



PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

CITY OF NOVI

Regular Meeting

May 23, 2018 7:00 PM

Council Chambers | Novi Civic Center
45175 W. Ten Mile (248) 347-0475

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 PM.

ROLL CALL

Present: Member Anthony, Member Avdoulos, Member Howard, Member Lynch, Member Maday, Chair Pehrson

Absent: Member Greco (excused)

Also Present: Barbara McBeth, City Planner; Sri Komaragiri, Planner; Lindsay Bell, Planner; Darcy Rechten, Staff Engineer; Rick Meader, Landscape Architect; Thomas Schultz, City Attorney

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Member Lynch led the meeting attendees in the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Moved by Member Avdoulos and seconded by Member Anthony.

VOICE VOTE TO APPROVE THE MAY 23, 2018 AGENDA MOTION MADE BY MEMBER AVDOULOS AND SECONDED BY MEMBER ANTHONY.

Motion to approve the May 23, 2018 Planning Commission Agenda. Motion carried 6-0.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

No one in the audience wished to speak.

CORRESPONDENCE

There was no correspondence.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

There were no Committee Reports.

CITY PLANNER REPORT

City Planner McBeth had nothing to report.

CONSENT AGENDA

There were no items on the consent agenda.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. LITTLE BIRDS MONTESSORI GROUP DAY CARE JSP18-24

Public hearing at the request of Little Birds Montessori, LLC for Special Land Use Permit

approval for Little Birds Montessori Group Day Care, Site Plan Number 18-24. The subject property is located at 24620 Taft Road in section 22, on the east side of Taft Road north of Ten Mile Road. The applicant is proposing to operate a group day care in their existing residence for not more than 12 children. A group daycare up to 12 kids in a single family residence requires a Special Land Use approval.

Planner Komaragiri said the applicants have run a daycare with up to six children since September of 2017, now they would like to operate a group daycare home in their existing residence at 24620 Taft Road for up to twelve children. The ordinance defines operations supervising seven to twelve children as group day care homes, consistent with the State of Michigan regulations and definitions. The subject property is currently zoned R-4 and surrounded by the same zoning. Group day care homes are a Special Land Use in the R-4, One-Family Residential District. There are no regulated natural features on the property.

The applicants currently occupy the home as their primary residence and are not proposing any exterior changes to the site. The applicants previously made a similar request in 2015, but due to several concerns expressed by the neighbors and the Planning Commission at that time, the request was denied. The major concern at that time was traffic circulation and adequate access for Fire and Emergency among other minor issues. The applicants have run a daycare with up to 6 children since September of 2017.

Planner Komaragiri said the subject property abuts the major thoroughfare and has access from Taft Road. The subject property has an existing provision on site for vehicles to turn around without having to back up onto Taft Road. In order to address concerns about Traffic in and out of the site, the applicant has proposed a drop-off schedule. They are proposing to offer four forty minute time slot for parents to choose at the time of registration. The choices will be limited to four families at a time. Pick up time is usually between 3 pm and 5:30 pm.

They also provided a parking plan for occasional special events, where they would limit one car per child. According to the applicant, there would be up to four events per year. The parking plan demonstrates how cars could fit in their front yard while still leaving a 7 foot clear access for fire and emergency purposes. Our acting Fire Marshall confirmed that it would be serve the purpose. The parking plan proposes to use some of the unpaved area in their front yard, which is highlighted in red fill under Car 1 and Car 12. The Planning Commission is asked tonight to make a determination, given the low intensity and low frequency of use at the time of special events, whether the total area to be used for special event parking purposes only should be paved or not.

Planner Komaragiri said the applicant has been diligently working with staff prior to making the request to identify and address the issues raised at the last public hearing in 2015. The Planning Commission is asked tonight to hold the public hearing and consider approval of the Special Land Use permit and should consider the factors listed in Section 6.2.C of the Zoning Ordinance related to Special Land Use requirements.

The applicant Akemi Nagakura is here with their representative Dennis Perkins to address any additional concerns you may have, and so is staff. Thank you.

Dennis Perkins, 528 W Grand River and representing the applicants, said to my right are my clients.

Akemi Nagakura, 24620 Taft Road, said I am the owner of the property.

Rikiya Nagakura, 24620 Taft Road, said I am also a property owner.

Mr. Perkins said I have listened to your planner go through her recitation to the Planning Commission, we have received two documents that show support for the project and one objection, although I'm not sure if it's an objection or if it's a support with conditions. I'm not sure how to read that, to be honest with you. However, it is our belief that we have complied with all the requirements of the zoning code for the purposes of this nature. And we are asking the Commission this evening to approve the application as recommended by the Planner. We're here to take any questions that you might have.

