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

Sri, can you call the roll, please.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Good evening, thank you.

Member Anthony?

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Absent, excused.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Member Baratta?
MR. BARATTA: Here.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Here.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Here.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?
MR. LYNCH: Here.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Absent,
excused.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Here.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: With that, if we could rise for the Pledge of Allegiance. Member Baratta, could you lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Pledge recited.)

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

MR. BARATTA: Motion to approve.

MR. ANTHONY: Second.

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

THE BOARD: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: We have an agenda. Presentations? No presentation. That brings us to our first audience participation.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: We have an agenda.

Come to our first item for the presentation. If any member of the
audience would like to address the Planning Commission on any matter that does not have anything to do with the public hearings that we have scheduled, please step forward.

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

Any correspondence not related to any of the other matters we have?

MR. LYNCH: No.

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

City planner report?

MS. MCBETH: Thank you. Nothing this evening.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: No consent agenda.

That brings us to our first public hearing. This is a public hearing at the request of Pulte Homes for Planning Commission approval of the preliminary site plan with site condominum phasing plan, wetland permit, woodland permit and storm water management plan.

The property is subject to the planned rezoning overlay plan and
agreement. The subject property is currently
zoned RT, two family residential, with a
planned rezoning overlay.

The subject property is
approximately 22.36 acres and is located on
the east side of Dixon Road, north of Twelve
Mile Road, Section Ten.

And the applicant is
proposing a development of a nine unit single
family residential detached site condominium.

Mr. Komaragiri: Good evening.

The rezoning and concept plan for the subject
property first appeared for public hearing on
August 26 of 2015.

The plan went through two
additional public hearings since then to
address staff and Planning Commission's
concerns from residents from Liberty Park
with regard to screening.

On March 9, 2016, the
Planning Commission recommended approval of
the rezoning request and alternate plan
followed by a public hearing.

On March 14, City Council
tentatively approved the rezoning request for
the PRO and directed the city attorney's
office to prepare a PRO agreement.

On June 27th of 2016, the
City Council approved the revised plan
rezoning overlay concept plan and agreement.
No major changes were made to the concept
plans since the Commission recommended that
in March. All the deviations from the zoning
ordinance have been approved by the council
and are included as part of the PRO
agreement. The applicant is currently
proposing to construct the development in two
phases.

The subject property is
approximately 22 acres and is located on the
east side of Dixon Road north of Twelve Mile
Road in Section 10.

The property is subjected
to a planned rezoning overlay plan and
agreement. The property is currently zoned
RT, two family residential with a planned
rezoning overlay, and it is surrounded by
residential acreage on all sides with R1 in
the east.
The future land use map indicates single family uses for the subject property and the surrounding properties.

There are regulated wetlands on the property and a considerable amount of regulated woodlands on property. The applicant is proposing a development of a 90 unit single family residential detached site condominium. The City of Novi wetland minor use permit for a 0.02 acre of wetland fill and a letter of buffer authorization for wetland buffer impact of 0.06 acres are required for the proposed impacts.

The City of Novi woodland permit is required for the proposed impacts for the regulated woodlands. 79 percent of the woodland trees are proposed to be removed, about 622 trees are proposed to be removed of which would require 985 woodland replacements. 403 tree credits are provided on site of which about 85 credits are proposed within Liberty Park greenbelt and 583 credits are paid into the tree fund.

The Liberty Park homeowners association has provided an open space
preservation easement to allow the applicant
to plant about 117 trees within their open
space area.

All reviews are
recommending approval with additional
comments to be addressed with final site plan.

The Planning Commission is
asked tonight to approve preliminary site plan, phasing plan, site condominium,
wfetlands permit, woodlands permit and storm
water management plan.

The applicant Bob Halso
from Pulte Homes is here, if you have any
questions for him and staff will be glad to
answer any questions you have for us. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Very good.
Thank you. Would the applicant like to
address the Planning Commission.

MR. HALSO: Good evening,
Mr. Chair, Commissioners. My name is
Bob Halso, representing Pulte Homes.

The staff has done an
excellent job of summarizing the proposed
plan.

I have nothing to add, but I am happy to answer any questions you might have.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Thank you. This is a public hearing, if there is any member of the public that would like to address the Planning Commission regarding this particular matter, please come forward to the podium and state your name and where you're from.

Seeing no one -- do we have one -- okay.

MR. MAGACHALI: My name is (unintelligible) Magachali (ph). I'm a resident of Dixon Road.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Just spell your name, sir, so she can take it down.

MR. MAGACHALI: (Inaudible). Magachali.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Please proceed.

MR. MAGACHALI: So I don't know how many of you (unintelligible) right through the street. It's a very quiet,
beautiful street with very, very low traffic. It's been always 12 unit homes on the whole street, 11 to 12 homes.

So with adding 90 plus more units, that's going to be a very high amount of traffic and even now with the lesser traffic, (unintelligible), at times I think late at night there is no lights, it's a gravel road, no lights on the street, and there are instances when we are crossing the street, (unintelligible) so fast and they are (unintelligible).

So, my point is, it cannot accommodate 90 units of home in that small of road. And that's our concern. Maybe they haven't had a chance to (unintelligible) the street, maybe I can bring that sign up or something like that. We are concerned about the high volume of traffic on this site. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Thank you very much. Is there anyone else that would like to address the Planning Commission?

MR. JAGDALE: Good evening. My name is Gaurav Jagdale. I reside on 28454
Witherspoon Drive. My backyard is facing Dixon Road.

What I want to speak about, the goal for this similar point, that the previous gentleman was mentioning about traffic. I did take some pictures a few months back of the traffic because of the Twelve Mile (unintelligible) from a two lane to a single lane right where Novi Road is, so there is a lot of congestion there. And some of the pictures I have emailed to Sri, maybe she can share them, and just to be clear, I want to rule out this is not impacted by the 275 shutdown. These photographs were taken October of 2015, so the shutdown of the freeway has not caused this congestion in the city road. What that depicts basically is a mile long, you know, stand, you know, back-to-back cars standing and people have difficulty getting into the subdivision and coming out of the subdivision. I have noticed just one accident during the morning rush hour, that has happened right at the entrance because people exit, and they take a left and head east to take I-96, also by
coming back in, people think -- people who are going into the subdivision, are sometimes subject to aggressive behavior because people think you are cutting into it, whereas we are just heading left -- you know, exiting as the second lane is finishing and making a entry into the subdivision.

So those are some of the day-to-day problems that we are seeing. So, you know, we will address the capacity of road at that juncture, and I think I would like to submit my objection for adding additional capacity in that area.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Thank you. When were these pictures taken?

MR. JAGDALE: These are October 2015.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Would anyone else like to address the Planning Commission at this time?

Go ahead. Please state your name and address.

MR. RAMDUSS: My name is Raj Ramduss (ph). My address is 28090 Dixon Road. My first name is R-a-j-k-u-m-a-r, last
name, R-a-m-d-u-s-s (ph).

As the gentleman said, the problem is there is a lot of traffic going on there. And also Liberty Park currently, those residents are using (inaudible) Dixon Road, so I would like to (inaudible) for the same reason.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Thank you. Would anyone else like to address the Planning Commission on this particular public hearing? Anyone?

All right. Seeing no one else, we are going to close that portion of the public hearing and turn it over to the Planning Commission. Is there any correspondence?

MR. LYNCH: Yes, I guess the first one is the gentleman that was up here, Gaurav Jagdale, he has the pictures of the public record, the traffic.

We have another one, it's support of the development business. This is from Richard J. Ketterman (ph), 18828 -- I can't read the road. The development plan
matches nicely with the surrounding developments.

