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CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Call to order the regular meeting of the Planning Commission for June 22nd, 2016.

Sri, will you call the roll.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Anthony?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Absent, excused.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Baratta?

MR. BARATTA: Here.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacopetti?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: He will be late.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Absent, excused.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Here.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Here.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member
Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Here.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: If we could stand for the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Pledge recited.)

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Looking for a motion to approve the agenda or a modification thereof.

MR. BARATTA: Motion to approve.

MR. LYNCH: Second.

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

THE BOARD: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have an agenda.

Brings us to our first audience participation. If there is anyone in the audience that wishes to address the Planning Commission on something other than the public hearing, step forward at this point.

(No audible responses.)

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We will close the first audience participation.
Correspondence?

MR. LYNCH: None.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Committee reports? City Planner report, Ms. McBeth?

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

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Awesome.

Come to our first item, which is a consent agenda, Pine Ridge, JSP16-17. Approval at the request of Acquira Realty Holdings for preliminary site plan and Section 9 facade waiver. The subject property located in Section 22, north of Ten Mile and west of Novi Road. The subject property is approximately 4.54 acres in the B3 general business district. The applicant is proposing removal of the existing facade for Pine Ridge, a multi-tenant shopping plaza along with some landscaping improvements.

Somebody make a motion?

MR. BARATTA: I'll make a motion to approve the preliminary site plan in Section 9 facade area based on and subject to the following. The allotted overage of (unintelligible) material 25 percent allowed,
57 percent, 51 percent provided. And the underage of brick material 30 minimum, 29 percent provided, because the proposed alteration was significantly improved, the overall appearance of the building is consistent with the intent and purpose of the facade ordinance, which is hereby granted and the findings are in compliance with the ordinance standards and staff review letter and the conditions and the items listed in the letter being addressed.

The motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Article 3, Article 4, Article 5 and Article 6 of the zoning ordinance. All other applicable provision of the ordinance.

MR. LYNCH: Second.

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

Any comments?

(No audible responses.)

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Sri, can you call the roll.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Baratta?

MR. BARATTA: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes four to zero.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Next the public hearing for the Rose Senior Living at Providence, JSP13-81. It's a public hearing at the request of Edward Rose and Sons for recommendation City Council for approval of the revised plan, suburban low rise PSLR overlay development, agreement application and revised concept plan and conditional approval of the preliminary site plan.

The property is located on the west side of Beck Road, north of Eleven Mile. The applicant is proposing to add a seven bay garage building to the west of the property which is currently being developed as a 182 unit senior living facility with both congregated care and
assisted living accommodations.

Sri -- Adrianna.

MS. JORDAN: So this property currently zoned R3, one family residential with the planned suburban low-rise overlay which allows the applicant to develop the property to serve as a transitional area between lower intensity detached one family residential and higher intensity office and retail uses.

It is surrounded by similar uses with R3 one family residential on the northeast and west sides and RA, residential acreage on the south side across Eleven Mile Road. Approximately 200 feet north of the subject property is the campus of Providence Park Hospital, where the zoning changes to office service commercial.

The future land use map indicates suburban low-rise for the sub property and the surrounding properties to the east and west, office commercial to the north, and an educational facility to the south across Eleven Mile Road. The subject property is currently under construction and
measures 20.71 acres.

As previously mentioned, there will be a 182 unit senior living facility with both congregate care units as and assisted living units as well as independent living units. Recreational features for the residents are proposed along with associated site infrastructure and landscaping.

An easement is being offered for an anticipated public trail connection from Beck Road through the site.

