson

David Greco

Robert Giacobetti

John Avdoulos

Michael Lynch

Ted Zuchlewski

ALSO PRESENT:

Barbara, McBeth, City Planner

Thomas Schultz, City Attorney

Kirsten Mellem, Planner

Sri Komaragari, Planner

Rick Meader, Landscape Architect

Darcy Rechten, Engineering

Certified Shorthand Reporter, Diane Szach

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Novi, Michigan.

Wednesday, August 23, 2017

7:00 p.m.

\*\* \*\* \*

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

Sri, can you call the roll, please.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Good evening.

Member Anthony?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Absent, excused.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Here.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Here.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Here.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Here.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Here.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Here.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: With that,

1 could we rise for the Pledge of Allegiance, please.

2 Member Lynch, could you start us,  
3 please.

4 (Pledge recited.)

5 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you,  
6 sir.

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

9 MR. LYNCH: Motion to approve.

10 MR. GIACOPETTI: Second.

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

13 All those in favor?

14 THE BOARD: Aye.

15 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Anyone  
16 opposed? We have a motion.

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

24 MR. ZACK: Good evening. My name  
25 is Gary Zack. I live at 359 South Lake Drive.

1 Although I appreciate this project, I object to many  
2 aspects of the project. The whole project in some  
3 ways appears to be poorly thought out. It destroys  
4 precious green space and prime picnic recreation are  
5 in Novi's only natural park. And such a large  
6 building intended for municipal use is really  
7 inappropriate in a park as well as in a lake front  
8 residential area. In addition, very few Novi citizens  
9 are aware of this project, and most of those who are  
10 object to it.

11 I object to the variances for setbacks,  
12 landscaping, allowed parking, wetland setback and tree  
13 placement. The City Council promised repeatedly that  
14 they would respect all ordinances and the neighbors.  
15 Our ordinances were put in place to protect us from  
16 inappropriate development and to maintain adequate  
17 buffers between buildings. The park is 380 acres,  
18 therefore there is no justification for any variance.  
19 How can we expect to enforce these variances on  
20 developers in the city if we do not follow them  
21 ourselves. Allowing these variances sets a dangerous  
22 precedent and is disrespectful to the neighbors. If  
23 the building were relocated to another property or was  
24 4800 square feet as shown in the conceptual plan  
25 presented by the city prior to the August 2016 ballot,

1 these variances would not be needed.

2 I object to the addition of any  
3 unnecessary traffic on residential South Lake Drive.  
4 South Lake Drive is a unique and very dangerous  
5 situation. You have a road bisecting residents' lake  
6 front front yards, many residential driveways, and a  
7 path with bikes and pedestrian traffic including small  
8 children and animals, all of this on an already  
9 severely overloaded residential road. The goal should  
10 be to decrease the traffic on the road, not increase  
11 it by any amount. I also question -- object to the  
12 traffic study. The numbers in the study do not make  
13 sense. If there are 318 trips per average day and you  
14 divide by 24 hours, you get 13.2 trips per average  
15 hour. How can the maximum peak traffic hour add only  
16 13 additional vehicles per hour? Even with the  
17 conservative assumption that traffic is evenly spread  
18 out over 24 hours, these numbers simply do not add up.

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

1 natural park.

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

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

12 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.  
13 Anyone else? Any other audience participation?  
14 Please step forward.

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

19 I'm writing to say that I object to  
20 the request to develop this property, and because I'm  
21 concerned about the burden that might be placed on the  
22 public at large and the nearby homeowners in Taft  
23 Knolls I and II, in particular with respect to  
24 construction traffic, safety to the children playing  
25 in the subdivisions, home security due to construction

1 contractors entering our subdivision, and tree removal  
2 and timely completion. I mainly want to talk about  
3 the first three points here.

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

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

23 And the primary reason for our  
24 concern regarding the usage of our streets to access  
25 the development is that they put the children of our

1 subdivision, of our neighborhood at risk  
2 unnecessarily. The additional traffic of nonresidents  
3 will increase the likelihood of accidents of which we  
4 cannot accept.

5 The construction vehicles and high  
6 volume of unknown contractors entering the  
7 two-completed communities, that's Taft Knolls I and II  
8 also puts our properties at risk. In the first four  
9 months of 2017, there have been already nine daytime  
10 home break-ins occur within the City of Novi.

11 Allowing construction vehicles to enter our  
12 neighborhoods would give the potential burglars the  
13 opportunity to pretend to be a contractor, and then  
14 break into a house when he observes homeowner  
15 schedules and knows when the homeowners are not at  
16 home. We are not open to the possibility of such  
17 risks.

18 In the past when the subdivision  
19 was in the process of being finished for Taft Knolls  
20 II, that is our subdivision when it was being  
21 developed, we had already experienced increased  
22 traffic to our existing homes by both contractors  
23 using our -- using our water and electricity without  
24 asking, and the potential buyers walking through our  
25 yards as if we are model homes. This type of activity

1 in addition to the recent home break-ins puts us at an  
2 unnecessary risk.

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

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

21 Our families deserve to be left in  
22 peace with our neighborhood that has finally been  
23 completed. It is quite possible for the builder to  
24 continue his work, but not in a fashion that connects  
25 our homes to his new development. The request to

1 utilize our subdivision for construction traffic and  
2 to align the new development to our subdivision is an  
3 unnecessary burden and risk that we strongly object  
4 to.

5 Thank you.

6 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

7 Is there anyone else?

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

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

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

1           that.

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

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

21                              Given that when I'm in my kitchen,  
22 in my bedroom, on my deck, if I look west, I'm going  
23 to be looking at this building. You know, I  
24 originally built the house, it was next to a beautiful  
25 park. I think we all could agree that that's a very

1 desirable thing to have. We're looking at a 9400  
2 square foot building replacing the park next to my  
3 house. If we can use a combination of solid fencing  
4 similar to what is there right now for the volleyball  
5 court with some new plantings, that can help alleviate  
6 sitting on the deck or sitting in the kitchen and  
7 watching people pulling in and out with their cars.

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

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

24 So if you do proceed with the  
25 proposed building, that once again if I could push a

1 button and make it go away I would, but if you do  
2 proceed with that, I'd like you to take these into  
3 consideration with the final plans.

4 Thank you.

5 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you,  
6 sir.

7 Anyone else?

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

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

21 Thank you.

22 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

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

25 MR. DUNESKE: Good evening. My

1 name is John Duneske. I live at 357 South Lake Drive.  
2 I would like to address the issues concerning the Lake  
3 Shore Park new building.

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

19 January 2017 City Council, I just  
20 watched the video again today, Mayor Gatt and Council  
21 members were looking at concerns that this building  
22 was not going to be big enough for weddings and big  
23 events, and that's in contrast to what the city  
24 charter is in Section 15.12 saying they can't use it  
25 for banquet facilities, parties, weddings, big events

1 like that. So it's in contrast to what it's supposed  
2 to be used for. The mayor was concerned about --  
3 not so much concerned where it was located, being at  
4 the front where the lake is at, his concern was  
5 bigger, he wanted it bigger. He was concerned about a  
6 building that was going to be built, 50 years from  
7 now, 100 years from now is it going to big enough for  
8 what the needs for a bigger rental like that.

9 The conceptual plan now is -- that  
10 you are looking at right now in August here that I  
11 just had a chance to look at just over the weekend  
12 here briefly, I was looking now that you're moving one  
13 of the shelters, and again I live close to the park  
14 where there is vegetation, I look at where the trees  
15 -- well 42 percent of the trees or 46 percent of the  
16 trees are being moved and relocated to other parts of  
17 the park like this. Right now there is a natural  
18 barrier along the fence line on the east property line  
19 between the homes, and you're going to be moving one  
20 of the shelters, and it's going to be moving it closer  
21 to the retention basin where now it's going to be more  
22 going right into -- the parking lot is going to be  
23 going right into our homes and looking into our  
24 bedrooms, kitchens and dining rooms and so forth like  
25 that. So the relocation of the parking lot so close

1 to the property line where our house is at is a very  
2 big concern and I would like that to be addressed  
3 also.

