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CHAIRPERSON GRECO: I'd like to call to order the April 27, 2016 Planning Commission meeting for the City of Novi.

Roll call, please.

MS. JORDAN: Anthony?

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Absent, excused.

MS. JORDAN: Baratta?

MR. BARATTA: Here.

MS. JORDAN: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Here.

MS. JORDAN: Greco?

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Here.

MS. JORDAN: Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Here.

MS. JORDAN: Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Absent, excused.

MS. JORDAN: Zuchlewski?

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Absent, excused.
I'd like to have the Pledge of Allegiance. Member Baratta, can you please lead.

(Pledge recited.)

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Looking for a motion to approve the agenda.

MR. BARATTA: Motion to approve.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Second.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Motion by Member Baratta, second by Member Giacopetti.

All in favor say aye.

THE BOARD: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: That brings us to our first audience participation. If anyone in the audience would like to address the Planning Commission on any matter that does not have anything to do with any of the public hearings that are up for tonight, please step forward.

All right. Seeing no one, we will close the first audience participation. Any correspondence not related to the public hearings?

Closing that.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Any committee reports?
MS. MCBETH: No.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: No committee reports. City planner report?

MS. MCBETH: Thank you. Good evening, Mr. Chair.

A couple of things I wanted to announce this evening. That the April 18 City Council meeting, the city council took action on an item that the Planning Commission had also recently considered.

City Council approved the request of the Learning Care Academy, also as at Everbrook Academy for the planned rezoning overlay development agreement and the revised concept plan.

We expect that this matter will return to the Planning Commission for preliminary site plan approval at the May 11 Planning Commission meeting.

I also wanted to introduce a new staff member to you, Adrianna Jordan. Here to my left.

She started as a planner with us about a month ago, and she is going to assist us with the workload that we currently
have in the department.

Adrianna has a bachelor of science degree in architecture from the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor, as well as a masters of science degree in transportation engineering and a masters of city and original planning both from California Polytechnic State University in San Louis Obispo, California.

So, Adrianna had served as a staff planner in communities both in Michigan as well as California, and she also recently worked as a safe board to school operations coordinator for the Michigan Fitness Foundation in Lansing.

So we are looking forward to having her here at the meetings coming up in the next few months.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Very good. Welcome Adrianna.

MS. JORDAN: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: All right. That brings us to our first public hearing. Public hearing at the request of the Ivanhoe Companies, for the Planning
Commission's recommendation to the City Council rezoning of the property in Section 12 located on the northeast corner of Twelve Mile Road and Meadowbrook Road from a residential abridge to R4, one family residential B3 general business, with a planned rezoning overlay.

The subject property is approximately 21 acres. The applicant is proposing a 42 unit single family residential development with frontage on and access to Meadowbrook Road, up to 22,000 square feet of commercial space with frontage and two access drives on Twelve Mile Road, and an open space park area at the corner of the intersection.

MS. MCBETH: Mr. Chair, I will have a brief introduction to this, and then our planning consultant, Rod Arroyo will go over the planning review letter, and then after that, I would like to go over the staffing consultant review letters briefly.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Very good. Thank you.

MS. MCBETH: Thank you. So as you know, the plans for this site have
evolved over the last couple of years or so since the applicant first approached the city with a development plan. A multiple family development with about 200 units was initially shown to staff, and based on our discussions, the plan has been modified multiple times since that first submittal.

The plan shown this evening is using the PRO option to develop the subject property with a 42 unit single family residential development and up to 22,000 square feet of commercial space along the Twelve Mile Road frontage.

Additionally, the applicant proposes to dedicate an open space park area near the corner of the intersection and commits to build a vehicle and bicycle parking for a trail at that location.

The Planning Commission has considered the plan in September of 2015 at a public hearing and recommended postponing consideration to allow the applicant time to address comments from the public hearing and from the staff and consultant review letters.

So as I said, Rod Arroyo is
present this evening, to present the planning
review letter and then following that, I will
go over the rest of the staffing consultant
letters.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Very good.

Thank you. Mr. Arroyo?

MR. ARROYO: Good evening. I
will be going over our March 20th review
letter. As Ms. McBeth indicated, this is an
application for concept plan approval for the
PRO overlay, plan rezoning overlay.

This project, I know you have
had this come before you, it's been -- the
applicant has been speaking with staff
over -- and consultants over a number of
months.

He's made a number of
modifications, making changes, reducing
density. This project is now before you for
consideration and it includes a number of
elements and includes a residential element.

It includes a commercial
element on Twelve Mile Road, and it includes
a park element, which would involve
dedication of property to the City of Novi as
a trail head as part of a non-motorized
transportation throughout the community.

The property is currently
zoned RA, residential acreage.

The property located to the
west is the MSU Tollgate farms facility. And
there is additional RA property located to
the north as well as to the east of the
subject property.

To the south, you have a
number of acres that are designated for OST.
You have some vacant development and you also
have existing office element towards the
southwest — at the southwest corner of
Meadowbrook and Twelve Mile, where South
University is located.

The applicant's proposal
before you this evening is for 42 single
family residential units. It is also for up
to 22,000 square feet of commercial space
with frontage on Twelve Mile Road. And then
there is the dedication park that I
mentioned.

As we get into the review, we
will talk a little bit more about the
specifies.

In terms of the potential development, the density that is actually proposed for this project of 42 units comes out to just under 2.5 dwelling units per acre when you look at the area designated for residential, as well as the park area.

If you take that total area and apply the density, that gives you a density of 2.49 dwelling units per acre.

They are asking for rezoning to -- with what the PRO overlay to R4 and to B3 for the commercial.

The density that is actually proposed will actually fit within R3, so it's not maxing out the density that would be allowed under R4.

There is also some substantial preservation of open space, 42 percent of the total site is proposed to be preserved as open space.

There is over eight acres preserved as open space and just over three acres is actually included in the area that would be designated to the city as a park.
Your master plan for land use designates that property with a plan density of 0.8 dwelling units per acre, single family residential.

This is an area, we actually have the density map included on page three, and we go through some of the objectives that are listed within the master plan as well.

There are certainly several objectives that this project could be considered as being consistent with, including encouraging residential developments to promote healthy lifestyles, protecting and maintaining open space within the community, continuing to strive towards making the city more likeable and more walkable friendly community. But it is not directly consistent with the density that's currently found within your master plan.

You're currently undergoing a master plan review, and there has been some discussion but no final determination about what the recommendation will be in terms of proposed density for this property.

So in terms of the -- we have
talked about the surrounding land use, one of the things we also include, because I think it's important to compare, the zoning classifications, there is a chart that shows us uses that are permitted under RA, also R4 and also B3, but the applicant is specifically offering conditions that would limit the uses that would, in fact, be opposed within the commercial portion, and I will get into that in just a minute.

So you have what on the surface would appear to be a rezoning request that would go to R4 and B3, but, in fact, you have something where the density is actually less than that, it's closer to an R3 density and the types of uses that would be permitted within the commercial component are actually less intense than if it was a straight B3 rezoning because of the specific conditions that the applicant is offering as part of that.

In terms of some of your standards, the subdivision ordinance does require a sub connection every 1,300 feet, unless certain conditions are met.
One, the extensions were impractical because of topography, dimensions or natural features where it would result in the creation of undesirable traffic patterns not customarily found in residential areas.

In this particular instance, there is a substantial buffer that's being proposed to the north of the property, you can see a minimum 50 foot buffer to the north, significant preservation of trees and open space. And there are also developed single family homes that are fronting on Meadowbrook Road north of the property, so a sub connection does not appear to be appropriate to the north.

To the east, that property is currently being considered for development as a place of worship, certainly having that type of roadway connection between also does not necessarily make sense from a traffic circulation perspective.

What the applicant is proposing is an emergency access connection to Twelve Mile through the commercial property, and so that would provide for a
second point of access.

But in terms of permanent open points of access, there would be one on Twelve Mile -- excuse me, on Meadowbrook Road that would serve the residential portion and the commercial portion would be accessed directly from Twelve Mile Road.

I know you are going to hear from some reports, from some of the other consultants dealing with natural features, woodlands, wetlands and the like, so I won't go into a lot of detail. I do want to discuss the conditions that are offered by the applicant as part of this PRO concept plan.

In terms of park and open space, it would be developed in accordance with the plan, with the donation of the park, which would include six parking spaces, a bench, bike racks. The park area would be graded, it would be seeded with grass, it would result in, as I mentioned before, a total of 42 percent of the site remaining as open space, 3.288 acres as park and a total of 3.8 acres as open space.
In terms of the residential it would be limited to 42 units, 2.49 units per acre. There would be a request for a reduction in certain setbacks and sideyard setbacks and lot width going to a minimum of 50 foot lot width, and reduction of setbacks to seven and a half foot, on the side yard, 20 foot front yard, 30 foot on the rear yard.

In terms of the commercial component, it would be limited to 12,000 square feet if its developed with two drive-thru uses or 22,000 square feet if there is a one or no drive-thru.

In terms of the tenant -- potential tenant mix, it would be limited by prohibiting certain uses, including fast food restaurants, fueling stations, day-care centers and several others I won't go into all of those, but automobile service being the other -- a lot of the more intense uses, it could, in fact, be permitted within B3 would not be permitted in this situation, if this project were approved.

In terms of woodlands and landscaping, one of the things that is an
important part of this proposal in terms of
the context of the property, given the fact
that this is a scenic drive and natural
beauty road, and the fact that it has the MSU
Tollgate Center located directly to the west
is the treatment of frontage along
Meadowbrook Road as well as the treatment
along Twelve Mile Road.

And there is a fairly
substantial buffer that you can see, that is
proposed so that that concept of having this
as a road that has a unique characteristic
that is scenic in nature, it has -- celebrate
the natural beauty and also be conceptually
aware of the uses that are in the area.

I know the applicant has been
working directly with MSU Tollgate farms on
the landscaping proposal along that
coordinator, attempting to take in that
consideration and come up with a plan.

