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CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: This is the regular meeting for the Planning Commission for June 8, 2016.

Sri, can you call the roll.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Anthony?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Absent, excused.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Baratta?

MR. BARATTA: Here.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Here.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Here.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Absent, excused.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Here.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Zuchlewski?
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Absent,
excused.

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

(Pledge recited.)

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

MR. GRECO: Motion to approve.

MR. BARATTA: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a
motion and a second.

Any other discussions? All
those in favor.

THE BOARD: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Anyone
opposed? We have an agenda.

Brings us to our audience
participation.

If there is anyone in the
audience who wishes to address the Planning
Commission at this time, please step forward.

MR. GIACOPETTI: On a matter
other than a public hearing?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: There is no
MR. TOROSSIAN: My name is Pat Torossian, T-o-r-o-s-s-i-a-n, the president of Asbury Park Homeowners Association.

The homeowners have had concerns about the soccer fields and the parking lot that's being proposed and being approved I believe today.

The noise, lights, headlights, future expansion, those concerns.

We met with the Blair, and he's been gracious to try to accommodate the needs of the homeowners. I have two questions for the Planning Commission.

First question. Notices were sent out to the homeowners, and they were asked to vote, yes or no for whether or not they wanted to proceed with this proposal. Everybody voted no.

And I don't see that impact or the results of that having any impact on the decision. It's like you took all the no's, you put it in the packet, you keep going.

So that's the first
question.

Second question is, utilization rate of the soccer feeds.

I live in Novi. I have lived in Novi for 25 years. And I will tell you, I have seen more soccer fields now that I ever have.

When I look at the utilization along Eleven Mile, out by Deerfield, Taft Road, I rarely see them used at all. At all. Let alone, having a requirement of two more being added to the roles, rather use that money more efficiently for other things like paths so you don't have, you know, to go onto the street, things like for that safety issues.

So, those are my two questions. I'd be happy to have this interactive and your response.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, sir. Anyone else?

MR. WARDEN: My name is James Warden. I live in Asbury Park, at 28265 Mandalay Circle.

I also want to express my
appreciation to Mr. Bowman. He met with us, as Pat mentioned, and has addressed some of our concerns.

And my request to the Planning Commission is to consider adding at the Novi city cost some additional trees. I think the latest plan from Mr. Bowman is much improved compared to what was presented during the public hearing. But I think there still in -- there still is room for improvement there, and I think the replacement trees are covered in the current plan, but I think if the City of Novi would consider adding an additional 20 to 30 trees along the area there, the strip where the parking lot is, and the south edge of the soccer field, I think that would also help to address some of the concerns of the homeowners like me.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you. Appreciate it. Anyone else? Seeing no one else, we will close the first audience participation. Are there any correspondence?
I don't see anything on the table. Any city committee reports? City planner, Ms. McBeth.

MS. MCBETH: Good evening. I just have one item to report this evening. The action that the city council meeting of Monday night, a slightly revised plan for the Learning Care Academy was approved along with the revised plans for the low rise overlay development agreement.

So it's been -- shortly the preliminary site plan will be submitted and we will bring that in front of the Planning Commission shortly as well.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Very good, thank you. Matters for consideration, item number one, Grand River Soccer Park JSP16-20. It's the consideration, the request of Suburban Showplace, LLC and the City of Novi, and for Planning Commission's approval of preliminary site plan, woodland permit, wetland permit, storm water management plan.

The subject property is located in the I1 light industrial and is
located in section 16, west of Taft, and south of Grand River Avenue. The applicant is proposing two soccer fields and associated parking on-site.

Sri.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Good evening, Members. As we know, Planning Commission held the hearing for this project at our previous meeting on May 25th and public comment was gathered. A copy of all the public responses from that meeting are included in the packet for tonight. The plan is presented before you for your consideration and approval.

The subject property, as we know, is located on the south side of Grand River near Suburban Collection Showplace between Taft and Beck and is zoned I1, light industrial, surrounded by R1, one family residential on the south, OST, office service technology on the north and light industry along all other sides.

The future land use map indicates industrial, research development and technology for the subject property, and
the property to the west and north, industrial, research development on the east and single family for properties on the south.

There are few regulated woodlands and wetlands on the property. The current project is a temporary public private partnership between City of Novi Parks and Recreation and cultural service department and Suburban Collection Showcase, LLC with an intent to use it for no longer than five years.

The fields will be used by the city while the city develops permanent fields elsewhere.

The community soccer fields are considered a primary use for the property and would be available during spring, summer and fall, except during the Michigan State Fair period and a couple of other events at the Showplace.

During that time the applicant is anticipating using the site for parking and staging of exhibitors and participant vehicles, only as a secondary
use. The applicant has provided additional
details for possible secondary uses in his
response letter.

The current plan includes
two U13 soccer fields and associated parking,
except for the handicapped spaces, which will
be paved. The rest of the parking lot and
the driveway will be gravel to serve the
temporary needs.

Six trees are being removed
within the regulated woodland boundary and
will require 18 replacement credits. The
applicant is proposing 27 evergreen
replacement trees along the edge of the
parking lot to screen it from the residential
area. Additional trees greater than eight
inch caliper have also been removed as part
of the land improvement permit which has been
issued, but they did not require replacement
trees as they are located outside the
regulated woodland boundary.

The city will providing no
parking signage along the proposed driveway,
for unobstructed fire and emergency access.
The city also intends to monitor for and
provide bike racks porta-johns and bumper blocks and off-season monitoring of parking lot.