The next one is from Herman -- I can't read the last name. It's an estate for Sylvia -- I can't read the last name -- 1189 East Lake Drive, Novi, Michigan it says support.

The next one is from (inaudible), 28467 Witherspoon Drive. I just want to keep natural beauty -- keep the natural beauty road as is. Dixon Road is the only access to the subdivision.

And the last one is an objection from Mr. Kashi (ph), Mushiwami (ph) 28075 Dixon Road. I have checked, the 90 homes be cutting down trees, which (unintelligible) nature resources, one of the great things about Novi and Dixon Road is the woodlands. It's a place where many animals will live. It mentions about the trees -- concern about the trees. That's the last thing.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Thank you. Now open it up to the Planning Commission for discussion. Anyone like to start.
Member Baratta.

MR. BARATTA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I know this project has been before us in the past. We looked at several of the issues.

I guess the two issues that I'm looking at with this particular menu, if you can help on this. Let's start with the traffic because I think basically the objections and the discussion we have heard, both written and verbal today related to the traffic, and also the woodland or the landscaping issues of cutting down the trees. I'm going to approach or discuss those two issues.

So, on the traffic, am I correct in -- I think I read a comment from ECT, which talked about that they were going to pave a section of the road from up on Dixon Road to Liberty Parkway. Is that -- this is for the petitioner, is that correct?

MR. HALSO: That's correct, Commissioner, that's part of the PRO.

MR. BARATTA: So that will be two lanes at that point, four lanes, how many
lanes is that going to be?

MR. HALSO: Two lanes.

MR. BARATTA: That will be two.

MR. HALSO: Yes.

MR. BARATTA: You feel that's sufficient to alleviate the traffic congestion at that point?

MR. HALSO: Well, we do. We have had two traffic consultant reports, submitted as part of this process. First was submitted early on, determined that level of service would not be affected by this development. I think that paving helps a little bit. And I think this body asked us to update that report before we came back before you, we did so. The conclusion was the same, level of service would be unchanged by this development.

The road section for Dixon itself was worked out with city engineering to keep speeds down. It's not a thoroughfare type section, that's correct. That's as to the traffic.

MR. BARATTA: Let me address this to Jeremy.
Jeremy, are we comfortable now that with the proposed improvements to the road, that we are not going to create any additional difficulty in this traffic -- in this area with the inclusion of these additional houses?

MR. MILLER: Yes, there has been two traffic studies reviewed by our consultants and they agree that shouldn't affect the level of service.

MR. BARATTA: So the improvement would take care of the extra impact on this road?

MR. MILLER: Yes.

MR. BARATTA: Again, this is for the petitioner, one of the things that's concerning, I want to address the landscape issue. Is, you know, when you see a developer come in, typically a housing development, basically clearcut indigenous vegetation, the trees. In this one you've got, I think if I'm correct about 700 and about -- excuse me, 622 trees that should be clear cut into 79 percent of the natural foliage for the trees on this property. I
understand that you're going to be putting some trees back and putting some money in the tree fund, et cetera.

My concern is, you know, we are basically getting rid of this natural vegetation, these older trees, this feel of our community of having these trees and creating a subdivision with new trees, that's very well designed, very attractive, very manicured.

This is a change in really the City of Novi's look and feel. And while I voted for the project initially, I think this is an area that we really need to look at because I do believe we need to work around this vegetation, these natural trees to create that environment. And I know we agreed to a project over at Eight Mile, and I believe it was Beck, when they clear cut the trees, it was a forced area because of the arsenic. I know we also did that at Ten Mile and Beck, again, little forested area.

I don't believe our committee members really approve of that. I mean, we have had a lot of difficult
discussions regarding that. And I know at
Eleven Mile between Wixom and Beck Road,
again, we did it again.
And I think that's
something, we really need to look at our
landscaping plan and decide whether we want
to do that. Because I think we could
probably design a project, utilize more of
that natural vegetation. And we are not
doing it.
And I blame us for doing
that, that's a conscious decision that we
have made at this panel. So I think -- I'm
also a member of the panel. So I think we
really need to look at this.
So, Bob, I guess what I'm
asking is, is there any way to add more of
this natural feature into your plan, are you
replanting some of these older trees, what
are you doing with them?
MR. HALSO: Well, let me give you
some credit by way of review of the process.
This is a very substantial arsenic
remediation plan for this site. We have
submitted a 742 page arsenic remediation plan
to the DEQ to approve all of our plan. The bi-product of that over much of the site is you have to clear the trees.

And I think that's -- there is some years back when this project was brought in, it was a $2 million problem, that identified -- we hope it's less than that, but it's a very substantial problem. So the trees go.

However, we have kind of fine tuned things to your point. If you look at the site plan, in the areas where we are not remediating, we have identified those little pocket parts and 42 percent of the quality trees on-site are contained in those areas. And that's a painstaking design -- I don't know if you recall the first plan, we had a centralized park that we thought was kind of symmetrical, but it didn't really do the job for the trees.

And so this particular plan is finely tuned to accommodate as many of the high quality trees on the site that we possibly can and still remediate.

So I think that's -- we
have done a pretty good job there, and again, I give the -- the city kind of pushed us along to get there because we weren't there to begin with.

So this is a bi-product of a lot of working together. We also reached an agreement with the city to plan on Dixon Road, which is relatively unique for some of the trees that we are removing, we are actually going to be beautifying Dixon Road and we have also reached an agreement with the Liberty Park homeowners association to plant trees in their 50-foot common area along Dixon Road, which is going to have a major impact on the feel of Dixon Road.

We had some photos from an earlier presentation that shows kind of a before and after, and while there are trees on our site, the majority of the Dixon Road right-of-way relatively -- well, if I might, and we're adding some trees to what the public will see as they come up Dixon Road. You also might note on our plan there is very, very little housing on Dixon Road. There is a few up in the northwest corners
there that's back to that pretty big buffer
of trees, and otherwise it's pretty much left
open, as best we could.

I think give yourself some
credit. We're doing a lot to remediate the
arsenic, which is a significant issue and I
think a great public benefit. And saving
pretty good selection of quality trees in the
process.

MR. BARATTA: Thank you very
much.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Thank you
Member Baratta. Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: I remember the
discussions. This isn't it the first
discussion. I do know that we sent you back
to the drawing board specifically for this
reason.

I think the arsenic removal
is a balance to try to take -- I do agree
with Member Baratta, it's a policy, you know,
we -- I thought we have been relatively
consistent with trying to -- I know I have
stated it, that granted we are going to
replace trees, we want to keep as many of the
trees -- this tree fund -- like I said
publicly, I'm not a fan of the tree fund,
although I do agree with the concept, I want
to keep as much of the foliage in the area
that you're removing it from.

I remembered a discussion
and I'm glad you were able to work with
staff, Dixon Road when we had all the
homeowners come in at either one or two
public hearings ago, that was the biggest
concern, what are they going to see on Dixon
Road. Right now they see a forest back
there.

And so correct me if I'm
wrong, my understanding was we added a
tremendous amount of foliage. You had to do
some negotiating to get access to the
property across the street on the west side
of Dixon Road, then we are adding more stuff
in the -- I don't know if it's east or
whatever, so from the perspective of the
adjacent homeowners association, they are
going to be totally screened from this.

I do appreciate -- I know
that we are kind of hard on you, I do
appreciate you going back to the drawing board on several occasions.

The plan itself, I do understand, if it was a ideal situation, I wish there wasn't arsenic there, I wish that we could limit the density, but I think with all the discussions we've had over the past year, it seems like a year, I don't know how -- pretty close to a year, I do like the project.