It's less formal in terms of
the planting like you would normally have,
typically a fairly formal planting, when you
have a buffer strip, this would be something
that would be a little less formal, but more
naturalistic, which I think would be consistent with the vision for this roadway, and with the vision that has been established for this particular corridor north of Twelve Mile Road.

They are also proposing to upsize the tree replacement, because the thought here is to have more of an immediate impact up front.

So that's also one of the requests that they give credit for planting trees that would actually be taller than the minimum that would be required.

The deviations that are being requested from the ordinance, I have touched on those briefly. They include the minimum lot size and width as well as the setbacks.

Then we do talk about some of the PRO ordinance requirements, part of that includes demonstrating the public benefit and as part of that, the applicant has listed several elements, including the public open space, the total open space being 42 percent, limiting the commercial to certain uses.

Also, one thing I did not
mention is the setback of the commercial
providing for green space along Twelve Mile
Road, which is not common for a commercial
development to have, that substantial green
space.

So essentially as you're
approaching this property from the east and
you're heading west, you will have a
landscape buffer in front of the commercial,
and as you wrap around the corner onto
Meadowbrook Road, you're going to have a park
at the corner and then you will have the
buffer strip that is being proposed along the
east side of Meadowbrook, which would then
continue to kind of carry forward that green
space all the way around the southern and the
western edge of the project. And then
development of the trail that is part of that
overall concept.

In terms of submittal
requirements, I believe they have met the
requirements for submittal, you've had a
number of reviews in the packet, I won't go
into those.

I will conclude by going over
Planning Commission options.

We have listed several options that you have. This is a recommendation to City Council. You can agree and have a favorable recommendation to Council to conditionally approve the request to rezone the parcel to B3 and to R4, with the plan rezoning overlay as has been proposed.

Another option would be to recommend that Council deny the request. And another option would be to consider another zoning classification.

This could potentially require another public hearing, if you were to make that type of a recommendation, or to conditionally approve only a portion of the request for rezoning while recommending denial of another portion or then postponing consideration.

Those are five potential options that would have been identified.

Our recommendation to follow number one, which would be to recommend to City Council that this project be approved.

We believe that this project
does demonstrate a substantial and
recognizable public benefit because of the
unique open space offerings that are being
included because of the unique treatment
along both Meadowbrook Road and Twelve Mile
Road to have buffer strips that would not
otherwise be provided.

And quite frankly, this is a
development pattern that you would not see
under a conventional development.

If this were to develop as a
RA property, with one acre lots, you would
not get the buffer strip, you would not get
the park land, you would not have a lot of
the other amenities that are associated with
this. So we think that should be taken into
consideration.

It's also in line with the
direction that we have been heading as we
have been working with you on your master
plan in terms of recognizing that this corner
may, in fact, be appropriate for more density
that has been historically designated for
this corner, so that's something I know
you're in the process on that, so it's a
little bit challenging because final decisions have not been made, but this applicant obviously has a right to come before you and ask for a recommendation. And that recommendation has to be made based upon the facts that are available at the time that the proposal is brought before you.

So our recommendation is a positive one. We believe this project should receive a positive recommendation.

I will be happy to try to answer your questions.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Thank you.

MS. MCBETH: Mr. Chair, I will go over the remaining reviews letters, if you don't mind.

The engineering review now recommends approval of the concept plan and storm water management plan. Previously stated concerns have been addressed and minor items may be further addressed at the time of preliminary site plan review.

The applicant will need to seek a design and construction standards variance for the sub street connection, as
Mr. Arroyo mentioned to the subdivision boundaries at intervals not to exceed 1,300 feet along the subdivision perimeter.

Engineering staff is in support of the variance provided that the applicant provides an easement and the funds to build the sub street to the north in the event that the connection to the north is ever needed.

The landscaping review noted a deviation from ordinance standards to allow the proposed upsizing of woodland replacement trees, evergreens throughout the site, and recommended that this upsizing shall not exceed 33 percent of the evergreen trees provided.

This recommendation is based on the standards of the landscape design manual, which does not allow additional credit for upsizing woodland replacement trees.

Additional deviations from the landscaping ordinance standards are requested and supported by staff, due to the proposed heavily landscaped design of the site and the
proposed improvements to the pond and
wetlands for the following three areas.

First, a deviation from
ordinance standards for the required
landscape berm, and the required trees and
sub-canopy trees to be planted on the berm
along the residential frontage of Meadowbrook
Road due to the existing wetlands and the
heavy vegetation proposed for that area.

Second a deviation from the
ordinance standards for the required
greenbelt landscaping south of the
residential area, approximately 540 feet, due
to the existing wetlands and other heavy
plantings proposed for that location.

Third, a deviation from the
ordinance standards for the required
greenbelt landscaping along the western
235 feet of Twelve Mile frontage due to the
existing wetlands and other heavy plantings
proposed for that location.

Rick Meader, our city's
landscape architect is present to answer
questions about those standards.

The city's environmental
consultant visited the site for the purpose of wetland, woodland verification as well as wetland boundary verification. The property includes a total of nine individual wetland areas, including an open water emergent wetland and a stream which is a tributary to the Walled Lake branch of the Rouge River.

The submitted plans proposed impacts to seven of the nine wetlands amounting to less than a quarter of an acre of the total 1.54 acres of on-site wetlands.

Wetland and water course buffer imparts are also proposed. The plan proposes to restore the degraded function of both the wetland and stream located on the south end of the site. Restoration activities include abandonment of the existing 350 foot stream channel and construction of a relocated stream channel of approximately 480 feet using a natural channel design.

The applicant proposes to improve the plant species diversity within the existing open water and emergency wetland by removing the basic plants, replace them
with native species, including wildflowers and trees. The natural feature setback areas will also be restored. Both an MDEQ wetland permit and a City of Novi wetland use permit will be required for the proposed impasse.

The environmental consultant recommends approval of the concept plan because the small isolated wetlands that are proposed to be impacted provide minimal environment benefits in terms of wildlife habitat and restore storm water sewage capacity and are dominated by non-native wetland plant species.

And because the proposed wetland restoration will be an improvement over the vegetation that currently surrounds the ponds.

The woodland plan review notes that the application now includes tree removals, and they are able to provide a more complete review.

The north half of the 20-acre site includes regulated woodlands as well as some of the south part of the site, a total of 402 regulated trees are proposed to be...
removed from the site and the required 718
replacement credits are proposed to be
planted on the site.

The woodland letter indicates
that along with the city's landscape
architect, ECT, supports the alternative
street scape landscaping that the applicant
has developed through coordinated work with
Tollgate Education Center. ECT supports the
use of woodland replacement trees and shrubs
currently proposed in order to supplement the
required trees along Meadowbrook Road, but
does not support the replacement of the
required street trees with Woodland
replacement trees.

Additionally, our consultant
ECT notes the city's landscape design manual
does not allow the upsizing of the woodland
replacement trees for additional credits.
The applicant requests deviation as part of
the PRO agreement.

ECT supports some upsets with
credit to provide additional landscape
interest and screening along Meadowbrook Road
and along the south edge of the residential
portion. 40 percent of the proposed evergreen trees are shown to be upsized from seven feet to 10 feet in height. That is 102 of the 253 total evergreens are proposed at 10-foot tall trees.

ECT recommends limiting the total percentage of upsized trees to 33 percent of the total provided, the woodlands review recommended approval subject to comments being addressed.

You may note in the suggested motion that recommendation -- those recommendations are included.

Matt Carmer from ECT is present this evening to answer any questions about the woodland and wetland review letters.

The city's traffic engineering consultant, AE Com has reviewed the submitted traffic impact statement that was prepared by the applicant's traffic engineer, and found that the analysis was acceptable and the level of services at the studied intersections is expected to remain at acceptable levels under the proposed
The traffic consultant has also provided comments on the submitted concept plan. Please note, additional correspondence has been received and was included on the table this evening, with another review of the submitted traffic impact statement.

Maureen Peters from AE Com, the city's consultant, is present this evening to answer any questions.

The fire marshal has reviewed the plan and finds the plans to be acceptable with comments to be addressed on next submittal.

The facade review of the proposed retail component and residential component will be completed at the time of preliminary site plan review.

The Planning Commission is asked tonight to hold the public hearing and consider making a recommendation to City Council on the proposed PRO and concept plan.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Okay, thank
you. This is a public hearing. If anyone would like to address the Planning Commission regarding this particular public hearing, please step forward.

Please state your name and address.

MR. RENTROP: Gary Rentrop, R-e-n-t-r-o-p, the address is 39723 Woodward Avenue.

I am representing Michigan State University Americana Foundation, Tollgate Farm area.

I wanted to commend Mr. Shapiro for working very closely with us to address the landscaping along Meadowbrook Road.

Having said that, at the last public hearing that was held on this, we took the position, we think that the PRO requirement should follow your master plan and that the master plan ought to find where it's going to land, and whether or not that master plan accommodates the PRO.

I have talked with your consultants and I recognize that apparently
the position of Novi is that they will not necessarily follow the master plan, but if the PRO program all together is acceptable, they will go ahead and act on that, regardless of what the master plan may say.

Having said that, if our position would be -- our position would be we would like to see master plan be dealt with first, if it is not going to be, and if what's going to happen is PRO is going to be recommended to Council, that we would encourage you and request that the landscaping plan with which Mr. Shapiro and I are and other people have worked very hard on, be implemented as part of the approval process. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Thank you.

Sir?

MR. OURLIAN: Good evening. My name is Rafi Ourlian, O-u-r-l-i-a-n. I am the chairman of the Armenian Community Center, which is the adjacent property to the east of the project of Beacon Hill Park.

We have worked with Mr. Shapiro as well and we support his plan.
I think this is a wonderful idea.

One of our recommendations is towards the commercial part of the property to add more trees. We are willing to work with him, either he would do it or we would do it, but we would work with him on that. But again, I think it's a wonderful plan and we, from the community center support the plan. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Thank you. Actually before I take more public comment, before we take public comment, I'd like to offer the applicant, would you like to address the commission?

MR. SHAPIRO: I thought maybe I'd listen to the public, then I will respond.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: That's fine. Thank you.