The applicant has met with the neighboring residents to address these concerns. The revised plans now include an improved circulation pattern in the parking lot, which included narrowing the driveways by a few feet so landscaping can be added to the south side to further screen the parking lot from the residential area.

Given the temporary nature of the recreational use of the property, the applicant is requesting landscaping deviations from parking lot landscape and screening, deviations from engineering design and construction standards for paving, stormwater and a taper line and few others. They are listed in detail in all the reviews letters and summarized in the motion sheet.

The deviations are requested to allow the applicant an option to accommodate the temporary recreational needs of the city, through minimal disruption of the site, therefore, keeping it flexible for future
development. Planning, wetlands, woodlands and fire are recommending approval with additional comments to be addressed with the final site plan.

Landscape, traffic and engineering are not currently recommending approval given the deviations requested, which are subject to Planning Commission and City Council's approval.

For those uses not specifically mentioned, the zoning ordinance allows the Planning Commission to make a determination for the minimum required parking spaces based on staff's recommendation. The current plan is proposing 79 spaces which are deemed sufficient by the parks based on the current usage patterns in other facilities. The Planning Commission is asked tonight to approve the preliminary site plan, wetland permit, woodland permit and the stormwater management plan.

Following the Planning Commission's consideration and approval of the plan, the City Council will consider any...
recommended deviations from the ordinance
standards related to the plan.

City Council will also
consider approval of an agreement regarding
the improvement and occupancy of the property
for community recreation fields.

We have our director of
parks, recreation and cultural services, Jeff
Muck, and the applicant, Blair Bowman is here	onight to answer any questions you may have
for them.

And as always, all staff
will be glad to answer any questions you have
for us. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, Sri. I appreciate that.

The applicant is here,
wishes to address the Planning Commission.

MR. BOWMAN: Good evening. My
name is Blair Bowman.

Just to clarify, this is
actually Serveman, LLC is the technical owner
of this property. And I just want to make
sure that that’s what the agreement reflects
and the record reflects.
I will say that before you tonight, you know, in the earnest attempt to fulfill a commitment and intent to truly provide something from the standpoint of a community giveback of meaningful nature, that will assist and help the parks and recreation program and the youth of the city as it relates to some of the recreational aspects.

I will say, I will temper that a little bit with that, you know, I did not ever intend to expect, it would be of this kind of significant magnitude to try to accomplish, you know, the clearing, cleanup and grading for a couple of turf fields that was a product of discussion to help in the pursuit of not a lengthy period of time, but a significant period of time, five years to help in the rotation of the improvement of some of the existing athletic fields.

It was born out of an intention that, you know, made a lot of sense, I thought at the time, to provide something I didn't intend to use this site for any particular need, for probably that period of time, easily.
Certainly looked towards future development of it in some form or fashion. In the meantime, if it could be used for some positive public purpose, even at a significant frankly expense that I was expecting to go to, I could kind of put that into the future bin and say that makes a bit if win-win sense and even with the potential of possibly on a couple of occasions, as we could foresee, using the site to help facilitate, particularly the State Fair. Again it seemed to make an awful lot of sense.

Now, I will say, and I have met with the residents, and I'm going to say, shame on me. I should have thought to approach them.

I really even said to them if I would have been developing this in a normal way, I would have thought to probably approach them ahead time and talk about any concerns.

But it just never dawned on me that a recreation type of a complex like this, with the amount of buffer that's there,
that there would have been those concerns. But after talking with them, I clearly understand what their concerns are.

We have done what I believe frankly are to the total limits of dealing with this site, the fields are no longer of full regulation size. They are positioned in a U13 style sizes.

From what I understand, they're going to be used largely for practice type of operations, so hopefully that will provide some accommodation. Then, of course, the reconfiguration of the parking and the placement of the replacement trees in a evergreen fashion is something that we were happy to do.

I will say, I want to state it for the record, I said it many times to them. You know, this being an interim use we will be looking to use this, certainly I will use the more intensely, under what will be, you know, a light industrial ordinance or whatever, applicable ordinance in the future is on this property. I have certainly pledged to them, under this approach, I will
certainly try to accommodate as best as I reasonably can, and certainly in the future, we have now established a dialogue and they know where I'm located, they have my contact information, if anything does occur on the site, from either -- frankly, even if it's the city's use, but certainly anything that we do, if there is any concerns that arise, we will continue to stay in contact, we will address those.

If there is anything persistent that really is a problem, that by everybody's determination should stop, then we will certainly make those accommodations and be open to that for the period of time that it's being jointly used.

So, I just wanted to say, that it really is something we intended to do as a very positive thing and to the extent that its caused any concern or consideration, we do apologize for that, we will work hard to try to work with everybody to make it as best as we can.

So there is any comments and I will be happy to answer any questions.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you. Mr. Muck, do you wish to address?

MR. MUCK: I will stand by for questions.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: In due course, sir. We will close the applicant comment and turn it over to the Planning Commission for their consideration.

Who would like it start? Member Baratta.

MR. BARATTA: Mr. Chair, thank you. Rick, I have a couple of questions for you.

Several of the issues that have come up today is -- I wrote a few of them down -- one was noise. I suspect that's from the use of the soccer fields and possibly the parking lot, headlights in the parking lot, glare.

I think there was a comment that maybe 20 or 30 trees to screen the parking lot from the adjacent homeowners.