Chair Pehrson asked if there was anyone in the audience that wished to address the Planning Commission regarding this project. Seeing no one, he said I believe we have some correspondence.

Member Lynch said yes, we have three. The first is from Ken A. DeBrecht, 24650 Taft Road. This is an objection or a support with conditions. The primary concern is the size of the daycare on a neighborhood residential street, increased traffic flow, signage.

The next is a support from Ashley Gloeden, 24660 Taft Road.

The next is a support with conditions from Daniel W. Brinkman, 24630 Taft Rd. The conditions are that they want a plan to keep the kids safe from the two bodies of water nearby, and a plan to keep traffic safe and flowing. They noted that there is considerable traffic already in the area.

Chair Pehrson closed the public hearing and turned it over to Planning Commission for their consideration.

Member Anthony said these are questions for the applicant. So the Montessori that you're asking for is up to twelve children there, what's the ratio of teachers or adults to children?

Ms. Nagakura said the ratio is six to one, so six children and one teacher. That's what the State of Michigan says.

Member Anthony asked what's the age of the children?

Ms. Nagakura said the age is two years old to four years old.

Member Anthony said so is there a director and two employees?

Ms. Nagakura said no, it's only myself and my husband, Rikiya.

Member Anthony said ok, so you both are the employees and operating it. Do you bring anyone else in or hire anyone else to work there?

Mr. Nagakura said as of right now, no.

Member Anthony said so as of right now, is there the likelihood in the future that you would?

Mr. Nagakura said we're not really thinking of it, no.

Member Anthony said so this is really where I'm going with question is if you do, now that adds a thirteenth car to the parking. And I went through the pictures of your parking, it

looks like it's well planned, but it looks like it's kind of maxed out at twelve. So an additional employee is obviously going to need to park. Which that is a concern, it looks like it may not fit there.

Mr. Perkins said the only times that you'll see all those parking spaces filled is four times a year. And that would be for events for children or families, but normally you're not going to see any people parking there. You'll never see twelve cars parked there on any given business day.

Member Anthony said and what are the state requirements for enclosure or security of when the kids are playing outdoors?

Mr. Nagakura said we need to have a fence, and we need to have a lock on the fence.

Member Anthony said I can kind of look at the aerial photos, is that what you have back there, a fence?

Mr. Nagakura said yes, it surrounds the backyard.

Member Anthony asked does the state ever do any inspections? And what is the frequency of those inspections?

Mr. Nagakura said it's the next three years.

Ms. Nagakura said it's every three years.

Member Anthony said so have you applied yet for the up to twelve to the State of Michigan?

Ms. Nagakura said we need this approval first, then we can apply to the state.

Member Anthony asked and then when they do, do they inspect the property before they issue it?

Ms. Nagakura said yes.

Member Anthony said and that is part of the state requirement and the state process for that.

Ms. Nagakura said yes.

Mr. Perkins said and that approval would have to become part of your file, too.

Member Anthony said and one of the neighbors commented that there are two water features. I only really see one in the aerial photo, where are those two water features?

Mr. Perkins said there are two small ponds.

Member Anthony said I see one on your neighbor to the north in their backyard.

Mr. Perkins said and then there is another one to the east.

Ms. Nagakura said the pond is on the north side, I don't know the second one that they're talking about.

Member Anthony said ok. I see a wooded area to the very east of your property, so does the fence for the play area prevent access to the wooded area?

Ms. Nagakura said yes.

Member Anthony said ok, good. So, parking is twelve which would be four times a year, but if we end up with an employee that's going to be something that would need to be looked at because that would require thirteen. You have fencing secure to prevent access to water features and you'll go through a state, on-site inspection before they'll issue that permit. Ok, I don't have any further questions.

Member Avdoulos said I like the fact that the parking is going to be expanded, what has been highlighted in red. Can it be, and I don't know if there's a tree in the way, but can it be expanded a little further so that there's an area where that arrow is that says north to the right of car number six, could that area be paved at all?

Mr. Nagakura said yes.

Ms. Nagakura said I think there is a tree right next to number six, but we can expand a little more on the west side.

Member Avdoulos said I was just thinking to expand it as much as you can just so that you're accommodating perhaps an extra vehicle. And then Sri, does this have to go to the fire department for any kind of review?

