

**REGULAR MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NOVI
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 2026, AT 7:00 P.M.**

Mayor Fischer called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL: Mayor Fischer, Mayor Pro Tem Casey, Council Members Gurumurthy, Heintz, Martinez, Smith, Staudt

ALSO PRESENT: Victor Cardenas, City Manager
Tom Schultz, City Attorney

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

CM 26-02-015 Moved by Casey, seconded by Smith; MOTION CARRIED: 7-0

To approve the agenda as presented.

Roll call vote on CM 26-02-015 **Yeas: Casey, Gurumurthy, Heintz, Martinez,
Smith, Staudt, Fischer**
Nays: None

PUBLIC HEARINGS: None

PRESENTATIONS: None

CITY MANAGER REPORT: None

ATTORNEY REPORT: None

AUDIENCE COMMENTS:

Patricia Small, 24047 Heartwood, is the President of the Echo Valley Civic Association. She came to speak about some issues in their community directly. Her colleague from the board, Kate Nagle, was also there to speak about three issues: paving of the roads, speeding through their community and the lack of access to the path that runs by their community.

Kathleen Nagle, 24117 Woodham, said she is a board member of the Echo Valley Civic Association. She came on behalf of the residents of her neighborhood at 10 Mile and Beck Road to share several concerns raised at their recent annual meeting. Echo Valley is one of Novi's older neighborhoods, and unlike newer developments, they don't have sidewalks. As a result, their children bike, skate and walk directly in the streets and they wait for their school buses on the roadside. This makes basic daily activities far more hazardous than they are in other areas of the city. She said they were there for help addressing cut through traffic. She said motorists routinely use their neighborhood to bypass the 10 Mile and Beck intersection to the point where, on Facebook, people have called it "the Echo Valley cut through." Speed limits are often disregarded, which is particularly dangerous during school bus pick-up and drop-off times because their stops

are literally in the road. Over the past several years, residents have requested occasional police patrols during these peak periods, but the requests have not been fulfilled. In one case, a resident was discouraged from making a request by the department due to concerns that it might upset neighbors if they were the ones to get pulled over. She said that because the widening of Beck Road will not take place for some time, this traffic pattern is likely to continue and may even worsen. Ms. Nagle said they respectfully request safe sidewalk access along the south side of 10 Mile to the ITC trail. Their neighborhood borders this beautiful community amenity, something Novi is rightfully proud of, yet their neighborhood residents cannot safely reach it. She said while other stretches of 10 Mile have sidewalks, many of which were added after the ITC trail was completed, the portion adjacent to their neighborhood remains unpaved. They're aware that the City has a plan for this sidewalk, but they are delaying it until 10 Mile is widened to see what the grading is. This short gap effectively cuts Echo Valley off from a resource intended for all residents, limiting safe access to recreational exercise in community spaces. Ms. Nagle said the condition of their neighborhood roads is deteriorating. These roads are not only what they drive on, but they are their walking paths, their bike paths and where their children play. They understand that Echo Valley may not yet meet the criteria for full re-paving, but the current road conditions, combined with the increased traffic and the absence of safe pedestrian access, create an environment that feels increasingly unsafe, especially for their children. Taken together, these issues make it difficult for Echo Valley to remain a safe and connected neighborhood where families can thrive, and residents can enjoy the community amenities that Novi offers. She said they appreciate Council's time, consideration and partnership and they hope to work collaboratively towards solutions that will improve the safety and quality of life for all of Echo Valley.

Daniel Fick, 22753 Cortes Street, said he had never addressed City Council before, so he wasn't sure what he was doing. He said he appreciated the opportunity to address Council. He understood that audience comments are not a question-and-answer format and that Council may have already addressed his concern in writing somewhere else, and he may not have seen the response. He said he has been a Novi resident since 2016 and one of the many aspects of Novi that he appreciates is its multiculturalism. With the rising spread of white nationalism, which he defined as a political and ideological movement advocating for the preservation of a white national majority, he is concerned about what Novi has been doing or will do to protect its residents from the terror happening in other communities like Raleigh or Minneapolis. More pointedly, he asked what is being done now to make sure that when DHS comes here, if they haven't already, that Novi residents will feel safe and will be protected. He asked what is being done now to inform our police department about their responsibility to protect the residents of the City. He asked what actions the Mayor and the esteemed Council members are doing now to protect this wonderful multicultural community from what he thinks to be a racist, white nationalist Trump administration and agenda.

Deborah Domke, 48801 Windfall Road, said she came to address Council about the Camelot Parc and Stonebrook Road issue. She said in 2018, the City of Novi approved the plans for Pulte to construct the Villas at Stonebrook. An unusual part of the

agreement, written within the Master Deed, was Villas taking responsibility for Stonebrook Drive, a private road, and the land alongside it. At that time, the only way to access the City of Novi's Wildlife Woods Park was by using Stonebrook Drive. Back then, there were only four pickleball courts and pickleball was not popular. By 2025, the City had doubled the number of pickleball courts to eight and pickleball had exploded in popularity. The amount of traffic on the private drive has greatly increased. She walks that road regularly and she can attest to the amount of speeding. It is just a matter of time before someone is injured along this road, leading to the now extremely popular Wildlife Woods Park. The residents in Villas at Stonebrook cannot patrol the road to stop the speeding. They have no authority and there is an anticipated influx of new residents using this sole entrance into the park as surrounding housing developments are getting approved by City Council. Given these conditions, Ms. Domke said the Villas at Stonebrook is requesting the City of Novi to take ownership of Stonebrook Road from Wixom Road to the park entrance. The road is being used as a public road to service the entire Novi community to the sole detriment of Villas at Stonebrook. They have no control over the road. The City, as a governmental body, enjoys certain immunities to liability that Villas does not have. They invite a meeting between Villas and the City to discuss the City of Novi taking ownership of the road. She thanked Council for listening.

Steve Potocsky, 48849 Rockview Road, said he came to talk about the Camelot project. He is in charge of the homeowners' association. There are three of them that have been trying to get an agreement, as was stated in the last meeting, for road maintenance or road upkeep. They still don't have it done. It's not for lack of trying; they just don't seem to have a consensus. He saw something in the packet that is far different than anything they've ever seen or heard of. They've asked for numbers rather than percentages because they've expressed their budget which shows numbers. They're just trying to get to what it really means as far as cost sharing. He said he liked some of the things the previous speaker had talked about, and he said they would love to investigate that as well. He thanked Council for their time.

Ann Nelke, 48646 Windfall Road, said she did not think the Camelot Parc proposal is ready to receive a final vote. One of the unresolved issues is the use of a private road with insufficient maintenance sharing. The developer is offering 15% of cost sharing to build 22 units. 22 units equals 26% of the 84 units to the east of Villas at Stonebrook and thus should be the minimum annual contribution. Taking into account the 446 linear feet this project would use on a daily basis, that number becomes 34%. Removing the building to the north (4 units) would reduce the concern Councilmember Gurumurthy had regarding potential basement flooding as there would be very minimal wetland impact. To address Mayor Pro Tem Casey's concern regarding lack of sufficient buffer between this project and their neighbors, thereby not placing an unnecessary burden on these residents from light pollution, street noise, etc., removing units 13-18 (6 units) would be a great solution. This now brings the number of units to 12 and justifies the 15% proposed maintenance sharing. This also reduces the number of vehicles pulling out onto the narrow private road or turning into the development on a daily basis, helping to mitigate safety concerns and traffic volume. Having less units also makes these appear more like single family homes rather than another townhouse project. The developer cites the Master Plan in regard to

these being a good transitional option to capture missing middle housing needs. Missing middle housing needs, according to 82% of Novi residents aged 18-85 would be single-story options where residents can downsize and stay in their community or young families can raise their children and then age in place. Only 1% since 2020 have filled this shortage. Finally, the developer is proposing to add a trail off of Wixom Road to offset lack of recreation area. She said the developer wishes to retain as many natural features as possible. Creating a trail would disrupt and disturb these features. Wildlife Woods Park has all of the recreational amenities the residents need.