4 I understand that the building was  
5 asked to be for polling. It's -- you don't need a  
6 building that is 84 -- well, almost 10,000 square feet  
7 to do polling for Precincts 11 and 12 when you're only  
8 getting at general and primary elections about  
9 600 people a day for both precincts. I mean, that's  
10 like 46 people an hour. So the necessity to have a  
11 large facility for polling, it's not necessary to have  
12 10,000 square feet, nor is that big -- a need of a big  
13 building like this for the library. I was speaking to  
14 the director at the library, you need about 100 square  
15 feet. You've got a library kiosk and a vending  
16 machine drop box, it takes less than 100 square feet  
17 to put in a library. So again, the size of the  
18 building -- the needs don't justify the needs or the  
19 size of the building at all.

20 Day camp, I have been involved in  
21 the city for 40 years with scouts working with at  
22 church doing day camps. I've done day camps at Proud  
23 Lake and all the parks around town here, and when you  
24 do a day camp out there, you don't need an indoor  
25 facility. Whether you're at Proud Lake or whatever

1 park you're at, Maybury, whatever it is, shelters work  
2 fine. If necessary when kids -- when children come  
3 out, and my children did it 30 years ago, too, come  
4 out to day camp, if there's going to be inclement  
5 weather, you bring a raincoat for that day, otherwise  
6 you're outside. And if it was windy or sunny -- windy  
7 out that day, you have a drop cloth or a canvas that  
8 you roll up and roll down to help protect from the sun  
9 on the shelters like that.

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

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

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

19 So we're asking the Planning  
20 Commission please go back and review what the  
21 community needs are instead of what some people want.  
22 Needs or wants. Lake Shore Park is not meant to be a  
23 community civic center building out there. Please do  
24 not approve the variances requested for the Preliminary  
25 Land Site and just go back and review what that is

1           there and possibly either move it back into the  
2           property where it's not going to be affecting the  
3           residents.

4                           Thank you.

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

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

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

23                          So here we are in August 2017, and  
24          I'm looking in the packet, and the building size has  
25          mushroomed from 4,800 square feet back in July 2016 to

1 9,400 square feet. It has nearly doubled in size.  
2 Consider the cost to the taxpayers. Consider the cost  
3 of building maintenance that will go on year after  
4 year.

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

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

1 traffic only by a painted line.

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

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

24 Furthermore, this building project  
25 is not very well-known and there is no sign in the

1 park about it, which is depressing citizen input. Few  
2 people would be inclined to look on the city website  
3 to discover, oh, there is a building going in.

4 And as far as like non-building  
5 issues --

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

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

15 Thank you.

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

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

1 knows what is included in this project.

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

6 You know, I agree with all my  
7 neighbors, this building is probably twice as big as  
8 it should be. And I thinking on the way over, imagine  
9 this for just a second. If you went to Village Oaks  
10 Lake, the city has some property, and if you drop a  
11 10,000 foot building inside of that subdivision, the  
12 residents would go nuts, you know.

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

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

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Thank you.

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

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

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

I worked on that -- I worked at PEA for approximately seven months. I think I billed 160 hours to the project. So Not only again am I a

1 resident, but this is partially my design. I did the  
2 drafting. The blueprints that you see, the  
3 preliminary design was done by me. I have 18 years of  
4 drafting and design. I originally started doing power  
5 plants. PEA subcontracted me out. I started doing  
6 parking lot design. I said, hell, if I can design a  
7 power plant, I can sure as hell design a park.

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

15 Mr. Thomopoulos, you were correct,  
16 this man here has the biggest concern. His line of  
17 site is going to be so impacted by that current  
18 30 foot, 34 foot setback. That's what I still don't  
19 understand even though that I did the design.  
20 According to code it's a 75 foot setback. It's  
21 30 feet, maybe a little more. That's ten yards.  
22 That's a first down. He has an amazing home,  
23 absolutely beautiful.

24 I agree that the building is a bit  
25 large. I haven't looked at the blueprints for this

1 building. I've been focused only on site design and  
2 parking lot layout and drainage and grading.

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

7 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: No, it's  
8 okay.

9 MR. BELL: Okay. Well, the City  
10 of Auburn Hills, the City of Bloomfield Hills, one of  
11 their standard parking designs is called double  
12 striped parking. That's basically where you have 10  
13 feet center to center, and within that 10 feet is a  
14 two-foot row, two foot of four-inch parking stripe,  
15 and that essentially allows an extra buffer. So  
16 parking spaces are tight. People go to this park in  
17 big trucks, minivans, SUVs, and they have kids and  
18 they're bringing toys, beach balls, lawn chairs,  
19 bicycles. Think of how many door dings you're going  
20 to have. Think of how many car incidents you may  
21 have. If you increase that 9 foot spacing, which is  
22 City of Novi ordinance, to a 10 foot center to center,  
23 you reduce the parking spaces by approximately  
24 10 percent. So instead of 129 you might have 113.

25 Again, I'm in a tough spot. I've

1 kept quiet during many City Council meetings because I  
2 had a conflict of interest. I no longer work for PEA,  
3 but nonetheless I'm still a resident and I value the  
4 concerns of my neighbors and my friends. So this guy  
5 here in my opinion has the biggest voice amongst all  
6 of us. Respect his lot, respect his view, respect his  
7 neighborhood.

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

19 A lot of hard work has been put  
20 into this. I know there have been a lot of voices and  
21 concerns, and there has been a lot of good thought by  
22 very high-skilled professionals. So it all goes back  
23 to my big concern is a 34 foot setback from the front  
24 versus 75 foot which is by code, and the pure scale of  
25 the building. I agree that it could probably be split

1 into two buildings. We did look at putting the  
2 building in the soccer field area. It wasn't very  
3 accessible, but nonetheless it could be done.

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

12 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Can you  
13 summarize, sir, please.

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

16 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Anyone else?

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

20 Correspondence?

21 MR. LYNCH: Okay. First -- most of  
22 them have to do with Taft Knolls III, and to save  
23 time, I think Ms. Tao basically read her letter here.  
24 I also noticed that there is another very similar  
25 letter from Ms. Amy Wang that will be put into the

1 public record, but I don't think I can do it justice.

2 I think that Mr. Tao explained the concerns.

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

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

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

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

24 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you,  
25 sir.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Committee reports?

City Planner report, Ms. McBeth.

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

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

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

MR. GIACOPETTI: I'll make a motion to approve the consent agenda.

MR. LYNCH: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: There's a motion by Giacometti, second by Member Lynch.

Any other comments?

Sri, can you call the roll, please.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?  
MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.  
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacobetti?  
MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.  
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?  
MR. GRECO: Yes.  
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?  
MR. LYNCH: Yes.  
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?  
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.  
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Zuchlewski?  
MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.  
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes 6 to

0.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.  
Next is Matters for Consideration.

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

1 lane to connect to mountain biking trails.

2 Good evening. How are you,  
3 Kirsten?

4 MS. MELLEEM: Good. How are you?

5 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Good.

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

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

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

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

23 MS. MELLEEM: The site contains  
24 woodlands and wetlands, but not in the areas of the  
25 proposed development.

1                   The proposed project is focused on  
2                   South Lake Shore Drive. Three structures are  
3                   proposed:

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

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

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

13                  Site amenities include an  
14                  amphitheater and covered porch adjacent to the  
15                  community building, 129 parking spaces including  
16                  7 barrier free, 46 bike parking spaces, several new  
17                  playgrounds and active recreation spaces, rain  
18                  gardens, and a bike path.

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

22                         1, a landscape waiver for lack of  
23                         berm along South Lake Shore Drive.

24                         2, a landscape waiver for lack of  
25                         street trees along South Lake Shore Drive.

1                                   3, a landscaped waiver for  
2                                   relocation of foundation plantings away from the  
3                                   foundation.