I understand that this is a temporary use, it's five years. I understand it's industrial zoning and this is certainly
less intense, making it a soccer field.

So my first question is, I see in this site that we have some -- I am looking at the south end of the site closest to where the homes are, that would be -- right where you see the street there. I see that's the wetland. I see there is trees there.

How many trees are we taking out of that wetland area?

MR. MEADER: That's actually -- he's going to have to answer that question. I don't want to give the wrong information.

MR. HILL: I'm Pete Hill from ITC.

MR. BARATTA: Hi, Pete, how are you.

My question is, the homeowners have some objections to whether there is going to be lights from the parking lot, noise, et cetera.

So my question is, in that wetland area, that's to the right side of the plan where the street is, that's where the homes are.
How many trees are we taking out -- were you proposing to take out of that area?

MR. HILL: Out of that area, those trees are coming out, that wetland is being (inaudible.)

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: And how many trees are you adding just to the south side of the parking lot as a screen?

MR. HILL: I don't know if Sri maybe can answer this better than I can. But the regulated woodland trees that are being removed, as Sri mentioned, there is six, requiring 18 replacement credits. The applicant is proposing conifers, which under the woodland ordinance, equated a one and a half to one replacement ratio. So for those 18 required, they are providing 27 woodland replacements in terms of pine trees. For screening, some up on the berm, right along Grand River, I think there is five. And then 22 kind of around the southern side of the parking lot, yes.

And the plan that's up in front of you there, may have more than 27
conifers on it.

MR. BARATTA: And what size trees are those, do you know offhand?

MR. HILL: Minimum six foot tall.

MR. BARATTA: Six foot, okay. Is it your opinion, that by adding those, let's call it 20 trees there, that should -- with the positioning of the trees, that should provide an adequate screen or certainly more of a screen than what you currently have with those houses?

MR. HILL: I think so.

MR. BARATTA: We are not taking -- you're not proposing to take down any trees from that area, where you're adding those 20 trees where the parking lot is, correct?

MR. HILL: Correct.

MR. BARATTA: That parking lot there, that's gravel, correct? I think the appropriate -- I don't know if you are the appropriate person to ask?

MR. HILL: That's my understanding, it's gravel.

MR. BARATTA: That's gravel.
It's not paved.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Except for the handicapped spaces.

MR. BARATTA: Except for the handicapped spaces. There is not going to be any street lights in that area?

MS. KOMARAGIRI: They are not going to be providing any streetlights. The hours of operation are dawn to dusk, so no additional lighting has been proposed.

MR. BARATTA: So we have got more screening. You have no lights, so there should be no issue, I would suspect, with additional, let's call it light pollution going into the houses.

Now I'm interested in noise. Is there any barricades at all or is there a gate or anything that is preventing cars from going into that area, after dusk, being proposed today?

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Is it general policy of the parks not to provide any gates. We don't have any gates on the facility, (unintelligible) throughout the city, so maintaining the city, there are no barricades
provided. But the park is open to proposed signage, park is closed after dusk that.

MR. BARATTA: That will be patrolled? Is that what the proposal is?

MS. KOMARAGIRI: The usual patrol. No additional patrol.

MR. BARATTA: So if there is an issue and the homeowners saw some cars back there, they could call and say, X, we gotten an issue.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: I would think so, yes.

MR. BARATTA: And is there any lights at all on the soccer field?

MS. KOMARAGIRI: No lighting has been proposed. The facility is closed after dusk.

MR. BARATTA: No speakers, no lights. It's dawn to dusk, that's it?

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Nothing proposed by the city.

MR. BARATTA: Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: That was it.
MR. BARATTA: That's it.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Very good.

Member Giacopetti.

MR. GIACOPETTI: I have a couple of questions for Jeff.

I have a question concerning the utilization of existing soccer fields and facilities, in terms of are they at their capacity. Are there leagues that can't be created because there are not enough fields. Would you maybe give us some background.

MR. HILL: So, there is a difference between what I would call game fields and practice fields. We run most of literally all of our at the ITC community sports park. The rest of the soccer fields around the city we have some practices at Brookfarm Park, we have had some teams practice at Lakeshore Park. Some of those are just for convenience, you know, with the coaches live in the neighborhood, they would rather practice close by instead of traveling to ITC.

The fields on Eleven Mile, those are practice fields, we don't use those...
for games typically. They're not as in good of shape, ITC is irrigated, they are well maintained.

But as Mr. Bowman stated, there is a significant need to improve those fields at ITC. Their current setup is an old structure construction standard with a crown method. If you spend any time out there, you can stand on one end of the soccer field and barely see the top of the soccer goal on the other end.

So it's not conducive for grid play. Any significant amounts of rainfall causes us to potentially shut down those fields. In fact, this spring there was a significant amount of time at the start of the year that we shut those fields down.

So when Mr. Bowman approached us with this proposal, it just made sense because we are going to need to reconstruct those fields. Those are budgeted out in CIP over the next few years. We need to literally tear those down to scratch.

We install the irrigation, install new drainage. So we need somewhere
to put those kids. And we are going -- we would put those kids on these fields primarily for practices. Again, reiterating, we have no plans to do any kind of application. We have no plans to install lighting. I would say that most of this is going to be held week nights. We are cognizant of parents' schedules, we are putting five, six, seven year-olds out there, so they are not going to be there until dusk. We are very cognizant of what we need to do.