Michele Duprey, 48566 Windfall Road, said she has been a resident of Novi for over 40 years. She is currently a resident of Villas at Stonebrook. She said she has always had faith that the Novi government would make decisions that are not only good for the City, but that are also good and in the best interest of its residents, the taxpayers. Sadly, today, she finds herself questioning the agreement that was made between Pulte and the City long before she purchased her home. The agreement was that the residents of the Villas at Stonebrook would become the sole owners of Stonebrook Road and yet allow unending traffic to Wildlife Woods Park through the Villas private road. She said, when this agreement was made, Wildlife Woods Park was a passive park. Then, it became an active park with baseball diamonds and then the pickleball courts. The pickleball courts have become so popular that Novi has decided to double the number of courts and add eight more parking spaces. This, of course, has resulted in a massive increase in traffic. This was not the vision nor the intent of the original agreement to have so many cars driving down their private road. It's just too busy. This is the only Novi park where the City tells its residents to use a private road to enter the City park. In fact, she said, in the planning stages, when it was questioned whether a traffic study should be done, it was determined that it was not necessary because they believed there would be little to no increase in traffic volume. The City did not even add a left turn lane on Wixom onto Stonebrook until last year. Traffic has increased dramatically. The City has greatly benefited from this agreement, leaving the 84 condos of the Villas at Stonebrook with the burden and sole responsibility of the wear, tear, maintenance and eventual replacement of Stonebrook Road. Now the City is telling the Villas residents that they need to share their private road and allow new cuts to be made on it to accommodate the new development. She said it's not fair. It's not equitable. It's not just and it's not right. She said do the right thing and assume your responsibility, your share of the responsibility. She said in her own opinion, Novi, you can take the road; it's paid for.

Martha Ryznar, 44875 Yorkshire Drive, said she has been a resident of Novi for 23 years. She strongly opposes giving tentative approval to Camelot Parc Townhome Plan. Even with the changes made, she said this plan is not good enough for our city and for protecting the important nature spots left in Novi. She said this developer plans to wipe out about a half a football field of wetlands and numerous mature trees. The City's rules say there must be a 25' buffer zone around wetlands to protect them, but this developer asked for a special favor so they can build too close to the wetlands north of Avalon Drive, building so close they could destroy this precious area with runoff from road salt chemicals and mowing. She asked Council to please say no. The proposed buildings are too close to the woodlands and wetlands, and the proposed natural buffer zone is

deficient. She said this developer is asking for nine special favors. She said there is a conservation easement on this property that is a legal, permanent promise to protect the land. She asked Council to please not allow the developer to undo this because they need a place to put a road or some pipes. About the developer's big problem with access to Stonebrook Drive, she said this road is private and the people who live in the Villas own it and pay for everything like fixing the road, streetlights and police protection. The developer wants to use this as their main entrance. Doing so would put a massive burden on the narrow road (only 25' wide). Moreover, the developer's rights to do this expired in March 2023. The developer claims he is acting in good faith, but he is currently infringing on private property with a void document. She asked Council to not allow this developer's missed deadlines to become a permanent liability for them—the taxpayers. She asked the City Council to stand with the residents and protect their valuable natural areas by rejecting this proposal and sending the developer back to create a good plan that is actually truly a good neighbor.

Nicole Herman, 48225 Rushwood Lane, said she lives in Echo Valley. She moved back to Novi with her family in 2019. She moved here for the schools and the parks. In Echo Valley, they have a huge problem with speeding through Edenborough and it has become a huge safety issue. She said they have people who use their neighborhood to cut through to 10 Mile or 10 Mile to Beck. She said as well as they have no access, they have no sidewalks to any of the trails at any of their entrances. She loves using the ITC trail and to be able to use it, she has to cross 10 Mile which is really dangerous. She asked City Council to consider finishing the sidewalk project from their neighborhood so they have a safe way to access the ITC trail and perhaps take some action, so the children are safe in their neighborhood from the cars that are speeding.

CONSENT AGENDA REMOVALS AND APPROVALS:

CM 26-02-016 Moved by Casey, seconded by Gurumurthy; MOTION CARRIED: 7-0

To approve the Consent Agenda as presented.

- A. Approve Minutes of:
 February 9, 2026- Regular Meeting
- B. Consideration of Ordinance 26-184.01 to amend the City of Novi Code of Ordinances, Chapter 16, "Garbage and Refuse", to allow for rates to be set by user fee. **SECOND READING**
- C. Acceptance of a highway easement from the property owner of 26255 Beck Road, parcel 50-22-17-400-044, for the reconstruction and widening of Beck Road between 11 Mile Road and Grand River Avenue.
- D. Acceptance of a highway easement and a temporary construction easement from the property owner of 47460 11 Mile Road (parcel 50-22-17-400-028) for the future construction of a roundabout at 11 Mile Road and Beck Road, in the amount of \$76,600.

E. Approval of claims and warrants – Warrant 1197.

Roll call vote on CM 26-02-016

**Yeas: Gurumurthy, Heintz, Martinez, Smith,
Staudt, Fischer, Casey
Nays: None**

MATTERS FOR COUNCIL ACTION:

- 1. Consideration of a new Class C quota license from OCK Company Inc and a special land use for the service of alcoholic beverages located at 24267 Novi Rd, and Agreement on the Prohibition on Profiteering by Class C Liquor License Holders.**

City Manager Cardenas said this application is located on the west corner of Novi Road and Grand River, operating in that commercial area. As Mayor Fischer mentioned, they are looking for one of the last quota licenses. They will need a special land use permit unlike the other one that already has one. This is different because there is no liquor license that's previously been in the location. The one you'll see later on has had a liquor license in that location, so it does not require special land use.

CM 26-02-017 Moved by Casey, seconded by Martinez: MOTION CARRIED: 7-0

To table consideration of a new Class C quota license from OCK Company Inc and a special land use for the service of alcoholic beverages located at 24267 Novi Rd, and Agreement on the Prohibition on Profiteering by Class C Liquor License Holders until the meeting of March 9, 2026.

Roll call vote on CM 26-02-017

**Yeas: Heintz, Martinez, Smith, Staudt, Fischer,
Casey, Gurumurthy
Nays: None**

- 2. Consideration of a new Class C quota license from Shake Shack located at 43335 Crescent Blvd, and Agreement on the Prohibition on Profiteering by Class C Liquor License Holders.**

City Manager Cardenas said this establishment is located in the Town Center area, formerly, Primanti Brothers, which is why they don't need the special land use permit. This is going to be by Shake Shack.

The Applicant stood and introduced himself as Chris Bogoski, the General Manager of Shake Shack, representing the Applicant. He asked Council what they needed to know as he had never been to a City Council meeting before. Mayor Fischer said this was an opportunity for Mr. Bogoski to share anything with Council that he would like them to know about the Shake Shack application. Mayor Fischer reminded Mr. Bogoski of the situation Council is in with one license available and two applicants on the same agenda.

Mr. Bogoski said he thinks Shake Shack stands for itself. It stands for something good which is their mantra and their mission statement. He said they're a big involvement in the community. In their first year, they did a lot of things with Novi High School. They supported the under 12 Heat baseball team. That's something they'd like to continue to do. He said this liquor license is only going to help them in the long run. It's going to bring the traffic in. He said they're not a fast-food place; they're a fast casual place which means they're a higher standard of dining. They want to bring the liquor license in. He said one of the things they do is carry a "shack meister," so they also do a lot of local branding. They use Brooklyn Brewery for that. He said you can't buy that beer anywhere else. It's specifically made for Shake Shack which makes it part of the experience. He said right now they're becoming a place of destination over there. In their first year, they were a little bit on the slower end, but the traffic is picking up, the percentage of sales is going up this year. They're up about five or ten percent right now. He just spent last week down in Atlanta at their corporate headquarters. He said they have a \$15,000 budget this year, specifically for their location for marketing and community involvement. He said he is a member of the Chamber of Commerce already like he was last year. He is working with Jenn Ludwig on the board there. He is trying to get involved with the community.