Planner Komaragiri said we shared the plans and what they are proposing, and they also met with our Fire Marshal before they submitted the application. What they have mentioned is that they wouldn't park the fire truck on their property, they would park it on Taft. They only need pedestrian access to get to their front door. And the seven-foot would satisfy that requirement.

Member Avdoulos said ok, as long as they're ok with it. Those are my questions.

Member Howard asked do you have any services that come into your home for the students? So, any extracurricular or any lunch services? I guess my question is to see in your daily functioning, the traffic that would come into the area.

Ms. Nagakura said we don't provide lunch, the children bring their own so we don't have any service daily. We have one service from the City of Novi Public Library, they come and do the story time for us once a month.

Member Howard asked as long as you've been in operation and you've undergone inspections with the State of Michigan, have you ever had any issues or any incidences?

Ms. Nagakura said no.

Member Howard said thank you.

Chair Pehrson said relative to the pick-up and drop-off of the kids, Mr. Schultz, it was mentioned that that was going to be staggered event. Is that something that can be contained in the language of the Special Land Use such that we can, more or less, be sure that we don't end up with the eight cars at peak time in the morning?

City Attorney Schultz said yes it can, and that was going to be my suggestion so you're way ahead of me. There's a specific document that you could ask to be made part of the record as part of the conditions of your approval, and in addition to that maybe a catch-all phrase that all the representations that the petitioner will be incorporated into the conditions of the Special Land Use.

Chair Pehrson said perfect, if that's the case then I have no particular issues with this matter.

Member Lynch said if there are no other comments, I will make a motion.

Member Anthony asked if we can call out a specific state inspection is required and passed?

Chair Pehrson said that is part of the agreement process with the applicant.

Mr. Perkins said I believe that is already covered by the state.

Motion made by Member Lynch and seconded by Member Avdoulos.

ROLL CALL VOTE TO APPROVE SPECIAL LAND USE MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER AVDOULOS.

In the matter of Little Birds Montessori Group Day Care, JSP 18-24, motion to approve the Special Land Use permit based on the following findings:

- a. Relative to other feasible uses of the site:**
 - 1. The proposed use will not cause any detrimental impact on existing thoroughfares (because the applicant has provided reasonable explanation in his narrative as how Traffic circulates in and out the site);**
 - 2. The proposed use will not cause any detrimental impact on the capabilities of public services and facilities (because there is no additional impact on capabilities of public services. The applicant has agreed to maintain a seven foot access from Taft Road to main entrance of the building clear of snow at all times);**
 - 3. The proposed use is compatible with the natural features and characteristics of the land (because there are no existing regulated woodlands or wetlands on subject property);**
 - 4. The proposed use is compatible with adjacent uses of land (because the applicant has an existing family daycare with less than six kids at this location for over two years);**
 - 5. The proposed use is consistent with the goals, objectives and recommendations of the City's Master Plan for Land Use;**
 - 6. The proposed use will promote the use of land in a socially and economically desirable manner;**
 - 7. The proposed use is (1) listed among the provision of uses requiring special land use review as set forth in the various zoning districts of this Ordinance, and (2) is in harmony with the purposes and conforms to the applicable site design regulations of the zoning district in which it is located.**
 - 8. The information provided by the applicant sufficiently demonstrates how Traffic circulates in and out of the site without the need for any additional site improvements;**
 - 9. The additional representations in the "Explanation" document provided to the Planning Commission at the meeting, as well as the representations of the applicants and their attorney in the application and in their presentation and**

responses to the Planning Commission at the meeting are expressly made conditions to this approval.

This motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Article 3.1.5, Article 4, Article 5 and Article 6 of the Zoning Ordinance and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance. Motion carried 6-0.

2. MERCEDES BENZ OF NOVI JSP 17-78

Public hearing at the request of Mercedes Benz of Novi for Special Land Use, Preliminary Site Plan, and Storm Water Management plan approval. The subject property is 4.7 acres and is located in Section 24, on the west side of Haggerty Road and north of Grand River Avenue. The property is zoned B-3 General Business. The applicant is proposing to expand the parking lot to accommodate additional vehicle inventory parking for the existing vehicle dealership.

Planner Bell said the subject property is in Section 24 on the northwest corner of Grand River Avenue and Haggerty Road. The parcel is 4.7 acres and is the existing site of the Mercedes Benz of Novi auto dealership with showroom, service center, and inventory parking. The property is zoned B-3 General Business, as are the properties across Grand River. The area to the west and north is zoned I-1 Light Industrial. The City of Farmington Hills is located on the opposite side of Haggerty Road, which is developed with fast food, gas station, and automobile dealership uses.

