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CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Call to order the July 26th, 2017 regular meeting of the Planning Commission.

Sri or Kirsten, can you call the roll, please.

MS. MELLEM: Good evening.
Member Anthony?
MR. ANTHONY: Here.
MS. MELLEM: Member Avdoulos?
MR. AVDOULOS: Here.
MS. MELLEM: Member Giacopetti?
MR. GIACOPETTI: Here.
MS. MELLEM: Member Greco?
MR. GRECO: Here.
MS. MELLEM: Member Lynch?
MR. LYNCH: Here.
MS. MELLEM: Chair Pehrson?
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Here.
MS. MELLEM: Member Zuchlewski?
MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Here.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: With that, if
we could rise for the Pledge of Allegiance. Member Zuchlewsiki, if you can lead us, please.

(Pledge recited.)

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

I'll look for a motion to approve the agenda.

MR. AVDOULOS: Motion to approve.

MR. ANTHONY: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: There's a motion and a second. Any other comments?

All those in favor?

THE BOARD: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Anyone opposed? We have an agenda.

We come to our first audience participation. If there's anyone in the audience that wishes to address the planning commission, please step forward at this time. There will be other times to participate.

Seeing no one, we'll close the first audience participation.

I don't believe we have any correspondence.

Any committee reports?

City Planner report, Ms. McBeth.
MS. McBETH: Thank you. Good evening. I have a couple of things to report from the July 10th City Council meeting, a couple of items the Planning Commission had also recently considered.

The City Council did approve the Special Land Use Permit and Preliminary City Plan for the drive-thru at the Novi Town Center. City Council also approved the two text amendments, one related to above-ground storage tanks in the OSD and I-1 districts and in the outdoor display areas in connection with the general hospital use.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you. Appreciate it.

The first agenda item is the public hearing for the Master Plan for Land Use update, a public hearing for Planning Commission's adoption of the 2016 Master Plan for Land Use in order to fulfill the requirements of the Michigan Planning Enabling Act and provide a plan for the future development in the City of Novi.

MS. McBETH: Thank you. Mr. Chair, I've got a few things to say. It's been a little while since we last talked about the plan, so I'll go over a little bit of that, the history of it.
So the Master Plan review process for the 2016 update began with the required written notice to the neighboring jurisdictions and other agencies. Following an initial meeting of the Master Plan and Zoning Committee, the City's staff and consultants provided opportunities for the public to comment on the draft plans and documents through an Open House that we held here at the City Hall, and through a dedicated spot on the City's Webpage which provided an easy link for everyone to access the documents as they were drafted and reviewed by the Master Plan and Zoning Committee.

Additionally, a survey for residents was provided on the City's Webpage which sought the public's thoughts on the market and retail availability in Novi. Following that was a business survey on the City's Webpage to seek responses from business owners regarding hiring trends, business needs, and where the business markets are going from our local business person's perspective. Results of these opportunities for public comment were included in the recommendations provided in the plan.

One key element of the plan update is the Grand River Corridor Study. The Corridor Plan is intended to identify and incorporate community
character aspects, seeks to promote economic vitality, and helps to recognize opportunities for development and redevelopment throughout the study area. A key concept is to identify opportunities for mixed use development consistent with the areas planned for the Town Center and the Gateway East District. Pedestrian-oriented and transit-oriented elements were reviewed taking into consideration the recommendations of the Town Center area plan. Over the last few months the City has undertaken initial steps to begin the creation of a Corridor Improvement Authority along Grand River with the expectations that the vision of that plan will be consistent with the recommendations of this Master Plan Update.

Another key element of the plan update are the redevelopment strategies. For this plan update, the City had focused on identifying and prioritizing sites, neighborhoods, and/or districts that may be positioned for redevelopment, infill development or adaptive reuse. Redevelopment properties that were selected for special consideration include the Anglin property at the northeast corner of Grand River and Town Center Drive, properties near Old Novi Road and Thirteen Mile Road, as well as the City West property. Over the last few months, staff has seen interest from
the development community in portions of all three of these areas for possible redevelopment, and we actually received one letter from Robertson Brothers indicating support of the concepts provided. That was included in your packet.

Once the Master Plan is adopted, the vision identified in each of the redevelopment areas will be fine-tuned and assessed in detail through the development of zoning ordinance text amendments. The Planning Commission will play an important part in developing these ordinance standards and will be asked to make recommendations to the City Council following the public hearings as each of these master plan recommendations are implemented through ordinance amendments.

I also wanted to mention that the Oakland County Coordinating Zoning Committee reviewed the draft copy of Novi's Master Plan Update. Oakland County Planner, Kristen Kapelanski, complimented the work that went into researching and writing the plan, and the numerous maps, photographs and charts that contribute to the readability of the plan. She highlighted the chapter that focused on the Grand River Corridor, noting that the plan presents a realistic vision of how a cohesive corridor can come
together to work for families, young adults and the active adult community. She further noted the introduction of the City West District concept that helps to address the needs for a vibrant and varied housing types in close proximity to and within walking distance of the commercial establishments.

Following the review, the Committee voted unanimously to endorse the County Planner's review of the Master Plan.

A public hearing was held by the Planning Commission to consider the Master Plan at the September 28, 2016 Planning Commission meeting for further discussion and possible adoption at that time. Following the public hearing, the Planning Commission made a motion to approve the Resolution to adopt the Master Plan for Land Use. Although approved by a motion of 4 to 1, the vote for approval did not meet the 2/3 threshold that is needed to adopt the plan.

Since there is a desire to have as many Planning Commission members participate as possible for the consideration of the plan, a poll was taken earlier this year to determine when a full quorum of members would be present. It was found that a full quorum of members would be present tonight, so thank you for coming out. The public hearing has been
scheduled for this evening.