MR. GIACOPETTI: So the field would primarily be used by elementary school students between the hours of say five to seven or five to eight, that's pretty much --

MR. HILL: On Saturday, if we needed to play on there, we typically start at 9:00 a.m., usually wrapped up by four. Again, a lot of this will be at flex because we don't know exactly how long the time frame is going to take us. We are going to have to start giving soon into construction quotes and time frames for ITC down the line.
MR. GIACOPETTI: They wouldn't be for adult leagues?

MR. HILL: No.

MR. GIACOPETTI: That was my primary question.

Secondary question for the applicant, Mr. Bowman.

How long has the holding company owned this parcel?

MR. BOWMAN: That's a good question. I think it's probably about a year and a half maybe now, maybe a little bit more than that.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Acquired for this intention primarily --

MR. BOWMAN: As a matter of fact, we were in the process. We looked at it for a while, then backed off of looking at it, and then ended up putting it under contract. And during second time that we were really seriously considering it. It's more along the lines of the master planning after this being made the whole corridor, our pursuit of the expansion parcels to the west of the existing Showplace operations, it's really
looking more towards the long term, if there is an opportunity, if was an opportunity to, you know, acquire some property that might work into an overall longer term master plan.

And I look at this as a future long-term development site.

Realistically. Would it be something that could support the overall Showplace operations in conjunction with the future years, sure. You know, I think we even developed an overall kind of a corridor improvement plan that showed even a pedestrian bridge and things like that, in a couple of different locations.

But realistically, you know, this is something that -- it came out of a conversation where I understood the interest and the need. I simply uttered, we are not going to be a whole lot with this for any foreseeable time, and would it help, and you know, gosh, if we could -- you know, on a couple of occasions throughout the course of a full annual period, 95 percent of the time is what I think I said, we wouldn't be using it and if the community could use it for the
better, you know, that would be -- that would
be great, so that's really how it all came
about.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Thanks. And I
guess a follow-up question really for staff.
Barb, prior to the
acquisition of this property, had there been
any other interests from other developers to
develop it in different ways in say the
last -- as long as you can remember?

MS. MCBETH: Just off the top of
my head, I don't recall any development plans
that I have seen for this property. So
nothing in the recent past.

MR. GIACOPETTI: But it is an
industrial one, so it could be used for
office or any number of uses, correct?

MS. MCBETH: That's correct.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Those uses would
be late and there would be light. They could
be -- you know, it could be open very late,
they could have lighting, they could create a
lot more traffic than we anticipated for
this?

MS. MCBETH: That's true. It
could be a general office use or a medical office use or it could be some kind of light manufacturing type of use. The light industrial district is pretty broad and allows a variety of uses that could be possible for this property.

MR. GIACOPETTI: I just wanted to double check, thanks. That's all of my questions. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Member Greco.

MR. GRECO: I do have a few comments.

First of all, based on the review of the materials, and what appears to be the city's needs, it looks like with respect to the utilization of the soccer fields is something that will be utilized. It looks like it was something that the city is looking for.

Next, with respect, this has been brought up previously at the previous meetings, and this evening, and also by Mr. Bowman, this is definitely a site that is going to be developed at sometime in the
future and definitely going to be a site
that's going to be developed at sometime in
the future, with something much more, or more
rather intense than what's being proposed
here.

Just a comment, in answer to
a question, this is a public hearing. The
notices to the homeowners go out for input.
And, you know, I have been on the Planning
Commission for, you know, close to a decade
and, you know, most people, most individuals,
unless you're business people, sometimes with
either speculative purchases or looking for
land to develop, but particularly, residents
that live in the community, you know, don't
want to see a lot of development go up.

You know, even though it's
private property, you see open fields. I go
back to my hometown in New York and all the
open fields that we used to run through or
play hide and seek or play capture the flag
in now have either mansions on them, or
different -- you know, different things that
are there. And you look back on it fondly as
a child, but it is private property that can
be developed.

So with respect to the input from the community, it's something that, you know, it is -- you know, at many times required by the ordinances and by the laws of the State of Michigan because the residents are so close there.

It's definitely something that, you know, speaking on behalf of the Planning Commission, but not specifically on behalf of any member, that everybody reads, everybody looks at them and everyone tries to take into consideration because as you know, or I'm sure you are aware, we are all residents of the City of Novi here, so we are all concerned about what's going on, not just sitting on the Planning Commission.

But, that being said, as Planning Commissioners, looking at plans, looking at development, looking at private property, looking at the needs of the city, which in this case, is a little bit more of a factor apparently, from Parks and Rec, then we are usually looking at, we got to take into account the ordinances.
So, I don't know if that answers your question specifically, but I know for a fact that we always look at and listen to what the residents have to say, maybe not do what the residents want to do all the time, sometimes our hands are tied by the laws of the ordinances, or particular uses and what's going on here.

There are a lot, just stepping aside from that, a lot of waivers being requested here. But certainly understanding the plan, the needs of the city and what is actually happening on the site, not necessarily against them, given what the city is getting back, for right now. Again, this a pretty, I would say less than moderate use for the site.

I do have one question for Mr. Bowman, though.

One of the waivers is -- looking through -- for the absence of a required bike rack, all right. It is a recreational field. I mean, we have heard that it's going be -- I don't think five and six year-olds are going to be riding their
bikes there. But it is going to be an open field, that's going to be open, part of parks and rec that, you know, kids or adults or people may want to, you know, show up and, you know, kick the ball around. I know I have with my son on empty fields, when we are not having practice.