The applicant is now returning to the Planning Commission with a revised concept and preliminary site plan to convert a portion of a parking bay to a seven car garage. In this review, only the proposed seven bay garage was reviewed for conformance with the zoning ordinance. Due to the constraints of the site and the design of the garage with mobility needs of older adults in mind, the applicant is requesting one deviation from the zoning ordinance. The proposed seven bay garage is located 22 feet and two inches from
the property line. The minimum required setback is 30 feet. The maneuvering aisle is currently 26 feet wide with an additional four foot wide area to transition between the garage and aisle. The zoning ordinance requires a 24-foot wide maneuvering aisle, however, the applicant states that the 26-foot wide drive aisle is necessary for fire truck access and the additional four foot wide concrete strip is required in order to transition the cross slope of the drive aisle to the flat garage entrance.

Planning supports approval of a revised plan suburban low-rise overlay development agreement application and revised concept plan and preliminary site plan and supports the deviation from the minimum required setback of 30 feet from the property line. This deviation can be granted by the City Council, per section 3.21.1D.

The proposed project meets the general requirements of Chapter 11, the storm water management ordinance and the engineering design manual.

Engineering supports
approval of a revised plan suburban low-rise overlay development agreement application and revised concept plan and preliminary site plan.

    Our engineer, Jeremy Miller, is here if you have any questions.

    The proposed project meets the general requirements of Chapter 37, woodland protection, zoning article 5.5 landscaping standards, the landscape design manual and any other applicable provisions of the zoning ordinance. Landscaping supports approval of a revised plan suburban low-rise overlay development agreement application and revised concept plan and preliminary site plan.

    Our landscape architect, Rick Meader, is here if you have any questions.

    The PSLR ordinance promotes a single family residential character. The proposed design exhibits that character and otherwise is in compliance with all requirements of Section 3.21.2C. Additionally, the applicant has revised the
design to provide brick extending to the freeze line on the front facade and the materials will match those used on the primary building.

With this revision, the design is in full compliance with the facade ordinance. The city's facade consultants supports approval of a revised plan suburban low-rise overlay development agreement application and revised concept plan and preliminary site plan.

The proposed project meets fire department standards. Fire supports approval of a revised plan suburban low-rise overlay development agreement application and revised concept plan and preliminary site plan.

Edward Rose and Sons representative Lindon Ivezaj is here tonight and would like to talk briefly about the project.

As always, staff will be glad to answer any questions that you have for us. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Did you say
the applicant was not here?

MS. JORDAN: I think he walked in while I was talking.

MR. IVEZAJ: Good evening. I think Ms. Jordan did a great job explaining the project. It's the best location on the site, screens are from both road frontages. That's pretty cut and dry. We did our best to cooperate the facade ordinance. I'm here for any additional questions.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Any correspondence?

MR. LYNCH: No correspondence.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Anyone in the audience wishes to address the Planning Commission on this particular matter?

Seeing none, we will close the public comment portion of this and turn it over to the Planning Commission. Who would like to start?

MR. LYNCH: If there are no comments, I'd like to make a motion for approval.

In the matter of Rose Senior Living at Providence JSP13-81, motion to
recommend approval of the revised concept
plan and to conditionally approve the
preliminary site plan pending City Council's
action to approve the revised concept plan
and revised PSLR overlay agreement based on
the following findings, City Council
deviations and conditions, listed in items A
through F in the motion sheet.

This motion is being made
because the plan is otherwise in compliance
with the approved PSLR overlay agreement and
PSLR overlay concept plan, sections 3.1.27,
sections 4.19, Section 4.20, Section 4.70,
Section 4.73, Article 5.0, Article 6.0 and
all other applicable provisions of the
ordinance.

MR. BARATTA: Second.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Motion by
Member Lynch, second by Member Baratta. Any
other comments? Sri, or someone call the
roll.

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

Zuchlewski?
MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Baratta?

MR. BARATTA: Yes.

THE WITNESS: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes five to zero.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: All set.

Thank you. For the record, can you show Member Giacopetti showing up at 7:05. Thank you, sir, for battling traffic.

MR. GIACOPETTI: My pleasure.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Next on the agenda is matter for consideration, draft update for Master Plan for land use. It's consideration for the Planning Commission for recommendation to City Council to approve and the release of the 2016 Master Plan for land use update to all neighboring committees and interested parties for a 63 day review period as required by state law and in conjunction with the thoroughfare Master Plan TMP.