Based on the arsenic that we had to overcome, you know we have to give the property owners the ability to develop the property yet try to keep it consistent with the surrounding area. I think, in my opinion, I think this is the best that we could possibly do to make a win-win situation out of this particular parcel. Although I do agree with Mr. Baratta that if there was an extenuating circumstance here, we definitely as a group need to really look at going forward with the removal and the clear cutting. I think that's the most attractive part of Novi is you're actually in the semi rural environment. If you want to get to,
you know, the clear cutting, you can go, you
know, to surrounding communities, Livonia,
Canton, places like that.

But with this particular parcel, I'm satisfied with the year's worth
of work that we have done, as much as we possibly can with this particular parcel. I am in support of it.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Thank you, Member Lynch. Anyone else?

Member Giacopetti.

MR. GIACOPETTI: If I may, I have some questions, if you can just give us a brief overview of the phasing. You said there are two phases?

MR. HALSO: The western most north/south street would go in first, and then the eastern most north/street would go -- that's kind of the phase line, if you will.

MR. GIACOPETTI: So everything west of that --

MR. HALSO: That going down there is kind of the phase line.

MR. GIACOPETTI: I see. And then
what is the timing for this? Where is the plan --

MR. HALSO: Development next spring, summer.

MR. GIACOPETTI: For phase?

MR. HALSO: Phase one.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Then phase two?

MR. HALSO: Would be probably the following year. And that, you know, it's a phasing plan. We may even do it all at once. You know, right now, we're a little premature, but we have the ability at least do it in two phases, if that seems appropriate. Some work, the arsenic remediation will be done over the entire site all at once.

So that will follow whatever course it may follow to get done.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Second question for you, in the last public hearing concerning this project, there was a gentleman who came and brought up the issue of screening and foliage on the opposite side that the audience members are concerned for.

Have you made any changes
or enhancement to screen the eastern property side from the residents who live off of Carlton Way?

MR. HALSO: We have not added it. They have a wonderful landscape buffer there. We are not disturbing it or adding to it in anyway.

MR. GIACOPETTI: I can see in the satellite light map, there is a buffer, that's their property and your property line. So the homes built on that border, their backyard will just be right up to that property line.

MR. HALSO: It will.

MR. GIACOPETTI: You're confident that there are no large gaps in foliage or landscaping that would --

MR. HALSO: It's a nice buffer, the entire buffer, I'm sure they were required to put it in at the time. From market perspective, I feel very comfortable with it.

I think on a lot-by-lot basis, if there were a gap, we'd probably plant some trees in the backyard for our
own -- for marketing a homesite.
   
   But right now we are

enjoying that buffer, which is entirely on
their property. We are not disturbing it in
any way.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Those are all of
my questions. I am a former resident of
Liberty Park development, and I can
sympathize with the audience concerns over
traffic.

Unfortunately, I feel like
those problems are created by poor planning
in terms of location of Declaration or
Independence Drive that leads onto Twelve
Mile. That's a very dangerous intersection.

My traffic concern is for
more for that intersection and the -- you
know, the backups that it causes further down
the residents of this development are
subjected to.

So in terms of our efforts,
I think we are responsible for the capital
improvement plan and pushing some of these
projects, maybe not in the ten year horizon,
the folks shouldn't have to wait ten years,
given all the development and new tax revenue that's coming to the city, you know, when you put in 90 homes it generates that much money and revenue and some of these projects in the vicinity need to be addressed. I'll get off my soapbox.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Thank you, Member Giacopetti.

Any other comments?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: I have a question for Jeremy.

Jeremy, do we know, this subdivision to the east -- or west rather, do we know how many -- approximately how many people or how many houses are in there? How many housing units?

My concern is traffic again. We have got 90 units over here, what do we have coming in from the existing traffic? Do we have a number?

MR. MILLER: I don't know that offhand. The problem we run into here is a lot of the traffic is from Twelve Mile, and that's an Oakland County jurisdiction road, so we are limited in what improvements we can
make to fix it.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Thank you.

MR. JAGDALE: With your permission, I have a figure, 352 homes.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: With that, I will go ahead and make a motion.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: I have a couple of comments. Thank you.

You know, this is a project that we have been considering for quite a while.

And with respect to the traffic, the area, everything that's been done with this, we have looked at it quite a bit, including again, looking at the traffic issues, not only tonight, but really looked at it previously before when we were dealing with these issues. And that's why we asked for another study to go over it, and what to do.

Now, with respect to Member Baratta's comments early on, with regard to making sure we are looking at what we are doing here, I wholeheartedly agree.
I think with this project, my feeling is we have spent enough time on it. We have spent -- you know, Mr. Halso of Pulte Homes has come back numerous times, so I am going to support it.

Although, I'm sure Mr. Halso remembers that I did not support it early on. For the reason with respect to the wooded area, and what we are doing in the City of Novi. You know, whenever someone as respectable as Pulte Homes, Mr. Halso comes before us, it's always a beautiful project, it's always going to be well done. It's always attractive, it's always exciting. We imagine, you know, whether it's large, estate type homes, or a townhome type thing, we all have families, relatives, people that we know. We imagine the mix and the diversity and everybody that's coming into Novi and it always looks good.

But that being said, we do have to consider what we are doing on a going forward basis, I think, because, you know, I know when we were doing this analysis, we have higher density here, lower density over
here and this seems to be a bridge between
the two, but sometimes a wooded area with
nothing there is a reasonable bridge, too.
Because even though it's higher density over
here, these apartments, I know, you know,
people in higher density apartments probably
appreciate looking at woods as much as anyone
in an estate type home. And, you know,
again, I'm going to support this project.

But early on, my biggest

concern was it is zoned a certain way, this
is a drastic change in the density. We have
had some that are closer calls. You know,
Ten Mile and Beck, which was, you know, 66
versus 62 and what we are getting and
different things. And this one was a more
drastic change, but I would like us to take a
closer look in the future, so I will get off
my soapbox. I am not going to withdraw my
support for this project. Again, which I
initially was not for, but, you know, so
those are my comments.

Member Baratta?

MR. BARATTA: Mr. Chairperson,
given that we have looked at this project, we
have studied it, we have an arsenic issue. 
You know, our concerns about the landscaping, 
we have had the applicant come back several 
times, I know we have him spend an awful lot 
more than money that probably he intended 
initially when he came before us. I was 
originally supporting the project and I still 
am.

I'd would like to make a 
motion to approve the preliminary site plan.

So in the matter of Dixon 
Meadows, JSP14-46 Dixon Meadows, motion to 
approve the preliminary site plan, based on 
and subject to the following: The findings 
of compliance with ordinance standards in the 
staff and consultant and review letters, and 
the conditions and items listed in those as 
well as other terms and conditions of the PRO 
agreement as approved, with these items 
beings addressed on the final site plan. 
This motion is made because it is otherwise 
in compliance with Article 3, Article 4 and 
Article 5 of the zoning ordinance, and all 
other applicable conditions of the ordinance.

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

Call the roll.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Greco?

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Baratta?

MR. BARATTA: Yes.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes five to zero.

MR. BARATTA: I have additional motions. To approve of phasing plan, matter of Dixon Meadows, JSP14-46 motion to approve the phasing plan based on and subject to the following: Findings of compliance with ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters and conditions and
items existed in those letters being addressed in the final site plan. This motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Articles 3, 4 and 5 of the zoning ordinance, and all other applicable provisions of the ordinance.

MR. LYNCH: Second.

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

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Greco?

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Baratta?

MR. BARATTA: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: No.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes four to one.

MR. BARATTA: Additional motion in the matter of Dixon Meadows, JSP14-46,
motion to approve the wetland permit based on and subject to the following, findings of compliance with the ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters, conditions and items listed in those letters be addressed on the final site plan, and the motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Chapter 12, Article 5 of the code of ordinances and all other applicable provisions under the ordinance.