Is there a reason for -- has there been any discussion about why no bike racks there?

MR. BOWMAN: Maybe I will answer that in a bit of wholesale fashion as it relates to some of the other required items. And it goes to my original comment about really just what was intended, never really thinking that every ordinance for a typical site plan process would apply to our trying to temporarily assist in the parks and rec.

So, we have gone well beyond what I ever thought would be required. I will just be very blunt. It still is in the factoring process right now as to exactly what the magnitude of those changes that we did say that we would agree to put in. In fact, for example, the sedimentation and
detention basin for natural feature conditions, just wouldn't have considered that that would be necessary, but we did. But anything for the use of the property or to make it functional for use, traffic control measures, parking blocks, bike racks, trash enclosures, bathroom facilities of anything of that nature, that would be something that, you know, we're -- and believe me when I say this, this is a very sincere, significant deal and I'm not just saying that it's a major investment that we are making.

The likelihood of which, that any frankly significant value for future value will be modest. It is for trying to give back. It is significant for the approach was to provide a significant base and with some modest items that the community might have to provide and probably with access to resources that we don't have, be able to provide, that really gets down to the just taper lane, the trash enclosure, the bike rack and things like that.

MR. GRECO: Thank you. Just a
final comment. I'm not sure you need bike
racks there actually, since it is on Grand
River. But I don't know. So anyway, that
concludes my comments.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: So
Mr. Bowman, relative to, and David, relative
to the contractor, the agreement that is
going to be written, stipulations in there
relative to hours of operations, for others
than the state -- other than the soccer
fields, when the State Fair comes around,
times and uses, usage times, those are all
indicated inside the agreement right now?

MR. GILLAM: I'm double checking
because, in fact, there was a draft that was
just circulated this afternoon.

MR. BOWMAN: I have not seen the
latest draft. I certainly am willing to
address certain things because I think I
shared my communication with the city what I
talked about with the residents. That any of
those types of things that we are dealing
with, a logistic component of the midway
operator, we would keep those in the very
northern portion of the site, so keeping it
well away. For any of the traffic trailers and, you know, vehicle parking aspect, we will do that during only normal operating hours.

So again dawn to dusk, that's the proper approach, I would have no problem to committing to that as well.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: I think from the last Planning Commission meeting, who was the gentleman that was here? (Unintelligible) When he was here. I think there was more consideration relative to the non-soccer operations as opposed to what might be used this on the off-chance --

MR. BOWMAN: I will clarify one thing because I believe he felt comfortable in his answer, and even was correct, that the camping areas for the State Fair will not be on the site. What the midway operator does with their empties and housing and components there, they will have -- I think it is three units that they have, there will be some -- they're bunk house style units. I just wanted to make sure that was clarified.

The other thing will be that
even though logistically movement in and out will limit it to those hours, that doesn't mean that an empty trailer won't be parked on that gravel surface throughout the course of the fair. Or for example, where we might need to move some of our stationaries onto that area during Comic Con to free up space on site for regular parking purposes. That's the intention of it.

But again I will -- even if it wants to be in written fashion, provide that if there are issues that are a concern to them, that they can certainly bring those directly to my attention, if there is any persistence to it or any problems, we will correct it or stop the practice.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: I have all the confidence in the world that kind of language will be included, and you as a businessman in the city will take care of that without the language even --

MR. BOWMAN: Absolutely.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: To make sure we have that. Mr. Gillam?

MR. GILLAM: The agreement as
drafted doesn't contain it, we can put
inglanguage in there that will deal with
Mr. Bowman's use of the property.

To the extent that the use
of the park is addressed that would follow-up
with the use of the ordinance and other
normal city policies.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: As far as
the usage for the soccer fields, I'm
perfectly comfortable with them. I think
again we're going above the replacement trees
trying to eliminate the aspects that might be
of noise generation for the citizens. I
think that this use is going to be far less
than what might have been placed on that at
some point in time. So I would be in support
of this.

MR. BARATTA: I had one other
question. Let me address to this Dave.

Dave, we got a temporary use
here. And let me just preface this by
saying. I think it's a great use. I think
Mr. Bowman is doing a wonderful public
service. I think he's going beyond what,
frankly, what most people would do, to help
the city.

But my question relates to this temporary use that we are going to have as a result, we are not going do some things that if were permanent use that we have to require, such as the road taper, and some other things that would have to be completed.

Did we have anything in our ordinance that allows for a temporary, such as this where we can give waivers, still be somewhat consistent with our decision making?

MR. GILLAM: I am not aware of anything specific as to a temporary use. I think the fact that it is a temporary use is a factor that the Planning Commission can take into consideration in determining whether or not the waivers are appropriate.

One thing would be the permanent waivers. The other end because it is a temporary use, you could make an argument that it would be -- more or less soften the impact maybe justify the waivers as opposed to a more permanent use.

One comment as to the issue with the deceleration lane, the traffic
lanes. Grand River is a county road in the area, so its relative (inaudible) decision that's going to be made by the county road commission, not by the city.

MR. BARATTA: So in this instance, assuming the recommended approval of this project, there is -- if Mr. Bowman or somebody else that would eventually purchase the property should Mr. Bowman decide to sell it, if he ultimately decides to sell it, they would have to come back in front of the commission and present a site plan that these decisions we are making today in regards to these waivers would not be applicable to that unquote, final plan?