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

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

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

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

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

25                                  The site plan was reviewed as a

1 combined Preliminary and Final Site Plan. The  
2 majority of viewers have recommended the Preliminary  
3 site plan, but have not recommended the Final Site  
4 Plan. Therefore, once the Planning Commission makes  
5 their decision, the applicant will be submitting a  
6 Revised Final Site Plan to address the comments in the  
7 review letters.

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

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

24 The Landscape review noted the  
25 three waivers that are needed. In addition, the

1 Landscape Architect is requesting additional landscape  
2 screening along the east side of the building between  
3 the proposed building and the residents on the east.  
4 The applicant has responded in the response letter  
5 that two of the items the Landscape Architect noted as  
6 potential waivers will no longer be needed as they  
7 will meet those standards.

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

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

22 The Fire review is the only  
23 reviewer that is not recommending the Preliminary Site  
24 Plan due to deficiencies that are required to be on  
25 the site plan. The applicant has stated in their

1 response that the three items will be addressed on the  
2 next site plan submittal.

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

8 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

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

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

19 Can I get the colored site plan up  
20 there?

21 MS. MELLEEM: It should be on your  
22 desktop.

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

25 MS. MELLEEM: You can switch the

1 computers.

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

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

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

20 The thing that was really a concern  
21 to us is the amount of green space on the property and  
22 how we can make a cohesive site plan and take  
23 advantage of any natural features that we have on the  
24 site and maybe organize the site a little better than  
25 what we had before.

1                   The existing site plan, you know,  
2                   we had dirt access road that kind of bisected the site  
3                   and separated the green spaces on the site, and one of  
4                   the major decisions that were made was to relocate the  
5                   access road to the west side of the site and  
6                   reconfigure the east green space to allow more  
7                   continuous green space for the residents. You know,  
8                   we're adding a new pavilion and we're adding a small  
9                   maintenance garage in addition to the existing  
10                  restrooms on the south side of the site. One of the  
11                  reasons we put the maintenance garage down there was  
12                  also to minimize noise and disruption on the north end  
13                  of the site. And so in order to maximize that green  
14                  space, we decided that locating the building on the  
15                  north side of the site would be really important to  
16                  maximize that green space, maximize the green park  
17                  experience.

18                  The other thing that we were  
19                  dealing with is stormwater management. The park  
20                  really had no stormwater management. So, you know, we  
21                  want to follow current ordinances, we want to do  
22                  responsible, sustainable design. We added two  
23                  detention ponds on the site. All the water is going  
24                  to be going through those detention basins and  
25                  filtered and exit into Shaw Lake. So that was a real

1 important goal for us to maintain and update the park  
2 accordingly to today's sustainable and responsible  
3 design standards. And the City of Novi has some very  
4 good, current, modern standards that apply, and we  
5 really tried really hard to achieve all of those  
6 standards.

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

17 So, you know, our goal was to  
18 provide a new park and to bring modern conveniences  
19 and modern technology and modern solutions and  
20 sustainable solutions to the park. It's a  
21 comprehensive plan. There is a lot of nuances in the  
22 plan. We located the building to the north on the  
23 north end. The building itself is 9,400 square feet.  
24 There's 8,400 in that program area. We can discuss  
25 the interworkings of the plan if you'd like to.

1                   The inspiration behind the design  
2                   of the building was for a park setting, and our  
3                   inspiration was related more to national park  
4                   solutions, state park solutions, you know, how can we  
5                   identify the building as a park-like building and not  
6                   a municipal building. That was not our intent. We  
7                   don't see it as a municipal building, we see it as a  
8                   park/camp building.

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

17                  One of the biggest design  
18                  challenges we had is working with the existing road  
19                  into the park and the pedestrian bridge or pedestrian  
20                  tunnel underneath the road, and maintaining grades.  
21                  And we're servicing the lake users with a restroom  
22                  that is inside the building. One of the other goals  
23                  that we had is to make that as convenient as possible  
24                  for the lake users. So there is two sets of restrooms  
25                  in this building, they're each about 500 square feet.

1 It's 1,000 square feet just for restrooms, and the  
2 square foot adds up quickly in buildings. So there is  
3 an outside access directly into these restrooms, you  
4 do not have to go through the building to utilize  
5 these restrooms. There is a graded walkway without  
6 any steps or any railings. It was designed to  
7 accommodate, you know, everybody, handicap accessible.  
8 Again, it's there for the lake users.

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

24 That side yard setback, we're still  
25 working on it. We're trying really hard. We want to

1 accommodate our neighbor to the east. We think we're  
2 going to make that work, and that's something that we  
3 can discuss in detail. You know, we're really close  
4 to a permanent solution that will not allow that  
5 variance, so we're happy about that. We have a little  
6 more flexibility east and west than we do north and  
7 south.

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

12 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

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

16 MR. GIACOPETTI: I'll start. I  
17 have a lot of concerns about this project. Some of  
18 them were expressed by the community members, some of  
19 them are -- they're not -- we're not in the business  
20 of reviewing programmatic needs, and we understand  
21 that and it's helpful to understand how the project  
22 was to come together, but my concern is that we're  
23 trying to squeeze I guess a square peg into a round  
24 hole here where we're trying to build a facility in a  
25 space that can't accommodate it with -- under our

1 current ordinances without some variances. That is my  
2 primary concern really. And we probably could -- with  
3 a greater budget we probably could accommodate this  
4 project and accommodate all the other concerns as to  
5 why you placed it there. And I think -- you know, I  
6 respectfully disagree with our facade consultant.  
7 Again, it seems like budget was driving the facade and  
8 the design of the building as opposed to holding  
9 ourselves up to the same standard that we hold  
10 developers to. And we've had this discussion before  
11 about the pavilion restrooms. So I'm -- did you look  
12 at other sites for the building, or was it just cost  
13 prohibitive to accomplish that?

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

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

25 MR. MUCK: Actually we did, and I

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

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

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

22 MR. MUCK: Well, we originally were  
23 planning a two-story building. As it's referenced,  
24 our capital needs assessment in 2014 indicated that,  
25 and we had a conceptual plan that we would place that

1 in the existing driveway. As we moved through the  
2 process and even went to City Council and talked about  
3 a two-story building, there was debate about whether  
4 one or two stories was appropriate. And as we got  
5 feedback from council and park commission and  
6 residents, it didn't appear that there was that type  
7 of desire for a two-story. So now we went down to a  
8 one story.

9 I could address the issue about a  
10 4,800 square foot original building. That was before  
11 the election in November when we had some voting  
12 issues at our precincts, and that's what really  
13 necessitated some of that increase in size.

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

21 MR. GIACOPETTI: That's very  
22 helpful. And I just want to say I appreciate the  
23 city's efforts to frugally use our tax dollars, but on  
24 the other hand, it's not my role here today at the  
25 table, which is to review these with the same

1 standards that we hold commercial developers to. So  
2 like I said, I'm struggling with it, but I'm looking  
3 forward to feedback of the other members of the  
4 commission.

5 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you,  
6 Member Giacometti.

7 Member Greco.

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

15 MR. RAY: Correct.

16 MR. GRECO: What is it going to be?

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

24 MR. GRECO: What about the plans  
25 for the trees? Looking at some of the -- I mean, the

1 photographs that we see aren't often the best because  
2 they're taken from the side, and I've been out there,  
3 but there is a tree line, right, between his property?

4 MR. RAY: Yes.

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

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

11 MR. GRECO: Right.

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

23 MR. GRECO: Okay.

24 MR. RAY: And by moving the  
25 building a little more, you know, we're trying to be

1 as sensitive as we can, and we're working as hard as  
2 we can, and we're pretty sure we'll be able to  
3 accommodate that.