Sri, good evening.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Good evening.

As you're aware, we have been working on the Master Plan update with Clearzoning our consultants under the guidance of Master Plan and Zoning Committee since August of last year.

After thorough research and discussions, we are now presenting the final draft for your consideration. Our consultants presented drafts at various phases at previous meetings. There are minor modifications made to content to provide additional clarification throughout the draft. Some significant updates are made to the land use map, residential density map and the implementation strategies from the last time you saw it. That will be discussed in later slides.

The following presentation will focus on the key items of the research and findings to refresh your memory, and mostly to tend to first time listeners, if any.

The Master Plan is intended to illustrate the vision for future and guide
the community to create development policies and make land use decisions. The facts, findings and recommendations are documented in nine chapters within the document.

The city has seen dramatic population growth since its incorporation in 1969, when the population was just over 9,500. The current estimated population is at 60,000.

Existing conditions chapter includes findings on existing, changing and future patterns of education, income, housing, employment and land use. Suburban communities around the country are currently facing a shift in the age of the population. The housing stock and transportation to that exists now is not well-suited for the aging adults. The statistics provided in this slide also indicate that Novi will be impacted by the aging population as well.

This chapter provides an overview of the extensive study of natural features prepared by the city in 2000. The study recorded the city's natural resources, including soils, topography, water features,
flood prone areas, woodlands, wetlands and
the other wildlife habitats. The current
master plan draft looks at the developed and
undeveloped lands individually but also
envisions a comprehensive, integrated
approach to preservation, conservation and
development.

The market assessment
developed for the City of Novi is based on
information gathered through research,
interviews and surveys. It finds that the
addition of entertainment uses will offer a
significant opportunity to capture the
spending of Novi residents within the
community. There is also room for an
increase in retail uses, provided that there
is an increase in housing to support retail
spending. The assessment suggests four
potential objectives that could be
accomplished through the pursuit of the
economic opportunities for Novi.

All meetings of the Planning
Commission and Master Planning and Zoning
Committee are open to the public and several
meetings include discussions with residents
In addition, an open house was held in October of 2015. Residents and property owners in attendance were fairly consistent with stating the need for making the city more vibrant to attract young professionals and keep empty nesters. Walkability is important as is creating an authentic identity for the city.

The updated goals and objectives are based on the previous Master Plan in conjunction with the public input and the current demographic and economic data to refine goals and objectives for the current plan.

This resulted in five main goals of the 2016 Master Plan, quality and variety of housing, community identity, environment and stewardship, infrastructures and economic development.

The future land use map has been updated with four changes as shown in the map, due to the development of Berkshire Pointe subdivision, Community Commercial is changed at Twelve Mile and Beck and
intersection is changed to single family residential.

Due to the studies and findings from Grand River corridor study, future land use for some of the properties along Grand River Avenue between Beck and Taft Road are changed to a new land category called city west.

Thirteen Mile and old Novi Road change is made from single family residential to pavilion shore village, which is also a new land use category.

MSU Tollgate farm property at the intersection of Twelve Mile and Meadowbrook is now educational facility previously used to be single family residential.

With this draft, all previously approved plan rezoning overlay projects are added, along with the future collector and non-collector roads.

The residential density map in this slide depicts areas of residential density changed from 2016 Master Plan update.

These areas identify
opportunities for diversity of housing stock
and address affordability. The city will
continue to insure new housing can
accommodate for different household size and
types of all income levels. It should be
noted that the map includes a disclaimer that
the actual maximum number of dwelling units
permitted per acre may be less due to the
site conditions and City of Novi Code of
Ordinance requirements and the specific
recommendations of the Master Plan for mixed
used areas.

The Grand River corridor
identifies six unique activity centers
primarily based on general land use and
development forms to develop a cohesive
corridor with an identity that is unique to
Grand River Avenue. A district plan is
prepared to create an identity for the
corridor as it runs through the city, but is
based on the existing activity centers.