The Future Land Use Map indicates Community Commercial for this property and those south of Grand River. North and west of the property is planned for Industrial, Research Development and Technology uses.

There are no wetland or woodland areas on the property.

Planner Bell said the applicant is proposing to expand their parking lot to accommodate an additional 25 spaces for vehicle inventory storage. Outdoor space for the sale of new and used vehicles is a Special Land Use in the B-3 District, and therefore requires Planning Commission action on a revised permit. The applicant requests a waiver of the required Noise Impact Statement, which is supported by staff as we agree the additional vehicle parking will not significantly increase the noise generated by the site.

Existing access to Grand River and Haggerty would remain. No changes are proposed to the existing building. The 0.5 acre of additional pavement will be accommodated by modifications to the existing single storm sewer collection system and detained in the existing basin on site. Engineering recommends approval.

The site plan is in general conformance with the landscaping standards but several waivers are requested. Two waivers are for requirements for street trees along Grand River and Haggerty, and greenbelt trees along Grand River. These are supported by staff because there are conflicts with utilities in those areas. A waiver is requested to not provide subcanopy trees in the greenbelt, which is supported because they will be providing canopy trees instead. A waiver of the berm requirement is also requested, and is now supported by staff because of the greenbelt width and the applicant has agreed to install a 3-foot high hedge as an alternative. Landscape recommends approval.

The applicant requests a waiver for the parking lot end island on the north end of the dealer inventory area, which is within a gated area not accessible to the public. Staff does not support this waiver as it does not meet City standards. Traffic recommends approval of the Preliminary Site Plan and Fire also recommends approval.

Planner Bell said the Planning Commission is asked tonight to hold the public hearing and consider approval of the Special Land Use permit, Preliminary Site Plan and the Storm Water Management plan. The applicant is here to tell you more about the project and staff is available to answer any questions you may have. Thank you.

Lee Ghesquiere, owner of Mercedes Benz of Novi, said I have with me Michael Brock from Hennessey Engineers who has done all of the site work that you are seeing. We have been at this location now for 21 years and due to a great business and a great location, we've been able to grow our business and we are, if you look at the overhead photo, out of space.

When we built the store 22 or 23 years ago, there was a large greenbelt area that you can see between the dealership and Haggerty Road that was deemed to be in a floodway, and we had enlisted an engineering firm to do a study and got FEMA involved and it was determined that it is not in the floodway. Therefore, it enables us to expand into that area for additional inventory and paving, which is what we're asking to do now.

Chair Pehrson asked if there was anyone in the audience that wished to address the Planning Commission regarding this project. Seeing no one, he asked if there was any correspondence.

Member Lynch said yes, there is one correspondence in support. Allie Fayz, Pheasant Run Plaza P.O. Box 1178 Dearborn Heights, which states that he is in favor of the request

Chair Pehrson closed the public hearing and turned it over to Planning Commission for their consideration.

Member Lynch said it seems like the only outstanding issue is the end island, I don't understand what the big deal is with that. Can you physically put it in there?

Mr. Ghesquiere said it's an existing condition already back in our inventory area where it's gated and locked, where nobody goes or is allowed to go without being escorted by a dealership employee. It's basically where we stage all of our new car inventory that's not up front on display.

Member Lynch said so it's back in a staging area?

Mr. Ghesquiere said it's back in the staging area behind a gated fence, locked. And it's not ever meant for anybody to go back there; if I had a guest, I would walk them back and look at cars but it's not ever meant for anybody to drive back there.

Member Lynch said ok, that was the only question I had.

Member Avdoulos said thank you for addressing the landscaping requirements, I think we're pretty good on that. In the beginning, I was kind of confused about where the parking would be expanded to because we just saw the new plan, I didn't see an existing plan. So I didn't know we were going to that.

Mr. Ghesquiere said the existing and the new don't look a whole lot different unless you're very familiar with the parcel because it's not that big of an area.

Member Avdoulos said as an architect, I do counts so I was kind of losing it for a while but I got it. I actually drove by it just to see. But I think it's all good and we appreciate the fact

that the business is doing well and you're growing and contributing to the community. We appreciate that. With that, I'd like to make a motion.

Motion made by Member Avdoulos and seconded by Member Anthony.

ROLL CALL VOTE TO APPROVE SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT MADE BY MEMBER AVDOULOS AND SECONDED BY MEMBER ANTHONY.