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

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

20 MR. GRECO: Make a representation.

21 MR. RAY: I do know -- I can say  
22 this from just past experience is that they will not  
23 build a line 5 feet from his house. So there are --  
24 he's right, there are setback and easement  
25 requirements. We just can't be that close to a

1 structure. So when they do that planning, they  
2 themselves will probably automatically move that line  
3 over. But we won't know until we work with their  
4 service planners, and that takes a specific process  
5 and a specific amount of time. So we're working  
6 through that process. It's their process, it's not  
7 our process. We have to work with them.

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

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

17 MR. MUCK: Well, so the original  
18 4,800 square feet, we didn't do any type of interior  
19 planning for that. So as we move through this, I  
20 think one of the things we mentioned is we now added  
21 interior and exterior bathrooms to this. You don't  
22 want to mix your beach goers with your activities  
23 within the building both from a maintenance  
24 standpoint, and then just from a functionality  
25 standpoint. So we added two sets of bathrooms,

1 indoors and out, so that did increase the size of that  
2 as well. We did add room for the library as well. So  
3 there were multiple things other than just voting and  
4 the camp space that added to increasing the size.

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

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

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

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

21 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.  
22 Member Avdoulos.

23 MR. AVDOULOS: Thank you. I first  
24 saw the plan at a Walkable Novi committee meeting, and  
25 I thought the layout was done very nicely. I think

1 the positioning of the building looking at it  
2 initially I had no issues with I think where it's  
3 positioned and then having sidewalks leading to the  
4 existing sidewalks so that beach goers can get to it  
5 relatively easily. The way the parking lot is laid  
6 out is my nicely done, too, because you do have some  
7 handicap access and then you have a walk that cuts  
8 through it.

9 Then as we start looking at  
10 concerns of those who are around this, especially the  
11 neighbor to the east, and I'm looking at a site plan  
12 here where I see a 75 foot setback, and it looks like  
13 the building is encroaching into that setback by about  
14 10 feet or so. And it was indicated that if we can  
15 look at maybe reducing the size of that amphitheater  
16 and pushing that building further west to give a  
17 little bit more buffer, I think that would be  
18 appreciated.

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

25 MR. RAY: I believe in planning's

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

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

20 MR. AVDOULOS: And the reason I ask  
21 is because if we can move the building to the west,  
22 then I'd also like to see if we can move the parking a  
23 bit, almost for the parking, edge of parking to align  
24 with the edge of the building so that the parking is  
25 not sort of overhanging into the setback, and then

1 light pollution going into the neighbor's lot.

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

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

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

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

25 MR. RAY: That's gross outside,

1 gross outside walls.

2 MR. AVDOULOS: So where the columns  
3 are and the overhang?

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

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

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

14 MR. AVDOULOS: Okay. In all  
15 honesty I have no issue with the look of the building.  
16 I think it parallels the design of looking at, you  
17 know, more park buildings, national park buildings.  
18 So that wasn't as big of a concern. And I can't  
19 remember if I did see this before or not. But I think  
20 taking into consideration those that are around there  
21 and then trying to understand the program and seeing  
22 if there is anything that could be, you know, reduced  
23 out of that project to sort of help with the size of  
24 the building and make sure that it's right sized. I  
25 mean, I'm looking at it to see if there was an

1 opportunity to rotate it 90 degrees so that you can,  
2 you know, maybe maximize some of that setback. But  
3 then again I think it looks better in this  
4 orientation. I don't mind it being up close to the --  
5 so I don't mind the front setback as much as the side  
6 setback. I think being respectful of the neighbors  
7 are the most important issues.

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

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

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

25 MR. RAY: When we get the options

1 from DTE, we'll present it to the city and maybe the  
2 building moving over more will give an opportunity.  
3 We do not want to bury a line in that tree line. So  
4 that was the other concern, not to effect that tree  
5 line in any way. It's hard to control DTE once you  
6 start them.

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

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

1           trying to make the best decision, you know, for  
2           everybody all the way around.

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

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

16                      MR. RAY: The other comment related  
17          to the past, what was shared and transparency.  
18          Because we did the concept design for the vote last  
19          year, and that concept design was a two-story 10,000  
20          square foot building, it was not 4,800 square feet.  
21          That was the original needs assessment the year or two  
22          before. And I want to just add that time line and  
23          correct that time line in terms of what was presented  
24          to the voters with the bond vote, okay. Because the  
25          4,800 was the needs assessment, but when they came to

1 us and asked us to do a concept design to see what  
2 could fit on the site and work with this bond program,  
3 we designed -- we did a quick little study based on  
4 the current needs that the rec department had and  
5 ended up with a two-story building that was about  
6 4,800 square feet each floor. So I want to make sure  
7 we're clear on how that all came to fruition with the  
8 city.

9 MR. AVDOULOS: Thank you.

10 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you,  
11 Member Avdoulos.

12 Member Zuchlewski.

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

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

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

1 MR. RAY: Right.

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

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

17 MR. RAY: There's code  
18 considerations, building code considerations here, but  
19 also you have to consider the usage of the building.  
20 This building services the youngest to the oldest.  
21 It's not a commercial office building where we can  
22 make an argument that a family restroom wouldn't be  
23 logical. We make design decisions based on usage, not  
24 minimum code or not to save square footage. So family  
25 restrooms in this type of facility as a camp building

1 is absolutely the right thing to do. There is a lot  
2 of families that are going to be using this facility,  
3 parents picking up children, and, you know, our vision  
4 throughout the park, the analogy we always use was  
5 that parent with a stroller with a newborn picking up  
6 a five-year-old, you know, how do they accommodate the  
7 families going through that process, and that was  
8 really the logic behind that.

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

12 MR. RAY: No.

13 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: They're coming  
14 out?

15 MR. RAY: They're coming down.

16 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Okay. Thank you.

17 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Member Lynch.

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

1 won't be fair. And you think that you can do the  
2 setback?

3 MR. RAY: We're pretty sure.

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

8 MR. RAY: We would welcome that  
9 condition.

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

18 MR. RAY: Right.

19 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.  
20 Member or if I might just for two seconds.

21 Ms. McBeth or Mr. Muck, walk  
22 through for me what the city did relative to community  
23 awareness of the overall project going forward from  
24 maybe this time and going backwards? Where did we  
25 start and how did we get to this?

1 MR. MUCK: I can start at the very  
2 start. Before we had the CIP vote, there was a CIP  
3 informational meeting held at Lake Shore Park to  
4 discuss this project with the entire CIP. I can tell  
5 you that one resident attended that. That moved then  
6 into the --

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

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

12 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Okay.

13 MR. MUCK: We move then into July  
14 2016. We did have a Parks Commission meeting where  
15 our finance director did a presentation on the CIP.  
16 This was a top focus of discussion at that.

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

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

25 The next meeting after that Council

1 did actually get more citizen input. We had quite a  
2 few residents put their comments on record.

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

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

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

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

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

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

24 MS. MCBETH: That's an excellent  
25 summary.

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

19                   The other item that I would like to  
20 address is the traffic on South Lake. So coming from  
21 the east to the west you're coming uphill over a  
22 curve. And I read the traffic study. I will say that  
23 I agree with the study, but I've also seen every study  
24 that has come in front of us. There seems to be a  
25 lack between what is written in paper and what you

1 often see at an intersection when you're trying to get  
2 from Point A to Point B at rush hour. And knowing  
3 that traffic is the number one concern, I think just  
4 about every topic that we talk about in the city,  
5 programmatically when you're having mom and dad drop  
6 off Billy and Sue and whoever and trying to get back  
7 in and out of the building back onto South Lake, is  
8 there the potential for egress further west to  
9 alleviate some of the traffic?

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

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

23 If I could make one comment,  
24 though, on the traffic flow. When we're looking at  
25 programming that building and you're talking about the

1 main heavy uses are during the summer 7:00 a.m. to  
2 6:00 p.m., that is just -- that is not 7:00 a.m. 100  
3 cars coming in. It is flow of traffic, ones and twos  
4 in and out throughout the day. You're not going to  
5 see a heavy, steady flow of 50 cars trying to get in  
6 that building at any one time, so that helps.