Would anyone else from the public like to address the Planning Commission on this public hearing?

(No audible responses.)

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Would the applicant like to strike address?

MR. SHAPIRO: I just want to put
a different slide up.

My name is Gary Shapiro from the Ivanhoe Companies. It's been a long process and I have enjoyed working collaboratively with the master plan committee, who we saw 14 months ago. And I think it was nine months ago we came before the Planning Commission.

As you know, I am quite passionate about the project. It's been a long road of starting from a lifestyle center to where we are today going from apartments now to condominium down to 42 units. We have presented an elaborate bullet point plan to show you. We will try to be quick because you know that sometimes we can go on from excitement from the project.

But I did put up the key features of the plan which I thought would be something just be appropriate to refresh the memory of the master planning committee and the Planning Commission from our last meeting.

That last meeting which was between eight and nine months ago, we were
given a lot of direction from you directly to work with staff and some of the key features that have changed really made this exemplary plan, starting with on the north border, we now protracted a substantial amount of woodlands and what's really dramatic, it was completely new design.

Immediately after that meeting, we talked to the Tollgate people, you know, over a year ago, but directly after that Planning Commission meeting, we met with them multiple times, and multiple times with your landscape and woodland staff, Ms. McBeth and Rod Arroyo.

The dramatic change in the plan was we added to the already deep setback of 50-foot nature corridor that all goes the way along Meadowbrook and wraps around. Particularly, we took a great degree of planning detail to reset the entryway, so we would accent the community and Tollgate. That's 140 feet deep and over 400 feet wide. And we designed the entryway that's low key, and mirrors the Tollgate type fencing.

We also put a woodland area in
the middle of the development, which you can
see, and added the side -- increased the size
of the park.

    I think the key -- there is
multiple great assets, but it's really my
view I've done multiple projects in Novi and
I'm quite proud of them. The PRO benefit of
this is just extraordinary. You know, there
are many views on what this could be. I know
the master plan calls for lifestyle center,
we have come up with something I think we can
be really proud of.

    We are keeping 42 percent of
the development open space. We are
dedicating giving to the city what on a
commercial plan would be upland, could be
part of a center, a gas station, a real park,
something that you will see in the brief
Power Point Brad is going to do is a hole in
your plan where you need trail head for your
walkability features of Novi.

    So in addition to giving the
land, we are planting on that land over 200
trees and over 150 bushes. We are hydro
seeding that. We are doing all of that at
our expense and delivering it to you, since
the last meeting, we have increased the
public benefits at your direction. We have
included the parking spaces. We have worked
with parks and rec. This is meant to be a
passive low key entry to Novi. We have added
the six parking spaces at our expense, the
bench, the bike rack.

As Mr. Arroyo mentioned, we
have the extra deep buffer in front to his
neighborhood center that wraps around. Those
are a few of the real key things that have
changed over the course of time since we left
you at your direction. And we are quite
proud of it, and we respectfully request your
recommendation tonight.

I will let Brad just kind of
shoot through the history for those of you,
you know, who may not recall what's
transpired over the last two years. Thank
you.

MR. SPADER: I'm Brad Spader from
MKS Studios. We have a number of slides, but
I think based on the staff comments and
review comments that were concise, we will
also try to be concise.

I'm going to go through some of these quickly and focus on things that I think are important for you and the public to see.

Introduce ourselves. We have quite a team of experts here. This is the cover that was on the report or the booklet that we gave to the Planning Commission staff.

So you know, this is digital, so it's kind of like a fly over. You can get into the details, so if you ever want to see, when we get the final site plan, the details. This is all electronic, show the details and the views and everything else. Some of which were asked of your staff and consultant reports.

Mr. Shapiro mentioned, I think one of the key elements here, one of the things we looked at is the idea of walkable Novi. Meadowbrook elementary school is to our north. That's one of the questions you had before. That's why we have sidewalks.

We have been working to make
this a very walkable development internally
and also to compliment the pathway plan, and
that's one of the reasons for the trail head
and park.

There have been, we talked
about before since there weren't really
questions from the audience, but keeping in
mind I think this is why the draft master
plan recommends future land use designation
consistent with our proposal because there
have been a lot of changes in the
characteristics of the area.

We have covered this before,
Twelve Mile, changes M5 connector and the
different developments, so the lower density
development to the north of us is really
different than the pattern of development in
the area. So we are very consistent with
development trends.

Other things that have been
going on along the Twelve Mile corridor and
the M5 corridor. All of this was in the
booklet we gave to the Planning Commission
showing the types of development in the
surrounding area.
We did look at a number of alternatives, including lifestyle centers, commercial and different types of residential, attached residential and so forth, some of which got mixed or negative reviews from city staff and consultant reviews before.

There are a couple of alternatives we want to remind you of. We first came in with this 54 lot, single family subdivision. There were a couple of changes made. One is we heard comments that it was too high, so we dropped it down to 42.

We also -- if you look at this drawing in the north that the buffer wasn't deep enough. There was concern about the consequences of implication on the low density RA properties to the north, so we have added a deep buffer there in response to comments we had on this.

Also if you look at this drawing see where our access point is onto Meadowbrook, there was concern from Tollgate Farms, they specifically asked us to shift the driveways 400 feet to the south, so we
put the driveway where they preferred, where
your consultant recommended, also there was
site distance considerations. So that was
changed to that plan.

This was the public hearing
plan. Again, we heard good comments from
staff consultants and you in responding, we
thought to the public, and this is a list of
all the changes we made. The key things are,
we had six homes that had a back onto
Meadowbrook Road, you will see on the next
shot we revised that, so there won't be any
homes backing onto Meadowbrook. We recessed
the entrance much deeper. We significantly
changed the greenbelt as we will show you in
this slide. We added park amenities. We
added details. We provided traffic reports
and wetlands and woodlands and more detail on
the landscaping. So a lot of additional
information, some of which is not typical for
this stage of a PRO.

Mr. Shapiro already mentioned
the key features of the plan. This is just a
list of the many changes we made to the plan
since we first presented it to you, so I
think we have kind of covered a lot of those already.

The key kind of components, one we have a residential neighbor. These are elevations that were provided in our submittal that show typical types of elevations, the quality we expect in Novi and to appeal young professionals, young families but independent seniors. So that's the variety of elevations that we have.

There were questions from you on more information or detail on the commercial and why we will come back with a final site plan once we have the detailed tenant mix and so forth.

This is an illustration of the type of elevations that we would expect for the project when we come back for final site plan approval, something you had asked for.

We were requested by Rod Arroyo and your traffic consultant, made comment to do a trip generation comparison of the existing zoning, what the uses are that are allowed in our proposed zoning.

In addition to that, addressed
some of the comments the Planning Commission had. We did a full blown traffic impact study, following the methodology that's used. HRC prepared a traffic impact study and found that our impact at the Meadowbrook and Twelve Mile intersection would be very minor and the level surface would be not effected.

And also at the Meadowbrook access point we would retain a level service A or B, and the only improvement needed along Meadowbrook Drive would be a right turn taper. So they looked at all the turning movements and so forth, since most of our traffic is oriented to and from Twelve Mile Road, there is no need for a left-turn lane or other improvements.

So the idea was to keep the road as kind of a beautiful road and not a lot of road improvements, so we have a taper which is what is required. And your traffic engineering consultant reviewed our traffic impact study. They actually told us what they wanted to see in the traffic impact study. We followed their direction, and they followed with approval of the traffic impact
study.

When we have the final tenant mix, if the traffic impact study needs to be revised. We did the traffic impact study with the highest generated uses, to drive through is another thing, so we think anything that we actually come back with will be at or below the traffic numbers that we used in the analysis. If that's not the case or something needs to be done, we would update the traffic impact study with the final site plan.

Mr. Shapiro mentioned that deep buffer on the north and the open spaces and so forth, so we will go over that.

I did want to show you this. This is the greenbelt. On the top is the old version. So the comments Ms. McBeth noted from your landscape consultant about the street trees. So if you see on the old version, on the top, we had regimented street trees across the frontage along Meadowbrook by the park. And partly in response to Tollgate, and partly in response to comments from the Planning Commission, we refused the
landscape plan so it looks more natural. We don't have those regimented street trees along the front.

If you see on the bottom, that's the new landscape plan. So at the request of the Tollgate, we came up with more of a layered landscape so we worked with land architects and professionals and we have kind of a layered landscaping, and they wanted to see more evergreen trees. So I understand your consultant would like less upsizing of the evergreens, but we have 102 evergreens that we are upsizing from seven to 10 feet, that's about $100 per tree, so that's $10,000 to upsize.

The idea was they wanted more immediate screening with the evergreens and they wanted year-round screening. So if we reduce the number of upsized evergreens, we reduce the number of evergreens, which in other cases really makes sense in the city, but here, it would not be consistent with what Tollgate wants, which is a more immediate impact and something that looks natural with a variety of sizes and provides
year-round screening.

So we -- several of you asked us to work with Tollgate Farms on the landscaping and we feel we really have, and we are asking for a number of waivers from the typical landscape requirements that are noted in your consultant report, to meet the expectations of Tollgate and the direction that you gave us.

All right. This is just one element of the landscape, again, to compliment Tollgate Farms, with the white fence and so forth recessing the access, so we feel the design will compliment Tollgate Farm and be a good transition and views along the very attractive Meadowbrook Drive going north of the site.

This is just a detail of the parks. We have about three acres of land that would be donated to the city and contours and hydro seeded.

We have got amenities that you asked to be provided before. The total open space could be viewed as a park to the public is over five acres. This all is wetland
enhancement area, so when the DEQ reviewed
our wetlands, they said the changes here will
be an improvement to the area in terms of the
environment, so we've had a -- in addition to
working with Tollgate Farms and all your
staffing consultants, we have had a number of
meetings with the DEQ to get their support.
So we have their preliminary approval.

This is one of the sheets
that's in the submittal that is more detail
on the wetlands enhancement. So we have got
a lot of wetland material and changes. Some
of the landscape waivers that we are looking
for are to be more complimentary to the
wetland. Typically we would have things like
berms in this area. Berms are not something
that the DEQ wanted to see around the
wetlands.