In the matter of Mercedes Benz JSP17-78, motion to approve the Special Land Use Permit based on the following findings relative to other feasible uses of the site:

- a. The proposed use will not cause any detrimental impact on existing thoroughfares *(since the dealership building is existing and the proposed use is not expected to generate traffic greater than previous);*
- b. The proposed use will not cause any detrimental impact on the capabilities of public services and facilities *(the expansion in parking area will not add significant impact on public services or facilities);*
- c. The proposed use is compatible with the natural features and characteristics of the land *(the proposed parking expansion will not impact natural features or other characteristics of the existing site);*
- d. The proposed use is compatible with adjacent uses of land *(the use is existing and the surrounding uses are compatible with the current use);*
- e. The proposed use is consistent with the goals, objectives and recommendations of the City's Master Plan for Land Use *(fulfills the stated objective to retain and support the growth of existing businesses and attract new businesses to the City of Novi);*
- f. The proposed use will promote the use of land in a socially and economically desirable manner *(the expansion of the existing inventory parking will benefit the existing business and its customers);*
- g. The proposed use is (1) listed among the provision of uses requiring special land use review as set forth in the various zoning districts of this Ordinance, and (2) is in harmony with the purposes and conforms to the applicable site design regulations of the zoning district in which it is located; and
- h. Approval of the waiver of the required Noise Impact Statement since no additional noise impacts are anticipated with the increase in parked cars.

This motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Article 3.1.5, Article 4, Article 5 and Article 6 of the Zoning Ordinance and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance. *Motion carried 6-0.*

ROLL CALL VOTE TO APPROVE PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN MADE BY MEMBER AVDOULOS AND SECONDED BY MEMBER ANTHONY.

In the matter of Mercedes Benz JSP17-78, motion to approve the Preliminary Site Plan based on and subject to the following:

- a. Landscape waiver from Section 5.5.3.B.ii for a Right of Way berm due to the greenbelt width, which is hereby granted. Landscape shrubs will be planted to provide alternate screening to be maintained at three feet;
- b. Landscape waiver from Section 5.5.3.B.ii.f for absence of greenbelt trees along Grand River because of conflicts with existing utilities, which is hereby granted;
- c. Landscape waiver from Section 5.5.3.B.ii.f for absence of street trees along Grand River and Haggerty because of conflicts with existing utilities, which is hereby granted;
- d. Landscape waiver from Section 5.5.3.B.ii.f for absence of sub-canopy greenbelt trees because canopy trees are used in their place, which is hereby granted;

- e. **Waiver from Section 5.3.12 for absence of an**
- f. **end island at the end of the northern central parking bay with the reasoning that this area is gated from public traffic, which is hereby granted;**
- g. **The findings of compliance with Ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters and the conditions and the items listed in those letters being addressed on the Final Site Plan.**

This motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Article 3, Article 4, and Article 5 of the Zoning Ordinance and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance. Motion carried 6-0.

ROLL CALL VOTE TO APPROVE THE STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN MADE BY MEMBER AVDOULOS AND SECONDED BY MEMBER ANTHONY.

In the matter of Mercedes Benz JSP17-78, motion to approve the Stormwater Management Plan based on and subject to the findings of compliance with Ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters, and the conditions and items listed in those letters being addressed on the Final Site Plan. This motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Chapter 11 of the Code of Ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance. Motion carried 6-0.

3. WOODBRIIDGE PARK JSP 17-67

Public hearing at the request of Pulte Homes of Michigan, LLC for Preliminary Site Plan, Wetland Permit, Woodland Permit, and Storm Water Management plan approval. The subject property is currently zoned RM-1 (Low-rise Multiple Family Residential). The subject property is approximately 9.23 acres and is located at the northeast corner of Novi Road and Nine Mile Road (Section 26). The applicant is proposing a 40-unit multi-family for-sale residential development with frontage and access to Nine Mile Road.

Planner Komaragiri said the subject property is located at the north east corner of Nine Mile Rd and Novi Rd, adjacent to the existing Shiro restaurant to the east. Saddle Creek apartment development is located just north of the property. It is currently zoned RM-1, Low-Rise Multiple Family development, with the same zoning to the north. It is surrounded by I-1 Light Industrial to the east and south with single family districts R-3 and R-4 across Novi Rd to the west. The Future Land Use Map indicates similar land uses as the existing ones for the subject property and surrounding properties.

The proposed project site contains a significant amount of City-regulated woodland area spread throughout the site. The site also contains regulated wetland areas, mostly on the southwest corner of the site. In addition, Thornton Creek flows through the southwestern portion of the project site.