Two minor additions are incorporated into the plan at this time: A map has been added that shows the Thoroughfare Classifications; and a map has been added that shows the Sidewalk and Pathway Plan.

There were also updates to the acknowledgement page, and those have been incorporated.

Staff and our consultants are here to answer any questions if you have any, and the suggested motion is included in your packet.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, Barb.

This is a public hearing. Is there anyone in the audience that wishes to address the Planning Commission on this matter?

There's no one.

I don't believe -- do we have any correspondence?

MR. GRECO: No correspondence.

MS. McBETH: There was one that was included in the packet.

MR. GRECO: Oh, in the packet from...
Robertson Homes.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: That's noted and in the record.

With that, we'll close the audience participation and at this point turn it over to the Planning Commission for their consideration.

Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: First of all, I wanted to thank you for the work that you've put in and all the effort that you've made to solicit public opinion and incorporate that.

I'm glad to see the interest in developing the Grand River Corridor and the formation of the Corridor Improvement Authority. So I'm very pleased on both of those.

So, one, I wanted to voice my support, and I think it's timely that at the same time we're looking at approving the Master Plan, later on today we're also going to be looking at a request from Farmington Hills in approving their Corridor Improvement Authority, and I would like to at that point talk about making sure we don't miss an opportunity that since they're our neighboring community and we're both looking at renewing our master plans, that we don't lose an opportunity at
working together on the Grand River portion in Farmington Hills that affects flow of traffic on Ten Mile and Grand River in Novi. So but I do like the work that you've done.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, Member Anthony.

Anyone else?

MR. GIACOPETTI: I have some.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Member Giacopetti.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Thank you. I'm going to follow up on Member Anthony's comment concerning the efforts of our neighbors in Farmington Hills. Has anyone explored or considered the opportunity to create one very, very large corridor authority as opposed to simply two that end at Haggerty Road? Because it just seems to be -- some of the challenge areas honestly are between where they're ending and we're kind of starting. I think that that area there should be considered for a target for redevelopment. So I can ask that if there is any consideration or if that's just crazy talk.

MS. McBETH: No. Through the Chair again. So you may recall that Farmington and Farmington Hills got started a little bit earlier than
we did on their corridor plan. As part of our plan we
thought we would just tackle a portion of the corridor
at first, and then on further discussion with a lot of
the stakeholders on the west part of the community and
the Grand River Corridor, we decided to expand the
study for the entire length. So I think at this point
we're doing what we can and are kind of following
behind what Farmington and Farmington Hills have done
in their setting up, and I think they're currently in
the process of that. And as I think we indicated in
the memo, the City of Novi is currently working on
setting up a Corridor Improvement Authority as well.

MR. GIACOPETTI: So I guess, and I
do appreciate all the work that has been done and
efforts to solicit community feedback on the Master
Plan, but otherwise this plan hasn't changed much
since we last reviewed it.

MS. McBETH: It has not. The
updates that I mentioned were the couple of maps that
have been highlighted and some acknowledgements.

MR. GIACOPETTI: And I'm going
to -- I think I'm leaning towards not recommending
this plan only because I don't feel like it does
enough to promote redevelopment, particularly along
Grand River where you have the redevelopment, the City
West District is limited, and you have just so much industrial property, some of which is very blighted, and I don't feel that -- I don't feel that this map for future use goes far enough to encourage developers to redevelop this property, because you're -- we need to make the zoning so enticing that it's worth their while financially to replace an industrial site with high-rise condominiums or, you know, something that we would consider an improvement. That would be one direction.

The other direction would be to just abandon the Town Center concept, because it hasn't really panned out. There isn't enough population density near that core to really promote a downtown, and that would be the other direction that I can support, which would be to abandon that. To either do it all, or abandon it and focus our efforts otherwise. Like the Walled Lake, I really -- in the redevelopment plan, that district in Walled Lake that is identified for redevelopment I thought was a great idea. But this plan sort of is a little bit of both, and I don't particularly -- for my taste I don't particularly care for that, because I don't think that will work. I don't think that corridor will be redeveloped in a way that is appealing if there are so
much industrial property along that corridor. That's just traditionally what it had been, that's the legacy of Novi and Grand River. It was an attractive place for industrial sites.

So I would like to see the plan personally to go further and expand that City West to sort of a Grand River corridor zone that went all the way the entire stretch of the city, or I would like to abandon -- or if not, I would like to see the Town Center district just abandoned and kind of start over, because I don't think -- I don't think our strategies are working, and I think it may be because our zoning is not enticing enough for developers to want to redevelop, rather their removing open space. And, you know, we saw recently commercial properties being developed north of Twelve Mile, and I think really that's a factor of developers are trying to create a sense of place for their offices and for their corporate homes where they look out and they see green open space and, you know, well-manicured landscapes. And so they're not choosing sites along Grand River that are in need of redevelopment, and this plan in my opinion encourages that.

So I can't support it. It's not because it's not a fine product, and it provides -- it was
well done, it's just that I would like to see it go one way or the other, but not try and straddle both because I think that is not successful.

MS. McBETH: Mr. Chair, I've got a couple of comments if you don't mind.

So there are a number of land use recommendations that are included in the plan that would transform some of the light industrial pieces, some of the vacant ones and some of the under-utilized ones, to either OST or another zoning district, and I think at some point those would be available and ready to go with an OST type of development or some other development that matches the plan.

The other thing that I think we're hopeful about, at least as staff people, is that the Corridor Improvement Authority will kind of bring the corridor together as a unified place within the city, and as it transitions from one side of the community to the other that the changes will come about and there will be consistency brought about by that as well.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, Barb.