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

20 MR. MUCK: Absolutely. When we  
21 look at recreation programming, we're not programming  
22 in peak traffic times. People don't want to come to a  
23 yoga class, they don't want to come to a senior  
24 program at 5:00 p.m. Our programs are going to be  
25 6:00, 7:00, not 7:00 a.m., 8:00 a.m. We try to

1 program outside of that, because working parents can't  
2 hit those heavy -- they're stuck in traffic.

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

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

1 comment, Mr. Ray?

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

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

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

13 Member Greco.

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

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MR. AVDOULOS: Second.

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

Any other comments?

Kirsten, can you call the roll, please.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Giacobetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: No.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: The motion passes 5 to 1.

MR. GRECO: I would like to make another motion in the matter of Lake Shore Park Building JSP17-43. Motion to approve the Stormwater Management Plan based on and subject to the findings of compliance with the Ordinance standards in the

1 staff and consultant review letters, and the  
2 conditions and items listed in those letters being  
3 addressed on the Electronic Stamping Set; and because  
4 it is otherwise in compliance with Chapter 11 of the  
5 Code of Ordinances and all other applicable provisions  
6 of the Ordinance.

7 MR. AVDOULOS: Second.

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

10 Any other comments?

11 Kirsten, please.

12 MS. MELLEEM: Member Lynch?

13 MR. LYNCH: Yes.

14 MS. MELLEEM: Chair Pehrson?

15 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

16 MS. MELLEEM: Member Zuchlewski?

17 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

18 MS. MELLEEM: Member Giacopetti?

19 MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

20 MS. MELLEEM: Member Avdoulos?

21 MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

22 MS. MELLEEM: Member Greco?

23 MR. GRECO: Yes.

24 MS. MELLEEM: Motion passes 6 to 0.

25 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you,

1 gentlemen.

2 Next item on the Agenda is Emerson  
3 Park JSP17-10, and it's a Zoning Map Amendment 18.717.  
4 It's a consideration at the request of Pulte Homes of  
5 Michigan, L.L.C. for Planning Commission's  
6 recommendation to City Council for a Planned Rezoning  
7 Overlay Concept Plan associated with a zoning map  
8 amendment from OS-1 (Office Service) to RM-2 (High  
9 Density Multi-Family Residential). The subject  
10 property is approximately 24 acres and is located on  
11 the west side of Novi Road and north of Ten Mile in  
12 Section 22. The applicant is proposing development of  
13 120 multi-family attached condominiums with frontage  
14 and access to Novi Road.

15 Sri, good evening.

16 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Good evening.

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

24 MR. LYNCH: Sri, can we hold on  
25 just for a second just so -- I can't hear that.

1 MS. KOMARAGIRI: No problem. I can  
2 wait if you want to take a small break or stretch.

3 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: No, that's  
4 okay.

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

23 The applicant is proposing a 120  
24 3-bedroom multi-family unit for sale residential  
25 development with frontage and access to Novi Road.

1 The PRO Concept shows two detention ponds on either  
2 side of the proposed entrance boulevard. The  
3 applicant is proposing private drives, public water  
4 and sewer, and emergency access off of Novi Road.  
5 Pocket parks and pedestrian walks spread throughout  
6 the development for active and passive recreation.  
7 This is not a gated community. The applicant is  
8 proposing to complete the construction in two phases.

9 The plan was presented to Master  
10 Planning and Zoning Committee on March 28 of 2017.  
11 Planning Commission held a public hearing on May 10th  
12 of 2017. The applicant has been working with staff  
13 since then to modify the plan to address staff's  
14 concerns. The revisions did not result in significant  
15 reduction in density. It was reduced from 6.6  
16 dwelling units per acre to 6.2 by eliminating about  
17 nine units. However, the applicant has agreed to  
18 include the proposed maximum density, maximum building  
19 height, and the total number of units as conditions of  
20 the PRO agreement. Changes include providing  
21 additional screening from residents to the west and  
22 post office to the north, changes to the alignment of  
23 the private drive, addition of common parking spaces,  
24 and increasing the distance between driveways near the  
25 buildings.

1                   In the past staff has expressed  
2 concerns about the density and the compatibility of  
3 the proposed development with the surrounding planned  
4 and development uses. Some of the concerns still  
5 remain, but staff notes that the applicant has made  
6 significant progress, made some changes to the layout  
7 which have alleviated most of those concerns.

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

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

19                   The proposed concept plan would  
20 require other multiple deviations from planning,  
21 engineering and landscape requirements which are  
22 listed in the motion sheet which are supported by the  
23 staff. The list of deviations did not change since  
24 the Planning Commission last reviewed the plans on May  
25 10 except for a few minor modifications. All reviews

1 are currently recommending approval of concept with  
2 additional comments to be addressed at the time of  
3 Preliminary Site Plan review.

4 One item of concern, as part of the  
5 public benefits, the applicant has proposed to donate  
6 \$90,000 for pedestrian enhancements along Novi Road to  
7 encourage pedestrian connectivity from the development  
8 to Main Street and the Novi Town Center. The provided  
9 conceptual plan illustrating potential improvements  
10 along Novi Road along with an estimate. The applicant  
11 has contacted Scott Sinikowski, a Permit Engineer from  
12 RCOC for preliminary input and have received favorable  
13 response. Staff has expressed concerns about soft  
14 costs for design and permitting and maintenance costs  
15 after construction. In the response letter, the  
16 applicant agreed to donate an additional \$14,000  
17 towards design and permitting and to include the  
18 appropriate funding towards future maintenance in the  
19 HOA master deed. Staff still anticipates that there  
20 may be some resistance to the improvements once  
21 details such as corner clearance, existing topography  
22 offset from the road are proposed from RCOC. In the  
23 event that the proposed improvements are not approved  
24 by RCOC or any other unforeseen circumstances, the  
25 applicant has indicated that the city may redirect the

1 funds for another appropriate public infrastructure  
2 improvement project in the project vicinity. The City  
3 may wish to consider other alternative benefits to the  
4 public land, such as the historic city cemetery north  
5 of the subject site or other public land in the area.

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

12 Thank you.

13 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you,  
14 Sri.

15 Does the applicant wish to address  
16 the Commission?

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

22 Again, we are proposing a 120 town  
23 homes off Novi Road as she indicated. The plan is  
24 sitting there. We were in front of you about three  
25 months ago, and we've gone through quite a bit of

1 changes working with your staff getting to the  
2 position where we have a full recommendation for  
3 approval from your staff.

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

14 Just briefly to recap, since we  
15 were before the commission in May, we've reduced the  
16 unit count from 125 to 120 town homes. We've added  
17 about 40 additional four season plantings along that  
18 western buffer that will give a better screening year  
19 round for that buffer area. And we've shared -- we've  
20 been to the site, shared those plans with the adjacent  
21 community. We've added a wood fence. We've added  
22 benches to the playscape and really expanded that area  
23 adjacent to the pond. So we think we've got a really,  
24 really nice play area and vista off to our wetland  
25 complex to the south.

1                   We've added more parking throughout  
2                   since there seems to be a shortage through this type  
3                   of use in the community, and we've made driveway  
4                   improvements, modified the emergency access way into  
5                   the site, secondary access, working with your fire  
6                   chief, and we've modified the road geometry quite bit,  
7                   that north east-west line to improve the vista and  
8                   drive through there. We've also offered to upgrade  
9                   our garage doors. We're proposing to have windows  
10                  throughout our garage doors and will really improve  
11                  that internal circulation and view throughout the  
12                  community. Again we're proposing a PRO RM-2 underlay.

13                   As far as the Novi Road  
14                  enhancements, we've talked to the county about what  
15                  could be acceptable. You saw a sample of the plan we  
16                  could propose and do out there. As long as there is  
17                  improvements on the Novi Road which is identified in  
18                  your Master Plan, something we're interested in the  
19                  project, again we're proposing to make a \$104,000  
20                  contribution, that's a \$90,000 contribution, and to  
21                  cover the design costs, an additional 15 percent, so a  
22                  \$104,000 contribution to the Novi Road enhancements.  
23                  And again, we did a design and budget to show what you  
24                  could illustrate. Everyone wanted to kind of see what  
25                  would we get for that money, and it really illustrated

1 that. We've talked to the Road Commission. It seemed  
2 to be something acceptable.