We are asking for wetland --
more wetland friendly vegetation around the
wetlands rather than what you would typically
have in a standard development in the city.

Last time we were here we had
a lot of slides about comments and responses
to staffing consultant reports, and this time
we want to thank the staff and consultants.

We've spent a lot of their
time with changes and going back and forth
and modifications to get reaction. A couple
of you told us to work closely with the staff
and consultants. We believe we have done
that.

Other than a few waivers that
we think are very consistent with the
approach we have taken, I think you see we
have recommendations for approval at this
stage.

So this is a phasing plan that
we were asked to provide. We are down to
just a few items for discussion. One is,
this has been noted a couple of times
tonight, to upsize 102 of the evergreens from
seven to 10 feet and to get credit for doing
that, because we think it's a more immediate
impact visually in this site.

There are a number of berms
that would otherwise be required along the
wetland, along the commercial frontage
between the commercial and residential. We
are asking to allow us to have landscaping
instead of the berm, again with -- to be keeping with the city of having a natural appearance, the berms are really a natural appearance, not something you see out at Tollgate Farms or on the site currently.

We also have some plantings in the right-of-way. Your landscaping department wasn't sure if that requires a waiver or not.

So we would request, when this goes forward to Council, if you gave us a favorable recommendation that you also note that support the plantings in the right-of-way as your consultants have recommended. We don't have to come back to you because we'd miss something to check off.

So that kind of summarizes where we are with the plans and all the changes and we would be happy to answer any questions that you have.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Very good, thank you.

Before I close the public hearing, is there anyone else from the public that would like to comment on this particular
public hearing?

(No audible responses.)

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: All right. Seeing no one, I will close the public hearing. Is there any correspondence?

MR. LYNCH: No.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Okay. Seeing no correspondence, we will open the matter up to the Planning Commission for discussion and comment. Who would like to go first?

Member Lynch.

MR. LYNCH: Thank you, Chair.

You have come a long with this thing. I appreciate your work. I think -- out of all of this, I know what you guys have been through.

I have my own individual feelings about the housing, but what I want to congratulate you on is your work with your neighbors.

We kept that area, it's in character. You have got that 90-foot buffer. I think that was the big stumbling block, we are going to put all this stuff in there, we are going to lose the character of that road,
you got Tollgate Farms, you have got the
closest church next to it.

I appreciate you guys working
together with the neighbors on that.

I personally -- as long as the
traffic, I think you have stated, we have a
traffic expert here you concur with? As long
as our traffic consultant concurs, I think
you have guys have done a pretty good job.

The only question that I have
is we worked so hard to maintain this
character, by putting this 90 foot heavily
wooded buffer along, what is it Twelve Mile,
or Meadowbrook.

How do we insure that
homeowners one and 28 or whatever, don't
infringe on that and take it upon themselves
to remove the things that you have worked so
hard -- we have worked so hard to accomplish?

Is there something, some
delineation in the topography, is there
something in the deeds? I mean, how do we
insure that this concept stays in perpetuity,
I guess I will ask you.

MR. SHAPIRO: Yes, that's
something that's very important to us and very important to staff and your consultants. There will be preservation areas designated on that, and it would be part of a very strict -- bylaws restrictions, which will be part -- which we submit with our final PRO agreement and our site plan approval.

So it will be there in perpetuity and there will be preservation areas designated to remain as such.

MR. LYNCH: So you're going to commit that there is something in there that says that somebody can't put another structure there, they can't tear it down, they can't touch, they can't fill, they can't -- I mean, almost like a conservation easement?

MR. SHAPIRO: That's correct.

MR. LYNCH: So that will be in the deed and that will be enforced by the association.

MR. SHAPIRO: That is correct.

MR. LYNCH: The city has some authority, even though it's in their deed,
where does the city -- sometimes these homeowner associations kind of take it upon themselves, how does the city fit into this? Does the city override the condominium association or homeowner association to insure that this conservation easement remains in place?

MS. MCBETH: Yes, through the Chair, we would expect that the neighborhood association would be like the first line of defense, that they would know that those are trees to be preserved.

But we would also request in any areas that have woodland replacement plantings, a conservation easement over those areas, so ultimately, yes, the city would also have some authority to enforce that.

MR. LYNCH: So the city can -- I just want to be clear. The city can get involved if the association fails to maintain this area or infringes on this area, is that correct?

MS. MCBETH: For areas within a conservation easement. That is the usual standard, yes.
MR. LYNCH: And the reason I'm kind of -- I have been through most of this and it seemed like, you want so much the development granted, it's kind of dense and all of that, but it seemed like we didn't want to change the character, that was the big stumbling block.

It sounds like you have worked with your neighbors and we have come to some agreement that we can actually maintain that character.

I think that's really the lynchpin of this whole project, in my opinion. I just want to make sure that if the association fails to abide by this deed restriction that the city does have the authority to go in and force the association to come in replant, you know, to bring that back to its condition -- I guess we got another comment.

MR. ARROYO: Mr. Chair, if I might just make a comment. Just to reiterate that, yes, in fact, there is going to be an agreement, a contract basically signed between the city and the developer if this is
approved, just like the item you have coming before you next Dunhill has already received their PRO approval and there is a copy of the agreement in your packet that is agreed to between the developer and the city. And I'm sure there is going to be, if this project is approved a similar agreement that will be put in place and in writing that all of those offerings that are being made by the developers, including the conservation easement will be in that agreement, and then I'm sure your city attorney can tell you about how that's --

MR. LYNCH: I'm doing this for two years because I've got both the neighbors sitting right here. And they're going to be there 15 years from now when the developer is long gone and it's being run, managed by the association. And if they see some demolition in that area, so to speak, then they will have the right to approach the city and the city can enforce this. I know how critical this was.
I mean, let's face it, everything we have been through has been on maintaining that character.

MR. ARROYO: Because of the PRO approval process, you get an extra level of protection because of the agreement that has to be entered into, between the city and the developer.

MR. LYNCH: So both of the neighbors, Tollgate and the gentleman from the Armenian church, you both have heard that.

I guess other than that, as long as we can maintain the character of the development, I know what we have been through.

I think you guys have done a good job and I will be willing to support this.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Thank you, Member Lynch.

Anyone else? Yes, Member Baratta?

MR. BARATTA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
Mr. Arroyo, did you indicate that a retail portion there would be no fast food, no fuel use in that area, and a number of other type of uses?

MR. ARROYO: That's correct. There are specific uses that are, in fact, being excluded through voluntary conditions that are offered by the applicant. And yes, in fact, fast food restaurants are on the list of those that are specifically being excluded.

MR. BARATTA: What else is on that list? Did you have that list there?

MR. ARROYO: I do.

MR. MELLEM: In your motion sheet under item E, it lists all of the uses they are excluding.

MR. BARATTA: Thank you very much.

MR. MELLEM: Under the City Council motion on the second page.

MR. BARATTA: Thank you very much.

Ms. McBeth, one question. I was reading the engineering report, maybe
it's Jeremy, do we have a sewer moratorium to make?

MR. MILLER: Yes, the moratorium is still in place from Wayne County.

MR. BARATTA: Do we have an idea how long that's going to last?

MR. MILLER: We don't have a timetable right now. We are working with Wayne County, Oakland County and the DEQ to get it resolved as soon as possible.

MR. BARATTA: To the applicant, Mr. Shapiro, does that cause you a problem for your project, having that sewer moratorium?

MR. SHAPIRO: We have been -- as an industry we have been looking it, and we believe that problem is going to go away. It's just a bureaucratic dispute, so to speak, we are expecting the -- if you're kind enough to approve us we will move forward obviously and sign (inaudible.)

MR. BARATTA: Thank you, Jeremy.

Mr. Shapiro, I think you have done a very well thought out project. We appreciate you working with the city and I
echo a little bit of what the Commission to
my right has indicated.

I think it's just an
outstanding project. And I appreciate all
your hard work. With that, I will be in
support of your project. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Thank you,
Member Baratta.

Anyone else? Member
Giacopetti.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Thank you. I
have a question for Mr. Arroyo.

On the matter of connectivity,
which is one of the items where it's -- I
think it's inconsistent with the ordinance.

In terms of the development of
the future master plan, if this region, area
of the city, were to increase in density
across the square mile that it is currently,
mostly, RA, wouldn't we really want to
enforce the connectivity issue between
subdivisions or developments whereas this one
has no subs to the north, where it would be
the only logical location?

MR. ARROYO: I would say, if that
was vacant property, there would be a concern there, but if you look at those lots that are fronting on Meadowbrook, they all have -- they have homes on them.

And you heard from the church that is proposing to go to the east, so that is not likely to develop as residential as well.

So I think what is important and what you see with this proposal is the substantial buffer. Because this does have additional density from the property, from this property and the property directly to the north.

If you were to put a sub street in, you would then lose some of that. You have got the requirement for the local street to have a 60-foot right-of-way.

MR. GIACOPETTI: I guess my philosophy, I will call it, to keep -- one way to keep Meadowbrook, its characteristics, is to have ways to divert traffic off of it, so that new development occurs in this area, you know, there are fewer cars driving up Meadowbrook because say there is a side
street to use that's parallel, but this -- if we were to approve four more of these along Meadowbrook Road, I mean, we will have no connectivity unless they all happen to be planned at the same time.

So really we -- by not insisting that condition, we would at least, for this first blush, we would be losing that ability to create like alternative routes other than Meadowbrook.

MR. ARROYO: I just don't see that there is a likelihood that you're going to see that type of redevelopment of existing single family homes into something more dense to the north.

Because if that was vacant property, maybe it would be looked at differently. I think that probability of any of that happening is extremely low.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Okay. Thanks for your work.

Mr. Shapiro, thank you very much for listening to our concerns and making changes. The plan is quite a bit, it's very nice, appreciate it. I think you have been
to more than some meetings than some members
of the Planning Commission in the last year,
so thank you again. That's it.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Thank you,
Member Giacopetti.

I will just make a few
comments.