Mr. Bogoski said he has a list of things they're going to be doing. They're planning on doing sponsorships and different events like the Taste of Novi they did last year where they set up tents, set up events, handed out vouchers, and handed out lemonades. He said they have also been working with Jenneva Kayser from the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services for the Sizzling Summer Arts Workshops where 225 kids get together every Wednesday in the summer. They'll be supporting that by showing up there, doing lemonades, things like that. He said they are also working with Marcel Badia from the Novi Parks Foundation, looking to sponsor the Pour on the Shore event. They want to be involved in the community. They'd like some staying power, and he believes the liquor license will be a big part of that drive. He said the marketing meeting he attended focused on driving sales. One of the things they need is to push sales. Otherwise, it won't be a profitable location.

Mr. Bogoski said he's been in this business for 39 years, beginning as a child all the way up through school and stuff. He has been working for 29 years as a professional, running liquor license operations. He has worked at MGM Grand where they have 40 beers on tap. He said he is well aware how this works. He was the general manager for Social Bar and Grill in Birmingham and then he worked as the general manager at Famous Dave's across the street. He said he is familiar with the area, and he understands the ins and outs of Novi, the community here and the expectations of what they deliver. He said Shake Shack delivers a five-star meal, despite it being fast casual. They would like to compliment those meals with a beer or wine. He said all Shake Shacks have a liquor license. He said they just seem to be the one that's on the outs right now, so he's looking to get that license. He said it will help with the percentage of increase in sales. He said it will also help their guests with their experience which means they will become that destination where everyone wants to come.

CM 26-02-018

Moved by Casey, seconded by Smith: MOTION CARRIED 7-0

To table consideration of a new Class C quota license from Shake Shack located at 43335 Crescent Blvd, and Agreement on the Prohibition on Profiteering by Class C Liquor License Holders until the meeting of March 9, 2026.

Roll call vote on CM 26-02-018

**Yeas: Martinez, Smith, Staudt, Fischer, Casey,
Gurumurthy, Heintz**

Nays: None

- 3. Consideration of approval to award a contract to Luigi Ferdinandi & Son Cement Co., and Santos Cement Inc. for as-needed concrete repairs, with the estimated annual amount of \$608,000.**

CM 26-02-019 Moved by Smith, seconded by Casey: MOTION CARRIED 7-0

Approval to award a contract to Luigi Ferdinandi & Son Cement Co., and Santos Cement Inc. for as-needed concrete repairs, with the estimated annual amount of \$608,000.

Roll call vote on CM 26-02-019

**Yeas: Smith, Staudt, Fischer, Casey,
Gurumurthy, Heintz, Martinez**

Nays: None

- 4. Consideration of resolution authorizing issuance of 2026 Unlimited Tax General Obligation bonds for Public Safety Facilities.**

City Manager Cardenas said this is the next step in the process with respect to the public safety facilities. Back in August, the community approved a new public safety millage up to \$120 million for three facilities and upgrading a fourth facility. At this point, this resolution is the authorization to issue the first series of bonds. Back a number of months ago, their consultants, PFM Financial Advisors LLC, Miller Canfield and PMR were here talking about different series to get to that \$120 million. At that time, it was between two to three series. Now, what is being recommended is three series with the first issuance being \$35 million. Two additional issuances will occur in the next two years, all totaling \$120 million. The representatives and consultants from PFM and Miller Canfield were there to address City Council and to walk them through the process.

Mr. Patrick McGow from Miller Canfield stood and said they were at the meeting to follow up on the bond proposal that was approved by the voters in August. He said this is the next item in the issuance process which is the authorization of the bonds. This would be the last action item by the City Council to approve the issuance of the first series of bonds that are being contemplated for sale this spring in an amount not to exceed \$35 million. Since they were last there and since the voters approved it, the city administration and consultants have been working on determining the structure and sizing of the bonds, based upon the needs, costs and timing of those projects. He said the recommendation

is to proceed with a \$35 million bond issue at this time and have the \$120 million bond proposal split into three separate issues over the next three years. There have been various considerations along the way. Mr. McGow said Sean Wahl from PFM was there to help answer any questions Council had about the structure. He thought it would be helpful to do that before they took up the consideration of the resolution.

Mr. Wahl said they have been working with the City on the bond projections, millage analysis and all of that. He said a lot of this has been a culmination of discussions between PFM, PMR and the City, trying to find the right mix in terms of project spend, project timing and bond funding. He said he put together some materials to help explain their thoughts. He said, as they've discussed before, there are multiple variables they are managing and trying to work through in order to determine the right funding mix in terms of timing, projects, what to issue and when. He put up a slide called "Factors Impacting Series Amounts and Timing." He said at the top, the real drivers are how much the funds are needed, how quickly the funds will be spent and what is the millage implication. They are working with a dual mandate of issuing \$120 million but also doing it within 1 mill over the next three years. Those are some of the things they continue to manage in terms of priorities. The other factors that are important that they continue to look at are taxable value growth rates and bond interest rates. As noted, they've assumed a 4% growth rate in the taxable value for the City for 2026. They should know that value in the next month and a half and that will come into play. In 2025, the City's growth was 5.4 % and the CPI was just over 3%. This year, CPI through the state is 2.7%. They'd really like to get a better understanding of that as they go forward. Mr. Wahl said bond interest rates are the other variable. They've got some market information, but the initial series of bonds is finalized with those rates when they price the bonds. He said moving that around throughout the process will impact the capacity here and there.

Mr. Wahl said they analyzed a two- versus a three-series approach. Initially, they were looking at two series—one for \$40 million in the spring of 2026 and the remainder for \$80 million in the spring of 2028. They've discussed the ideal which was to issue \$120 million from a construction perspective all up front but given the variables he just mentioned (taxable value, growth rate, bond interest rates and the one mill levy cap), it isn't feasible. The new finance plan is for a three-bond series—one in 2026, one in 2027 and one in 2028. The first one they're talking about authorizing the issuance of is \$35 million in May 2026, then \$40,000 million in May 2027 and then \$45 million to wrap up the authorization in May 2028.

Mr. Wahl asked rhetorically how they got there and why a three-series option makes sense. Initially, they were going to do \$40 million and \$80 million, but the three-series approach allowed them to take a vast majority of that \$40 million upfront in 2026 and allowed them to move \$40 million from the final series to 2027. From the discussions with the City and Plante Moran Realpoint, that seems to fit very well with the City's cash flow, timing and project needs.

Mr. Wahl showed a second slide called "Updated Plan of Finance." He said this proves the series' timing, estimated market rates and then the millage comparison showing that

the one mill levee is expected to be levied in the next 10 years as the bond series come online.

Mr. Wahl showed a third slide called "Historical Taxable Value Growth History." He said one of the important variables is historical taxable value growth and taxable value growth going forward. He said the taxable value is looked at and set on an annual basis. The Bulletin 14 of 2025 from the State Treasury Department came out and set the rate of inflation for 2.7%. That means if a property does not change hands or is not sold, it should grow at 2.7% this year. Previously, that was 5% in 2024 and 3.1 % in 2025. In their projections, they are assuming that the City's taxable value grows at 4% for the next four years and 3% thereafter.

Mr. Wahl put on a fourth slide called "Tax-exempt Municipal Interest Rate Movements." He said they spoke previously on the municipal market back in August. A lot has happened since then, but the market is still in a very similar place. He said there are some different things going on in the graph, three that he wanted to highlight. One, the tan bands are the historical ranges for the interest rates in the last 10 years, the tax-exempt municipal market. The dark blue line is where those spot rates are for each maturity today. The light blue line is where those were a year ago. He said you can see the dark blue line today, in years 1-15 is pretty much in the middle of those historical bands, right about on average. The longer end, 15-30 years, you can see that the blue line is on the higher side. He also pointed out the comparison between the shape of the curve between last year (the light blue line) and today (the dark blue line). He said short-term rates are lower today than they were a year ago. Long-term rates are slightly higher than they were a year ago. That curve has steepened such that short-term rates are lower and long-term rates are a little higher.