MR. LYNCH: Second.

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

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Baratta?

MR. BARATTA: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Greco?

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Yes.

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

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes five to zero.

MR. BARATTA: In the matter of Dixon Meadows JSP14-46, motion to approve the woodland permit based on and subject to the following: Findings of compliance with the ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters, conditions and items listed in those letters being addressed in the final site plans, and motion is in compliance with Chapter 37 of the code of ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the ordinance.

MR. LYNCH: Second.

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

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Greco?

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member
Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Member Baratta?

MR. BARATTA: Yes.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes five to zero.

MR. BARATTA: Final motion in the matter of Dixon Meadows, JSP14-46, motion to approve the storm water management plan based on and subject to the following: Findings of compliance with the standards in the staff and consultant review letters and the conditions and items listed in those letters being addressed on the final site plan, and motion is made because it's otherwise in compliance with Chapter 9 in the code of ordinances and all other applicable conditions and provisions of the ordinance.

MR. LYNCH: Second.

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

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member
Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Baratta?

MR. BARATTA: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Greco?

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Yes.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes five to zero.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: That's it.

Good luck.

Next, our next public hearing, is for the Suburban Showplace expansion.

This is a public hearing at the request of TBON, LLC for Planning Commission's recommendations to City Council for approval of special land use preliminary site plan, wetland permit and storm water management plan.

The request is for expansion of the building and parking lot for land within the OST Planned Office Service
Technology district and OST Planned Office Service Technology district with an EXO, exposition overlay district.

The subject property is located on Section 16 north of Grand River Avenue and west of Taft Road.

The applicant is proposing to expand the existing showplace exposition facility by adding a 175,815 square foot building addition, with associated parking lot and other site improvements.

The site plan is proposing off street parking lot, and an adjacent OST zoned property to serve the exposition facility, off street parking lots and another site require special land permit.

Sri.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: The subject parcel is located in Section 16 north of Grand River Avenue and west of Taft Road. The current site plan proposes expansion to the existing exposition facility well known as Suburban Collection Showplace.

The request is for an expansion of the building and parking lot for
land within the OST and the OST district within an EXO overlay. The site plan is spread across two different parcels with different zoning districts.

Off-street parking lots in OST are typically a permitted use. However the site plan is proposing an off-street parking lot to serve the exposition facility which would require special land use.

The applicant has expressed his intent to combine both parcels into one prior to the final site plan approval. The subject parcels have OST zoning to the west, I1 light industrial to the east and south, and abuts I-96 right-of-way on the north.

The future land use map indicates office research and development for the subject parcels and the surrounding properties, except industrial research and technology on the south.

There are a few related wetlands and woodlands on the property. The site plan is proposing to expand the existing showplace exposition facility within the EXO overlay district by adding 175,000 square
foot building, in addition with associated parking lot and other site improvements. The new building addition will house a 90,000 square foot exhibit hall and several smaller exhibit spaces, pre-function space with access to meeting rooms, and a warehouse addition on the north side with loading docks and receiving area.

An about 18,000 square mezzanine is proposed to be added as a second story overlooking the new lodge exhibit hall and an existing building located at the west end of the facility will be removed to accommodate the addition and allow additional outside patio areas similar to those found near the Hyatt Hotel on east side of the site.

The applicant is proposing to utilize the OST service technology parcel immediately to the west of the Suburban Collection Showplace, primarily for parking for existing exposition facility, and as a secondary and temporary use as fairgrounds, outside exhibits and as a ride and drive automotive research lot to test vehicle
capabilities in a variety of situations.

A total of 2,951 paid parking spaces are proposed for the new expansion. The overall master site plan shows two additional expansion parcels to the west, but are not part of the site plan request at this time.

To accommodate the proposed secondary uses, the applicant is proposing a flat paved area with no interior parking lot islands to allow for the greatest flexibility in test course design, similar to existing ride and drive lot previously approved on the east end side of the site. A striping plan has been submitted but the applicant has indicated the automotive research uses have requested that it either remains unstriped or restriped in a muted color.

The applicant has submitted a community impact statement which was provided as part of your packet along with the site plan. The site plan would require multiple ZBA variances for ordinance deviations and a City Council waiver in order to accommodate proposed secondary uses.
discussed so far. The variances that were applied for were building setbacks reducing the parking lot setbacks and the minimum required parking on-site, lack of islands, minimum distance between building and off street parking lot, and exiting the maximum (unintelligible). And a council waiver is required for proposing painted (unintelligible) in lieu of required raised (unintelligible).

Engineering is providing conditional approval that requires M.D.O.T. approval of the storm water retention basin discharge to the I96 right-of-way.

The proposed site plan does not meet the minimum landscaping requirements in the proposed parking expansion on the west to allow for alternate use of parking lot as a ride and drive automotive research lot and other (unintelligible) earlier. The variance referred into parking lot -- reduction interior parking lot, trees, interior island space, parking space, longer than 15 continuous space, parking lot plantings and foundation plantings. And landscaping
requested to pay a little bit additional
attention towards screening for loading
spaces along I-96 right-of-way.

The applicant indicated
that after the trees are transplanted, the
screening would be adequate. The site plan
does not propose any impacts to the woodlands
on-site. The plan appears to propose .14
acres of fill within existing wetland, west
of existing parking lot for the construction
of additional site parking. This impact
would not require wetland mitigation. The
plan also proposes to impact .37 acres of
25 foot woodland buffers. The applicant will
need a City of Novi non-minor wetland permit
and wetland buffer authorization.

The proposed expansion
would generate significant traffic to and fro
from the site. The applicant has provided a
major event traffic plan in lieu of required
traffic impact study. Because of the
anticipated use of the site, it was
determined that a traditional traffic impact
study would not be required, but rather a
TMP, traffic management plan should be
provided to define the courses of action SCS personnel would enact during major events, such as the State Fair and Comic-Con.

City staff and consultants have met with the applicant to address majority of concerns listed in the review letter and the METP review letter.

Based on the meetings, it was determined to revisit the right turn/taper lane requirement in future, possibly in two years, or if determined by the city, sooner as listed in the motion sheet under specific conditions.

A section nine facade waiver for the overage of horizontal rib metal panels, vertical metal and split faced CMU is required. Facade states that it is evident that proposed addition will be harmonized with the existing structure.

The applicant has provided a facade board which is in the front of the podium.

All reviews except traffic are recommending approval with additional details to be provided with the final site
plan.

The applicant is requesting all applicable variances and waivers as listed in staff and consultant review letters.

Planning Commission shall consider the factors listed in Section 6.1.2C, in the review of special land use, as the parcels are not combined at the moment.

Planning Commission is asked tonight to recommend approval to City Council for a special land use, preliminary site plan with EXO overlay, woodland permit and storm water management plan for the proposed -- wetlands permit and storm water management plan for the proposed expansion.

The applicant Blair Bowman is here tonight to answer any question you may have.

As always, I'm happy to answer any questions you have. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Thank you.

Would the applicant like to come forward and address the Planning Commission.

MR. BOWMAN: Good evening.
Blair Bowman representing TBON, LLC and that is the owner of the property at that end of the facilities, where the project commonly known as the Suburban Collection Showplace resides, and in addition where now the expanding flexible State Fairgrounds, the revival effort that we undertook about five years ago now to bring back the Stair Fair, which is growing, and one of the significant reasons for the request for the flexible style use of the west of the surface parking area.

So first I would like to thank staff and the administration immensely. There has been many, many months of work to try and find, you know, common ground and the maximum meeting of the ordinance approach, but also looking at the utility and the flexibility needed for what we now believe to be is our best foot forward with regards to both from a physical layout standpoint and a facade and architectural standpoint.