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

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

21 When we were in front of you in  
22 May, we thought we had a pretty favorable feedback  
23 from you. We had the building separation, and one of  
24 the big things we negotiated with the city was finding  
25 the balance of what that corridor through the town

1 home development is, how much green space in front  
2 between sidewalks and the road or between -- behind  
3 the buildings, and that really impacted us, but that's  
4 what we brought to you in May, 125 units and kind of  
5 defined what that road corridor was going to be.

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

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

14 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you,  
15 appreciate that.

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

19 Member Lynch.

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

1 MR. ANDERSON: Since May?

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

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

13 MR. LYNCH: Yes, I like that.

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

18 MR. LYNCH: No, I understand, I  
19 understand. And hopefully you took that as  
20 constructive feedback, but right now we've got a bunch  
21 of RVs parked out there, and this is certainly more  
22 attractive than that. And at the same point, we want  
23 to make sure that what we do here, we're not going to  
24 do anything that we wouldn't do anywhere else in the  
25 city. I think it's an appropriate use for that land.

1 The traffic I think really is governed by that light  
2 that's in front of the post office. There is a light  
3 right there in front of the post office on Novi Road.  
4 So the ingress and egress into that subdivision  
5 shouldn't be --

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

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

16 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.  
17 Anyone else?

18 Member Greco.

19 MR. GRECO: Yes, thank you, through  
20 the chair. With such experienced applicants,  
21 including Pulte Homes, which does a great conceptual,  
22 great product, great plans, everything does look  
23 great. My only problem is is that I don't think a  
24 condo complex belongs there on Novi Road. I don't  
25 think -- I appreciate the enhancements, I appreciate

1 all the work that has been done. When I saw this in  
2 May I believe for me it may have been about the first  
3 time that I saw it, I believe I expressed I didn't  
4 think that it fit there. It is close to the Panera  
5 Bread and the downtown area. I don't think it's a  
6 walkable type of situation. I mean, yes, there are  
7 sidewalks on Novi Road and you can walk out the  
8 entrance and walk north on Novi Road, but it's not a  
9 downtown type area, you've got to cross that bridge  
10 over the train tracks.

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

17 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

18 Anyone else?

19 Member Giacometti.

20 MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes. I just want  
21 to say that I think this -- I'm going to support -- I  
22 initially felt that way. I think this project has  
23 come a long way, and I appreciate your hard work for  
24 working with us to do that. It did strike me at first  
25 as being out of place, but I can't see really any

1 other use immediately or even in the near term going  
2 into this location, and it's a dramatic improvement  
3 over the sort of blighted property that is there now,  
4 and the offset from Novi Road seems to be enough. I  
5 wish the sub to the west had a connection, but there's  
6 nothing we can do about that now because there is  
7 nothing there. I hope that the city which owns the  
8 property to the north takes advantage of an  
9 opportunity to create some sort of transitional  
10 development, and so that's on I guess us. So thank  
11 you.

12 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Member

13 Avdoulos.

14 MR. AVDOULOS: I, too, struggled  
15 when I first saw this, and continued to go up and down  
16 Novi Road just to see what makes sense or if this  
17 makes sense. And, you know, looking at what is -- you  
18 know, trying to look at what is across the street,  
19 what is going to happen in the future, but I think in  
20 all honesty the work that has been done and what could  
21 end up being there, this might be the appropriate  
22 development, and then hopefully this will spur on a  
23 different type of chain reaction to something. And  
24 I'm hoping that the city does take advantage of this,  
25 and then dovetails off of it. So I appreciate it.

1                   The one thing I am struggling with  
2                   is also the road -- Novi Road enhancements that were  
3                   presented, and is that something that is going to  
4                   really work or do we need to further develop so that  
5                   these enhancements can also sustain themselves or be  
6                   sustained, because you're not going to I believe have  
7                   as many people walking up and down here initially. If  
8                   it gets developed further, that might be the point.  
9                   So what I was also trying to do is I went to Twelve  
10                  Mile between Novi Road and West Road where we have  
11                  Dick's Sports on one side and then we have  
12                  condominiums on the other side, and then we have  
13                  office building and a little medical clinic and then a  
14                  bank building and then some more condos. So I could  
15                  see where if we can start establishing that kind of a  
16                  rhythm, then this might be the genesis of beginning  
17                  that type of development along Novi Road.

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

1 project.

2 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

3 Mr. Zuchlewski, any comments?

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

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

19 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you,  
20 sir.

21 Member Giacobetti.

22 MR. GIACOPETTI: With that I'd like  
23 to make a motion. In the matter of Emerson Park  
24 JSP17-10 and Zoning Map Amendment 18.717, motion to  
25 recommend approval to the City Council to rezone the

1 subject property OS-1, Office Service, to RM-2, high  
2 density multi-family residential, with a planned  
3 rezoning overlay concept plan.

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

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

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

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

24 This motion is made because, A, the  
25 applicant has presented a reasonable alternative to

1 the Master Plan for Land Use recommendation of  
2 Community Office for the parcel as indicated in the  
3 applicant's letter dated March 20th, 2017, noting the  
4 appropriateness of a residential use for the site  
5 given the close proximity to Main Street and Town  
6 Center, and the ability for additional nearby  
7 residents to add vibrancy and support for local  
8 businesses.

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

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

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

23 E, the city's traffic engineering  
24 consultant has reviewed the rezoning impact study and  
25 found that a reduction of 1,402 trips per day, 264 for

1 the a.m. peak hour and 225 trips for the p.m. peak  
2 hour is estimated based on the zone change from office  
3 to residential.

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

10 MR. AVDOULOS: Second.

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

14 Any other comments?

15 Sri, can you call the roll, please.

16 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Thank you.

17 Member Greco?

18 MR. GRECO: No.

19 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

20 MR. LYNCH: Yes.

21 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

22 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

23 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Zuchlewski?

24 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

25 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacometti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes 5 to  
1.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: All set.

Thank you.

MR. ANDERSON: Thank you.

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

Sri.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Thank you.

The subject property is located on  
the east side of Taft Road north of Ten Mile Road in  
Section 22. The property totals about 9.6 acres.

1                   The current zoning of the property  
2                   is R-4, (One-Family Residential), on north, east and  
3                   south as well. The properties on west across Taft  
4                   Road are zoned Residential Acreage. The future land  
5                   use designation for the property and surrounding  
6                   properties on north, east and south is single family  
7                   as well. Educational facility is indicated on west.  
8                   The site has substantial portions of regulated  
9                   wetlands along the front and rear property lines. It  
10                  also has a considerable amount of woodlands along the  
11                  east boundary.

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

23                  The existing drainage easement is  
24                  1.53 acres and the preservation easement is 1.51  
25                  acres. A twelve foot wide strip of land was excluded

1 from the easement to allow for driveway access from  
2 Taft Road to the existing home. The applicant is now  
3 proposing to dedicate a total of 5.2 acres of land  
4 into open space preservation option and is also  
5 requesting a 60-foot right-of-way through the  
6 easement. In other words, if the submitted plan is  
7 approved with the proposed easements, the applicant is  
8 proposing to dedicate an additional 2.16 acres to the  
9 city be preserved.

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

18 The feasibility of both the  
19 bonafide plan and the proposed Open Space Preservation  
20 Plan is dependent on Council's inclination to modify  
21 the easements. Staff has shared a memo with the City  
22 Council explaining the issues with the easements.  
23 Staff had not received any comments at that time, and  
24 has proceeded to review the plans based on the  
25 assumption that Council will be willing to consider

1 the modifications following Planning Commissions  
2 review of the plan. However, we received one comment  
3 from one Council member this morning expressing some  
4 concern about the proposed modification. Staff's  
5 current recommendation for Planning Commissions's  
6 approval is contingent on Council's approval to the  
7 easement modifications.