Mr. Wahl put up a fifth slide called "Municipal Interest Rate Movements" that shows where they've moved in the last three months. On the lefthand side, you have your maturities or tenor one year to 30 years, on the righthand side, there are rates and moving left to right are the weeks. This is starting roughly from Thanksgiving up through last week. He said you can see the green is a reduction in rates. They've seen a considerable reduction in rates in years 1-20 and then relatively flat long. This is just a comparison between where they've been since they last spoke and when they started this process at those different maturity tenors.

Mr. Wahl showed a sixth slide called "Bond Issuance/Sale Process Outline." He said in terms of the bond issuance and sale process, these are some things they've continued to discuss, but method of sale has been determined as bonds will be sold by a negotiated sale. PFM issued an RFP for underwriting services that were received, tabulated and bid were provided to the City. They provided some information as part of putting together the authorizing resolution that Mr. McGow will cover. From there, a preliminary official statement or the municipal market's version of a prospectus will be put together in the next month, and a rating will be applied before that discussion will happen. That prospectus or preliminary official statement will be published in early April. They anticipate pricing the bonds in mid- to late April and closing the bonds in mid- to late May.

Mr. McGow said the resolution before Council does several things. As he mentioned, this would be the last action item by the Council to authorize the bonds at which point it delegates various city administration members to finalize the sale of the bonds. He said the bonds would be authorized in an amount not to exceed \$35 million to pay the cost of the project that was approved by the voters. It authorizes a negotiated sale to an underwriter to be selected. The City has received proposals from underwriters for that and the resolution delegates authority to the city manager and/or they have it set up for the authorized officers as the City Manager, Assistant City Manager or Finance Director. He said the resolution would delegate to those officials to apply for ratings, move forward with the bond sale and then authorize them to award and approve the sale of the bonds after the bond pricing. The way a negotiated sale works is that you essentially select an underwriter up front who works to market your bonds to potential investors. They then receive bids on a day and then come back to the City with the interest rate and the scale which is then reviewed by your financial advisor to make sure that's a market rate. Then a bond purchase agreement is signed between the City and the underwriter. It allows for more pre-marketing of the bonds, as well as the flexibility on the timing related to the sale of the bonds and the structuring. The resolution says not to exceed \$35 million, but again, this is built around essentially what is expected to be needed from a cash flow basis, but also based on whatever interest rates are received at the time of the bond sale and the taxable value to keep that estimated millage rate for the debt levy to be at or below one mill. He said this provides flexibility to adjust those depending on what those final interest rates are at the time of the sale of the bonds. He said he'd be happy to answer any questions about the bond resolution or questions about the structuring and sizing of the bonds.

CM 26-02-020 Moved by Martinez, seconded by Casey: MOTION CARRIED 7-0

Approval of resolution authorizing issuance of 2026 Unlimited Tax General Obligation bonds for Public Safety Facilities.

Mayor Fischer asked Mr. Wahl, going back to the \$35 million and how that was calculated, as Mr. McGow said, the authorizing resolution says not to exceed \$35 million. He said as he understands it, the authorized officers as designated, have the ability to make the final determination on that amount. He asked if there is any sense in authorizing up to \$50 million or \$60 million at this point? Then, as pricing comes in, et cetera, then that determination can be made to come down to \$35 million if it needs to be in order to stay within the one mill. He asked how they got to the \$35 million and if they're giving enough flexibility to the city manager and themselves to potentially front load some of the issuance right now.

Mr. Wahl said that is a really good question. He said some of that moves with interest rates. A lot of this came from a discussion between them, the City and PMR about what the City needs at this point for the first series within the first year and what can they reasonably expect to spend. He said he believes that number was not less than \$25 million, but somewhere between \$25 million and \$30 million. They landed at the \$35 million

number because they figured, through discussion, if it was close to \$30 million and the market was strong, they could accelerate some of that issuance into this issue—up to the \$35 million. He said the other thing that is competing with this is that if you look at 2026 and 2027, it's a combined \$75 million. He said if they tried to do all of that in 2026, they certainly couldn't get there. The more they were to issue in 2026, the less they could do in 2027. A lot of that discussion went back and forth and ultimately landed on not exceeding \$35 million, then \$40 million and \$45 million. He said it was their understanding that this is what is needed to do the project.

Mayor Fischer asked Mr. Wahl if it is not worth increasing that amount, in anticipation of a potential where that demand is there, that the rates are low enough. He asked Mr. Wahl if it doesn't hurt the City to issue in a strong market and hold onto the cash. Mr. Wahl said yes and no. He thinks they settled on this as a good amount with some buffer. He said the City could certainly go up. They figured the top end of affordability for the first series of bonds was in the \$45 million range, but then again, there are some other variables that come into play with some assumptions in terms of the City's taxable value growth for this year. As soon as they know that value, they'll have a little bit better understanding. He said the Mayor has a point, the City certainly could go more than this. From their discussions, from the kind of expectation on spending, they thought \$35 million was a good number.

Mayor Fischer said it goes back to their chart with the short end of the range being right at market within the historical bands. He said he believes it's a strong time to issue as much as they can now. Mayor Fischer told Mr. Wahl if he's comfortable, he doesn't want to get in a situation where when they're doing series two and series three, they're looking at these curves and they've shifted way up. He said, apparently, federal governors are talking about inflation and how we might see rate hikes again. He's seeing new tweets every single day. He gets nervous that they're going to be in a higher interest rate environment on municipal bonds in the near future and that that is much more likely than that they will be in the same or lower. That's why he thinks front loading would be the best thing, but if Mr. Wahl and Council are comfortable with the \$35 million authorization, he will go along with it.

Member Gurumurthy said she had a general comment about the public safety project. She said she really liked the advisors' timeline in terms of where they are going. She said she knows it's very hard to have an overall timeline at this point, like a five-year or even next year's timeline, but for quarters two and three of 2026, she would like some high-level milestones that they can see, maybe in an administrative packet. That way, they can see what will be happening in quarter two, like if Council will be approving the design or something like that. She requested that they be given something like that for the upcoming quarter.

Roll call vote on CM 26-02-020

**Yeas: Staudt, Fischer, Casey,
Gurumurthy, Heintz, Martinez, Smith**
Nays: None

5. Consideration for tentative approval of the request of Avalon Investment Group, LLC, JSP25-02 Camelot Parc Townhomes, for a Planned Suburban Low-Rise (PSLR) Overlay Development Agreement Application and Concept Plan.

City Manager Cardenas said as a reminder from last time, this came before Council back in December. This is a revised plan for the empty property of 8.24 acres on Wixom Road. Back in 2023, City Council saw this as a PSLR request for the site for 46 units. That plan was ultimately denied, and the new plan Council has in front of them is for 22 townhome units in five two-story buildings. The units will be for sale, and each would have a two-car garage, as was requested from a neighboring residence. The subject property is currently zoned R-1 One Family Residential with a PSLR overlay. This will come back eventually, if it gets approval for a final PSLR agreement.

Mr. Jared Kime with Atwell introduced himself and said they had just been before Council in December 2025. He said instead of rehashing the full presentation that they did previously, he tailored to address Council's specific comments and feedback that they provided in December. He showed a slide called "Summary of Revisions" that outlined the updates. He said they added the walking path connection back into the plan connecting to Wixom Road and to find an access easement over the pathway. He said he had some exhibits that they would highlight for Council as a quick overview. They added some additional trail next to the pond area within an additional viewing space to increase the number of observable amenities that the public can use. They defined the preservation area. He said he knows there were a lot of questions about what that was going to look like overall. They've added a 10' wide private open space behind each of the units, creating more of a usable backyard space for each of the units. Consequently, the addition of this area enabled them to remove one of the previous deviation requests not having quite so much of the individual private open space that they had had previously there. He said they've expanded the grading impacts behind units 19-22, as they've discussed. This increases the amount of wetland impact on the property, but it does create that usable rear yard space. He said he'll discuss what they did with some of the buffers there. They moved the wetland protection signs so they're located adjacent to the road. This will serve as an additional reminder that this is buffer space to the wetlands, even though it is a reduced buffer space from the typical 25' there. He said they revisited the trees. Previously, they had a bunch of trees they were paying into the tree mitigation bank for. They've planted an additional 26 trees on the site. They've revisited the calculations based on some direction from city staff about the additional shrubs and other landscaping that they're already implementing into the plan and how that affects the calculation. They've significantly reduced the number of trees that have to be paid into the mitigation bank. One side note, they did address a revised comment or note on the plan about the emergency access gate and the timing on which that gate had to be closed. Previously, it stated before any building permits would be issued, that that gate had to be closed which didn't coincide with the intention to maximize the amount of use of that emergency access drive for construction access. Changing that to reflect the first C of O for a building instead of the actual building permit itself allows them to use that drive for more of the construction access and less of Stonebrook Drive.