I'm not going to reiterate
what the rest of the Planning Commission has
already stated, however, just again like to
commend Mr. Shapiro.

We all know he is very
passionate about the project, but also at
least with respect to this one also
passionate about satisfying the neighbors and
satisfying the city consultants and coming up
with something again as our consultant has
also mentioned and we have all mentioned
keeping the character of the road, getting a
development in there that makes sense, the
park land, the commercial along Twelve Mile
seems to be the right mix despite how it's
currently zoned which would probably likely
change.

So with that, I will likely
support the project. If anyone would like to make a motion.

Member Baratta, do you have another inquiry?

MR. BARATTA: I do.

Mr. Shapiro, what was approved at City Council, in looking at the uses for the retail. It looks like you're limiting or eliminating or prohibiting really uses not conducive to being near a neighborhood. You said tattoo parlors and things like that.

Would you have an objection if we added things that use like a vapor shop would be prohibited, things of that nature, things that are not conducive, in my opinion, to a residential neighborhood?

MR. SHAPIRO: That particular use, I would not have an objection. I would be willing to add that to the list.

MR. BARATTA: Perfect. With that Mr. Chair, I would make a motion.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Very good.

MR. BARATTA: I would make a motion in the matter of the request of Ivanhoe Companies for Beacon Hill JSP-15-08
with the zoning map amendment 18.710, motion
to recommend approval to the City Council
re zoning of the subject property, RA
residential acreage to R4, one family
residential and B3 general business with the
plan to rezoning overlay PRO.

The recommendation shall
include the following ordinance deviations
for consideration by the City Council.
Reduction of required minimum lot size and
minimum lot width for one family detached
dwellings, reviewed against the R4 zoning
standards to allow for smaller lots, 10,000
square foot and 80 required, to 6,000 square
feet and 50-foot provided.

Reduction of minimum front
yard setback from one family detached
dwellings reviewed against R4 zoning
standards, 30-foot required, 20 provided.
Reduction in minimum sideyard setback and
aggregate sideyard setback, one family
detached dwellings reviewed, against R4
zoning standards, 10 feet with 25 feet
aggregate required, seven and half to 15 foot
aggregate provided. Reduction in minimum
rear yard setback from one family detached dwellings reviewed against R4 zoning standards, 35-foot required, 30 foot provided, deviation of ordinance standards to allow proposed upsizing of woodland replacement trees, evergreens throughout the site and the amount not to exceed 33 percent of the evergreen trees provided, 102 of the concept plan as recommended in the landscape review letters, and based on the standards of the landscape design manual, which does not allow additional upsizing woodland replacement trees.

The deviation from landscaping ordinance standards to the following areas, due to the proposed heavily landscaped design and the proposed improvements of the pond and wetlands. Deviation of the required landscaped berm and the required trees and sub canopy trees to be planted on the berm along the residential frontage of Meadowbrook Road due to the existing wetlands and heavy vegetation in this area. Deviation for the required greenbelt landscaping south of the residential area approximately 540 feet, due
to the existing wetlands and other heavy
plantings proposed for this location. And
deviations from the acquired greenbelt
landscaping along the western 235 foot of
Twelve Mile Road frontage due to the existing
wetlands other heavy plantings proposed for
this location.

In addition, if the City
Council approves the rezoning, the Planning
Commission recommends the following
conditions be requirements of planned
re zoning ordinance agreement. Applicants
offer to dedicate 3.28 acres to the city for
the establishment of a public park with the
following improvements made by the developer.

Mass and fine grading of 5.63
acres, including topography, enhancement
wetland and woodland replacement plantings
and seeding of upland park, augmenting the
creek removal of damaged culverts and
realigned with the creek. Creation of a
(unintelligible) system to effectuate a
waterfall spillway to be viewed from the back
of the park, enhanced design for landscaping
retention ponds, habit restoration,
installation of wetland enhancement
plantings. Applicant to construct six
parking spaces of bench and bike racks. A
minimum of 42 percent or 8.8 acres of open
space as shown on the concept plan, limiting
the number of dwellings to 42, in accordance
with the concept plan, limiting the
commercial square footage to 22,000 square
foot or less, a maximum of two drive-thru
establishments in the commercial area. The
applicant offers to exclude many of the more
intense uses permitted in B3 district
including fast food restaurant, fueling
stations, produce sales, day-care centers,
business schools and colleges, private clubs,
veterinary hospitals, clinics, car washes,
bus passenger stations, new and used car
showrooms, tattoo parlors and add vapor
shops, outdoor spaces for automobile sales,
and automobile service centers. Preservation
of a 10-foot wide wooded buffer along the
east property line, and a minimum of a 50
foot wide buffer along Meadowbrook Road as
showed on the proposed concept plan.

At the time of the preliminary
site plan review, the landscaping facade
plans for the commercial phase should meet
the minimum zoning ordinance standards.
Woodland replacement trees shall not be used
in place of the required street trees along
Meadowbrook and Twelve Mile Roads, further
recommendations of landscape review letter
with modification to be shown in subsequent
submittals.

Applicant complying with the
conditions listed and the staff and
consultant review letters.

In addition, I'd like to add
that we would allow planting in the -- I
think that's the setback. I believe that's
the term --

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: The
Meadowbrook right-of-way.

MR. MEADER: Excuse me. I did
find out from the engineers, that is allowed
to have extra plantings within the
right-of-way so that's okay.

MR. BARATTA: Okay. And the
motion is made for the following reasons, the
proposed density shown in the PRO concept
The proposed concept plan displays sensitivity to the adjacent large lot RA properties in area, that the use of buffering along the edges of the site, including preservations of the existing vegetation.

The proposed concept plan shows the preservation and enhancement of the wetlands on the site. The applicant has worked cooperatively with the Tollgate Educational Center to create landscaping along Meadowbrook Road that presents a more natural look than blends with the Tollgate
frontage. The site is adequately serviced by public utilities, traffic impact statement that was submitted with the rezoning request was found to be acceptable and the level of service at study intersection, is expected to remain at acceptable levels.

Submittal of the concept plan and any resulted PRO agreement provides assurance to Planning Commission and City Council of a manner in which the property will be developed.

Commissioner Lynch pointed out one error and that was in F, it says a minimum of 50 in the preservation. That should be 90-foot.

MR. LYNCH: Well, there was confusion. I thought this was 90 foot buffer along Meadowbrook Road.

MR. SHAPIRO: No. The buffer -- in there some places it's 90 feet. What the change was, we moved everything so it's an additional 50 feet. It is not 90-feet. You were looking at some of the illustrations where it shows some places it's 250. In most places it's 90, but the preservation area
that we added is 50-feet.

MR. BARATTA: You're okay with that?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MR. BARATTA: We will strike that comment.

MR. LYNCH: I will second the motion.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: We have a motion by Member Baratta, a second by Member Lynch.

MR. GIACOPETTI: I have a question for staff.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Yes.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Condition A concerning the grant of -- the grant of land to the city, if the city doesn't want the property as a park, because they don't want to maintain it, and assume the expense, what happens to the PRO -- I'm sorry, the RUD?

MR. GILLIAM: Well, that's a term that would have to be basically negotiated. I mean, at this point in time that's something that the applicant is offering to the city.
If, in fact, it's something the city doesn't want to accept, then ultimately, the city would have to make a decision without that offer of a public benefit, it's still an agreement if the city wants to move forward with it.

MR. GIACOPETTI: I see. Would it be appropriate to add a condition that would say, the city or existing community trust or some other organization, or -- is it your recommendation, Mr. Gillam, we just leave it as it is?

MR. GILLIAM: At this point since we are at a preliminary stage, my recommendation would be to leave the motion as it is and if we have to cross that bridge down the road, we can.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Thank you. We have a motion and a second. Call the roll.

MS. JORDAN: Baratta?

MR. BARATTA: Yes.

MS. JORDAN: Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.
MS. JORDAN: Greco?

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Yes.

MS. JORDAN: Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Motion passes four to zero.

MR. LYNCH: Good luck.

MR. SHAPIRO: Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: All right.

Moving onto our next public hearing. Dunhill Park JSP15-30.

This is a public hearing at the request of Hunter Pasteur Homes, Dunhill Park LLC, for Planning Commission's approval of the preliminary site plan, wetland permit, woodland permit and storm water management plan.

The subject property is located in Section 32 at the northwest corner of Beck Road and Eight Mile Road on 23.76 acres. The property is subject to a planned rezoning overlay plan and agreement.

The applicant is proposing to construct a 31 unit single family residential
development and the cluster arrangement with
frontage on and access to Eight Mile Road.

To our city attorney, one of
the members just excused themselves for a
moment. We still have a quorum generally for
the meeting. Should we wait or --

MR. GILLIAM: If the member is
just going to miss the staff's presentation,
no offense to the staff, I think we can
proceed. The important thing is the member
is here to hear any comments from the public.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Thank you.

MR. MELLEM: So tonight we have
Dunhill Park. So the subject property is
located in Section 32 at the northwest corner
of Beck Road and Eight Mile Road.

The current zoning is RA,
residential acreage with the same to the
north and west.

It is abutted to the east by
residential, the City of Northville and to
the south by single family residential and
Northville Township.

Would you switch to the staff
laptop, please.
The future land use map indicates single family on all sides. The applicant has elected the PRO option to create a floating district with conceptual plans attached to the rezoning of the property, which were approved by the City Council on January 11, 2016.

There are about 2.7 acres of regulated wetlands spread around nine areas of the site. There are also regulated wetlands on-site which include ten specimen trees.

Our planning consultant, Rod Arroyo, from Clear Zoning has reviewed that site plan for conformance with the zoning ordinance.

He is here tonight to present his findings and I will summarize the remaining reviews after his presentation.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Very good. Thank you. Mr. Arroyo.

MR. ARROYO: Good evening, once again. I will go over our March 30th review letter.

This project has an approved
PRO for the site. We have had this project before you in a conceptual nature for the process.

Council did, in fact, approve it with the R1 density. That is the site plan that you have before you. You have a preliminary site plan that is consistent with what has been proposed in the originally approved concept plan for PRO on this property.