Anyone else?

Member Greco.
MR. GRECO: Yes. I just have a few comments. I do -- I think that Member Giacopetti's concern are valid, and I think they are valid concerns with respect to what we're trying to achieve generally and what we're seeing come in. That being said, with respect to this document being at the end stages, I think that, you know, some of the things that maybe Member Giacopetti brings up, you know, and we do it again need to be looked at, you know, through the Corridor Authority that Ms. McBeth brought up, maybe it would be the time to again try and coalesce and get all of those things together.

So while I definitely respect Mr. Giacopetti's points that he's making, and I think they are valid, with respect to this particular document and the work that was put in with this, with the items and the issues and the zoning that are there, I think, you know, it was a picture of what we wanted and what we were looking for at the time, and I, you know, I'm satisfied with the document as it exists right now as we kind of already approved.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Member Avdoulos.

MR. AVDOULOS: Thank you. I hadn't seen the document in many years. I was on the
commission in the early 2000's and was fortunate
enough to be on the Master Plan and Zoning Committee.
So it's done quite a bit of work, and it looks like a
great amount of information has gone into it a little
bit differently than what or how it was presented
before? I definitely -- I do agree with some of the
comments that, you know, things could be looked at a
little differently. This Master Plan with the
Corridor Authority will help advance some of that
discussion.

I've been a resident for 25 years,
so I've seen a lot of what the Master Plan has done
for the City in a positive way, in a surprising way.
There are some areas that are very frustrating, and,
you know, you just have to diligently keep working at
it, but also provide opportunities for developers, you
know, to come in. And so if in the course of a
developer's review of where to land in the city, I'm
sure that when it comes to the Planning Department and
they begin looking at it and there is indeed a unique,
you know, opportunity, maybe that can be brought
forward and we can look at it. Sometimes it takes one
or two developments to really spur something and catch
on.

Grand River is, you know, a really
interesting road and a corridor in its history and how it's developed, and I had honestly my reservations when we were looking at having the expansion of the library and the park on the corner, and that's turned out to be a really nice area, almost like that's the central part of Novi. I'm not convinced that you can create a downtown like the Town Center. I think downtowns have to evolve and become organic. But I think, you know, that's another thing to study, you know, what can we do to help that out.

So I think as we progress, with each and every iteration of this, it does get better. And I do like the fact, too, that we're including things on sustainability and the environment. And then I would like to really hone in on that with the developments that come up. Because we had an instance a couple of months ago where the developer just paved the entire surface of their property, and that was in a way in my opinion a bit irresponsible. You know, 30 percent of what we see of the built environment is basically parking. So this begins to address some of that, and that's helpful, too.

So I understand the concerns, but I think as we progress, we can maybe dial in and concentrate on those. And I think if we look at some
of these major areas where there are intersections interfacing between the two communities, that we'll then address an area that can spur both ways. So I think what has been presented, at least from my fresh eyes again, has been a nice improvement over time, so I'm for the package that's been presented to us.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, sir.

Member Greco.

MR. GRECO: At this time I'd like to make a motion, and I'd like to make the motion for the Planning Commission to adopt and approve the resolution adopting the City of Novi's 2016 Master Plan for Land Use as presented on Pages 9 and 10 of our packet as is.

MR. ANTHONY: Second.

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

Kirsten, call roll, please.

MS. MELLEM: Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Giacopetti?
MR. GIACOPETTI: No.

MS. MELLEM: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Motion passes 6 to 1.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

Next on the agenda is Matters for Consideration. Item Number 1, Bolingbroke Woodland Permit. Correspondence from Singh Development to request reconsideration of the conditions of the approval of the Woodland Permit for the Bolingbroke site plan.

Kirsten, good evening.

MS. MELLEM: Good evening. A letter was received by planning staff from Singh Development regarding the Bolingbroke Woodland Permit that was approved subject to a number of conditions at the June 28th, 2017 Planning Commission meeting. The applicant would like the Planning Commission to reconsider the conditions that were a part of the
woodland permit approval. The conditions are as follows:

That the applicant should pay the 537 proposed off-site replacements to the City of Novi tree fund should either of the following conditions occur:

1. No building permits are applied for and issued for the Ballantyne site by December 2017, or

2. If the current owner of the Ballantyne site, Singh Development, sells the property.

The applicant's letter states that the slow down in the very high-end homes market has delayed construction of the Ballantyne site and would like the Planning Commission to consider an extension of the deadline to December 2022.

The City's woodland consultant does not support the extension based on the intent and stipulations of the Woodland Ordinance that states replacements:

- Should be on-site within the same woodland area
- Elsewhere on the subject property, or
- Credits paid into the Tree Fund.

Staff recommends that the additional five years the applicant is requesting is too long of a time frame to wait for the necessary replacement of the 745 regulated trees that were removed in 2005 from the Bolingbroke site, and that the time frame is not consistent with the intent of the ordinance. Staff advises a defined time frame for planting the replacements in order to uphold the intent of the Woodland Ordinance.

It is up to the Planning Commission if you wish to reconsider the motion that was made at the last Planning Commission meeting and if you wish to entertain an alternate time frame for the woodland replacement trees to be planted. If the Planning Commission wishes to reconsider, then staff recommends the deadline be November 1, 2018. We believe this is a reasonable time in order to give the applicant time to obtain building permits and to update the site plan.

A suggested motion is provided in the cover memo dated July 20th, 2017. If the Planning Commission has any questions regarding the applicant's letter or the staff memo, City staff and the applicant's engineer are here to answer any questions.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, Kirsten.