MR. GILLAM: That's correct. The agreement as drafted for this particular temporary use would apply the potential purchasers of the property, if the temporary use was going to continue. But if the temporary use is no longer going to continue, and if someone else is going to -- or Mr. Bowman, or a certain man, for example, is going to come and develop the property, they're going to have to comply with every
single requirement of the ordinance or obtain the appropriate waivers, same as anyone one else would.

MR. BARATTA: Thank you very much. Appreciate it.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Member Greco.

MR. GRECO: I would like to make a motion.

In the matter of Grand River Soccer Park, JSP-20, motion to approve the preliminary site plan based on and subject to the following the waivers, due to the temporary nature and primary and secondary uses proposed and subject to the City Council approval of design and construction standard variance, in the matters set forth in A through O, in the motion, and the findings of compliance with ordinance standards and the and staff consultant review letters and the conditions and items listed in those letters being addressed on the final site plan, and because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Article 3, Article 4 and Article 5 of the zoning ordinance and all other applicable
provisions of the ordinance.

MR. BARATTA: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a

motion by Member Greco, second by Member

Baratta.

Any other comments?

Sri, can you call the roll.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Baratta?

MR. BARATTA: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes

four to zero.

MR. GRECO: I'd like to make

another motion. In the matter of Grand River

Soccer Park JSP-16-20, motion to approve the

wetland permit based on and subject to the

findings of compliance with the ordinance

standards of the staff and consultant review

letters and the conditions and items listed
in those letters being addressed on the final site plan, and because the plan is otherwise in compliance with chapter 12, article 5 of the code of ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the ordinance.

MR. BARATTA: Second.

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

Anyone else?

Sri, please.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Baratta?

MR. BARATTA: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes four to zero.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Make another motion for Grand River Soccer Park, JSP16-20 to approve the woodland permit based on and subject to the findings of compliance
with the ordinance standards and the staff
and consultant review letters and the
conditions and items listed in those letters,
being addressed on the final site plan and
because the plan is otherwise in compliance
with chapter 37 of the code of ordinances and
all other applicable provisions of the
ordinance.

MR. BARATTA: Second.

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

Sri, can you call the roll.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Baratta?

MR. BARATTA: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member
Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes
four to zero.

MR. GRECO: Another motion in the
matter of Grand River Soccer Park JSP16-20, motion to approve the stormwater management plan based on and subject to the findings of compliance with ordinance standards and staff and consultant review letters and conditions and items listed in those letters being addressed on the final site plan and because it is otherwise in compliance with chapter 11 of the code of ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the ordinance.

MR. BARATTA: Second.

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

Sri, please.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Baratta?

MR. BARATTA: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes
four to zero.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

All set. Thank you, sir.

Next is the public hearing for zoning ordinance, text amendment 18.276. It's a set for public hearing for the July 13, 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: Thank you. As you may recall, the Planning Commission approved the Town Center area study in 2014. The study was designed to evaluate and make recommendation on land use, zoning, design guideline and wayfinding. The study results also offered modifications to zoning ordinance, among other items to facilitate the development of existing and vacant parcels into a viable and active Town Center area and coordinate and approve with surrounding sub areas.

The map in front of you shows the properties that are currently zoned
Town Center and Town Center One.

This map identifies all the parcels that would be currently affected by the proposed zoning changes zoned TC and TC1, and may be affected if the property owner chose to rezone to TC or TC1, which are identified as TC commercial or TC gateway.

Some of the recommendations are straight while some need further research and review and some are identified to be studied as part of the current master plan for land use update. Staff has separated the suggestions accordingly, and they're color coded as shown on your screen for easy understanding throughout the document, which is provided for your review and comment. Planning staff reviewed and recommended modifications by the area study and are proposing to amend the few sections of the zoning ordinance. The current amendment regarded as phase one will include the first set of suggestions. Staff will do further research on the phase two recommendations and will present it before the Planning Commission at a later time.
The staff version of the proposed phase one amendment, which is provided as part of your packet, is subject to review and changes by city staff and/or the city attorney's office.

The Planning Commission is asked to review the proposed phase one amendment, and if acceptable, set a public hearing for the proposed text amendment for the July 30th meeting. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, Sri.

Turn it over the Planning Commission for thoughts or recommendation.

Member Baratta.

MR. BARATTA: Maybe you can help me with this.

I read the information that is provided. We would be really looking at this area which was supposed to be a walkable area of the Town Center.

I think over the period of time, we kind of changed the character of that because I really -- and just looking at the way this was designed, we have got
restaurants, you have got a kind of a ring going north and south with the highway, you got restaurants, there is a barrier because we now have a road that kind of bypasses the intersection of Novi and Grand River, that takes you back to Grand River.

So it's really -- then you have got a shopping center. It's really not walkable when you head to the southeast corner.

And then we have got Grand River, which is busy, then we have got that Town Center area.

Again, we are not really walkable from the restaurants, the shopping center, unless you want to have some issues crossing Grand River to get into that southeastern corner, where the Town Center is.

So we really changed the character from what I think the initial objective -- initial objective of this area was, was to make it a cohesive walkable area, with some apartments to the south, and I would suspect some small shops on that
northeastern quadrant, and just connecting.

So really what we have today is really more of a suburban shopping environment.