The applicant is proposing a 40-unit multi-family for-sale residential development with frontage and access to Nine Mile Rd. The development includes seven buildings which are 5 and 6 unit attached town home style units. Private roads are proposed to serve the development. There is an on-site detention pond proposed west of the proposed entry drive from Nine Mile Road. The development also proposes a connection to Shiro restaurant parking to the east for secondary emergency access only.

Planner Komaragiri said the applicant for the eastern parcel (Shiro's site) at the time of site plan approval has provided a 15-foot easement on the subject parcel and intent to build a berm or a wall when a residential development is approved next to Shiro. With the current proposal, the applicant is proposing to vacate the 15-foot berm easement. The

applicant is currently proposing a berm and screening along a portion of the eastern property as shown on the screen. This would require a couple of landscape waivers, supported by staff. Vacation of the berm would require City Council approval. Due to the significant area of wetlands and woodlands that occupy a third of the property on the south, the current layout would require reduction in side and rear yard setbacks as listed in the motion sheet. Planning recommends approval subject to City Council approval of vacation of the berm and Zoning Board of Appeals approval of setback deviations.

Water and sewer is provided by connecting to the City system along the east side of Novi Rd. Stormwater would be collected by a single storm sewer collection system and detained on-site in a proposed detention basin. The applicant is proposing a sidewalk on both sides of the entrance road and is no longer seeking the deviation for lack of sidewalk. Motion sheets have been updated to reflect this item. Engineering is recommending approval.

Landscape has raised some concerns with regards to the earlier submittal for lack of screening from commercial use to the east and landscape deviations sought. The applicant has been working with our landscape architect and we are currently recommending approval subject to the deviations listed in the motion sheet. All deviations are supported by staff in general with additional information to be updated at the time of Final Site Plan.

The site contains a total of 0.1 acres of wetlands, of which the applicant is impacting about 0.05 acres with up to 450 cubic yards fill. The plans also include about 0.26 acre impact to 0.5 acres of wetland buffers.

Planner Komaragiri said the plan appears to include 479 surveyed trees. The applicant is proposing an 80 percent removal. It appears that about 50 percent of the total replacements required are proposed to be planted on site. There is slight inconsistency in woodland calculations in the current submittal which the applicant agreed to address at the time of Final Site Plan. In general, the proposed site contains trees of medium quality. Woodlands recommends approval.

A traffic study is not required based on the proposed trip generation. The proposed entrance drive location off of Novi Rd would require a waiver for not meeting the minimum required for same-side and opposite-side driveway distance. The applicant has worked closely with our traffic consultant in identifying an optimal location due to the existing natural features along that frontage. Traffic recommends approval.

All proposed facades are in full compliance with the Façade Ordinance. A Section 9 Waiver is not required for this project. Most of the elevations will be similar to the Emerson Park, which Planning Commission has approved in the past. The applicant should note that the vinyl siding is not allowed.

Planner Komaragiri said Fire recommends approval with additional comments to be provided with Final Site Plan. The Planning Commission is asked tonight to hold the public hearing and consider approval of the Preliminary Site Plan, Wetlands Permit, Woodlands Permit, and Stormwater Management Plan. The applicant, Joe Skore from Pulte Homes, is here tonight with his engineer Bill Anderson to answer any questions that you may have.

Bill Anderson with Atwell, said thank you for entertaining us tonight. We are the engineers and planners for the project. As Sri indicated, Joe Skore, the Vice President of Pulte Homes, is here as well as is the property owner, Irwin Arkin. We are here for Woodbridge Park Preliminary Site Plan approval tonight, and we just wanted to briefly go through the

plan a little bit.

That's the location as indicated; we have apartments to the north, we have commercial immediately to our east, to our south, and residential to our west side there. For zoning, it's existing RM-1, which for the three-bedroom that we're doing allows a density of 5.4. Less bedrooms, the density goes up to 7 to 9. It's master planned, as well, for higher densities.

We're proposing an attached single-family townhome product for that missing middle housing product. There's a lot of single-family, there's a lot of traditional three-story apartment attached multi-family. This is a two-story townhome and our density is 4.3, so density is not really an issue with the existing zoning or your Master Plan.

As you look at this site, it's pretty complicated. It's only a little over 9 acres, there's actually 30 feet of relief on this site – from the north to the south it falls 30 feet. You can see I have some steep slopes noted across there. We do have wetland and floodplain in that southwest corner. And then we usually go out and actually qualify the trees and there's medium to good quality on that southwest side, and a little lower quality tree stand up on that northern side, is what our folks told us. And of course we did our tree survey and that's all in there. But that's the existing condition that we're working with.