8 The applicant is requesting a  
9 reduction of the minimum site area from 10,000 square  
10 feet to 8,000, a minimum lot width reduction from 80  
11 feet to 70, and a minimum side yard reduction from  
12 25 feet total two sides to 20 feet total two sides, as  
13 the proposed site plan utilizes Open Space  
14 Preservation option as preserving approximately 54  
15 percent of open space on site.

16 The current site plan proposes an  
17 extension of existing Danyas Way to provide a through  
18 connection to Taft Road. Engineering review  
19 identified a couple of variances that are required for  
20 lack of sidewalk on one side of the street for a  
21 portion of Danyas Way near the wetlands, one for not  
22 meeting the minimum stormwater detention buffers, and  
23 another one for not providing a stub street at 1300  
24 feet intervals. While staff supports the stub street  
25 variance, staff is not in support of the sidewalk

1 waiver as the proposed impacts indicated by the  
2 applicant to the wetlands are not significant enough.  
3 Staff is not also in support of the vegetated buffer  
4 requirement as there is no precedent for the deviation  
5 and the proposed buffers do not serve the intent of  
6 the requirement. Landscape review identified two  
7 waivers for absence of required berm and five required  
8 street trees along Taft Road due to presence of  
9 existing wetlands. Staff is in support of those two.

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

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

22 About 66.4 percent of the regulated  
23 woodlands are being preserved. The proposed removal  
24 would require about 27 replacements, all of them will  
25 be provided on site. The removals are proposed for

1 development of lots and the proposed detention around  
2 the Danyas Way towards the east span.

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

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

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

20 MR. POWELL: Hello, Planning  
21 Commission. My name is Mike Powell. I'm the design  
22 engineer for the project. And I think the planning  
23 staff did an excellent job in presenting the details  
24 of this particular project, and as what was said, we  
25 were before you on May 10th in our first presentation.

1 Since then we've been working very carefully with  
2 staff to mitigate any of their concerns.

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

18 There also seemed to be stated in a  
19 couple of the letters that there was concern of the  
20 previous developers of Taft I and Taft II. This is  
21 not the same developer. That development was done  
22 under a different developer, and by means of  
23 coordinating with a bank because of some foreclosure  
24 issues, and so this developer was not part of any of  
25 the development in Taft I and Taft II. To set the

1 record perfectly clear, they did purchase a couple of  
2 lots in there, but they were not responsible for any  
3 of the development requirements, and the bank was  
4 actually required to complete those improvements in  
5 Taft II.

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

18 The bigger issue is the sidewalk  
19 along the wetland area. As can be seen from the hand  
20 there along the wetlands entering Taft there on the  
21 north side of the access drive, it was just strictly  
22 my professional opinion that people have access out to  
23 Taft Road down one side of the roadway. I tried to  
24 minimize the disruption of the wetlands in that area  
25 by making the sidewalk all on the south side of the

1 drive so there would be a crossing on the Danyas Drive  
2 at the end of the homes there, just west of the homes,  
3 and they would cross to the south side of Danyas Way  
4 out to Taft Road, and then they could either way  
5 because there is another crossing out there at Taft  
6 Road. So they could turn south or go north on Taft  
7 Road. So it's just a -- or it was just a  
8 recommendation from a crazy engineer to try to  
9 minimize the disruption of the wetlands, but we opened  
10 that discussion up to the Planning Commission.

11 The other item that is a little  
12 more subjective is none of the lots encroach into any  
13 of the wetlands on this site. However, there are a  
14 number of lots that encroach the rear yards and one of  
15 the side yards, encroach into the buffer yard of the  
16 wetlands, and the request from the developer is to  
17 allow him to put signs along the rear yards and right  
18 along that buffer line notifying those homeowners, and  
19 of course it's in their Master Deed and Bylaws  
20 identifying that that is a permanent buffer easement  
21 for those wetlands letting them know that no  
22 fertilizing, no mowing, no cutting of any kind is to  
23 go beyond that 25 foot buffer line. And that probably  
24 needs additional discussion with the Planning  
25 Commission as well.

1                   Otherwise we're asking for your  
2 approval for this open space plan. As Sri pointed  
3 out, the standard development can be done with that  
4 15 lots. We believe the open space development  
5 substantially improves the preservation of the  
6 wetlands and fits the design of this lot or this  
7 parcel a great deal more than the standard development  
8 does. Therefore we're before you tonight to ask for  
9 the open space approval as well as recommendation to  
10 the City Council for the various modifications and the  
11 easement requirements.

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

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

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

24                   MS. MCBETH: Just to clarify, we  
25 don't believe that they would be able to get that lot

1 that Sri is pointing out right there because of the  
2 difficulty of accessing that.

3 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Okay. Thank  
4 you.

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

9 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Very good.  
10 Thank you, appreciate that.

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

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

17 MR. POWELL: Yes.

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

22 MR. POWELL: The owner is certainly  
23 willing to as I said put up a buffer there to not  
24 allow the physical entrance to traffic. We'd have to  
25 coordinate that with the fire department very

1 carefully to make sure that emergency access was in  
2 there, but we would be able to build a permanent or a  
3 physical buffer there.

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

7 MR. POWELL: Zero construction,  
8 correct.

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

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

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

22 MR. POWELL: Yes.

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

1 MR. POWELL: Right.

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

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

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

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

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

22 MR. POWELL: And I understand the  
23 concern. The reality is the owner has been  
24 contemplating what to do. Certainly we don't want to  
25 put chain-link fence up through the development.

1 MR. LYNCH: No, no. I'm more  
2 looking at an enforcement. Because what happens with  
3 these things is all of a sudden this wetland area,  
4 which is supposed to be this, all of sudden somebody  
5 starts mowing in and mowing in and mowing in, and  
6 pretty soon you've got these two places -- I mean,  
7 they're right next to each other.

8 MR. POWELL: Correct.

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

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

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

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

25 MR. LYNCH: I'm doing this for a

1 point, because that it doesn't have it.

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

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

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

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

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

21 MR. POWELL: Correct.

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

25 MR. POWELL: That's correct.

1 MR. LYNCH: All right. Thank you.

2 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you,

3 Member Lynch.

4 Any other comments?

5 Member Avdoulos.

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

16 MS. KOMARAGIRI: As part of the DCS  
17 variance request, the applicant has provided the  
18 numbers, like how much wetlands would have to be  
19 impacted if they proposed a sidewalk, and they  
20 expressed a concern that if those impacts were  
21 approved, then they may hit the threshold, the  
22 mitigation threshold requirement, but staff looked at  
23 the numbers, and we don't agree that they would still  
24 be under mitigation requirement threshold, and the  
25 impacts are very minor, under .1 acre. So if city

1 would still -- I mean, there is a conflict between  
2 impacting wetlands and providing connectivity.  
3 Sidewalk is a preference because maintenance-wise it  
4 is easy for the city to maintain concrete sidewalks.  
5 Boardwalk is another alternative but not highly  
6 preferred because it comes with its own set of  
7 challenges.

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

11 MR. POWELL: No problem then,  
12 Commissioner.

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

18 MR. LYNCH: Depends on the people.

19 MR. AVDOULOS: Exactly. Everything  
20 depends on the people. I like the idea that we're  
21 developing this piece, because now it will make this a  
22 more contiguous -- it's not a contiguous development,  
23 but just the traffic flow and everything through that  
24 makes it a lot safer, and having that dead end there  
25 really doesn't make sense. And then I like the fact

1 that we've got a large amount of open space for the  
2 property to the east of this. So I appreciate that,  
3 and, you know, I'm in support of the project.

4 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.  
5 Member Greco.

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

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

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MR. AVDOULOS: Second.

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

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

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Sure.

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

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

MR. GRECO: Correct.