I'll turn it over to the Planning Commission for your consideration. Who would like to start?

Member Anthony.

MR. ANTHONY: Thank you. So with -- I guess I'll direct this to staff. So as we stated here, the original agreement in order to relocate the trees to another off-site location wasn't placed for 12 years.

MS. MELLEM: The original site plan was started in 2005 is when it was stamped, and 2007 is when they actually took the trees down and started site work.

MR. ANTHONY: Okay. So 2005 is when they initially set out to begin the development. And then the developer allowed the or let the site plans expire, did I understand that correctly, which then made the agreement -- kind of ended the agreement on relocating the trees, which is why we're here asking to extend that agreement, do I understand that correctly?

MS. MELLEM: So the original site plan from 2005 we didn't have completion agreements or
the two-year time frame at the time when they started
the agreement. So a completion agreement was put
together after the recession to complete it, and that
was not completed. The applicant came back when the
site plan expired to reintroduce it in 2014, and then
let it expire again.

MR. ANTHONY: Okay.

MR. SCHULTZ: Through the Chair,
and Kirsten will correct me if I'm wrong, just to make
sure, because there a couple different agreements that
are relevant here. So the original concept of
relocating trees from one Singh Development to another
was from the Oberland Development to Ballantyne. So
there was an agreement to that effect. That never
happened because Oberland was essentially given over
to Pulte which instead of planting the trees on
Ballantyne paid into the Tree Fund.

MR. ANTHONY: Okay.

MR. SCHULTZ: So Bolingbroke is now
coming back to you after a long hiatus, and they're
just trying to essentially put the same concept into
play with a different Singh Development to the same
Ballantyne Singh Development. So the question for you
was has this one been hanging out there long enough
that you don't want to wait for Ballantyne to develop,
and I think the staff is saying it's been a long time
that these trees were cleared, maybe we need to end
it, but they have the recommendation that we would do
a new agreement, essentially there would be a new
approval to transfer if you agree to do that for
Bolingbroke. They still have to come in and deal with
the fact that Ballantyne now is not going to get, you
know, the trees from Oberland. So they're probably
going to have to come back on Ballantyne and go
through that to amend the process, right? I mean --

MR. ANTHONY: So Ballantyne needs
the trees for its development?

MS. McBETH: So, yes, Ballantyne is
basically a farm field, and part of the nice aspects
of that RUD was that Singh Development was proposing
to do some off-site plantings there to kind of
re-forest that part of town.

MR. ANTHONY: Okay. So now I see
how the agreement was structured. Five years is a
long time considering the amount of time that we've
already gone through that, and we're -- I think we're
well past the 2008/2009 drop. But from my view, and
I'll let the rest of my fellow commissioners discuss
this, I can support a short extension in order to get
all of these development site plans back on track so
that these could be completed, but not -- I really
couldn't support after all this time of going back and
forth the full length your request asked for.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you,
Member Anthony.

Member Zuchlewski.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: I agree with what
you're saying. I mean, '22 is a long way out there,
and if we can shorten that up and sweeten this or put
some pressure on the developers so that something
happens. It seems like nobody is willing to make a
move here and they're waiting for the best times of
history to build something. I think it's been long
enough. That's my opinion.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Anyone else?

Member Giacopetti.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Some questions.
What is the city's recourse when someone doesn't
fulfill its commitment? I mean, is it a judgment, or
do we have to go to court? Is there a fine?

MR. SCHULTZ: I guess no one is at
the point of not fulfilling a commitment yet. I mean,
theoretically Ballantyne if they ever start to develop
that, they're going to have to get the trees from
somewhere and plant 800 trees or whatever it is.
Bolingbroke, if you decide to let them -- you know, for a while you had a chance to plant them somewhere else, but if you don't, you're going to have to pay into the Tree Fund. That becomes an obligation of the property essentially. So if they ever want to develop it, they're going to have to do what they're obligated to do. So it's not a question of suing them or anything like that. It all falls into place eventually. Obviously we've been waiting on Bolingbroke since '07 when things went south, but eventually if they're going to do something on that property, they'll step up and do this.

MR. GIACOPETTI: I guess my concern or frustration as a resident comes from a different direction, which is this project is put off because of the demand for high-end housing. I mean, there is no shortage for demand for sort of medium level, you know, medium income housing options. So I guess my frustration or reluctance to agree to any extension is that, you know, they're sitting on property waiting for the market to come around for million dollar houses rather than, you know, it would be in the city's interest to have something attractive placed there sooner rather than later. So it's hard for me to approve an extension honestly. Just my thoughts.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Member Lynch.

MR. LYNCH: Yes, you know, I share the frustration, but at the same time I think it's in the best interest of the city to develop the property. I don't agree with five years, I agree. I don't mind a slight extension if they're serious about development. I think it's in the best interest of the city to develop the property. And, you know, you're never going to have conditions perfect for whatever market, but I don't want to give up, but at the same time I agree with Member Anthony that we need to -- I guess we need to be I guess conscious of a win-win for both the city and the developer.

Like I said, I don't agree with the five year. A year or two extension, you know, I don't think is unreasonable. And then after two years I think, you know, if I plan on still being here, I would be willing to say, no, that's just enough. But I just think it's in the best interest of the city to develop the property, and I would like to do as much as we possibly can to get the process moving and act in a manner of good faith with the developer. But I do agree with Member Anthony, five years is way, way too long. So I'm willing to entertain proposals from my fellow commissioners of an extension of any period.
less than five years.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, Member Lynch.

For my purpose I go along with staff's recommendation for 2018. I think that's far away enough. Five years is way too far out for me to approve or recommend anything like that.