Lastly, Mr. Kime said there are significant changes to the proposal for the contribution to the maintenance with the Stonebrook Villas HOA adjacent. He said they can go through the details on what the current proposals are on that. As the residents noted in the earlier discussion, there hasn't been an agreement reached on that yet. They're still in negotiations/discussions to come to a resolution there.

Mr. Kime showed a slide called "Public Nature Trail" that highlighted the additional trails and three bench areas that he talked about. The highlighted green area would be considered a public access area where they would have an easement over it. The trail that continues south of the detention pond and into the site would be considered a private area. They're trying not to encourage the public to traverse all the way into the pond and down into the development. They put up signage that at that point, that's the end of the public access area.

Mr. Kime showed another slide called "Preservation Area." He said the preservation areas are highlighted in green. This is what would be physically put into a preservation easement that they would execute with the City. It's over 50% of the site area. Overall, on the development property between all the common green space and the preservation area, over 75% of the site is green open space use, usable for the residents and mostly usable for the public.

Mr. Kime showed a slide called "Wetland Impacts." He said, regarding the wetland impacts, they highlighted them in green. He said they'll call it the "buffer" row of shrubs to help delineate between the actual delineated wetland area and where the buffer space is. In discussion with city staff, there was talk of moving all the shrubs up adjacent to the curb line itself, but the fear is that having the shrubs physically up against the curb line, they would ultimately end up damaging the shrubs with regular maintenance. Instead, they've placed the signs up by the road, kept a natural, grass-type buffer between the wetland and those shrubs and let those shrubs act as the last line of defense to protect the wetlands. Behind the units, they flip-flopped that idea where the protective row of shrubs is up against the private open space behind the building to maintain that border with the residents where the buffer space is growing behind those shrubs to further protect the wetland even though there's a little bit more wetland impact in this area. Ultimately, with this slight increase in wetland impact, they went up to .65 acres of mitigation that would be required. What physically fits on the site at this preliminary level is .61 acres of mitigation which means they are deficient by .04 acres of mitigation which they propose to construct elsewhere within the city per the city ordinance allowances.

Mr. Kime showed a slide that highlights where they've added additional trees into the plan to help mitigate some of the payment into that tree fund. With these additions, and you can see in the calculations, there's credit for some of the native seeding and the large shrubs (they're planting far more) which means they'd be able to claim more credits towards, but there's a cap on the percentage that those can credit towards. He said they've gotten down to 13 trees to be paid into the fund versus the 53 trees that were previously proposed.

Mr. Kime showed a slide called "Stonebrook Drive Shared Maintenance." He said on this exhibit, the proposed maintenance contribution on Stonebrook Drive is depicted. He said if Council looks in their package, they'll see this in a little bit more detail. Their previous proposal took the maintenance contributions up to the Camelot Parc Drive entrance. They've essentially doubled the distance of the roadway that they would be contributing towards. In addition to doubling that distance, they've also offered to contribute to the sidewalk maintenance, the lawn maintenance and the costs for the irrigation heads for that space. He said at a pro rata share, based on the number of units (22 in Camelot Parc and 84 in Stonebrook Villas), that's 21% of the units on a per unit basis of double the length that they were previously in for.

Member Smith said he appreciates the efforts of the developer to minimize the impact on the site, to provide public benefits and to work with the residents of Stonebrook Villas. He said he also appreciates the work of the residents of Stonebrook Villas and their HOA to come to an agreement. He is, however, disappointed that this issue is back without an agreement on the shared road. After Council delayed it in December, his hope was that the next time they saw it, an agreement would be reached, and they'd be ready to move forward. Recognizing that it takes two parties and sometimes some extra time to negotiate in good faith to reach an agreement, he would like to provide one more chance for the parties to come to an agreement on the shared road up until the next Council meeting on March 23, 2026. He won't support any further delays after that. It is their job as the Council to make these tough decisions, but he thinks in this case, hopefully, the parties are close and will be able to come to an agreement.

CM 26-02-021 Moved by Smith, seconded by Heintz: MOTION CARRIED 5-2

To postpone consideration for tentative approval of the request of Avalon Investment Group, LLC, JSP25-02 Camelot Parc Townhomes, for a Planned Suburban Low-Rise (PSLR) Overlay Development Agreement Application and Concept Plan until the meeting of March 23, 2026.

Member Gurumurthy said there are a number of changes and updates that have happened. She appreciates the new public trail. She was going to ask how they're going to prevent the public from accessing that area when part of it is public and part of it is private, but she thinks they've already answered that. She asked who will be maintaining the public access. Mr. Kime said it will be the responsibility of the association because it is on the association's property. They will be responsible for the maintenance of that trail. One thing she has learned during her term is that this responsibility needs to be communicated clearly through whatever means like the master agreement. She has seen this where the current residents agree to it, but then future residents move in and they don't know about it. She asked the developer how they intend to clearly communicate this information to the residents on whom the responsibility lies. Mr. Jim Polyzios said with each purchase agreement, there will be a separate addendum specifically dealing with this issue where the residents acknowledge that this path can

be utilized by the public, but it is still the HOA's responsibility to maintain and take care of. This will avoid issues of residents coming to City Council complaining about the public using their trail system. Member Gurumurthy clarified that it will upfront. Mr. Polyzius said yes, it will be a separate document that he can ask the city attorney to approve before he sends it out.

Regarding the wetlands, Member Gurumurthy asked if they were planning to mitigate them within the site. She said that would be great if they could do that, especially because it's so small. Mr. Kime said they are providing .61 acres of the .65 acres on the site itself. He said it is the difference, the .04 acres that, based on the preliminary design plans, they were deficient in the space to do that. They would construct that elsewhere within the city at the developer's cost. Member Gurumurthy said having over 50% of the land being preserved is something she really appreciates, especially with the development. She said the other thing she would encourage the developers to do is continue to look for areas within the site where they could put the trees.

Member Gurumurthy said she was not on the Council at the time Stonebrook Villas were approved, but she has taken the time to understand some of the history of it, especially because this issue has come up a couple of times. In 2023, Camelot Parc was proposed as 46 apartment units and, of course, open parking lots which didn't align with how the neighborhood was. It was denied. It has come back to Council with several updates. Now, it's 22 for-sale townhomes and lower density. Another thing she understands is the whole public benefit concept. When the Villas were approved, Stonebrook Drive was a public benefit. The public uses it to get to Wildlife Woods Park. This was one of the reasons the Villas was approved. When Council raised some of the concerns, they raised the ideas about open space, being a public benefit and it was very important to her that the parties aligned. She said she was hoping, as Member Smith said, that the developers and the residents at Stonebrook Villas had come to an agreement before the meeting.

Member Gurumurthy said she understands that there is currently a proposal from the developer that has raised the rate from 7% to 15%. The developers corrected her and said it's up to 21% and double the area, including the sidewalks, the landscape, the irrigation, the trimming of the trees along Stonebrook Drive and the mulching. He said everything they have asked him to do he has included in the proposed scope. He can't give them the number they want. They want an economic number and he can't give them a number without looking at the contracts, peeling back the coverage of the driveways, the walkways of the house, the landscaping around their units. He has to scale it back, get to a legitimate number and use that number to budget going forward. He said they could evaluate that budget every year. Currently, the insurance agent for the Villas and their developers' insurance agent is the same guy. His plan is to use the same HOA management firm to make this a seamless transaction where things are transparent so that there are no questions or issues.