But it is really going to give us the ability to provide for the environment for the expansion of our existing
events.

There are two major investor trade shows that are the largest drivers of this effort. They are at the forefront, but also some of our other major consumer shows will be able to expand as well, and then also, of course, the fair.

We then looked to the opportunity to attract some additional types of events that we have not uniquely or not done before in the past, and they will be more unique style events and really trying to look at the traditional traffic planning approach was very, very difficult at best and really coming out of our last effort with Comic-con which was a three-year process where we worked all the different agencies, State Police, the Department of Transportation with their dynamic messaging system, Oakland County in the signalization, not in just our immediate area, but around the surrounding area, the Novi police department, the administration, our staff and others, created an opportunity for us to actually, with even significant increase in
attendance, they -- I think by all measures that was a successful event and we kept all the areas in green or only for short periods of time yellow, where in the past years there was some significant red or stopped traffic. So building on that, is what we are looking to do from the traffic plan and it really is currently, as our schedule goes out to 2018, it will only be those two events. As I was saying to the administration, I hope that we do have the opportunity to implement this METP and have opportunities to work on that. But coordinating it with even directional items, staff items and signalization efforts and things like that, I think is a very valid approach.

I have got my consultants here, from the architects, engineering and landscape architectural group, happy to answer any questions that you might have.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Just one quick one. What was the attendance this year at Comic-Con?

MR. BOWMAN: I am going to answer that as best as I can. Because it is a
proprietary thing to that industry. But I would just tell you it was a 35-ish percent increase. And over the course of the single day Saturday, which we know, we counted the cars and we know that that is our peak of all peak days ever, and they come at a very reasonably early time, then they stay for an incredibly long time, which creates all of those factors for that unique event.

We will actually do more people in one day for the State Fair, but we have, you know, three to five people per car. We have about two and a half hour stay instead of a seven hour day, so I'm not directly answering your question because it is a very little bit of a sensitive issue with the promoter of that event.

We did submit some information though in writing that the administration assisted with that does have some numbers in it.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Thank you. Anything else?

MR. BOWMAN: No. Be happy to answer any questions. I'm sure there is
going to be a good amount of them and happy
to answer it and certainly any of our
professionals will as well.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Very good,
thank you. All right. This is a public
hearing. Does anybody, a member of the
public, want to address the Planning
Commission regarding this particular public
hearing in the Suburban Showplace Collection
expansion?

All right. Seeing no one,
close that portion of the public hearing.
And I'm going to ask is there any
correspondence? I think there was.

Member Giacopetti, if you may.

MR. GIACOPETTI: There is a
letter from a Charles Latham, no address
provided, but he is a property owner across
the street from the proposed development, and
in his own words, wholeheartedly agrees with
the request and that the project should be
approved.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Thank you.
The public hearing is closed. Turn it over
to the Planning Commission for discussion.
Who would like to go first.

Member Zuchlewski.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: I just have a
few questions, Blair.

First having to do with the
curb cut on Grand River and the M.D.O.T.
standards, I guess. What is the reason,
maybe you want to pass it on, but what was
the reason that you're looking for a variance
on that curb cut? I'm thinking a decel lane
maybe. I think that the infrastructure at
the entrance we currently operate from, which
is our intention to operate from, those
should meet all standards, correct?

MR. BOWMAN: I don't think we are
looking for any variances in that regard. Is
there any --

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Maybe I am
reading this wrong. That's probably -- I
thought it was on Grand River. But it's a
taper. So that's fine. I was thinking a
decel lane.

There was a discussion at a
previous meeting about the landscaping and
the people cutting through in the northwest corner parking on private streets, if you will, or in subdivisions, and walking through an area. Has that been addressed for those citizens, so that traffic isn't there, you know, the foot traffic, and people parking in front of their homes and that sort of thing?

MR. BOWMAN: If I can take a crack, I think you're talking about the soccer park.

So we did end up organizing use of the replacement trees, doing those in evergreen fashion versus deciduous, which required some factor of additional amount of planting, so we are putting those along the southern end of that particular property.

You know, as far as their indication is, I certainly have to take them at their word, that there is some parking going on, there is some subdivision streets, things like that, people are walking. I do believe that this year, I believe that there was much less of that, if any, that occurred. We had adequate parking opportunities, that was the key thing, is creating not only on
our site, but having the shuttle opportunity to the high school parking lot, which -- for that particular Comic-Con event, because I know it's kind of funny, but to see Yoda and Chewbacca and things like that walking down the streets, but we did not see that as much this year because of those coordinated efforts to some alternative opportunities for them. And we hope to promote that more and people really liked that -- the use of the shuttle, and the bi-product of that was also that very modest $2 per rider fee, we raised a significant amount of money that went to the Novi educational foundation as well, too.

We are going to continue to build on that and hopefully get even up to 1,200 vehicles daily to take us up on that opportunity, as that continues to grow.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Very good, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Thank you, Member Zuchlewski. Anyone else? Member Baratta.

MR. BARATTA: Blair, just following up on Chairperson Zuchlewski's
comment, the driveway, that western driveway.

I notice on the plan there

is no taper, is that accurate?

MR. BOWMAN: There is not on the

far west, and there is a small -- it's a

larger driveway opening for what would be

considered what we are calling gate three,

which is the center of the gate.

MR. BARATTA: The western one, or

the one that --

MR. BOWMAN: So we were looking

at it kind of the fairground, in the

vernacular, gate one is the main east

entrance that we have traditionally used to

signalize. Gate two is our western entrance,

that is going to be -- those two will be our

continued primary 98 percent of the time

utilization for feeding all of the lots

including the new one.

Then you go a little

further west, it will be gate three, which is

on the west edge of the darker surface area

there, keep going -- there it is. Then a

furthest west entrance point on the far west

of the aggregate surface lots, that former
Anglin property, that's gate four.

Now, those are entrance points, they're curb cuts. They are, you know, curb and cement aprons, but what our approach is there, and I think as you heard it in -- this is the first time I heard the two-year, look back, which I am totally fine with. For the two times a year that we know we are going use it now, and even if we are to increase that and handle it in the fashion that we did with the Comic-Con coordinated plan, it worked well and you do want to use them for ingress because that's the key factor is to get them in, get them positioned in a parking spot as quickly as you can.

Currently, to do that for a couple of events, we have been -- I will use single digits over the course of a year, for a number of events, there are major utility poles, gas lines, you know, multiple sidewalk issues, parking lot issues, right-of-way issues, that the resolution of which would be extraordinarily extensive at this stage.

So realistically, if it is a major event like the Comic-Con with the
assistance direction and even use, you know, appropriate authorities, assisting in those regards, we can get them in safely and certainly out safely.

MR. BARATTA: Explain to me the two-year look-back on the traffic.

MS. MCBETH: If I might, through the Chair, Jeremy could certainly answer that question. I also like to point out that we do have our city traffic engineering and consultant here tonight, Maureen Peters. She can address the comments about the taper lane and about the major event traffic plan, if you have any questions for her.

MR. BARATTA: That would be great.

Explain to me the traffic. I'm concerned about traffic on this major material. I know Blair's group is widely successful. And I am concerned that we are not getting the traffic off of Grand River, so --

MS. PETERS: Initially we had a traffic impact study, with the volumes, it warranted to provide a traffic impact study.
But because of the use of the lot, because the parcel being, you know, special event and not an every day peak period type scenario, we said, let's look at this from a different perspective. Let's put together some sort of event traffic management plan that coordinated the police department, the Oakland County with their signals, and MDOT personnel with their DMS message boards and any other stake holders that might have any part in organizing or being able to help manage the traffic.