MR. GIACOPETTI: If I may through the Chair. What was the justification for five years? I'm not sure I fully understand. That to me is tipping your hand that you're not planning on developing the site for five years.

MS. McBETH: That was included in the applicant's letter. I'm not sure if Mr. Norberg (ph) wants to address that any further, but that was the request that was inputted in the letter.

MR. NORBERG: I'm George Norberg with the engineer. Unfortunately Mike couldn't make it today. But the five years was I think as he stated in the letter is the market right now for that type of development, it's just not there. So the hope was -- I mean this is -- the transplanting or putting the trees on this property and creating smaller woodlands, and they'll be placed in preservation, it's of course an enhancement to the Ballantyne development. So
holding off isn't -- I mean, it has to do with the Ballantyne property itself, but that is why, the market is just not there for this type of development. And a one-year time frame just doesn't seem enough to get from where we're at today to building permits. And maybe there is some other number, two years, three years, that might make more sense.

I do believe, though, that when Bolingbroke was done, I wish I had these numbers, I believe that the funds for the trees that were removed that had to be replaced, that those are in escrow at the City, and maybe there is a way to confirm that. Because most developments when they take trees down, at the precon, we have to have those monies set aside, and I believe they've been at the City for probably 10, 12 years now. So it's not something that -- the obligation is there of course, but so is the money. So I just thought I bring that up.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

Member Lynch.

MR. LYNCH: Just one question. You mentioned the guy named Mike.

MR. ANTHONY: Mike Kahm.

MR. LYNCH: Oh, from Singh?

MR. NORBERG: Yes, from Singh
Development.

MR. LYNCH: Because that was -- I do remember -- well, I do remember a meeting where this gentleman came in and stood in front of the Planning Commission, it was in the 2007/2008 time frame saying that the market is never, ever going to recover, and this had to do with the golf course property where they wanted commercial and stuff like that north of Ten Mile. And since that time we've had Maybury Estates, which is a high-end project, we've had the project over on Beck Road and Eight Mile, right, it's a high-end project, and I think there was one other one.

MR. AVDOULOS: Tuscany Estates.

MR. LYNCH: Tuscany Estates. So I'm -- I guess I'm a little more skeptical now that -- I'll wait for the rest of my planning commissioners to voice their concern, but I'm little more skeptical now than I initially was before I understood who the gentleman was he was talking about.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

Member Greco.

MR. GRECO: Just briefly. You know, I too, you know, am not interested in giving an extensive extension, but I will just, you know,
comment that we do have some plans and things that we
did approve. There was an economic slow down and
there are issues with regard to market. I'm not an
expert in the real estate market for high-end homes or
medium-end homes, but it is -- there are issues that
are there. Why there are other high-end ones
developing while this one isn't, the answer is I don't
know. What I do know, though, is that when we have
something in place or we have a site plan or we have
plans that are there, it is a big mess to undo or deal
with once it gets abandoned. It is a problem. It is
a problem that is an issue not only for the residents
around but for the City, the City staff, City Council
dealing with agreements that are abandoned, properties
that are abandoned, you know, obligations that are
abandoned and people walk away. So I was glad to hear
that at least money, we believe, or the funds are in
escrow. So that at least helps me a little bit that
we can hold someone's feet to the fire or deal with
the issue that was promised to us.

So all of that being said, while
I'm not in favor of an extensive extension, it has
been long enough, I do not object to the staff's
recommendation. I was thinking actually even a
shorter time like a year from today or something that
provides maybe another six months, but I'm not opposed if it is the consensus of the commission to go with the staff's recommendation.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Do we have a motion there?

MR. GRECO: Sure.

MR. SCHULTZ: And just a reminder. Two motions, one to reconsider, and then a vote on that, and then a separate motion to take whatever action you want.

MR. GRECO: First I would like to make a motion to reconsider. In the matter of Bolingbroke JSP17-34, motion to reconsider the motion that approved the woodland permit approved by the Planning Commission on June 28th, 2017 as requested by the applicant in the letter dated June 30th, 2017.

MR. ANTHONY: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a motion by Member Greco, second by Member Anthony. Any discussions?

Kirsten, please.

MS. MELLEM: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: No.

MS. MELLEM: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: No.
MS. MELLEM: Member Lynch?
MR. LYNCH: Yes.
MS. MELLEM: Chair Pehrson?
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.
MS. MELLEM: Member Zuchlewski?
MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.
MS. MELLEM: Member Anthony?
MR. ANTHONY: Yes.
MS. MELLEM: Member Greco?
MR. GRECO: Yes.
MS. MELLEM: Motion passes 5 to 2.
MR. GRECO: Next I would like to make another motion in the matter of Bolingbroke JSP17-34, motion to approve the Woodland Permit subject to the applicant being required to pay the 537 proposed off-site replacements to the City of Novi Tree Fund should either of the following conditions occur:

That no building permits are applied for and issued for the Ballantyne site by November 1, 2018, a one-year extension.

Or, if the current owner of the Ballantyne site, Singh Development, sells the property.

This motion is made to allow the
applicant sufficient time to obtain the required permits, update the Ballantyne site plans with respect to the Bolingbroke replacement trees, and request the site plan extension on the project due to expire in December 2017. This motion is subject to the findings of compliance with the ordinance standards and the staffing consultant review letters and all of the other conditions and items listed in those letters being addressed on the electronic stamping set.

This motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Chapter 37 of the Code of Ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the ordinance.

MR. ANTHONY: Second.

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

Kirsten, please.

MS. MELLEM: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: No.

MS. MELLEM: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Zuchlewski?
MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: No.

MS. MELLEM: Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Motion passes 5 to 2.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you very much.