Goals for the corridor are
presented along with the concepts for
redevelopment. The concepts provide an
opportunity to create a true sense of
identity through streetscape enhancements and other place making tools. The suggestions provided in this chapter are very encouraging.

As part of implementing goals of the Master Plan, three specific redevelopments slides have been identified by the city that are currently vacant or under utilized, given their location, unique features and size. They are identified as the pavilion shore village, city west and Anglin property.

Redevelopment of these sites offer the opportunity to increase housing and still let business growth in concentrated areas of the city allowing the rest of the city to retain its existing suburban character.

This includes action strategies that advanced the goals and objectives of the Master Plan. With that draft, completed and irrelevant strategies have been removed, goals that described community's vision for the future, objectives described how the community can achieve the
goal. Specific recommendations that may require zoning, policy, transportation and other items are included as action items to help achieve the objectives.

The Planning Commission is asked tonight to recommend that the City Council approve the release of the 2016 Master Plan for land use update to all the neighboring communities and interested parties for a 63 day review period as required by the state law and in conjunction with the thoroughfare Master Plan.

During the review period, the public comments will be collected by staff. After the 63 day review period, a public hearing will be scheduled by the Planning Commission to hear verbal comments, review the comments collected by the staff. Adoption of the plan will not take place until after the review period and public hearing. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, Sri. With that, I'll turn it over to the Planning Commission for their consideration. Who would like to start?
Member Baratta.

MR. BARATTA: Thank you, sir. Well, I have concern with a couple of the areas in the proposed Master Plan.

The first would be pavilion shore. And just driving that area, and looking at the area, I know we are allowing in this proposed Master Plan to allow retail. And I just don't think retail works there. I think the traffic has a very low density. I think it's going to fail. It's primarily a residential area, near the lake, and I think it would be a mistake to put in a retail component there.

The second part of it is the Grand River corridor where we're proposing to go from office research development to again a retail overlay industrial, et cetera, but allowing retail.

The reason why I'm so negative on retail in those particular areas is what's happening in the retail industry right now, is a consolidation and concentration. Internet based retail is here, they're growing, and the brick and
mortar retailers are scaling back. They're consolidating, they're concentrating. We have a gem in this entire northwest quadrant over at the mall. And the mall is just a significant attraction of retail of different types.

If you look at the Nordstrom and the Lord and Taylor, you don't have a Nordstrom and Lord and Taylor from Lansing, south, to Monroe, Michigan. And what you find is that this jewel attracts in those areas. When you look at metro Detroit, you have got our mall, which is in the top two, you have the mall to the east in Troy, Somerset, and you have the Sterling Heights mall. If you look at the Sterling Heights mall, they're not doing well. Because they allowed that shopping center with the Nordstrom to be constructed down the block to the east of them, and just did not allow for that concentration.

So what we are doing here is we are taking -- we are allowing our retail to spread. As a result, diminishing that concentration and the power of that retail.
It's going to be a problem for us.

The second thing we are doing, is when you look at these research industrial type of uses, what do they look for. They look for basically highway visibility for easy access of the truck and other vehicles, and in this corridor between Beck and Grand River or Wixom and Beck, you have two interchanges, you have got great visibility to the highway, and when you look at -- these are prime corridors for business. Not necessarily retail, but business. And then when you look around this, we are not an island in Novi, we're part of the community, you got Wixom to the east, and you've got the (unintelligible) to the north. And these communities are starting to develop. It's not like what you have in Washington DC and I think that's one of the examples, it was the federal project, which is up in -- I don't remember if it was Bakersberg (ph) or one of those, where you have nothing but just dense, dense population and growth and business, et cetera. We don't have that here.

And I think we are going to
be changing something that we can really
attract business and research and development
and areas such as that to make this a very
strong community, as opposed to diminishing
it with retail and other uses. And those are
my two points.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, sir. Anyone else? Member Giacopetti.