You need cars, and that's what we have there, unless we are changing the character, to try to go back to something more walkable. Some of the things we are saying in the text amendment is, you know, let's put restaurants with a drive-thru. If you're a franchise restaurant, you don't have a drive-thru, you're not going to locate there. Even Starbucks they typically don't locate a facility without a drive-thru, drug stores, same way. They want the drive-thru for that extra revenue, the drive-thru convenience.

So really I guess the first question is, are we trying to make this walkable or are we taking that next step away from the walkable environment to more of a suburban shopping environment.

What that's I see here. We are allowing some of these things.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: We have two
amendments that are being proposed within the
Town Center area.

The one is proposed by the
city staff based on the recommendations from
the study. The second one is for a
drive-thru amendment.

I just want to clarify. Are we talking about the second one that's on the agenda or --

MR. BARATTA: I was given basically an overview, what I think both of them were. Because it's really integrated, as we look at this area.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: As of now, we are kind of treating them both separately. The current amendment based on the suggestion is sticking with the intent of the Town Center area study where we are trying to make it a cohesive walkable kind of environment.

MR. BARATTA: So I guess my suggestion is as we look at each of these areas, we can't look at them as separate and distinct.

We basically have one integrated area, this intersection, we have
got the wall on the north, we have got the
shopping environment on the northwest corner,
the highway and Novi Road, then you have got
this section here. It's really one area.

What's happening in this --
from what I am seeing in this industry, is
consolidation of retail. Consolidation,
concentration, and if we are going to make
this really a robust, call it a walkable
area, you got to look at this whole area as
one, and not segments, or it doesn't work.

You know, in my interview
this week, I was asked the question where is
retail going. My answer was retail is
concentrated. If you look at why that
Novi -- why a mall is successful here,
because you can go all the way up to Lansing
and you really don't have a good mall. You
don't have Nordstrom, you don't have Lord and
Taylor. You got Sears, Penneys and Macy's.
But those are the draws, the inside of the
mall, because of those two, you've got some
upscale retail. And that's why we are so
significant here. And the southeastern
quadrant, again, if our goal is to make this
walkable, we have look at this entire area.

I personally think that when we allowed the theater to go behind the former Builders Square, over where those of you remember Builders Square, is up where Kohls is, caused this from changing the traffic pattern significantly, where we used to have the Bally's, where the Wal-mart is currently, I think you would have seen a walkable environment, you would have seen the entertainment, you would have seen the restaurants. We made that mistake. We are not looking at it in totality.

So that's what I'm seeing as we looked at the master plan. I know the master plan is coming out for Grand River. We look at this ordinance here, as we are looking at some changes in it, I just think we are making a mistake, unless we look at it as an integrated process or program.

That's my opinion.

MS. MCBETH: I would like to comment on that, too. So the study that was completed in 2014, that was the intent, to look at the TC and TC1 districts in total and
see what might need to be updated.

The last study had been in probably the late '80s and '90s, when it was developed and ordinance standards were developed at that point as well.

So as Sri had mentioned, there is a comprehensive list of ordinance amendments. This is kind of the first step that staff has recommended taking, several of the smaller ones that are more easily achievable at this point. And then we will be coming back as some additional changes we predict a little bit farther down the line.

I think we also need to take into consideration that we do have some undeveloped land in the TC and TC1 areas and areas that would be ready for redevelopment.

We are not -- the staff is not really quite ready to give up on the idea that it could be a walkable area, especially if additional residences come in. So if it is created as more of a main street area, it's possible that it could be still be a viable walkable area.

MR. BARATTA: I'd really like to
look at that master plan for this area. Because I also believe it could be walkable, I really do. And, you know, I think we need the residential. We need to concentrate it.

MS. MCBETH: Perhaps when it comes back for public hearing, we could provide the study again.

It's been a little while since we have taken a look at it. We could provide that again, take a look at those.

MR. BARATTA: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Member Giacopetti.

MR. GIACOPETTI: I'm on the same page as Member Baratta.

Where I look at the local communities that are sort of the benchmark for walkability. I can't imagine entertaining these ideas. I can't imagine Plymouth, I can't Northville, I can't imagine Grosse Pointe, entertaining this in a district that is walkable. Hopefully walkable retail. It seems like giving up and going backwards.

I understand the developers
have come in and the market says, this is what the market is interested in. But then on the other hand, the planners tell us the long-term vision is walkable communities. The two are at odds right now. I was questioned if I was frustrated at the City Council hearing and it's just, you know, I'm struggling to do that balance. I understand what with the market wants, the market doesn't apparently want to get out of their car, but on the other side, I do believe with the -- you know, the planning community says that the future viability of the community are more walkable. So, you know, I'm --

MR. GRECO: No comments right now.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Move forward to set the recommendation?

MR. GRECO: Let me ask you this. Let me put something to the Planning Commission out there.

Before considering -- or I mean, we could set it for a public hearing, and we could get the study as part of our packet and have the public hearing and the
study at the same time and, you know, make
our decision or we can always put off our
decision when we have the public hearing.

Does the members of the
commission sitting here want to have that
information first in advance of considering
setting it for a public hearing or do you
want set -- putting it out.

MR. BARATTA: See, I don't think
I'm ready at this point with the facts that I
have to analyze it, to really come up with an
effective plan to turn this area into
something that we are envisioning. Maybe we
need more work on it, maybe we don't have.
But again, I don't have that information to
make that decision.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Is that
available, Barb?