Next on the agenda is the Farmington Corridor Improvement Authority comments. It's a comment on the Farmington/Farmington Hills Grand River Corridor Improvement Authority (CIA) Grand River Corridor Vision Plan as a sub plan to the City's master plan as required by the State of Michigan Municipal Planning Enabling Act (Act 33 of 2008, as amended).

MR. ANTHONY: Chairman Pehrson, I'll have to recuse myself from the vote because I'm on the Corridor Improvement Authority for Farmington, but after staff does its presentations, I'd just like to make a couple comments if that's permitted before the vote.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Do we have a
motion to recuse?

MR. GRECO: Motion to accept Member Anthony's, or do I --

MR. SCHULTZ: We were discussing whether or not there's going to be an actual vote, and I think in your packet it says --

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Motion to approve.

MR. GRECO: So I can make a motion to accept the recusal, the request for recusal by Member Anthony.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Second by Member Zuchlewski.

All those in favor?

THE BOARD: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Anyone opposed?

Thank you, sir. Appreciate it.

Sri?

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Thank you. The City of Farmington has originally adopted the Grand River Vision Plan in 2013. Now they intend to adopt it as a sub plan to their Master Plan. They have asked us to comment on their plan as required by the

As you're aware, as part of our 2016 Master Plan update which we discussed earlier tonight, Novi planning staff and consultants studied Grand River Corridor from Haggerty Road to Wixom Road. Haggerty Road acts as a line of separation between Farmington Hills and Novi. The project study area for the Farmington Hills Grand River Corridor stops at the intersection of Mayfield Street and Grand River Avenue in Farmington. There is an approximate 3.5 mile stretch along Grand River Avenue in Farmington Hills which is not included in their project study area.

Farmington Hills is preceding us in our efforts to improve Grand River Corridor. Novi planning staff believes that the proposed vision plan will complement Novi's own vision plan in the future and will likely to have a positive impact on the City of Novi. It does not conflict with our recommended goals or negatively impact the City of Novi's infrastructure. The joint CIA performed an extensive outreach to gather public input at the Farmington Hills. Novi staff supports their efforts. Some of the notable recommendations from their vision plan are included in the memo.

It is the planning staff's
recommendation that the Planning Commission authorize
the Planning Commission Chair to send a letter to the
City of Farmington Hills Planning Commission
complimenting them on their proposed adoption of the
Grand River Corridor Vision Plan and state that their
proposed plan supports the City of Novi's Master Plan
for Land Use.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, Sri.

With that, turn it over to the
Planning Commission for their consideration. Who
would like to start?

MR. ANTHONY: Am I allowed to make
comments?

MR. SCHULTZ: If the Chair allows.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Well, all
right.

MR. ANTHONY: So that both the
Farmington Hills and Farmington Corridor Improvement
Authority have done a really, really nice job.
They've looked at things along really improving Grand
River. And you can tell that was very blighted if you
drive through there, and their plans incorporate the
same concepts as our staff's does, making it walkable.
They also are looking at issues such as traffic calming, and they've done a successful job of negotiating with MDOT who happens to have control of Grand River in that area. So that's another government entity that is very cooperative in achieving their goals for their municipality.

The zone from the bridge that crosses M5 to Haggerty Road is not included in Farmington Hills Corridor Improvement Authority, so there is a gap. Now, what both Farmington Hills and Farmington have done is met with MDOT over the bridge that goes over M5 to discuss that congestion that occurs there. MDOT has provided them four or five different renderings of concept to improve that.

Now here in Novi the reason why that is important is because we have Ten Mile Road which is a corridor that gets a lot of traffic that cuts right through a cluster of residential neighborhoods that the Ten Mile Meadowbrook intersection is their gathering spot, and that where the Ten Mile Road and Grand River Road split, at some point it was modified to where it makes the natural flow go to Ten Mile as opposed to Grand River.

Because this is in Farmington Hills, I would recommend our staff reach out to
Farmington Hills or Farmington staff to talk about the MDOT proposals for the bridge and try to include that junction so that we can do -- modify the infrastructure in such a way that we encourage traffic to Grand River, hopefully work with whatever government agency controls it to widen it, and then to discourage or calm traffic that moves through our neighborhoods on Ten Mile.

So that's my one comment. And when I work on the other side, because my office is building is on the other side, I do keep an eye out over that because I also have an interest, and I wanted you to be aware of the progress they've made.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, Member Anthony. We appreciate that.

Anyone else?

MR. GIACOPETTI: I have a question. I don't know if anyone felt -- through the Chair, if anyone felt that this letter could be even more enthusiastic in terms of reaching out to form or -- reaching out to form some sort of partnership because of this gap, if there are ways to partner or to create some more formal synergy between our efforts and their efforts. So I not only support this letter, but am wondering if anyone else feels that it could even say
some more.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Okay. Anyone else?

Member Avdoulos.

MR. AVDOULOS: I was thinking along the same lines, having both cities work together and maybe the committees from the planning commissions of each city maybe getting together for, you know, a little work shop just to -- instead of having one group have ideas and then pass it back and forth, and sometimes, you know, even at work when you get e-mails and you're starting to play ping pong, you just pick up the phone and call so you hear it right away. So I think that would be good.