Mr. Anderson said last summer we met with your staff and we have been working with it. We've done three submittals; we started concept planning with about 46 units, as you can see on that north side we had roadway constraints up there, we had long dead ends, Fire Department turnarounds, and some geometry issues. We modified secondly, we went in with a PRO actually that originally went down to 45 units and did some more detailed grading, where we ran into constraints at Novi Rd. Novi Rd drops off a lot right there, we couldn't even make the grading and the sidewalk work for ADA constraints, so it was back to the drawing board. And again, we're working with your staff and consultants and we ended up with the plan today, our third submittal package and actually going straight site plan, RM-1 straight zoning. We're at 40 units, and coming off of Novi Rd. And that's again where we're at today.

And that's our plan right there, 40 units. We have a nice, secluded enclave development. It's got a circular road, albeit that northern road is emergency access only but it can act as a pedestrian pathway. We have a nice winding scenic drive off of Novi Rd. I'm sorry, off of Nine Mile Rd. So comes in off of Nine Mile into our site, we have three little recreational nodes there. We have some benches, the mailbox cluster, with some bike racks, just a couple of spots there. The enhanced common open space, we have a lot trees existing. Significant open space on this property. To the south of all of our units is about four acres, just over four acres. So it's only a nine acre site and the south half is really, beside the detention basin which we'll augment with trees and everything, you're going to end up with about four acres down there. Again, we're enhancing quite a bit. And then of course we do have sidewalks throughout.

There's a little bit of the product, that's the front elevation of the product, a little bit more. Again, it's a two-story townhome, we have flexible floor plans, it's got a single-family residential character to it. All units have a two-car garage, façade variations with different materials on the front and we varied the roof lines to add some interest, as well. That's something Pulte has been working on as recently as six months ago.

Deviations, we decided we wanted to talk to you about that because I think last time Mr. Skore and I were here, you guys said we love your project but why are you coming here with all these deviations? And here I am again, coming to you with all of these deviations. I want to briefly talk about that. We're developing an infill site property, it's a small parcel

with very complex site conditions. And I have to have a marketable housing product with that, as well. And we think the three-bedroom product we have does that. And even with that, I have Ordinance design parameters that we can't always meet.

Mr. Anderson said our design process is that we review the existing conditions; we look at the topography, the steep slopes, the wetlands, the woodland quality, and the adjacent uses. In this case, we know what our adjacent uses are – we have a restaurant to the east, we have an existing apartment complex to the north, so we kind of know what we're up against as far as borders. Our marketing housing product, Pulte has done a lot of studies in this area. We want to sell, we're selling three-bedroom, two-car garage for-sale condominium units – so that has to be a particular size and we think it's going to be a great product for this area. It fits, again, that missing middle housing demographic.

So when we lay that out, we take that housing product that we're confident about, utilities and homes, and we do a best-fit on the site, given the existing conditions and the product we want. And we're trying to minimize grading impact to the natural features. The example would be how much retaining walls I have versus property setbacks and all that. I want to keep my retaining walls less than six feet tall, you start getting too much and on the top it's a safety concern. On the other side, if you're on the bottom, you get shadow, you don't get snow melt. So there's a constant battle. Again, I have 30 feet of relief across here. So we have to make sure our layout hits all the public safety and health features, and this thing does.

Mr. Anderson said but we do get into landscape requirements and orientation requirements that are basically the waivers we're talking about today. Again, a very challenging site and density is not the issue, it's just having to deal with some of these orientation matters. But that's really what we're here today to talk about, and there is a PRO process, this is a straight site plan. We have the waivers in front of us, we're prepared to talk about all of them. Again, we've been with your staff and we have their full support on the proposal today. We're willing to go through any questions you may have on our layout.

Chair Pehrson asked if there was anyone in the audience that wished to address the Planning Commission regarding this project.

Irwin Arkin, 43100 Nine Mile Road, said good evening. I am representing the subject property, the adjacent property to the east, 43180 Nine Mile Road known as Shiro Restaurant, and the adjacent property to the east of the adjacent property, at 43100 Nine Mile Road known as the Arkin Building.

The terrain of the property has its challenges, with the Rouge River, wetland, woodland, along with the tremendous drop off. The proposed development is part of a long range plan, where as we give to the City and allow for the widening of Nine Mile and Novi Road intersection. We went through a land split in 2016 when we added acreage to the corner site while saving the landmark Shiro Restaurant. We feel the site plan permits the Storm Water Management goals and will not negatively impact any neighbor or alter or change the land. The owners of all three parcels strongly support the total approval of the request made. Thank you.