MR. GIACOPETTI: I mean, just a question on process really. After the 63 day
review period, we will collect the comments
and have a chance to -- based on that
feedback?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Barb?

MR. GIACOPETTI: That's generally the process, Barb?

MS. MCBETH: Yes, that's generally the process. The release to the
county and the surrounding communities and
the utility companies and other agencies for
review and comments. The county does a
careful review of the Master Plan, in
comparison to the surrounding communities to
make sure there wouldn't be any conflict with
that. Then it comes back to the city for a
public hearing and adoption.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Thanks, Barb. I would say I agree with Member Baratta. In some regards, I do think the Walled Lake district -- or I'm sorry, pavilion shore district screams for not necessarily retail but restaurant and -- bar and restaurant concepts.

I mean, I think it would be a very desirable location for those types of businesses, but not necessarily The Gap. And, you know, the question I have is, I don't mind the retail component of the Grand River corridor, however, I guess my tradeoff would be is there a way to rezone existing retail areas into a residential or some other use to make that -- to make that possible.

Because it seems to be a clamoring amongst developers for retail space right now that they're running out of room -- not retail, I'm sorry, for residential, they are running out of room and, you know, we're approaching redevelopment, where should that be. You know, are we really addressing it, the plan. So those are my preliminary
comments and feedback and I don't want to
belabor that.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

Member Lynch.

MR. LYNCH: You know, I share the
comments I have heard already made, the
comments of Member Baratta. I do agree with
the logic about the Grand River corridor and
I don't -- with the brick and mortar with the
Novi Town Center being a destination point in
Novi, we really don't want to shoot ourselves
in the foot by doing something that's going
to harm that area.

I don't have a problem with
moving forward with this thing, but I think
City Council needs to take a look at it, and
think about the points that Member Baratta
made because this could be a long term issue
for the city if we do it wrong. My only
comments.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: I just tag right
onto Member Baratta's comments. I think once
we start diluting existing businesses, rents
are only going up and giving people options
to go elsewhere. I think we could end up
with a Northland here if we are not careful
and it can happen pretty quick, so I just
want to tag onto that.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Anyone with
a motion?

MR. LYNCH: With that I'd like to
make a recommendation that the Planning
Commission recommends to City Council the
release of the draft. Is that how the motion
has to be, we recommend the release of the
draft to City Council.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a
motion by Member Lynch, second by Member
Zuchlewski, any other comments?

Sri?

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Baratta?

MR. BARATTA: No.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member

Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes four to one.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

Next on the agenda is the draft, final report for the Thoroughfare Master Plan. It's the consideration of the Planning Commission for recommendation to City Council to approve the release of the 2016 Thoroughfare Master Plan to all of the neighboring communities and interested parties for a 63 day review period in conjunction in the 2016 Master Plan for land use.

MS. MELLEM: Good evening. So tonight we present the draft final report of the Thoroughfare Master Plan.

The study began in October 2015. We have the plan here -- the plan to present to you today.

Mr. Corradino is here from the Corradino Group and he will give a brief overview of the report.

And then the Planning
Commission again is asked to recommend to City Council to release the document in conjunction with the Master Plan for land use. We are going to take those together, leave those with the neighboring communities and have the 63 day review public hearing after that. Thank you.

MR. CORRADINO: Good evening. I am Joe Corradino as I first mentioned.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Can you get closer to the podium in case there is somebody on TV watching, that one can hear you.

MR. CORRADINO: I want to thank you for letting me be here again. This is the point at which we have a draft of a plan for you and the community to review.

Our approach is multi-modo, we looked at sidewalks, pathways, we looked at roads, corridors, we looked at intersections. And we also looked at mass transit.

We effectively, and I'm going to do a shorthand version of this, I have been here and done this with you before.
What we did was so far, three public meetings. I'm going to have another one tomorrow here.