The nice thing is is that Farmington's interest in the Grand River Corridor is actually, you know, it's very natural, because that's where their downtown nucleus is, and so they want to extend it. And, again, it's one of those things where you're driving down Grand River and it's great through Farmington, it's not bad as you come out, and then you get to that, you know, dreaded Halsted area, and then you go past that and it's a mess until it splits. And so, yes, there has to be some concentration. And I think because this road is not only important to our
communities, but important regionally, and it's a big animal, I think it would be opportunistic if we can do something like that. But I'm in support of this. So thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Member Zuchlewski.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: My only thought is that with the two cities combining their efforts, and I know there is dichotomy of scale, there is a lot of good things that can come out of this, dichotomy of engineering, what have you, but do we lose something in the tradeoff. I mean, do we lose the voice? Are we now 50 percent of what we would have been having authority to go ahead on our way? You know, when you form a partnership like that, is there any loss? That's my only comment. And if it's -- maybe it's not even a real worry.

MR. ANTHONY: I can share the experience.

So Farmington -- each city's Corridor Improvement Authority meets separately and they develop their own plans, and then they have joint meetings so that they can create contiguous flow so it's not abrupt between the communities.

One of the benefits is that they
have the same engineer, who we happen to be using for
our Corridor Improvement Authority, and they have the
same legal counsel that we happen to also have. So it
would -- since the outside services are consistent,
and that each city spends their own time developing
their plan and then come together to make sure the
transitions are together, like perhaps at some point
there may be a rapid bus transit line that goes down
Grand River, so they can work jointly on that, they
make sure that they have connections. They can do
that between the nonmotorized work plans. But the
cities do retain their independence, and they cost
share on when the same consultant is working on
perhaps similar visions or doing survey studies.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: So you
mentioned the cost sharing. So here is what maybe a
recommendation might be. I think we move forward with
the letter as is with the notes that we have, because
I think we have to now suggest that the City has to go
back and formulate a strategy as to, A, how to do it,
and how they're going to get Sri to pay for it.

So maybe with those notes we can
ask the planning staff to kind of move the ball
forward, because those are all great ideas, and I
think it makes perfect sense so long as there is a
financial ability for us to pursue that going forward.

Member Lynch.

MR. LYNCH: Just one comment from engineering experiences. I don't think the customer or taxpayers really care who is paying for what as long as it looks like it's supposed to be there. So Commissioner Avdoulos' I think comments are critical. If somehow we can get everybody working together, because people don't really care if they're in Farmington Hills or Novi driving down there, they just -- they don't want the mess that they see right now. You don't want to see two distinct, you want it to be contiguous. And anything that we can do on the Novi side to make sure that our customer, it's seamless to them, I think we should do it. If it means improving the letter or reaching out to them or whatever you need to do to make sure that everybody is on the phone talking to each other instead of sending e-mails and posturing themselves Farmington versus Novi or, you know, I think it would be in everybody's best interest.

MR. GIACOPETTI: I'm sorry, are you ready to make a motion?

MR. GRECO: No. I was going to comment.
MR. GIACOPETTI: Sure.

MR. GRECO: You know, if I think from Member Giacopetti's original comments, it wasn't actually enter into a partnership, but just to enhance the letter to explore the possibility of potentially entering a partnership. We can take this letter and add something -- you know, just add a sentence that says, you know, the City of Novi has created it's own Grand River Corridor study group, you know, we extend an invitation or invite you to reach out to us or we'll reach out to you to explore potentially meeting to discuss whether or not there is a possibility of coordinating some of our efforts, something like that. You know, because that's -- without agreeing to anything, it's just adds another sentence or two that says, you know, we are interested in potentially meeting to explore the coordination of efforts if it makes sense.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes, that's exactly what I had in mind, something like that. You've crystalized my thoughts.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Barb, is that something that you can amend?

MS. McBETH: We can definitely add something like that to the letter.
MR. GIACOPETTI: While we're on the topic, just a quick question for counsel I guess, or Member Anthony. These authorities, they're funded by the -- not by the taxpayers, but by the businesses along the corridor, correct?

MR. SCHULTZ: So most likely.

MR. ANTHONY: It's actually both. So the municipality does put in some funds, but the Corridor Improvement Authority does allow the authority the ability to collect some tax revenue, incremental increase in taxes that they can then use in the future. Those do not mingle from city to city. Farmington has their own pot, Farmington Hills has their on pot, Novi would have their own pot.

MR. GIACOPETTI: But a pot of the -- a pot of the TIF is it, that could be co-mingled?

MR. SCHULTZ: No. So I guess just to jump on those comments, that even though they have a joint plan, they have their own separate boards. There's a joint board, too, but they have separate boards. They have separate agreements with Oakland County as to what kind of tax monies they can capture, because that's where most of it comes from. So with the increase in value over time in tax revenues,
that's what is going to fund to some degree or another depending on your agreements with your local taxing communities and your own community, that's going to fund it. There was a little bit of seed money, more obviously from Farmington Hills to their group, and, you know, a smaller amount from Farmington because they have a smaller piece of the, you know, the overall area. So that kind of gets everything started, but the cities can contribute as much as they want to keep this thing going, but the idea is it's funded through taxes, through tax captured essentially.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

MR. GRECO: So with that I'd like to make a motion to approve our Chairperson Pehrson to execute and sign the letter that's been presented to us approving or not objecting to the Farmington Hills Grand River Corridor Vision Plan, and also add a sentence or two indicating that the City of Novi has also, I'm not sure what exactly we've done so far, but created a group or a plan for our Grand River corridor, and to invite the Farmington Hills authorities to meet with our city's group to explore the possibility of coordinating efforts, language to that effect.
MR. LYNCH: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: There's a motion by Member Greco, second by Member Lynch. Thank you.

Any other comments?

Call the roll, please.

MS. MELLEM: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Abstain.

MS. MELLEM: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: And Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes. Motion passes 6 to 0.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Excellent commentary, gentlemen. Thank you, appreciate it.