Member Gurumurthy said she appreciates all the effort this has taken. At the end of the day, the parties have to align and come to a decision. Two things that stand out with this property: 1) preserving 50% of the land and 2) creating a middle place for residents. She

said with any development, it's hard to preserve and she is really impressed that they are preserving so much and she sees when people cannot afford single family houses, they're in apartments and they would like to move to a place like this. She sees this development as a middle place. With respect to the maintenance agreement, she believes it is really important that the parties align. She appreciates how the developer has updated the percentage. Overall, she is in favor of this development for the reasons she has highlighted. If it is just time that the parties need to come into alignment, she supports tabling this issue today. She said on March 23, 2026, this issue has to come back and she hopes that by that time, the parties will be in alignment on this issue.

Member Heintz said he agrees with what was previously said by the other Council members. He asked to clarify if the buffer zones are no mow, no fertilizer zones and adjacent to the wetlands, if it would be the HOA's responsibility to make that part of their contract with the lawn care provider. Mr. Kime said yes, it would be part of the HOA's contract that they would have to sign with their lawn care provider. They would identify this is a buffer zone. It's a no-mow zone, so you shouldn't see any lawnmowers going in this area. The signage will be in place. The developers have more signs proposed per linear foot than what was recommended by the staff. Member Heintz asked if it were to happen, it would be something that would be dealt with within the HOA. Mr. Kime said yes, there would have to be notice provided to the maintenance provider saying something like, "You're impeding in an area that you're not supposed to. Please stop or your contract will have some fines."

Member Heintz said he appreciated all that had been said. He appreciates the delicacy and the thought that's going into all the ways they can maximize the amount of green space and wetlands and the conservation easement. He said he finds it interesting that a lot of times when developments are proposed in front of them, they have pushbacks about the impacts on the land itself. In this case, it's more the paved space that they're working through right now. He hopes that they will do their best to continue to use this extra time to iron out those needed details to make sure everyone is good with the agreement.

Member Martinez said he would have liked to see this come a little bit more in terms of changes than the last time. He thought Council was pretty clear about the standards they put out there, things that they were looking for. He gave the developers credit for the private open access that is now in compliance with the ordinance. The standard they have to apply under their ordinance in state law is there has to be a recognizable, substantial benefit to the community, that it will not result in unreasonable increases to service utilities, that it won't place an unreasonable burden on surrounding land nearby, that property owners in the natural environment will not cause a negative impact on surrounding properties and that it is consistent with the goals and objectives in the Master Plan. He said he will keep hammering it home because their ordinance tells them they have to go beyond the requirements of the ordinance. There has to be specific identified features to do that. Meeting the base requirements of the ordinance is by itself not sufficient for PSLR benefit and any deviation that goes against the strict text of the ordinance has to have some substitute safeguard to go with it. He asked if the public

benefit showing had improved. He said perhaps marginally. He said he can give the developer some credit there, but the fact that a deviation is no longer required as to the open space does not mean it goes beyond the requirements of the ordinance which is the standard they have to reply.

Member Martinez said as the 10% active open space is an ordinance compliance, that's not anything above and beyond. The public access easement from Wixom strikes him as one of the few clear benefits that gives the public a formalized route to the open space system in the school campus. The question for him is whether it becomes substantial enough to offset the remaining deviations and he doesn't think so as of right now. He said they really tried to impress upon them—not just the Applicant, but also the folks in the HOA and the Villas—that it is important to them that people are coming together to try to find common ground. He thinks Member Smith's proposal tonight is reasonable, but at some point, this project is going to come before Council for a vote and he hopes that everyone gives their best shot to be reasonable, to come together, to try and start over to try to get something done. At some point, one side or the other is going to overplay their hand. He thinks that's something that both parties should be cognizant of. He appreciates that they got a draft agreement, but he would like to see what that agreement will be ultimately. He wants to know exactly what is being done and he would like to see that incorporated into the PSLR development agreement and made a condition of PSLR approval because he thinks it's hard to treat that as a fully reliable substitute safeguard which is what their ordinance contemplates. He said he believes this project is marginally better than before, but it is still borderline in his mind. All of the other points that have been brought up are required compliance under their ordinance or slightly better than what their ordinance already demands.

Member Martinez said he came into this meeting prepared to deny this. He believes they have given this project a lot of time, a lot of thought and it doesn't feel like they are getting anywhere. That was his concern coming into this today. He said they are really lucky that Member Smith is a little bit more diplomatic than he is, but the fact that this is back before Council in its current form, he would characterize it as being substantially similar to what was already tabled. He'll support Member Smith's motion, but if this comes back to them, he'd like to see them take specific note of what it will take to get a yes vote for him. That is a fully defined, binding set of substitute safeguards for the remaining deviations, especially a clearer upgrade to active open space, more area amenities or both, or more substantial park and trail enhancements tied to those deviations, a complete wetland mitigation plan that meets or exceeds the required mitigation and a meeting of the minds between Stonebrook Villas and the developer incorporated as a condition of the PSLR. He said he is open to a PSLR solution. He recognizes that this is a tricky parcel of land, but if he has to apply a test of the ordinance, which is that there has to be a recognizable and substantial benefit to the community and substitute safeguards that our own ordinance requires, he doesn't think he could find that tonight. He invited the developer to come back once they've been able to figure out those remaining points that he just raised. He hopes they can come to a final vote on this sooner rather than later. He encouraged all parties to be reasonable. He doesn't want either party to come away from this thinking they get more than the other. He would like both of them

to come back a little unhappy because that means that they will have both been reasonable and that the project that comes before Council and the proposal that comes before Council will be closer to meeting the standards of their ordinance.

Member Staudt asked if any police leadership were at the meeting. City Manager Cardenas said no. Member Staudt said one of the questions he'd like to get addressed at some point is it's a private road that goes into a public park. What level of law enforcement monitoring happens on that road? City Manager Cardenas asked Member Staudt to clarify what kind of monitoring he was asking about such as speeding on that road, patrolling the park, etc. Member Staudt said there is a road that's between a city use and a public road. He asked what our law enforcement's responsibility on that road is. Member Staudt asked City Attorney Schultz to respond. City Attorney Schultz said he would normally defer to Novi's police, but because they were not in attendance, he said it is a private road. There can be an agreement between the City and the owner of the private road for speeding enforcement and things like that. The parties could explore that. Member Staudt said that is not currently in the agreement that they signed years ago. Member Staudt said there was also an argument brought up that Council doubled the space of the parking and doubled the space of the pickleball courts. He said at the time, they anticipated a specific use and now, they've doubled that use. He asked rhetorically if Council has any responsibility for that. Member Staudt asked City Attorney Schultz and he said the non-rhetorical answer would be that he doesn't believe so. Member Staudt clarified and said, "So you don't believe so legally." City Attorney Schultz said that is correct. Member Staudt asked City Attorney Schultz that if Council had made this into a 50-car parking lot, they would have no responsibility. City Attorney Schultz said he believes, from a legal perspective, as an easement, it serves the same property and that from a legal perspective, there is not an issue there. He said you can make your own judgment on other issues. Member Staudt interjected that there is a legal perspective and then there is a fairness and political perspective. The political perspective is I was sitting here, voted for it and I never anticipated an increased use there. That's something to consider.

Member Staudt asked City Attorney Schultz about the pump area that is there. He asked if that is owned by a separate, private entity. City Attorney Schultz said yes, it is. Member Staudt asked if this private entity has any responsibility. He asked what the public has to offer them. Did they give up something? Were they the owners of the road? City Attorney Schultz said yes, the road moved, their access road. Member Staudt said that was their access road. City Attorney Schultz said yes. Member Staudt said they gave up ownership of the road to create this private road for the development and for the City's usage. City Attorney Schultz said yes, he'd have to go back and look at the details about giving up ownership, but basically, they were involved in the discussions, and they had access and now they continue to have access. Member Staudt said the private owner has little to say about this because they contributed the road.