So what we have planned to do is work with staff as well as Blair's group to put together, we will call it outline or a shell for this traffic management plan, and then during these major events, he will be filling in the information and coordinating -- putting together contact lists and coordinating with the various stakeholders to make sure that all mitigation letters are in place prior to the event. For that kind of handle -- that was our recommendation in lieu of a traditional traffic impact study. This really wouldn't
give us what we needed.

MR. BARATTA: You will get the data --

MS. PETERS: It's not necessarily the data that we are requesting. It's more of the coordination to make sure that everything does operate properly.

If after that -- and then as part of that I think there should be a post-event analysis performed to make sure that, you know, all -- everything went as planned, you know, if there are different signal timings that need to go in place, let's do that for the next event until we get it right, that type of thing.

So the first go-around is for them to look at what happened with the Comic-Con and meet with the stakeholders that were involved, COC and M.D.O.T. and police department and make sure that what they did for that event worked well, and that -- see if there is anything that they can improve upon with regard to that.

So that's -- we feel like that that will, you know, bring everybody
together and make everything run as smooth as possible with the existing facilities around the Showplace.

With regard to the driveways and the taper lanes, the volume on Grand River right now warrants a taper at every driveway. However, again, like we stated, it's only going to be used once or twice a year.

Blair has said that he plans to keep those gates at gates three and four closed, unless there is a major event where they need additional access to the venue.

And in talking with Sri last week we came to the conclusion that let's see how it goes, again, you know, with the expansion and the use of these lots, and if there is a need at that time, if we are seeing that there are major backups in the right turn lane heading westbound going into the driveways, that will bring that to Blair's attention. Hey, this is not what we want to see, this is not what we were expecting, now is the time to do something.
So it would be recommended that he collects some sort of operational analysis to provide quantitative data that says my driveways are operating fine, there aren't any crashes here, there aren't any, you know, anything -- (inaudible) traffic flow on Grand River because of the event traffic and then it can be readdressed. Rather than saying, you need to put in the tapering, you need to put in the right turn lane, even though you're only going to use it twice a year.

That was the agreement that we came to.

MR. BARATTA: Then we can enforce the agreement, at that point if the taper is needed?

MR. GILLAM: It's made a condition of the approval, yes.

MR. BARATTA: Thank you very much.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: I have a couple of questions I would like to ask.

MS. PETERS: Sure.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: I have gone
before highway departments many times,
especially on Grand River.

   It's always been a year

process or many years to get something done,
curb cut. And they have got -- you know, you
have got your standard book. There is no
deviations from the standards of drawings,
the red line and people go crazy, oh, my God,
do this. Not only having an approach with
the decel lane or whatever, but having to
move approaches so they're not across the
street from somebody or they are across from
streets from somebody, so it's at the whim
pretty much. But it's always been legal and
it's always been documented, and I'm just
looking at this and thinking, okay, what kind
of -- you know, once we step outside of the
box, you know, well, this is special for this
thing, we have got other items in play to
make this work. First off, I never heard of
that.

   Now, because it takes

the -- it takes the policing of the road and
the construction of the road, it takes it
away from the highway department and it now
takes the liability and puts it on Blair and company, all right.

So I am kind of worrying about number one, the legality of it that it's an exception to a rule. It's not like trees. I mean, if somebody gets hurt on that road, and seriously hurt, then all of a sudden we are going to be looking at each other, say wait a minute, we approved that. And so I don't think we have the power to approve it. I don't know if the highway department has the power to deviate from that. I just want to bring that up. The insurance, you know, is there going to be insurance to cover this, if there is a severe accident, is it going to go back to the Suburban Place, if you will.

And then I'm also interested in the cost of that taper and that decel lane, and that fact it's never been an issue as far as I know that somebody can deviate from what is the standard because of the cost. All right. So I'm just throwing these out a little bit.

But again what's the cost
of bringing in the police department and fire
department and all these other -- I mean,
that's the city now, I would think, to police
this and to be there on time.

So these are just thoughts
that I wanted to throw out and be on the
record of that this is kind of a first for
me.

MS. PETERS: Sri, there a piece
of the motion that says that they need to
gain RCOC's approval for, they need to take
this to the county because this is a county
roadway and make sure that they're in
agreement with some of these.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: So that's a
piece of this the county has to buy in on --

MS. KOMARAGIRI: It's right after
the motion that talks about the two year
revisiting. It says the applicant has to
what work with RCOC to gain any approval
needed.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: So this is all
contingent upon that.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Right.

MS. PETERS: There are also
measures that they could put up. They could restrict the right turns into these two driveways. There is already the left turn -- center left-turn lane, that WOULD be able to accommodate eastbound left turns into driveways. So it could be -- it restricts the right turn into these other driveways.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: I would think the right turns would still be safer than the left hand turn is.

MS. PETERS: Right, but the facility is already in place for the left turns, so at least it's getting it out of the travel lane.

MR. BOWMAN: Can I please address. Just to kind of expand on that point.

The experience, limited as it is, that we have had is when we are looking to alleviate traffic from Grand River, we are taking it mostly from Beck Road, coming eastbound, using the left-hand turn lane taper wouldn't assist in that regard.

So that's where the use of
moving them into those drives through the
dedicated left-hand turn lane is what would
be the normal operation for that or coming
from the west to the east moving on into the
lots that way.

What we did just talk about
a bit is that we could actually again control
whether we would then send any -- if even our
other entrances were starting to back up a
little bit, which for major events, frankly,
that does occur, no matter where you go, we
have had -- besides the one kind of event
that we've had over the past few years with
Comic-Con in the new facility here, compared
to what we used to have at the old expo
center, I mean, you know, (unintelligible)
all the time for backing up expressways for
15 miles. It was a very difficult site to
work with. So we have got a huge
improvement.

That's why it's important
to note that along the entire frontage of the
existing showplace there is already the taper
lane. There is a passing lane there, so that
is going to stay there. That is what we are
going to use, 98 percent of the time, literally for ingress and egress, so that is all there to the conditions of RCOC and everyone else.

And then just to point out one of the things that we will BE doing, we have engaged our traffic consultant, Mike Labadie is engaged by many other major event centers, and the reason why this, I think would bear legality, and all the things you point out about insurance, things like that, we will have to have those. We do have IT in place already. Is that major event facilities that even don't have anywhere near the road systems like MIS and things like that, they put in into place major event planning programs in order to handle those things. Downtown, they're doing, you know, for ALL the different stadiums and things like downtown right now.

To your point about cost, currently, so for the whole effort on the State Fair, that is a very collaborative even statewide effort. The Comic-Con, the various agencies that came to us, they were anxious
and interested to do that, to make sure that
as part of their job, frankly, that that was
coordinating and we have really successfully
done that. If we do that on a regular basis,
or even any -- let's say event three comes
in, in the plan, there is going to be an
analysis of what the effort manpower is going
to be and there is going to be a charge to
that producer. That's going to be all
discussed up front before we sign on the
dotted line and have the event.

        Okay. And then we will go
through the process of doing the event
hopefully successfully in preventing it and
then have a download at the end as to what we
need to do better. So just wanted to address
those.

    MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Thank you.

    CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Thank you.

    Member Baratta.

    MR. BARATTA: I did want to
finish this.

    The parking area to the
west, we are not going to put -- the proposal
is not to put the raised islands, that's
really a showplace, isn't it. It's more like a display area where they put --

MR. BOWMAN: It's an extension of the showplace, displaying it outside. That's going to be the midway, that's going to be expanding by 20 percent this year. They are bringing in four more spectacular rides.

We are talking with the manufactured housing group which is related to our RV producer, where they might bring in a 16 unit very cool month long display of manufactured housing, that would be great addition to the line.

Again, any of those islands that would be there would present those type of instructions, but building on the success that we came before you and thankfully received permission to do the smaller now, which would be ride and drive lot on the east, that has what has been highly used, very successful.