The subject property has just over 23 acres, the preliminary site plan proposes 31 lots and 33 percent of the site is proposed to be preserved as open space, which is consistent with the PRO concept plan.

We talk on page two a bit about the summary of the PRO agreements as well as the dimensions in terms of lot size, lot width and setbacks. Those were all addressed through the PRO approval process.

There were specific deviations that were approved with the PRO, those are listed on page three and they deal with setbacks, they deal with landscape
deviations, and there are a number of them listed A through K, and I won't go into all those details because I know you reviewed them previously when this project was before you.

In terms of the Council's approval, there were specific conditions of the approval and those were also listed here. I don't see them necessarily go into those in details for the site plan.

In terms of the infrastructure, this project does propose an access road off of Eight Mile Road.

There is a proposed sub with a temporary T turn around at the north property line. There is also emergency access that is proposed from Beck Road, which provides for secondary access to the property.

There are sidewalk improvements, sidewalk along Beck Road, sidewalk along -- going along Eight Mile. In terms of natural features and open space, there is a substantial amount of preserved open area that previously mentioned. I know you have review letters from the wetland and
woodland consultants.

In terms of the lot sizes, the average lot size is 15,799 square feet, versus 21,780 that would be the typical minimum lot size in R1 zoning district.

The one issue that we did identify are the two entrance signs. These are within the allowable area, but the sign height exceeds the five foot limit for subdivision entry signs.

Because this is a PRO, I believe it would require that Council allow for a larger sign area, that would be the route to take, or that sign would have to be modified to be in conformance with your ordinance requirements.

Also, because this is a subdivision, there is specific design requirements which you have identified on page five and we find that the project is in compliance with your ordinance requirements as well as the PRO deviations.

So we do recommend granting conditional approval of the preliminary site plan because it does, in fact, comply with
the conditions and deviations that are set forth in the PRO agreements subject to resolution of the sign issue that we previously identified.

I will be happy to try to answer any questions.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Thank you, Mr. Arroyo.

Kirsten.

MR. MELLEM: Engineering is recommending approval. Wetlands is approving as noted in the review letter, for a wetland minor use permit and authorization to encroach on the 25 feet natural feature setback.

ECT has asked applicant to consider modifications of the proposed lot boundaries to minimize impacts to on-site wetland setbacks, which have not been changed from previous submittals. Especially impacts on wetland C, which are of a high quality wetland.

The applicant was also asked to demonstrate alternative site layouts that would reduce the overall impact.
The woodlands is approved as noted in the review letter, with recommendation for woodland permit. The applicant has been asked to minimize impacts to on-site wetlands as well to the greatest extent possible, however 20 percent of the regulated trees will be preserved.

The applicant was asked again to demonstrate alternative site layouts that would reduce the overall impact.

Fire, in your packets has approval to not recommend. However, the fire marshal and the applicant's engineer have come to an understanding and will be approving the approval today. So fire is recommending approval.

Landscape, traffic and facade are also recommending approval.

The Planning Commission is asked tonight to consider the preliminary site plan. A wetland permit, woodland permit and storm water management permit.

The applicant representatives are here to answers questions. As always I am here to answer any questions as well.
CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Very good.

Thank you, Kirsten.

Would the applicant like to address the Planning Commission.

MR. WERTHEIMER: Good evening, Randy Wertheimer, W-e-r-t-h-e-i-m-e-r.

We appreciate being in front of again this evening, all the work that the staff has put in with our team to get to this point.

We have seen each other a number of times. We are happy to answer any questions that you have may have.

One item I want to mention on the sign height, I think that may have been an error by our landscape architect. We are happy to conform with the ordinance of the entry sign height to the neighborhood.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Okay, very well. Thank you.

All right, this is a public hearing. If any member of the public would like to address the Planning Commission regarding this particular public hearing, please come forward.
(No audible responses.)

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: All right.

Seeing no one, we will close the public hearing on this matter and is there any correspondence?

MR. LYNCH: Yes, just one from John Dodge, 47209 Dunsaney (ph) Court, Northville, in support, however they are not in favor of any road expansion around Eight Mile and Beck.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Thank you.

All right. With the public hearing being closed, I will turn the matter over to the Planning Commission for comment and discussion. Anyone would like to start.

MR. LYNCH: I guess I will go ahead.

First of all, I'd like to congratulate you. I know where we started. This is another case of kind of sticking with the plan and kind of working through all the loose ends with the staff.

I appreciate both staff and your participation, it makes this job a lot easier.
With that, I'd like to make a motion. In the matter of Dunhill Park JSP15-13 motion to approve the preliminary site plan, based on and subject to the following conditions listed on the motion sheet A through C.

This motion is being made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Article 4, Article 24 and Article 25 of the zoning ordinance, and all other applicable provisions of the ordinance.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Second.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: We have a motion by Member Lynch, second by Member Giacopetti. Call the roll.

MS. JORDAN: Baratta?
MR. BARATTA: Yes.
MS. JORDAN: Giacopetti?
MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.
MS. JORDAN: Greco?
CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Yes.
MS. JORDAN: Lynch?
MR. LYNCH: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Motion passes four to zero.
MR. LYNCH: In the matter of Dunhill Park, JSP15-13, motion to approve the wetland permit based on the subject to following, findings are in compliance with ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters, and the conditions and items listed in those letters being addressed in the final site plan.

This motion is being made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Chapter 12, Article 5 of the code of ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the ordinance.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: We have a motion by Member Lynch.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Second.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: And a second by Member Giacopetti. Call the roll.

MS. JORDAN: Baratta?
MR. BARATTA: Yes.

MS. JORDAN: Giacopetti?
MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. JORDAN: Greco?

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Yes.

MS. JORDAN: Lynch?
MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Motion passes four to zero.

MR. LYNCH: In the matter of Dunill Park, JSP15-13, a motion to approve the woodland permit based on and subject to the following items A and B listed on the motion sheet.

In addition this motion is being made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Chapter 37 of the code of ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the ordinance.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Second.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: We have a motion by Member Lynch, second by Member Giacopetti. Call the roll.

MS. JORDAN: Baratta?

MR. BARATTA: Yes.

MS. JORDAN: Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. JORDAN: Greco?

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Yes.

MS. JORDAN: Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Motion passes four to zero.

MR. LYNCH: The final motion. In the matter of Dunhill Park, JSP15-13, motion to approve the storm water management plan, based on and subject to the following.

The findings of compliance with ordinance standards and the staff and consultant review letters and the conditions and items in those letters being addressed on the final site plan, and this motion is being made because it is otherwise in compliance with Chapter 11 of the code of ordinances and all other applicable ordinances.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Second.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: We have a motion by Member Lynch, second by Member Giacopetti.

Call the roll.

MS. JORDAN: Baratta?

MR. BARATTA: Yes.

MS. JORDAN: Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. JORDAN: Greco?

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Yes.
MS. JORDAN: Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Matter passes four to zero.

That concludes our public hearings. Next we have matters for consideration.

Matter number one Covington Estates, JSP15-02 consideration at the request of Biltmore Land LLC, for recommendation to City Council for approval of a residential unit development plan alternate.

The subject property is located in Section 31 north of Eight Mile, west of Garfield in the RA residential acreage district.

The applicant is proposing an RUD and a 48.83 acre parcel to construct 38 single family residential units.

The applicant is proposing a temporary relocation of the emergency access drive along the north property line from Garfield Road as an alternate to the current proposed emergency access drive in the
neighboring property to the east and the event easements are not required.

MR. MELLEM: So Covington Estates is before you, and the parcels in question are located west of Garfield Road and north of Eight Mile Road in Section 31 in the City of Novi. The property totals 48.83 acres and the current zoning is RA.

The zoning to the northeast and west is RA, and to the south is Northville Township and Maybury State park. The future land use map indicates single family residential for the subject parcel and the surrounding properties.

Natural features on the site, there are few regulated wetlands and woodlands on the property.

The applicant has proposed a 38 unit single family residential unit development, an RUD on 48.85 acres. The purpose of the RUD option is to permit an optional means of development, flexibility in an RA through R4 residential district, which allows a mix of various residential dwelling units and to permit permanent preservation of
valuable open land, fragile and natural resources and road community characterize that would be lost for conventional development.

The current plan is proposing a variety of lot sizes, with four lots conforming to the underlying zoning district RA, the rest of the lots conform to the R1 requirements.

The proposed density if 0.8 units per acres, consistent with the RA zoning of the site.

The current plan proposes to preserve the natural features of the site and provides active recreation for the residents with 42 percent of the site intended for open space. A paved pathway connection is proposed for a trail to Garfield Road, which provides opportunities for active or passive recreational on the size in the future. The applicant is proposing a gated community.

This submittal is to provide an alternate RUD plan in the event that the Balatine development is not constructed prior to commencing construction of the site.
The plans have been prepared to illustrate an alternate plan which includes a temporary 20-foot wide asphalt and brick paver emergency access drive along the north property line from the proposed Covington Drive cul-de-sac, connecting Garfield Road, gated on both ends. And a water main connection to Garfield Road in the same area.

Minor modifications to units 18 through 12 are proposed and shifted to accommodate the width of the proposed emergency access road.

If approved, the applicant would have a means to construct Covington Estates regardless of the timing of Ballantine.

The original site plan was approved by the Planning Commission on August 15, 2015 and was approved by the City Council on September 14, 2015.

The plan is in general conformance of the code except for a few deviations as identified in the review letters. Planning is recommending approval.
of the current plan provided that City Council provides modification to lot sizes and building setback reductions.

Engineering is recommending approval of the revised RUD plan with additional comments to be addressed with the next submittal.

Engineering identified two DCS variances, design construction variances that would be required.

One is to be able to exceed the maximum distance of 1,500 feet between Eight Mile Road and both emergency accesses. Two is to provide a sub street to the subdivision boundary and both are not to exceed 1,300 feet along the subdivision perimeter.

Landscape and fire recommend approval of the revised RUD plan with additional comments to be addressed with the next submittal.

Traffic, wetlands and woodlands did not review since there were no changes to these parts of the plan.