The first two public meetings, and we asked the community to pay attention to a thing called community remarks, which is on your website. We had 68 specific comments. We have about 2,000 hits, people going to the site, and we then asked people at the public meetings to also take a touch pad and rank or rate, if you will, things that were important.

The report will show you that community remarks as well as the touch pad ranked similar things at the highest levels. I should say that road improvements was not at the highest level. Nonetheless, we addressed all of those and tried to come up with a logical plan.

We met three times with the Planning Commission, and at some point in the process we'll meet with City Council as the review continues.

I screwed this slide up, but nonetheless, this is what the plan calls for.
First of all, we suggest, recommend, that Beck Road be widened, it will either be a boulevard or it will be a five lane facility, depending on what we can squeeze in.

When we talk about squeezing it in, we are talking about a three and a half mile section effectively touching about 65 parcels, and the typical acquisition is about 25 feet. So we're not in anybody's house, and we're basically up upon the edge of the road to try to widen it to a five foot lane.

We wind up with a cost in today's dollars, we did not inflate the cost for a future year. But our cost is 21 and a half million dollars. That compares to an estimate of about ten or more years ago that was more like half of that.

The Ten Mile Road proposal is almost $20 million. We spread those two projects over ten fiscal years so that there was a practical way of addressing them.

There is new money available particularly from the state and the feds,
state's money doesn't flow unless until next year, but nonetheless, if you read and seen 275, et cetera, you know, gone very well, a lot of money that is new, goes to old, which means fixing a lot of broken infrastructure. And so capacity improvements are not at the top of the list, and that's what we are calling for, but like most things in life, the squeaky wheel gets the motion grease and to the extent that you have these very, very new current plans, and you can work with your legislative folks at the state and federal level, our opinion is it's an achievable plan.

We have 13 new intersections that we try to define everything from painting new crosswalks to new signals to retiming signals, to reconstructing turn lanes.

The sum of those parts is about $6 million spread over four fiscal years. The ability to do that, let me show you in just a second, as is compared to your current budget, we got two dozen segments that are pathways for $4 million.
That's over six fiscal years, consistent with your pathway program, and your regular expenditures, the pace of your regular expenditures. So when you add that up, you're talking in the neighborhood for roads and intersections about $56 million and about $4 million, that's spread over many years now for side paths, sidewalks and pathways.

The public transit portion, older adult services, absorbs about $160,000 a year from public and private sources.

We propose a mall circulator, Town Center, et cetera, and we costed it, and we suggested that it be a demonstration project, see if it works, work with the merchants, advertise it, and effectively spend, we recommended $45,000. You don't need any new equipment, you can use the older adult vehicles to do this test monitoring of it, if it works, then the system can be extended, either in time of day or route.

Regional transit, we tested an extension of a number of routes, and those
routes coincide roughly with what we see in the Master Plan put out by the regional transit authority. And we costed those for full blown service, then we backed off of that and looked at more limited service in the a.m. and p.m. cross town, cross county routes, et cetera.

That service was about $2 million. The referendum in November is all in or none in. You can't opt. You opted out as a community two years ago I believe it was in 2014, when the tax, the millage, I think went from about five and a half to one mill.

An additional 1.2 mills is being asked for. On individual city or county, village can opt out.

And so it's an all in or no in, none in, because the regional vote across all the counties and the southeast Michigan area, that regional vote, if it's 51 percent, so to speak, then you're in. There is a provision in the plan that says no county can get back in service less than what it costs, 85 percent of what it costs in your taxes.
So there is a floor, if you will, by county. There is no understanding on my part whether that goes to an individual area, an individual city, it does apply at this point to the county.

If you have a 1.2 mill property tax it's probably going to cost somewhere between 3 and 3 and a half million dollars per year in extra taxes, but with that would come regional service. You should read the Master Plan. I'm sure you will before you vote, but it is -- it's aggressive, and it talks to making things much more 21st century for a community of this size, not Novi, but the region.