Member Staudt he is much happier with the 21%. The beauty of being a City Council member is they can disagree with each other. He disagrees with some of the things that have been said. He thinks the development has been well done. He told the developers

they have jumped through a lot of hoops. This road issue has got to get resolved. Last time they were there, he made it very clear that it had to be resolved in order to get his vote. It's not done. He is happy that the developer has gone up to 21%. He asked the developer what 21% equates to in dollars. Mr. Kime said it depends on the size of the pot that you're talking about. Member Staudt said yes, what is the size of the pot the developers are using to base their estimate on. Mr. Polyzios said he didn't come up with an economic number. He was given certain numbers and he needed more information to understand exactly what those numbers represent. Member Staudt said based on what he was reading on the developers' slides, they have a pretty good idea what those numbers represent in terms of totality. For example, if the road is being repaved, will the developer be paying 21% of that? He asked them point blank. Mr. Polyzios said from Wixom Road to the park entrance, yes. Member Staudt said if the total is \$200,000, the developers will be paying 21% of \$200,000. Mr. Polyzios said that is correct.

Member Staudt said he's not sure if this project gets tabled, he'd suggest that the developers come back with some real numbers, make some estimates. He's a 25-year home owners' association treasurer (he has quit it because it was too painful), so he's assuming that the developer is going to come up with some measures so that their residents understand that they have a long-term liability for this property. Member Staudt said they will put that in their deed restriction or whatever it is that tells them as long as they live there, those residents are going to have to pay 21% of all those expenses. Mr. Polyzios said that is correct. He said Mr. Petoskey asked him to create a separate document so his buyers would not be blindsided when they have to pay for any special assessments or major road improvements. Member Staudt said that's kind of like the residents that live in Stonebrook Villas. They feel blindsided by what happened in their situation. Member Staudt said this is crystal clear and Mr. Polyzios said absolutely.

Member Staudt asked Mr. Polyzios how they got to 21% after starting at 12.7%. Mr. Kime said it's a matter of understanding how the calculations occur. Member Staudt said he doesn't care about calculations. Member Staudt said, at the end of the day, the 21% is creeping a lot closer to what he thinks is the fair standard. He's happy they have a calculation that came to 21%. He heard some of the residents mention 20-25%. 21% is in the ballpark where he would feel comfortable. Mr. Kime said 21% is the exact unit percentage breakdown Camelot versus Stonebrook Villas. It's based on a unit-by-unit basis. It's not based on the size of the pie. They've got the defined area and every unit in Stonebrook and every unit in Camelot Parc drives over the same road so they're each paying their own proportionate share of the shared portion as illustrated for the improvements. Mr. Polyzios said it's not just the road; they're talking about the lawn service, the irrigation, the sidewalks. He said he is throwing more things into the pot that he is willing to take care of from Wixom Road to the park entrance.

Member Staudt said, as an accountant, he'd like to know what that pot is. Is it \$20,000, \$30,000, \$50,000 or \$100,000? They're talking percentages right now. It's going to turn into real money at some point. He said he doesn't know what will happen on this vote to table it, but he will say this: both sides have a responsibility to meet and get this done. He said clearly, the developer has a legal right to this property, and he knows there is some

dispute about that. He said this road was set up so that the owner of the property would have access to it. He accepts that. He thinks they have gone out of their way to propose a development that fits what they wanted for that property which is a lot of green space and a lot of easements and a lot of conservation. He said let's see what happens on this first vote. If it gets tabled, and they come back, he is telling them, they need to get it done.

Mayor Pro Tem Casey said she'll give the developers a quick breather. She asked City Manager Cardenas what they're hearing about the wetland mitigation within the city is the smallest amount they've ever heard. She clarified with the developer that the amount is 0.04 acres. They said yes. She said that needs to get mitigated within the city. She said she knows generally, they've had some challenges trying to see if they've got that kind of space. She asked if the City has 0.04 acres available for them to do the mitigation in the city. She said she knows they don't have "banks" per se. City Manager Cardenas said they would have to look at that. He is sure there might be something available somewhere, but he did not feel like he could give them a definitive, complete answer on that. Mayor Pro Tem Casey said she just wanted to make sure because generally, developers have much more that they need to mitigate and Council doesn't have that kind of space in the city. She was happy this is such a small amount and she's very hopeful that they can find that in the city to make it a process that works for everyone.

Mayor Pro Tem Casey said the developers had heard a lot from her colleagues. Generally, she agrees with the feedback that shares that she's pleased with how they've built out the development. She appreciates the fact that they're talking about a 50% conservation easement. She feels like they've done a great job looking at protecting the wetlands. She appreciates that they've brought in more trees versus paying into the tree fund. She appreciates all the work they've done. She differs from her colleagues in saying that what they're proposing in terms of not just trying to maintain the road, which was the charge that was given to them by Council, that they are working with the residents and figuring out how they can help maintain the road. They've done that. They are offering to maintain it beyond their own driveway. They're offering to maintain it to the park entrance. They're offering to maintain not just the pavement, but snow clearing, sidewalks, mowing, and irrigation. She appreciates the work they've done. She can understand that there's some challenges in understanding what 21% means. She looks forward to seeing what that number comes out as. She also looks forward to the HOA helping work through that with them, so they understand the commitment they're making. She would like them to have a number in their heads that says they are committing to x amount of dollars per year. She would like them to have confidence in that number because she knows that number will likely go up year after year as costs rise. That will then be something that the residents of Camelot Parc will be taking on as part of their HOA year after year. That becomes their responsibility to maintain the developers' commitment. Mr. Polyzios said that is correct. If he were to give them a number today, it will not be the same number two or three years from now. He said he is dealing with a percentage to say this is what it is on that given budget or that given year. He will try to figure out exactly, break down the cost that the Villas incur and try to figure out what

that means for him and what the percentage means. He can bring that feedback back to Council.

Mayor Pro Tem Casey said she appreciates that. This is an awkward situation for several reasons. A previous Council made a determination when the Villas was built that they would accept a private road with access to what is now Mr. Polyzios's development with access to the City's park. That was a public benefit that they expected from the Villas. Now it has become more of a challenge than they expected it to be when they accepted that benefit back in 2016, she thinks it was. They're here now and she thinks, generally, she appreciates what they've done. She said she will look at them and say she expects continued progress on the negotiation. She will look at the HOA and say she expects continued progress on this negotiation. Initially, she is not in favor of tabling this project because they did that once in December. They postponed to give time for this negotiation to happen. It still hasn't happened. She's not sure that giving it another month is the right thing to do. She said she would tentatively approve it tonight and then allow the continued negotiations as they're working out the agreement. There might be some leeway at the Council table to move for that. She said as it stands right now, she thinks they've done a good job in working to come up with this calculation. It concerns her slightly that they will have 21 units that have this kind of cost that they'll be bearing year after year, but that will be their decision when they purchase. It will be fully disclosed to them when they purchase. She looks forward to seeing this come back to Council for tentative approval in the not-too-distant future with a solid negotiated agreement between the developers and the HOA.

Roll call vote on CM 26-02-021

Yeas: Fischer, Gurumurthy, Heintz, Martinez, Smith

Nays: Casey, Staudt

6. Consideration of final approval for rezoning property north of Eight Mile Road, west of Garfield Road. The development is Mariella Estates, a 10-lot single-family project. The zoning will change from Residential Acreage to R-1 with a Planned Rezoning Overlay. SECOND READING

The petitioner stood and introduced himself as Chris Rothhaar with Atwell. He said this is their second time coming before Council. He is seeking final approval for the 10 units as part of the Mariella Estates. He said since the last time, there have been no changes to the plans. They've just finalized the development agreement and they're working through the final site plan with city staff.