The best is when they are trading the models for the auto show, that's something you have to come and see. It's wonderful.
MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Strike that from the record.

MR. BARATTA: I don't know what to say to that. I have no comment.

So truthfully if you have the raised islands there it would probably cause a hazard of some sort anyway, so I don't have any issue with that.

I think it's -- I characterize it as a display area. But thank you very much. I think this looks like a great project.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Thank you, Member Baratta. Anyone else?

You know, we are, I think in the City of Novi, we are both on the Planning Commission and around the city, really proud of what's been going on at the Suburban Showplace over the years.

It's really grown and the events that are that coming in, just really world class.

You know, with all the deviations that are here, I mean, it's a product of you guys owning the product
next-door and it is being really treated as one, you know, it's really not that big of a deviation. I mean, the place is located in the right place, there is great events going on. It sounds like, I mean, we have an owner here that's really invested in the success and the success of the events, so I am in favor of this expansion.

Member Lynch, would you like to --

MR. LYNCH: With that I would like to make a motion.

In the matter of Suburban Collection Showplace expansion, JSP16-12, motion to recommend approval to City Council for the special land use permit based on the following findings listed on the motion sheet in items A through G.

This motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Article 4.4, Article 4, Article 5, Article 6 of the zoning ordinance, and all other applicable provisions of the ordinance.

MR. BARATTA: Second.

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

Sri.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Greco?
CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?
MR. LYNCH: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Zuchlewski?
MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Baratta?
MR. BARATTA: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacopetti?
MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes five to zero.
MR. LYNCH: In the matter of Suburban Collection Showplace expansion, JSP16-12, motion to recommend approval to City Council for the preliminary site plan with expo overlay based on and subject to City Council approval for the following waivers proposed in design and constructions standard variance listed in items A through R
on the motion sheet.

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

MR. BARATTA:  Second.

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

MS. KOMARAGIRI:  Member

Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI:  Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI:  Chair Greco?

CHAIRPERSON GRECO:  Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI:  Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH:  Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI:  Member

Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI:  Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI:  Member Baratta?

MR. BARATTA:  Yes.

MR. KOMARAGIRI:  Motion passes
five to zero.

MR. LYNCH:  In the matter of
Suburban Collection Showplace expansion
JSP16-12, motion to recommend approval to City Council for the non-minor wetland permit based on and subject to the following:

Findings in compliance with the ordinance standards and staff and consultant review letters, conditions and items listed in those letters being addressed on the final site plan.

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

MR. BARATTA: Second.

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

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Baratta?

MR. BARATTA: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.
MR. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Greco?

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes five to zero.

MR. LYNCH: Finally on the matter of the Suburban Collection Showplace JSP16-12, motion to recommend approval to City Council for the storm water management plan, based on and subject to A, the applicant to obtain M.D.O.T. approval for the storm water detention basin discharged to the I96 right-of-way; B, the findings of compliance with the ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters and the conditions and items listed in those letters being addressed on the final site plan.

This motion is being made because it is otherwise in compliance with Chapter 11 of the code of ordinances and all other applicable provision of the ordinance.

MR. BARATTA: Second.

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

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Greco?

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Baratta?

MR. BARATTA: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes five to zero.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Very good.

MR. LYNCH: Actually I just found my packet and we did have one correspondence.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: We already did. All right. Very good. Good luck.

MR. BOWMAN: Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: That ends our public hearings and brings us to matter for consideration.
This is to set a public hearing for Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment 18.276. The request is to set a public hearing up for the August 24th, 2016 Planning Commission meeting for text amendment 18.276 to consider amending the City of Novi zoning ordinance in order to incorporate recommendations provided in the Town Center area study.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Good evening again.

Staff is proposing minor text amendments to implement some recommendations offered by the Town Center area study, approved by Planning Commission in 2014.

The Planning Commission was asked to consider setting a date for public hearing for proposed text amendment previously on June 8th regular meeting. At that meeting, staff was directed to hold a study session to further discuss the amendment TC and TC1 requirements, initiated by recommendations from the Town Center area study along with another proposed text
amendment to allow drive-thru's within the Town Center area, initiated by the applicant. A study session was held on July 13 during which the commission discussed the intent and objectives of the Town Center area study, based on commission's direction, staff determined that further research is required for Town Center drive-thru amendment based on the additional information to be provided by the applicant. However, the current amendment does not include the drive-thru and only includes few minor changes to ordinances based on the area study recommendation only.

The Town Center area study was designed to evaluate and make recommendations on land use zoning and such to communicate city's visions and goals for the development in the study area. The study offered recommendations to modify the current zoning ordinance to implement to facilitate development of existing and vacant parcel into a viable and Town Center area. Staff divided the amendments into two categories,
recommendations that are straight forward,
some that need further research and others
that were studied as part of the current
master plan for land use. The three
categories are color coded in the document
provided as part of the packet. A sample is
shown on your screen. The current amendment
regarding as phase one will include the first
set of suggestions, marked in green in the
documents. Staff will do further research on
the second set of recommendations marked in
orange, and will be presented before Planning
Commission at the later.

Changes to the zoning
ordinance include recommendations for the
Town Center TC and TC1 districts. The
current phase is proposing simple amendments
that include minor modifications to the text
for five sections of the zoning ordinance
listed in the memo. The details are provided
in your packet. The Planning Commission is
asked to review the proposed amendments and
if acceptable set a public hearing for the
August 24th meeting. At that time, the
Planning Commission will make recommendation
and the City Council will ultimately approve or deny the amendment and propose alterations as well. Planning staff and the city's attorney's office will provide further review of these standards as the ordinance amendment is brought forward for public hearing. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Thank you. Any discussion from the members -- discussion or motion discussion?

MS. MCBETH: I can fill in a little bit of time, if you'd like. I think these are some good amendments that we looked at very carefully coming up to the conclusion of the 2014 Town Center area study.

A lot of the ones that we are tackling here in the first round are relatively minor, and would facilitate any development plans that we might see coming in, and we do anticipate, not to spoil any surprises, we do anticipate that there will be some plans coming in the near future. So at least a couple of these would assist with that. Those development plans we think,
additionally, you know, the master plan for land use is under review right now, and we are anticipating a September public hearing for the final approval and adoption of that plan, which will also have some recommendations for the Town Center area, maybe even some modifications from what we have seen already. So we will keep you abreast of those changes as they come forward, but at this point we would recommend setting the public hearing, it's a month away, get the Planning Commission thoughts on these relatively minor ordinance amendments and then proceed with the recommendation to Council.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Thank you.

Any discussion?

MR. BARATTA: Give me one more minute.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Sure. I do have a question -- I know without -- I mean, for Ms. McBeth. You know, it might help for the public hearing if there was a discussion or maybe somebody who is coming in that might be a potential stakeholder to say why these
changes would be helpful to them. You know, I know plans and commercial -- you know, to do things in a certain way. You know, if there was somebody who was coming for the public, since it is going to be a public hearing, obviously developers or commercial businesses are going to be the ones that are most effected by the ability to do something here. Any of them wanted to come in and talk to us as well about why it would be helpful from a commercial perspective, that might be helpful.

MS. MCBETH: Mr. Chair, I would be happy to do that. We could even seek letters from the property owners in that area to see if they are in support of these changes or have any issues with those.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: I think that would help us out significantly because I don't suspect we are going to get a whole lot of public input. We may, but I don't suspect if we are going to, and maybe if we got that side of it from somebody who might find these changes attractive, that would be helpful for us for considering whether or not we want to
change a portion of our ordinance.

Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: If we were going
to do that, staff was so inclined to recruit
opinion leaders, I would like to hear from a
broader audience beyond existing landowners
to residential property developers, what --
the Town Center is going to be heartburn
since is our last study session. I feel like
it's the Emperor's New Clothes at times,
where it's a suburban shopping mall, it's not
a thriving downtown.

I guess what I'm struggling
with is that what the Town Center is lacking
is population density to support walkable
community and businesses and a developer
comes in tonight and is willing to remediate
$2 million worth of arsenic, squeeze in 90
homes in a different part of town, why is no
residential development coming to the Town
Center, where that's the goal to, in my mind,
to make it residential.

What do we need to do, what
does the ordinance need to do or can we do to
encourage residential development, mixed use.
And I'm struggling with that because I think when you see everything being squeezed in around town, all kind of developments, condominiums, apartments, high end apartments, and then homes where people apparently don't want any property.

I don't see why -- I don't understand why we are not getting more residential proposals. So that is my interest. I would like to see the ordinance or ordinance proposals to include some provisions that would start residential development in the TC1 and TC2 -- excuse me, TC and TC1 districts.

MS. MCBETH: Mr. Chair, I think we can provide some additional information before that public hearing in August, if the Planning Commission chooses to set that. We do have some information that is forthcoming regarding some additional ideas for the master plan, maybe additional ordinance amendments to facilitate some work that might be done there.

MR. LYNCH: If I may. That being said, kind of feedback, I think that some
members would like to hear -- I don't think August, the end of August when folks are on vacation is a really good time to solicit that kind of professional input, but so would it be realistic or prudent to push it back further after summertime to -- if that's the nature of the type of hearing we are seeking.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: September might be -- most people are around in September. I think I'm pretty sure I'm going to be around on August 24th, but I know I will be around in September. That might make sense.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Not me, for seeking input. Does that throw off some larger plan?

MS. MCBETH: I don't think it does. We could certainly work with a date in September, that would be fine. I don't think it throws off any larger plan.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Member Baratta.

MR. BARATTA: Let me add onto Bob's commentary.

When I look at the City of
Novi, particularly the Town Center, this geographic area, I'm looking at it more than just at this intersection. And I'm looking at how we approve projects throughout this quadrant. And Bob's point, we just approved 90 homes.

If we truly wanted this -- I truly believe it can be the Town Center, to your point, residential, if we truly want a Town Center, we have to look at the entire quadrant. We have to come up with a plan, we need to stick with it.

If our goal is to add residential in this quadrant, why would we approve multi unit properties in other places until this gets completed. Once it's completed, then we can expand out. Because if we don't do that, we are never going to complete this, just not going to happen.

So, I think that we need to look at the entire project, the entire area and not just this intersection in totality and decide what we want this to be.

MR. GIACOPETTI: To add onto that, if there is consensus, I don't know
that there is by City Council and Commission
away to preserve open space is to encourage
the redevelopment of other areas where we
think residential, higher density residential
would support some higher community
development, this is an example.

I am sure there are other
examples, distress and properties along say,
major thoroughfares, so I think there might
be some -- I think there is lot of merit to
that.

MR. BARATTA: Your point, it
sounds like it's running the same wavelength
here. We are looking at this Grand River
corridor, I think in that presentation it
said that about 12 percent of the City of
Novi had been undeveloped. And one of the
issues that we are going to have, this
happened in my confirmation hearing, was that
the question was posted to me, you know, we
can continue to develop new. We have a
problem with the old areas, because they are
going to deteriorate as people move out and
how do we get those redeveloped. That's all
part of what we want to happen by keeping
those areas gentrified (ph) by consolidating our efforts, having your growth in certain areas, don't expand it out until you have that -- I'll call it the econ-omental (ph) scale if you like or that concentration when you have that growth here.

You will see in those peripheral areas that may be a little re-gentrified and they will be redeveloped and they will look better. And that goes for not only this Town Center area, it also applies, you know, if you look where Busch's supermarket is, off of Ten Mile there, I mean, that center is -- I wouldn't call it a class A center. I would call it a little bit retired, but we consolidate it, this happened when Kroger wanted to come in and be at the corner of Novi and Beck, we sat down and we made a conscious decision, if we put -- if we allow that property be rezoned, Kroger, to be honest with you, I voted for Kroger, if we put the Kroger there, it would adversely affect the condition of those older areas. They may not have articulated it, but that's what the practical effect was. And, you
know, I think the Busch's looks better today, but that center still needs to be improved. Little bit tired still. Again you got to concentrate your efforts.

MR. GIACOPETTI: You are opening up a broad issue. But since the last draft we saw the master plan and the major thoroughfare plan, I think that Ten Mile and Meadowbrook, part of that major thoroughfare, we have a challenge and I don't think the master plan addresses it.

Residential property on busy roads becomes distressed and the property value is lower and there are properties I feel along Ten Mile Road between Haggerty and Meadowbrook that are looking pretty bad. I don't know how valuable given they are on a major thoroughfare. I think that really it's our responsibility to look for strategies on how those properties can be redeveloped. So eventually if the road is ever widened, you know, someone is not doing 45 up on your porch, but there is the type of development, be it residential, higher density residential or office, or something,
but something needs to be put in place that would encourage a developer to perhaps, you know, clear out distressed properties along major thoroughfares. I think that that's -- you know, we need to maybe encourage that a little bit more rather than rezoning open space to allow for higher density. I think that's what we should be looking at. I don't know that the master plan has any tools in place -- enough tools in place for redevelopment. I think the time is now and redevelopment is the number one priority, given the feedback we get from meetings about, you know, natural beauty and wildlife. I'm pro development, but I would like to see some of the other older areas of town redeveloped before, you know, you end up with eastern part of Novi, will become distressed. It's a matter of probably a decade unless some things are done, unless we do some things.

MR. BARATTA: I think it's part of the clear vision on the part of -- starting with us. I think it goes into a master plan and then there is execution. It
starts with that clear definition. You can get consultants in that gives us a great power point, we have all been there, we have all seen them, they're beautiful. But when you really get the granular on those and you see what's the plan, how good is the plan in that very pretty power point, if that's lacking, the plan isn't they good no matter how pretty it is.

MR. GIACOPETTI: That being said, I would like to make a motion to set the public hearing for the zoning ordinance text for September --

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: What would be our second meeting in September?

MS. MCBETH: The 28th.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: September 28?

MR. GIACOPETTI: I won't be here, but I will submit some comments.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: We will make it for October.

MR. BARATTA: First meeting in October, what day is that?

MS. MCBETH: October 5th.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: What about
September 14th?

MR. GIACOPETTI: September 14 would be good. How about the second --

October 26th?

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: October 26.

MR. BARATTA: I will make myself available.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: That's fine.

October 26th.

MR. GIACOPETTI: I'll be in Germany.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: So you're not available on the 26th?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Or the 5th.

October 26th is fine.

I'd like to make a motion to set the public hearing for the ordinance text amendment 18.276 for the 26th of October.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: We have a motion by Member Giacopetti.

MR. BARATTA: Second.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: A second by Member Baratta.

MS. MCBETH: Mr. Chair, if I
might, since that's allowing us quite a bit of time, if staff could also present some additional modifications to the Town Center district at that time, in addition to the ones that have been presented tonight and a month ago.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: I don't have any objection. That's fine.

MS. MCBETH: Thanks. We have a motion and a second.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Member Baratta?

MR. BARATTA: Yes.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Greco?

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Yes.

MR. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes five to zero.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: Any
supplemental issues?

No. Brings us to our last audience participation. Closes our audience participation.

Looking for a motion to adjourn.

MR. BARATTA: Motion to adjourn.

MR. LYNCH: Second.

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

THE BOARD: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON GRECO: We are adjourned.

(The meeting was adjourned at 8:35 p.m.)
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