So we believe that, as in the past, it will be a decision for the voters, but this time the voters are not in a position, if you will, to say we don't want to pay the tax in Novi. It's all in or not.

So we talked about 46, I think it was, million dollars for roads and another $5 million, I'm sorry, at the intersections -- so about 46 million and right now you contribute a little over
$11 million to capital improvements for your infrastructure, road infrastructure, you contribute another 3 million for maintenance.

The sidewalks, if you will, effectively, your program is straight over a number of years, but it's fairly aggressive, one of the best I've ever seen for $11 million. And right now the older adult service, we have not made any adjustments to it. We did look at some adjustment in the infrastructure, couldn't justify it, so it's $160,000 a year and we make no proposals to change that.

So that's what we've done. It's in a detailed report, and I'm sure you have -- if you have questions I would be more than happy to answer. And you can get in touch with me, obviously, by email to our client and we will respond as quickly as we can.

If you need a further meeting face-to-face or otherwise, just let me know. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, sir. I appreciate that. Turn it over to the
Planning Commission for their thoughts and consideration.

Who would like to start?

Member Baratta.

MR. BARATTA: Thank you, Mr. Corradino. I do have a couple of questions.

In reading the plan, we have two pages that I had some concerns about. Well, actually three. One, does the -- when you talk about the expansions of the roadway, I certainly think both areas that you have described are needed to be expanded, you include in your budget a taper so the neighborhoods can actually get onto those streets?

MR. CORRADINO: Yes, if you look at the plan, it's in the back of the report.

MR. BARATTA: It's right there.

MR. CORRADINO: And again, you're going to focus in on you in these drawings because you will have a lot of public input and eventually you'll get to a design that you like.

One of the things that we also suggest because of the neighbor's
concerns, is that you look hard and fast at noise walls, noise attenuation walls, and a that's a sign in and of itself, but there are a number of clusters. We count about four dozen homes that are affected by noise and we suggested that not only tapers for entrances, and safe entrances and exits, et cetera, but also look at the noise issues.

MR. BARATTA: I find that kind of an interesting comment regarding building noise walls for some of these homeowners that would -- I would suspect would be a very big negative to the homeowners?

MR. CORRADINO: Well, two things. There is a lot of quote, noise today. And you will hear people complaining about that, when this gets more public.

Secondly the wall doesn't have to be ugly. Thirdly, if I could attenuate the noise and protect -- if it's high enough to be intrusive and protect my property value, we're sure it's a tradeoff. Now, you're looking at a slope, so that the wall again, doesn't have to be 50-foot high, but we suspect that noise
walls need to be examined. You have to justify them like going through an eye of --
you just can't put up a noise wall, at least if you're going to use federal money.

So you have got to prove that it's cost efficient based on the number of homes protected and it does the job obviously.

So it's a long drawn-out process, but again, if the neighbors don't want it, and I have the sense that they would appreciate it, but that's from a long distance away, but it's still the suggestion that designers have taken into consideration when they do their work.

MR. BARATTA: The other point was when you mentioned the program on the mall circulator. Describe that in a little more detail. What are you proposing there?

MR. CORRADINO: When we started, there were suggestions. And one suggestion was regional transit. We looked at it. Costed it, pretty expensive, but it came from community remarks, the input.

And we were -- offered the
idea of a tram, a people mover between the malls. And we looked at that and it was not unlike the regional rounds, it's not cheap. So we thought if there was a viable idea, particularly if you got the regional service, and people were being delivered to the mall area, which is a target of the RTA's plan, then once they got there, they ain't got a car. Even if they drove there, you don't want to be running back and forth between centers, then the circulator would connect those malls and, you know, at a reasonable price. If you can get in there and the merchant doesn't block you out.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: So you are looking for a bus type of scenario?

MR. CORRADINO: There is a picture in the report, but it's a lift equipped, handicap equipped van. That's what it is. Small vehicle. You know, not a 40 footer, it's a small van.