The Planning Commission is
asked tonight to make a recommendation to
City Council to approve the RUD alternate
plan for the Covington Estates site. The
applicant representatives are here to address
any questions you might have.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Very good.

Thank you.

MR. BARATTA: Question for the
applicant, if you don't mind.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Can you
please step up to the podium and identify
yourself.

MR. STOLEMAN: David Stoleman
(ph) Biltmore Development, 89 Lake Shore
Road.

MR. BARATTA: Thank you,
Mr. Stoleman.

At the Planning Commission
meeting, I was very much in favor of your
project. And the only thing I think that
stopped in my viewpoint me voting for it, was
a comment with respect to -- I believe there
was a group who owned the property next-door
that was also in the audience that you were
buying the property from.
It came out that maybe they weren't going to cooperate or they hadn't heard about you needing an alternative access. And at that time, we said, please, gentlemen, work together see what you can come up with.

And I had absolutely no objection to putting that temporary easement for emergency in the back where you currently have it proposed, with the exception I thought it was important for two adjacent property owners, particularly, you know, working together, sell the property back and forth, one to buy, one to sell.

Have we had any discussion with that, with the sale of your property? I believe his name is Mr. Grewal, G-r-e-w-a-l, from Singh.

MR. STOLEMAN: Yes, after the meeting, per your direction, I spoke with Singh Development, they considered granting us a temporary easement and ultimately denied it. Which I guess isn't -- it’s not a typical request to ask someone for a temporary easement all the way across the
property. So subsequent to that, and per your direction, we made changes to the plan in order to deal with the concerns the residents had. We shifted the bike path as far south as we could, creating an 80-foot distance between that and the nearby homes. We had landscaping requested, you know, following your direction.  

MR. BARATTA: Very much. I appreciate all your work in this project. And I don't have any other questions. Thank you very much.  

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Thank you Member Baratta. Anyone else?  

Go ahead, Member Lynch.  

MR. LYNCH: Actually we do have some -- we do have some correspondence here. This is Covington.  

I am not going to read it. It's two pages of emails involving this access, and I will go ahead and put it into the record. I'm not going to read the whole thing.  

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: We will accept the note, email or letter into the
record.

Any other comments by any other commission members?

MR. GIACOPETTI: I think I share Member Baratta's --

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Member Giacopetti.

MR. GIACOPETTI: I mean, I am disappointed that your neighbor wasn't able to come to an agreement on a temporary easement.

And I guess there is no alternative other than not requiring them to have an access road, is that accurate, Barb?

MS. MCBETH: Yes, through the Chair, I think that's correct.

I mean, at this point, they have the needs to provide the emergency access along their property. An alternative would be to not require it at this point. And since we don't know when the property next-door might develop, I think our fire marshal would recommend that we have the emergency access until that time when the connection can be made through the adjacent
Thank you. Any other comments?

MR. LYNCH: Since we have no other alternative, I'd like to make a motion in the matter of Covington Estates, JSP15-02, motion to recommend approval of the residential unit development plan, alternative, subject to and based on the following findings.

Findings A through E, including F, subtext 1 through 14, on motion sheet, along with items G through J on the motion sheet.

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

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: We have a motion by Member Lynch.

MR. BARATTA: Second.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: And a second by Member Baratta. Call the roll.
MS. MCBETH: Barrata?
MR. BARATTA: Yes.
MS. JORDAN: Giacopetti?
MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.
MS. JORDAN: Greco?
CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Yes.
MS. JORDAN: Lynch?
MR. LYNCH: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Motion passes four to zero.

MR. STOLEMAN: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: That brings us to our next matter for consideration.

All right, our next matter for consideration is a thoroughfare master plan presentation.

MS. MCBETH: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I will provide a brief introduction and then our consultant will come forward.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Thank you.

MS. MCBETH: So the City of Novi is in the process of preparing a thoroughfare master plan covering the entire city.

The intent of developing a
The thoroughfare master plan is to establish physical and cultural environments and to support and encourage safe, comfortable and convenient travel by a variety of modes, motor vehicles, non-motorized transportation, pedestrians, bicycles, et cetera. We feel that the thoroughfare master plan is an important component in Novi's transportation planning efforts and will assist the Planning Commission and the City Council in making strategic and sustainable investments in roads and pathways.

The analysis and recommendations that result from such a plan will help identify short and long range transportation improvement priorities community wide.

The thoroughfare plan is intended to identify deficiencies in the existing major road network, provide traffic forecasts and review the functional classifications of the road. It's also intended to develop alternative thoroughfare improvement plans from minor road improvements to full scale corridor upgrades.
Rank future road projects and help identify needs.

Since the last Corradino Group lead by Joe Corradino who is here tonight to provide the brief presentation, we have worked collaboratively with the city's thoroughfare master plaster steering committee, made up of staff members from the city manager's office, community development, the department of public services, the police department and older adult services.

In an open house held in December, that was attended by approximately 50 people, the purpose of that open house was to present the process that will be used to complete the plan and seek feedback from the attendees regarding various transportation related issues.

Several Council members as well as a Planning Commission members were in attendance at that open house as well as other representatives from southeast Michigan Council of Governments, the Road Commission for Oakland County.

The materials presented at the
open house was included in a previous packet that the Planning Commission had access to.

Another presentation was provided in February at the Meadowbrook Commons to seek additional feedback from our older adult community. Progress on the plan has been made with evidence as seen in the technical memoranda that are available for review on the city's web page, some of which was provided in the packet this evening.

Tonight Mr. Corradino would like to provide a summary of the work that's been completed so far.

His presentation, as I said, will take 15 minutes after which the Planning Commission may ask questions.

Tomorrow evening the city is hosting a more extensive presentation of the thoroughfare plan for any interested members of the community. That presentation will be held here in the City Council Chambers from 6:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m., and as I said, the community members are invited.

Mr. Corradino, please proceed.

MR. CORRADINO: Thank you. Thank
you for allowing me to be here. We're helping put together an update of your thoroughfare master plan.

We met back in December and showed you a schedule, that we're proceeding on. We are ahead of schedule. If you look at the April milestone, this is a point at which we have a meeting with the Planning Commission, prior to a meeting with the general public.

A number of documents have been produced and are on the website.

As we said earlier, our job was to look at all the modes in a practical way, to examine a number of roadway corridors and look at some funding sources, particularly because the State and the Federal Governments have passed new funding laws.

The sad fact is, that the state is far behind in maintaining roads, and so there is very little money available for capacity improvements. So it will take a concentrated effort to do some of the things that are proposed in a preliminary plan.
With the project and in meeting and through contact with the public, we tried to take their ideas and make them into the analysis and then look at those as it relates to the data we were generating.

The people that came to the meetings, the two so far, were given touch pad polling devices, just like you see on TV, they then scored, if you will, gave us their opinions.

Most of the folk involved in the meetings were older than 55 years old, not atypical, but you need to know that when you see some of the results.

Every comment that we got through the computer, the community remarks platform, was responded to. We got generally speaking 64 original comments and many, many more support comments.

For example, on roadway improvements, recommendations, suggestions was made to widen Ten Mile Road. That's one comment. But it got almost a dozen and a half thumbs up if you will.

The number of comments
diminishes, nobody talked about freight obviously, bus transit got two comments which spurred analyses that we had undertaken, and there were a few bicycle improvements.

The results of our work is -- are shown here. This is not all of the polling, but it's a couple of key factors. Most of the folks that attended our meetings, interestingly use cars, either they carpool or they drive by themselves, few take transit, most of that is from the older adult services system. When asked again, remembering that a number of these folks, the majority, the vast majority were older than 55, those folks indicated that they would like to see sidewalk and safety improvements, bicycle improvements and roadway traffic signalization in the main transit, some support and roadway widening got second lowest support.

Nonetheless, we are considering roadway widening. This is why -- this is probably better seen on your pads. The red is congestion. That's our forecast of what happened -- our estimate of what
happens in 2015.

If you look at the map closely, Beck Road, as you probably understand, in the p.m. peak is red, red, red.

Ten Mile is red for major sections and then there are other spots that cry for some attention. When we do what we do, people have a hard time, if you will -- oops.

You see that little ball that is moving, in clock time, watch Beck Road, on the middle of the slide. This is Waze, W-a-z-e, GPS data, congestion data, for a Wednesday between about 4:00 and 7:00 o'clock. As you can see, the red continues to build and build and build on Beck Road.

We have got similar information for like Ten Mile Road, for you to review, but the fact of the matter is that after about six things begin to ease off and by about 7:00 p.m., it's free flow again. You experience that probably every day.

So what we saw in the computer
is happening on the ground. And then we
looked at the future, forward, it's the same
but worse. More red happens on one spot or
another, so in the incremental way, we dealt
with things, looking at individual
improvements, having seen those data on the
maps that we just looked at. We said, okay,
let's make some individual improvements. I
turn to one, widen Twelve Mile from Beck to
Cabaret. Alternative 12, widen Novi from
Nine Mile to Nick Lidstrom Drive.

We put those improvements in
the computer and tested them one at a time.
The chart on the left basically says, how
many miles am I going to travel in
congestion.

The chart on the right says
how many hours am I going to travel in
congestion, the bottom red line is basically
what would happen in 2040 without major
improvements.

The degree to which the lines
shrink, the yellow zero lines are any
indications of improvement. And the three
that are doing the most individually are
three, seven and 11. Basically, three, Beck Road from Pontiac Trail down to Twelve Mile, seven, the rest of way to Eight Mile and Novi, and 11, Ten Mile.

Then we looked at combining these. We said, is there a practical way we can put roadway segments together to come up with a cost effective way to make congestion less.

And so what we did was take three and seven and 11 and then put that into one combination called I. And I compared to that red line, all the other yellow lines, is a significant improvement from 100,000 vehicle miles of congestion to something in the neighborhood of less than 60. And whether it's vehicle miles or vehicle hours, that's where we get the performance.

Now you can see on the left-hand chart that G might be better, G means that we have got to add Meadowbrook widening, it wasn't cost effective to get that incremental improvement.