CM 26-02-022

Moved by Casey, seconded by Martinez: MOTION CARRIED 7-0

Approval of the request for Mariella Estates JZ24-43 with Zoning Map Amendment 18.750, to rezone from Residential Acreage to R-1, subject to the attached Planned Rezoning Overlay (PRO) Agreement and exhibits including the corresponding PRO Plan, the conditions of this Motion, and the conditions listed in the staff and consultant

review letters, and also subject to any changes and/or conditions as discussed at the City Council meeting, with any final minor alterations required in the determination of the City Manager and City Attorney to be incorporated by the City Attorney's office prior to the execution of the final agreement. This motion is made for the following reasons, and only upon the assumption that all conditions and requirements of this motion and the PRO Agreement, will be satisfied:

- A. The proposed R-1 zoning district is consistent with the Single-Family use recommended in the Future Land Use Map, and fulfills the intent of the Master Plan for Land Use, and because:**
 - 1) The additional homes allowed under the new R-1 District designation will not detract from the project area and, given the anticipated quality of the custom homes, the development generally will be an enhancement to the project area.**
 - 2) The amount of open space on the site and the landscaped buffers mirror what has been provided in recent adjacent developments, and exceed what can be required in the R-1 District.**
 - 3) The preservation of the wetland area is beneficial to the environment, providing aesthetic, habitat, and stormwater functions.**

- B. For the foregoing reasons and the conditions contained in the PRO Agreement, the proposal will result in an enhancement of the project area as compared to a "straight" R-1 designation, and will result in benefits to the public that would not otherwise be available with a straight rezoning R-1, and the deviations listed in the Agreement are necessary to secure the enhancements listed above and in the PRO Agreement.**

- C. This motion is made because the proposed R-1 zoning district is a reasonable alternative to the density recommended in the Future Land Use Map, and fulfills the intent of the Master Plan for Land Use, and because of the site specific development features that will result in an overall benefit to the public that outweighs any detrimental impacts of the project.**

Member Martinez said he was not on Council at the time when this came before them, but having read the comments made at the time, he agrees with most of them. He thinks this PRO agreement does a really good job of laying out the enhancements to this area of the city and why this approval is in the public interest. To him, it boils down to the two central issues: the compatibility with the nearby single family neighborhoods and

protection of the natural features at the site. As they balance that, as they're required, this net increase of four homes, even though it is above what the Master Plan's density says, it's still constrained effectively to one unit per acre. He thinks that is a really, really admirable design. He also thinks it is worth mentioning the city has spent considerable money to improve the conditions of their utilities in this area to support development like this. He wants to applaud them and he finds that the PRO standards are met from his perspective and that approving this agreement is in the best interest of the city.

Roll call vote on CM 26-02-022

**Yeas: Casey, Gurumurthy, Heintz, Martinez,
Smith, Staudt, Fischer**

Nays: None

7. Approval of the FIRST READING of Text Amendment 18.306 to reclassify auto washes from Principal Permitted Uses to Special Land Uses in the B-3 District, and to add use standards to be met by new Auto Wash establishments.

City Manager Cardenas said as we all know, there might be a few more auto car washes available in the city at this point. With that in mind, the Ordinance Review Committee met to review possible zoning ordinance text amendments related to the auto washes with the interest in allowing greater discretion by the Planning Commission through a Special Land Use process and subject to a number of use standards that would need to be met by the new auto wash establishments. The ORC made a recommendation that the draft ordinance be forwarded to the City Council for approval to send to the Planning Commission for public hearing and recommend back to the City Council. At that time, on September 10th, the Planning Commission did hold a public hearing and recommended approval for the tax amendment to the Council which is at this first reading at this time.

CM 26-02-023

Moved by Casey, seconded by Martinez: MOTION CARRIED 7-0

Approval of Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment 18.306 to amend various sections of the Zoning Ordinance to reclassify auto washes from Principal Permitted Uses to Special Land Uses in the B-3 District, and to add use standards to be met by new Auto Wash establishments along with other minor changes, subject to further modifications as determined necessary by the City Manager's Office or City Attorney's Office. FIRST READING

Roll call vote on CM 26-02-023

**Yeas: Gurumurthy, Heintz, Martinez, Smith,
Staudt, Fisher, Casey**

Nays: None

CONSENT AGENDA REMOVALS: None

AUDIENCE COMMENT: None

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

1. Long Range Strategic Planning Committee – Mayor Pro Tem Casey

Their committee met with and had a great conversation with Shockey Consulting. They presented to them their environmental scan based on all the information they've been able to receive from the City including all their Master Plans, all their goal setting, and all the work they did with Rebecca Ryan. She told Council they all had that in their admin packet from a couple of weeks ago. She hopes they reviewed it and got the gist of what they see. They gave them some good recommendations in terms of things for the committee to consider. They also worked on looking at some of the survey questions that will go out and be presented to the Novi residents. She thinks their next meeting is coming up next month.

2. Finance and Administration Committee – Mayor Fischer

Mayor Fischer said they met last Thursday. For the second time in as many years, they met with a subset of the Novi Community School District. He said, as Council could recall from his committee report back then, they wanted to sit with this committee and talk about potential partnerships as they are moving forward with their building off the high school which is just to the west of Novi Way, right by the City's Power Park. Those conversations went really well last year. Obviously, since that time, the District's bond has passed. They wanted to have a couple more discussions as they could use some easements on Novi Way as well as some ability to access the City's retention ponds. They wanted some feedback on what that might look like. They gave them some feedback. The next step is for them to come in front of full Council with their proposals on how they would address a couple of those items in support of their project. It was a good, continued collaboration with them.

That was one of four items they had that night. Second was a CIP meeting. That's where they meet with a couple of planning commissioners as part of their annual process and review the CIP. Mr. Cardenas did a very good job presenting that and they recommended that that go to the Planning Commission for their approval and obviously, it makes its way to the City's overall budget process as well.

Third was an update from PMR, walking them through some of the budget tools that they'll be using and their latest budget estimates for each of the different projects. They are set to come before Council to present the same information in a couple of weeks.

Fourth, they had a good discussion on the Ice Arena over the last six months or so. They've been getting a lot of information on the financial viability; the future capital uses. He said, as Council can recall, this was kicked over to that finance committee to talk about the future of the Ice Arena. The committee and the administration will be putting something together for Council to have a discussion on the next steps as far as that goes.

He encouraged all of the Council members to take a look at their finance committee packet and look out for the additional information City Manager Cardenas will be sharing.

3. Public Utilities & Technology Committee – Councilmember Gurumurthy

Member Gurumurthy said they had a good meeting. They had a representative from Metronet Fiber at the meeting. They are kind of a partner, a construction partner, to T-Fiber or T-Mobile. They talked about the whole process, how they informed the residents. 180 days prior they sent cards. She is sure some of the residents have already gotten their cards. They saw there was an opportunity where they would even come to Council for an opportunity to collaborate and communicate to the residents. They talked about that and they, in fact, indicated that they were planning to do 12,000 houses in about two years, which was good information. Rob is continuing to do a great job of updating the city map with where the fiber is available.

In terms of GLWA, there are updates on their websites. What they requested is their plan that they are going after. They want to see how they're doing with the plan. Hopefully, they are going to get that information and the progress they are making. They also wanted to have an ad hoc meeting in early March with them to understand where they are.

In terms of Priority Waste, there is a dashboard that's put together in terms of data showing the delayed pickups and stuff. That's coming up. The data is being updated from all the calls. She encourages all residents to call whenever they have a delayed pickup because that is the data they use. She knows the City is planning to meet with Priority Waste, using that data.

Lastly, the DTE representative will attend their next meeting which will be on March 19th. They'll be talking about a couple of things like December outages and then overall infrastructure, if possible.

MAYOR AND COUNCIL ISSUES: None

COMMUNICATIONS: None

ADJOURNMENT – There being no further business to come before Council, the meeting was adjourned at 8:48 P.M.

Melissa Morris, Deputy City Clerk

Justin Fischer, Mayor

Transcribed by Diana Charles
Customer Service Representative

Date approved: March 9, 2026