MR. BARATTA: Your comment about the regional transport. So you're -- explain what -- you talked about, if I understood correctly, that there is a regional program
where 51 percent of the community said they want to be part of it in the county, that they have a plan. Is that accurate? Do I understand that correctly?

MR. CORRADINO: There was a law passed, I think it was 2010, and I have been around doing regional transit since 1976, so -- and it couldn't get anywhere, any time. And then things started to budge with the Quicken Loans trolley up Woodward, and people started talking about, well, we got to do more. So they formed a regional transit authority, and in the laws that they created, they decided that unlike in the past, and you as a community say no, I don't want, and, you know, get service from Smart, you can't do that. So your county, Wayne County, Monroe County, Washtenaw, all those, the sum of all the parts, if it gets to be more than 50 percent one way or the other, you're all tagged the same. Nothing additional or 1.2 mills additional.

MR. BARATTA: Thank you very much for your information. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Anybody
else?

(No audible responses.)

Mr. Corradino, in the document, you had just about every intersection, as I read through it, had -- you did a crash study or a study relative to the number of crashes in the intersections, percentage basis. It seemed like every time I got to the next intersection and the next intersection and the next intersection, the predominant methodology of a crash was a rear-end collision, from a greater than 50 percent for just about each intersection.

What signalization, modernization efforts helps that? Because here is my --

MR. CORRADINO: Take somebody's cell out of this hand --

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Because my skepticism is, we are going to spend a lot of money retaping, retiming, re, re, re and I still have a 17 year-old driver looking at his cellphone, and I don't see the percentages, I don't see the technology that -- and the modernization helping that
particular modality of the problem.

MR. CORRADINO: The problem you've got, like most communities with these characteristics of crashes, is congestion. And so tooling up to the light, and I think the guy in front of him, the lady of front him slowed, and do this, she is -- now, there is a section of the report that talks about the future, and I had a brief conversation with Kirsten about autonomous vehicles, you know, Google's new facility up here off of Beck Road, that they're going to do research and development on connecting autonomous vehicles.

It depends on who you talk to, but that seems to me now I'm getting educated to be more on the near term horizon than not.

That isn't going to help these intersections, because you're not going to have connected vehicles for a while on arterials. You're going to have connected vehicles on freeways and that will make a major difference, accidents laying with all kind of things. But at the end of the day,
sorry, to use that phrase, end of the day,
the end result is that distracted drivers are
greater now than ever. It's hard to find
somebody in the morning not on their phone,
they're allowed to do that under first
amendment. But people are texting and
texting is not helping whatsoever. So how do
you solve that, hit your kid.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Okay, thank
you, sir. I appreciate it. Anyone make a
motion? Member Lynch.

MR. LYNCH: I'm going to make a
motion to -- a recommendation to send this to
City Council. So that's the motion.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Well done.
I don't know how you came up with that.

MR. BARATTA: Very articulate. I
will second.

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

(No audible responses.)

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Sri?

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member

Zuchlewski?
MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Baratta?

MR. BARATTA: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes five to zero.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Next on the agenda is the approval of the May 25, 2016 Planning Commission minutes. Changes, modifications?

MR. LYNCH: Motion to approve.

MR. BARATTA: Second.

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

Sri, can you call the roll.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

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

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Baratta?

MR. BARATTA: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes five to zero.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Next, matters for discussion? Anything? Supplemental issues?

MS. MCBETH: Mr. Chair, I should just remind everyone we do have a presentation by Mr. Corradino tomorrow evening at 7:00, same place, but more detail and maybe additional members of public.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

Next we come to our last audience participation?

(No audible responses.)

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Waving at the only member of the audience that probably doesn't want to come say anything to us.
Close the audience participation. Motion to adjourn?

MR. LYNCH: Motion to adjourn.

MR. BARATTA: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: All those in favor?

THE BOARD: Aye.

MR. LYNCH: Anyone opposed?

(Meeting was adjourned at 7:50 p.m.)
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