Next on the agenda is the election of the officers and appointments to committees.
MS. McBETH: Thank you. Good evening. It's that time of year again. After July 1st when the Mayor and City Council have appointed members to various boards and commissions, we've noted in an e-mail at least that Member Anthony has been reappointed for another three years and we'd like congratulate him on that.

But typically the first meeting following that reappointment, the planning commission decides on officers for the next year, as well as committee assignments for the next year. And we had sent out the annual chart that indicates who has been serving on the various committees, who has been the chairperson, vice chairperson and secretary from last year as well as who has served on each of the committees last year and request to know who would be serving on those committees in the next year.

I think Member Zuchlewski was the only person who has responded, so we've included those in the chart in front of us.

MR. GRECO: I'm glad you said that, because I was like, oh, man, I didn't respond.

MS. McBETH: So typically I believe the chair, the vice chair and secretary are selected first, and then the committee members are selected.
MR. ANTHONY: I think we have a very good chairperson that we should keep, so I would nominate our Chairman Pehrson to remain our chairperson.

MR. GIACOPETTI: I'd like to make a second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: A motion and a second. Any other discussion?

Do we want to voice vote?

MS. McBETH: I think a voice vote is fine.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: All those in favor?

THE BOARD: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: I guess I can't vote.

MR. GRECO: Do you accept?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: I accept.

MR. ANTHONY: And I would make the same motion for our vice chair, that we keep Commissioner Greco as our vice chair.

MR. AVDOULOS: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a motion and a second.

All those in favor?
THE BOARD: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Anyone opposed?

MR. ANTHONY: And the third motion to keep Commissioner Lynch as our secretary.

MR. AVDOULOS: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a motion and a second.

All those in favor?

THE BOARD: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you very much, appreciate that. Thank you, Member Anthony.

As to the commission committees, anyone have any --

MR. LYNCH: I wouldn't mind staying on the CIP. I hit a little bump in the road this January so I didn't make it.

MR. ANTHONY: Right now I'm only on one. So if there is one that is in need.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Which one would you like to be on?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: CIP, or do you need --

MR. ANTHONY: CIP is good. I like
that.

MS. McBETH: I believe that Member Zuchlewski had responded first and requested a regular position on that and not an alternate.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Okay. I didn't mean to take that away from you.

MS. McBETH: Just to let you know.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Do you want Master Plan and Zoning? I can give you that.

MR. ANTHONY: Okay. I'll take that.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Cup of coffee and we'll make the switch.

MR. AVDOULOS: I don't mind staying on the ones that I've been targeted with.

MR. GRECO: I don't have any objection staying with the ones that I'm targeted with either. I mean, I suppose does anybody have any requests on any committees they want to be on?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: That at least puts everybody on two, and some overachievers on three.

MR. GIACOPETTI: That's me. I can --

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: No, no.
MR. GIACOPETTI: I can give one of my seats to --

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Is everybody fine? Is everybody okay with what that is? Does anyone have any special requests?

MR. ANTHONY: I'm good staying on implementation.

MR. GIACOPETTI: I would like to be on the rules committee.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Rules are as good as mine.

MR. GIACOPETTI: I can -- Chair Pehrson, if you would like to remain on the CIP, I could go to two or -- you're on three now.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: I just gave up Master Plan, so I'm only on two. I shared. Mom taught me that, so I shared.

MR. GIACOPETTI: We need three for the Walkable. Would you like to be Walkable Novi?

MR. ANTHONY: What would I give up? Implementation?

MR. GIACOPETTI: I thought you wanted to be an overachiever. I'm good with the current assignments.

MR. ANTHONY: Yeah, I'm fine.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Good. We're done. Do we need a vote?

MS. McBETH: No.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: An oath in blood?

MS. McBETH: I will put this in an e-mail. If I get anything incorrect, please let me know.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Item Number 4 is the approval of the May 10, 2017 Planning Commission Minutes. Any modifications, changes?

Motion to approve?

MR. AVDOULOS: Motion to approve.

MR. ANTHONY: And second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Motion by Member Avdoulos, second by Member Anthony. Any other comments?

All those in favor?

THE BOARD: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Anyone opposed?

Approval of the May 24th, 2017 Planning Commission minutes.

MR. AVDOULOS: Motion to approve.

MR. ANTHONY: And second.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Motion by Member Avdoulos, second by Member Anthony. Any other comments?

All those in favor?

THE BOARD: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Any opposed.

Thank you. Any other matter for discussions? Supplemental issues?

MS. McBETH: Mr. Chair, I have supplemental issues. The technology in this room is going to be upgraded I have heard in the next month.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Holographic?

MS. McBETH: In the next month or so.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Virtual reality?

MS. McBETH: I think it's going to be a nice surprise for everybody, maybe a little bit more room to work on the table, so that will be nice. So I just wanted to alert you to that, this may be the last time you see the monitors in front of you.

Secondly, and maybe more importantly, our IT department is going to be updating everybody's access through the iPads. So they have asked for everybody to call to make an appointment to
come in and visit with the IT department to get that 
upgrade sometime between now and the next meeting, 
which is two weeks from now. If you can't make it 
during regular business hours, they have said just let 
them know some other time that would work for you and 
they will accommodate that.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Okay.

MS. McBETH: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

Appreciate it.

That brings us to our last audience 
participation. She's back. I don't believe our 
audience participant wants to participate, so we'll 
close the last audience participation and look for a 
motion to adjourn.

MR. LYNCH: Motion to adjourn.

MR. ANTHONY: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Motion to 
adjourn, there's a second. All those in favor?

THE BOARD: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Anyone 
opposed?

Thank you gentlemen, ladies. We're 
adjourned.

(The meeting was adjourned at 8:06 p.m.)
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