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

MR. GIACOPETTI: So a friendly

1 amendment that it stops after the or?

2 MR. GRECO: Yes, accepted.

3 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Does the  
4 seconder accept?

5 MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

6 MR. GIACOPETTI: I have one last  
7 question.

8 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Please, yes.

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

12 MS. KOMARAGIRI: The construction  
13 entrance off of Taft?

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

18 MR. SCHULTZ: Through the chair, I  
19 think the applicant has actually affirmatively said  
20 that he would do that, and I think under those  
21 circumstances I think it's appropriate. I would make  
22 it subject to review by your building department and  
23 engineering department to make sure they're in  
24 agreement with it, but assuming they are, I think we  
25 can add that.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MS. KOMARAGIRI: I think we can say that at the time of soil erosion control permit review.

MR. SCHULTZ: Okay.

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

MR. GRECO: Accepted.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Secunder?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

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

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes, Danyas off of Taft.

MR. GIACOPETTI: That the applicant would --

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: He's got it.

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

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

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Good catch. Thank you.

With that, any other discussions?

Sri, can you call the roll, please.

1 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Thank you. And I  
2 apologize, I couldn't follow --

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

5 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

6 MR. LYNCH: Yes.

7 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

8 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

9 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Zuchlewski?

10 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

11 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?

12 MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

13 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacopetti?

14 MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

15 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

16 MR. GRECO: Yes.

17 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes 6 to  
18 0.

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

21 MR. GRECO: Next I would like to  
22 make another motion. In the matter of Taft Knolls  
23 III, JSP16-67, motion to approve the wetland permit  
24 based on and subject to the applicant should consider  
25 demarcation of the wetland buffers on-site behind lots

1 4, 5, 6, 7, 14 and 15 through the use of proposed  
2 easement signage and potentially other means such as  
3 boulders and decorative fencing along the setback  
4 boundaries; the findings of compliance with Ordinance  
5 standards in the staff and consultant review letters;  
6 and the conditions and items listed in those letters  
7 being addressed on the Final Site Plan; and because  
8 the plan is otherwise in compliance with Chapter 12,  
9 Article V of the Code of Ordinances and all other  
10 applicable provisions of the Ordinance.

11 MR. AVDOULOS: Second.

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

14 Any other comments?

15 Sri, please.

16 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

17 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

18 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Zuchlewski?

19 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

20 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?

21 MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

22 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacopetti?

23 MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

24 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

25 MR. GRECO: Yes.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes 6 to 0.

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

MR. AVDOULOS: Second.

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

Any other comments?

Sri, please.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Thank you. Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacopetti?

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes 6 to 0.

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

MR. AVDOULOS: Second.

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

Any other comments?

Sri, please.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacopetti?

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Most passes 6 to  
0.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Now you're  
all set.

MR. POWELL: Thank you again,  
Commission.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Item Number 4  
is the approval of the June 14, 2017 Planning  
Commission Minutes.

MR. LYNCH: Motion to approve.

MR. AVDOULOS: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: There's a  
motion and a second. And I have a correction if I  
might. Page 51, Line Item 20, where it refers to

1 Chair Pehrson making the motion, that should be Member  
2 Anthony. Then on Page 53, Line Item 2, it refers to  
3 Chair Pehrson making the motion. That should also be  
4 Member Anthony. With those modifications?

5 MR. LYNCH: Okay. Accepted.

6 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: All right.  
7 With that if we can call the roll, please.

8 MS. MELLEEM: Member Giacopetti?

9 MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

10 MS. MELLEEM: Member Greco?

11 MR. GRECO: Yes.

12 MS. MELLEEM: Member Lynch?

13 MR. LYNCH: Yes.

14 MS. MELLEEM: Chair Pehrson?

15 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

16 MS. MELLEEM: Member Zuchlewski?

17 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

18 MS. MELLEEM: Member Avdoulos?

19 MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

20 MS. MELLEEM: Motion passes 6 to 0.

21 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Item Number  
22 5, the approval of the June 28th, 2017 Planning  
23 Commission minutes.

24 MR. LYNCH: Motion to approve.

25 MR. AVDOULOS: Second.

1 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a  
2 motion from Member Lynch, second by Avdoulos.  
3 Any other comments?  
4 Kirsten, please.  
5 MS. MELLEEM: Member Greco?  
6 MR. GRECO: Yes.  
7 MS. MELLEEM: Member Lynch?  
8 MR. LYNCH: Yes.  
9 MS. MELLEEM: Chair Pehrson?  
10 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.  
11 MS. MELLEEM: Member Zuchlewski?  
12 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.  
13 MS. MELLEEM: Member Avdoulos?  
14 MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.  
15 MS. MELLEEM: Member Giacopetti?  
16 MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.  
17 MS. MELLEEM: Motion passes 6 to 0.  
18 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Item Number  
19 6, approval of the June 26, 2017 Planning Commission  
20 minutes.  
21 MR. LYNCH: Motion to approve.  
22 MR. AVDOULOS: Second.  
23 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a  
24 motion by Member Lynch, second by Avdoulos.  
25 Any other comments?

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Kirsten.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Giacobetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Motion passes 6 to 0.

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

Supplemental issues? I don't think any.

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

MR. ZACK: Yes. Sorry to come up here again, but I just want to make a few comments.

1 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: That's okay,  
2 we're here all night.

3 MR. ZACK: My name is Gary Zack at  
4 359 South Lake Drive, and I have to say I understand  
5 the challenges that are faced in putting ten pounds in  
6 a five pound sack, and that's essentially what NSA has  
7 tried to do to meet the city requirements, and I  
8 applaud their effort. I mean, it is a nice design  
9 given what they have to work with.

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

20 In regards to the transparency, I  
21 heard a lot of comments about all the social media in  
22 this. I'd like to know why we don't just use the good  
23 old-fashioned sign in the park that says this is  
24 coming and we'd like your input. That I think would  
25 get maybe more response. People are pretty busy. I

1 encourage you if you're Novi residents to ask your  
2 fellow neighbors if they're aware of this. I think  
3 you'll find very few or none of them are.

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

14 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you,  
15 sir. Appreciate it.

16 Anyone else?

17 MR. DUNESKE: John Duneske,  
18 357 South Lake. Just a couple quick comments again.  
19 The building is beautiful. I'm just not sure if it's  
20 the right building at the right spot. And I  
21 appreciate you taking into consideration the setbacks  
22 especially on the east side of the park. I know that  
23 questions were asked today about what was the  
24 purpose -- you know, the cost seems to be driving the  
25 size of the building here, where it was two stories

1 and now it's one, and two stories cost more. Again  
2 the question was polling, library and camp lake shore,  
3 and when you're using the park eight weeks out of the  
4 year, Camp Lake Shore is eight weeks out of the year,  
5 that's 7 percent of the time, to justify that big  
6 building is hard to understand and no one has  
7 clarified that. I know Director Muck says that -- he  
8 has said it's not going to be used for a banquet  
9 facility, but if you go back to the minutes and the  
10 video of January 19th, 2017 of this year, the mayor  
11 has said this is for weddings, this is for big events,  
12 it's for rental, we need it. And I don't know who  
13 would be in violation of the charter which says no  
14 development of Novi property for -- inside of parks  
15 for banquet facilities. So please take that into  
16 consideration.

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

1 packet that you have there.

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

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

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Thank you for your time. I  
appreciate it.

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

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

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

MR. LYNCH: Motion to adjourn.

MR. AVDOULOS: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: All those in  
favor?

THE BOARD: Aye.

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

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, Diane L. Szach, do hereby certify that I have recorded stenographically the proceedings had and testimony taken in the above-entitled matter at the time and place hereinbefore set forth, and I do further certify that the foregoing transcript, consisting of (121) pages, is a true and correct transcript of my said stenograph notes.

*Diane L. Szach*

Diane L. Szach, CSR-3170  
(Acting in Wayne County)  
Oakland County, Michigan  
My Commission Expires: 3/9/18

September 11, 2017.