MS. MCBETH: It is. We have it
on the web page that you can take a look at
any time. We could send you a link to it.
If you want to see it now, we can give it to
you, in two weeks at that meeting that's
coming up in two weeks, then have another
matter for discussion about it, if you like
to do that. Or, you know, we could provide
it, as Member Greco said, at the same time as
the public hearing.

MR. BARATTA: Would it be
appropriate to have a work session and go
through that with the Commission so we can
analyze it and maybe update it with some
additional recommendations before we bring it
to a public hearing so we have some
integrated plan we feel comfortable with?

MS. MCBETH: Yes, if the
Commission wishes, we could have a study
session, talk about and delve into the
details of that plan that was adopted in
2014.

This additional component
that we are going to get to here in a minute
is the drive-thru restaurants, which was
outside of the recommendations of that plan.
But if you wanted to, we could have a special
study session to talk about all of those
things.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Could we set a
public hearing, you know, for further out in
the future to give us time to review this?
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: To the impetus of setting the public hearing, now to --

MR. GIACOPETTI: I was thinking like September, October.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Is it --

MS. MCBETH: There was two things. We do anticipate that development plans will come in for the Main Street area at some point coming up. We have had some preliminary discussions. And maybe one or two of these would be important to those reviews. The second impetus is the applicant has requested review for drive-thru restaurants of a certain limited nature in the TC district, Town Center district, which is mostly on the north side of Grand River. So those two things have brought this at this time.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Did we have open -- does it look like the agenda is coming up or going to be filled?

MS. MCBETH: I think the agenda in a couple of weeks is going to be quite full. We will be getting into July. I don't
think we have projected too far out into July yet, so we could take a look at the agendas in July.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We can look at a July time frame to -- if you could shoot the link to us, provide us with a little direction. And then maybe look at the July time frame because I think that's usually slower amount of movement. Maybe we can set aside one of the Planning Commission dates for a study session, to have a discussion open to the public, as it is, but just, you know, be able to talk about this particular topic.

MS. MCBETH: That sounds good.

MR. GRECO: I think what we could do, probably today, what I'm hearing is reset the matter for consideration, number two, for a future meeting as a matter for consideration to consider setting it for a public hearing after we have had a chance to look at everything.

MR. BARATTA: Okay.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Isn't it just to table --
MR. GRECO: Should we just table it.

MR. GILLAM: That would work, yes.

MR. GRECO: Make a motion to table the matter for consideration number two, of the request to -- or consideration to set a public hearing for zoning ordinance text amendment 18.276 to a future meeting.

MR. BARATTA: Second.

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

Any other comments?

Sri, can you call the roll.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Baratta?

MR. BARATTA: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes
four to zero.

MR. GRECO: I'd like to make another motion to table the matter for consideration number three on the agenda, to consider setting public hearing for zoning ordinance text amendment 18.277, to a future Planning Commission meeting.

MR. BARATTA: Second.

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

Sri, can you call the roll.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacometti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Baratta?

MR. BARATTA: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes four to zero.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Next item is the approval of the April 27, 2016
Planning Commission minutes. Any modifications or changes?

MR. BARATTA: Motion to approve.

MR. GRECO: Second.

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

Sri, can you call the roll.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Baratta?

MR. BARATTA: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes four to zero.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: The approval of the May 11, 2016 Planning Commission minutes.

MR. BARATTA: Motion to approve.

MR. GRECO: Second.

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

Any other comments? Sri, please.

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

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Baratta?
MR. BARATTA: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?
MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes four to zero.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

Any supplemental issues?

Last audience participation.

Is there anyone in the audience that wishes to address the Planning Commission at this time?

Seeing none, close the audience participation.

MR. BARATTA: Mr. Chairperson, I did have one supplemental issues.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Go ahead.
MR. BARATTA: You know, one thing that I would like to -- just the panel to consider, you know, when we are going through our discussions and discussions with some council, I think Councilman Munch made a presentation to us regarding the landscaping and all old growth, new growth, et cetera. You know, some things came up, we, you know got -- we are a mature city, and I think -- I don't remember if this percentage was accurate or not, but about 12 or 14 percent of the city hasn't been developed, I don't know if that's the right number.

And as we do these projects, you know, we got this old growth, it's surviving that natural flora. When we do these projects and approve them, what you will see, and I was looking at the Ten Mile and Beck Road project, I think it's Vallencia (ph) where they put in the hedge, it's not. It wasn't the right landscaping. So last year they died, they're under warranty, sometimes they replace it, sometimes they don't.

So the question is, with old
growth flora, should we protect it? Should we keep the older trees, should we allow the developers to do clear cutting and even though it's economically viable to do that, trust me, I know what they cost, and require -- be a little more stringent on -- let me rephrase that. We should be a little more particular on what we let get cut down. That was brought up in the council meeting in several of our questions.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Address that. Barb, that came up two or three sessions ago, we were talking about the woodland ordinance in general, maybe again, have Pete show up and provide his input relative to what that ordinance is, and then try and find that wonderful balance between taking everything down and, you know, just I'll throw money at it, here is your tree replacement.

I think Mr. Schultz was here as well, I know he was cringing because there are certain things we can and can't do relative to that, so --

MS. MCBETH: I wonder if it would
be appropriate at that same study session to also bring up this topic and maybe have two topics.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Sure.

MR. GRECO: That would be great.

I think so.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Now can I --

MR. GRECO: Motion to adjourn.

MR. BARATTA: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: All those in favor.

THE BOARD: Aye.

(The meeting was adjourned at 8:10 p.m.)
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