So now we come back to 2040 and we have made I part of the plan. But all
of the congestion doesn't disappear. We don't build our way out of all your congestion by proposed widening of the roads. But if you looked at the red and looked at what we consider improvements for the future, the near term future at intersections, almost every red spot is being approached with a cost effective, we believe, improvement that will address the congestion.

So we have got a series of intersections and we have got a series of roadway improvements.

Here is one, an example. Beck at Grand River Avenue. The bottom of the chart, where it said 1.22, that means you're 20 percent over capacity in 2040 in this location. But when we simply add a double left turn on Beck -- I'm sorry, on Grand River Avenue, at Beck, it drops to less than one. That improvement being made effectively gets you to a point where you're getting, I believe, a good return on investment. That's less than a million dollars worth of cost involved to help that congestion go from 20 some percent over capacity to less than that.
We looked at walkway/pathway improvements. If Beck and Ten Mile were to be improved, a number of the priorities would be taken care of because sidewalks would be part of the design. But there are others, 24 segments that are prioritized in your annual update. All of those are part of the plan.

It was suggested in community remarks that we look at a regional bus system. And we tried to connect up with SMART and the little park and ride lot nearby.

We costed out that service both for two routes being extended throughout the week, and then less than throughout the week to try to control the cost. We use SMART's numbers for a cost per mile, cost per hour and came up with service that could be highly expensive if you ran it all the time, and you're not supported from a millage standpoint of SMART right now, so if you were at all interested, you could go to the limited service, which you can see has fewer runs during the weekday and no Saturday and Sunday service.

We didn't think in working
with the committee this was a viable option. We presented, it's a policy decision on what you want to do. Also public comments in the community remarks was why doesn't somebody build a tram between these two malls on each side of 96, 12 Oaks and it's partner mall.

We looked at that. We looked at all kinds of devices, ranging from Disney World conveyance to a gondola, a ski lift. It's a many million dollar deal. So consistent with trying to be practical and have vision that's pragmatic, we said let's do a circulator.

We laid this circulator out. You can design that circulator to touch with whatever you want, but we tried to cost it out so that it would be practical and yet may be affordable. The bottom line cost for that circulator, we recommend is at the very bottom of the chart, is $45,000. We suggest you run a survey -- a circulator for five hours a day, on Saturdays with existing equipment, and do that, if you would, on a trial basis for six months. You are going to get the mall owners to allow you on their
property, which is not an easy deal.

There is also the opportunity
to talk to some of the merchants, maybe even
the mall people about some financial support.
But we thought that circulator on a limited
basis for six months trial at $45,000 was not
an unrealistic way to approach the future and
respond to that issue of whether it's a tram
or some kind of connection. You park at a
mall, you don't unpark, you go to the next
mall, if you so care, or to any shopping
around by getting on the circulator, that
operates every 30 minutes.

We also looked at the very top
of the chart at the cost of the roads,
$10 million for Ten Mile, from Haggerty to
Taft, 60.3 million for the widening of Beck.
Beck would be either a five lane road or a
boulevard. Haggerty would be a five lane
road.

We fix 13 intersections at a
cost of over $2 million, then we take the
investment for the bike -- the pathways and
sidewalks and it comes up over to $4 million.

We looked at the older adult
services. They were suggested to us that the fares were unfair. The multiple trips that you're going to be taken by seniors, if I want to go to my doctor, then I want to go to have lunch, then I want to go to the bank, then I want to go home, $3, $3, $3 and we were told that at the adult services headquarters, that's unfair, it's just too much.

We so looked at the data for a specific month, that month was July of last year, there were nine people making multiple trips at once. And most of those trips were three for $9. The typical trip is two for $6.

So we didn't think that it was an unfair burden. We were looking to put in a zone fare system, so it would be much more affordable. We thought that when we took a step back, looked at the service that was provided, the quality of the vehicles, that the system was effectively operating, as you can afford to operate it this year. I can't remember the agency, one of the agencies in city government had to come up with another
25,000 plus dollars to close the loop, the
gap in the funding of the OAS transportation
service.

So with a deficit in my way of
talking about it, we didn't think you needed
to stretch unless you feel you have got the
resources to do that.

City Council appropriates
about 20,000 some money, few thousand comes
from marketing, advertising promotions, some
money comes from fares then 25, $30,000 has
got to be put in by an agency within the
city.

So our recommendation in
summary are roadway widening over the course
of the nine or ten years in the future, not
tomorrow.

Design would have take place,
and then if you were lucky, you could go
forward with support from the state and the
feds, but like everything in this world, it's
politics with a big P. And somebody needs to
effectively get the message, get the focus
and move forward. Now is the time to start.
You folks will have a plan that will be up to
the date and it's a plan that not many others will have that up to date. Secondly.

They have got some money, so your legislators plus your contact with DOT and the government will make things happen.

So that's where we are in terms of a roadway, the intersections, the pathways and the transit system. It's a pragmatic look, and we told the steering committee that, it's a pragmatic look at what might be done, can be done, and it takes time to do it, but we have laid it out so that it takes a good ten years to get everything together and make everything come to a conclusion.

So I will stop and see if you got any comments or questions.

MR. LYNCH: I do have a comment. I was just wondering when you did your model, there is some -- I am only going to talk about, you know, South Lyon to the west of us is booming, a lot of our traffic problems, especially in the Ten Mile area and also the Grand River, Beck, you know, that area.

Did you take into account if
they were going to be paving Napier, that
gives people an opportunity to offload some
of the demand off of Ten Mile onto Napier
over to Eight Mile, or did you just do it
static, assuming that all the roads are going
to stay the same?

MR. CORRADINO: No, sir, we
considered the roads would be in good
condition, which is the emphasis of the
state's investment for the next five years.
By the way, start investing until 2017. We
assumed it would all be in good condition.

We didn't just take Novi, we
took -- there is local traffic, we could
probably parcel out which is which.

MR. LYNCH: I think a lot of
the -- you know, a lot of what we see here
is, you know, the comments, the demand coming
going east, you know, from South Lyon. And
if there is any other alternatives other than
widening Ten Mile or widening, you know,
whatever, Nine Mile, you know, some of those
intermediate roads to get people offloaded
onto Eight Mile, which is a larger road,
or -- you know, so you can bypass, because
Beck gets all jammed up.

I was just wondering if, you know, if you looked at all that stuff, you took that all into account.

MR. CORRADINO: We took, you will see in the report, we took, you know, the main line system and we connected it up -- with a cobweb full of non-main line roads. Then we assigned traffic to all of it. So if somebody wanted to take a shortcut, it would load up.

There is too much attraction along things like Beck and along Ten Mile, and so it's hard to divert the traffic somewhere else. Why not 96, but it just doesn't happen. So you know, like politics, in this instance, so much traffic is local.

MR. LYNCH: I was -- I don't know what kind of model you have. I was just wondering if you did any of monochroic simulation, okay, if I add more capacity, maybe not like we would consider widening roads, maybe paving a road and just trying to understand where the demand is coming from. You know, you certainly did that at certain
points in time, if you looked at any of that.

MR. CORRADINO: We used a model called Transcat, which is a standard, if you will, in the industry. We looked at the population, employment developments that are forecasts by you, then in the same -- back to you, and it gives us a very dynamic look of the future.

We used the Waze data to make sure the model wasn't, you know, tiled, and for all practical purposes, we got 85 percent correlation to what the model was doing, and all the traffic counts. And then we did the Waze situation, and so we think we are getting a realistic assignment, but we did the flood, the cement work -- it's in one of our reports, a cobweb of --

MR. LYNCH: I was just trying to understand how the model was developed. I'm trying to link it to a theory of constraints type thing that we used to do.

MR. CORRADINO: It reiterates, it keeps trying to stick traffic, and when it can't go there, I want to go this way, then the model starts again. It keeps on doing
that. Finally, it reaches equilibrium.

That's what you saw in the maps.

MR. LYNCH: All right. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Thank you, Member Lynch. Any other comments?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Just a thank you for coming in.

MR. CORRADINO: I don't what Giacopetti is or Baratta or Greco, but I almost feel at home. I don't know about Lynch.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: I was thinking that when you got up there.

MR. LYNCH: Wait a minute. My mom's name was Gianoni.

MR. CORRADINO: Thanks, guys.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Thank you. All right. That brings us to our next matter for consideration, approval of the January 13, 2016 Planning Commission minutes.

MR. LYNCH: Motion to approve.

MR. BARATTA: Second.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Motion by Member Lynch, second by Member Baratta. All
in favor.

THE BOARD: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Next matter is approval of the March 9, 2016 Planning Commission minutes.

MR. LYNCH: Motion to approve.

MR. BARATTA: Second.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Motion by Member Lynch, second by Member Baratta. All in favor?

THE BOARD: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Next is approval of the March 23, 2016 Planning Commission minutes.

MR. LYNCH: Motion to approve.

MR. BARATTA: Second.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Motion by Member Lynch, second by Member Baratta. All in favor?

THE BOARD: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: That concludes our matters for consideration.

Any matters any discussion?

MS. MCBETH: Just one more thing.

We do plan to reschedule the
master plan for land use study session coming up here. We are hoping for a consensus on that in the next few days. Once we do that, we will announce that again to a number of members of the public who would be interested in coming out to that study session.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Thank you, Ms. McBeth.

Any supplemental issues?

MR. GIACOPETTI: One note. I think during the public hearing for the Ivanhoe project, Beacon Hill, there were a few more correspondence received. I have copies here, a letter of support from Community Choice.

MR. LYNCH: Right.

MR. GIACOPETTI: For the record, there is a letter of support from Community Choice. There is a letter of letter from A-e-c-o-m, concerning the traffic impact study. And a letter from Fleis & Vandenbrink, also about the traffic impact study, just for the record.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Thank you, Member Giacopetti.
That brings us to our next audience participation. If anyone like to address the Planning Commission, seeing no one.

Like a motion to adjourn.

MR. LYNCH: Motion to adjourn.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Second.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Motion by Member Lynch, second by Member Giacopetti.

All in favor.

THE BOARD: Aye.

(The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.)
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