Tina Mahlmeister, 43421 Cottisford Rd, said I live on the west side of Novi Rd there, I am the first house on the left. As far as all of this, I didn't know about any of this until we got the letter in the mail and I have spent a lot of time putting together my presentation. I'm a little bit disappointed when I saw the plans out back in regard to the quantity of trees that are being cut down. It is a complex site condition because of the Rouge River. You know,

Thornton Creek is part of the middle branch of the Rouge River, it's a tributary.

And along with that, we have deer, we have all kinds of wildlife, and sustaining all that is very important. Now we're going to put in a big basin and the deer constantly cross over because they're in my yard and they cross over Novi Road to the east right in that area with the basin. So now we're affecting the wildlife in the area. I am not objecting to the fact of progress, I just feel that maybe there's a way that they can work with maybe a lesser number of homes. The plan that they have out there to replace the trees – how can you replace a tree that is huge with a little stick tree? I have seen many Pulte home developments and have seen what they have done to address the elevations and go in there and plat the property.

As far as traffic, there is major traffic in the area depending on the time of day and what have you that you are there. Depending on the day and time, there is always traffic. We're always trying to get out. That is our subdivision, this is my driveway with the cone because people are constantly turning in there because they forget that it's Nine Mile coming up and not whatever road that they're planning. More traffic, these are all date and timed. And then we're looking at, and you can see the time where this traffic – it takes 14 cars from Novi Road and Nine Mile to hit the entrance of our subdivision, Brooklyn Farms which is Cottisford Road. If we're adding 40 single family units, you can anticipate at least 40 cars, possibly 90 cars adding to that, because the main thoroughfare to the freeway is Novi Road.

Ms. Mahlmeister said ok, we're also looking again, people waiting to get out. It is not unusual to be four and a half minutes in order to get out of our subdivision. Not only if we're looking at a traffic standpoint, we're also looking at the deterioration of the road. These were just taken, and this is all traffic is going to lead to problems with the road. And I don't know how this is going to be addressed.

We've been at that property, my husband and I, since they've expanded Novi Road and Nine Mile intersection, and I can go on with more of this, and according to that when it was made up and this was when the expansion of Novi Road and Nine Mile Road to add the culverts in there to help with the, basically the flooding that came ten feet from our deck at the time, when Thornton Creek is flowing so heavy with rain. I don't understand how the City had this path here, and it's talking about how this is a pedestrian focal point, which is right here at the corner of Nine Mile and Novi Rd.

They also talk about how they want to keep and have a small park. So I don't understand how we can go ahead with this when we're looking at tearing down so many trees.

Ms. Mahlmeister said here we have all of these apartment complexes, and now we're going to add even more to that, which is going to add to the traffic, which is going to add to the problems with the ecosystem in regards to the wetlands and the woodlands and I don't know who is monitoring that but I have seen it.

I know we can't stop progress, but we can choose to decrease the negative effects on our wetlands, the woodlands, and the road. I don't know if these plans are written in stone that there's going to be 40 units in there or if that can be cut back to address it, but we have very exclusive subdivisions in the area. One is Montebello subdivision, the other is Bellagio, which have beautiful homes which can do it but they don't have to cram 40 homes in a little area, a 9 acre area, as well as just keeping the land and decreasing the traffic.

Ms. Mahlmeister explained that Novi Road widens for a distance near the intersection,

and then it cuts off. People are constantly racing here and you can't tell me that these people who are moving here are not going to use this as a major thoroughfare to get to I-96. I don't know if they're going to expand Novi Road all the way through but we've got to do something to accommodate the traffic, let alone the noise and also to help save the woodlands and the wetlands. Thank you for your time.

Chair Pehrson asked if there was any correspondence.

Member Lynch said there is correspondence but they are from Irwin Arkin, he already has spoken here tonight.

Chair Pehrson closed the public hearing and turned it over to Planning Commission for their consideration.

Member Anthony said I feel concerned, also, in preserving the natural areas and features that we have in our City. So I hear you, but I also want to share how I look at this as we're looking at a piece of property that's difficult to develop. And I see the residential home that's over to the west side of Novi Road, so I do see that. I also see that to the north of this property is already multi-family, and that is consistent with what we have in this area.

We have an industrial commercial park that's to the east, in fact I used to work in there and over at Roethel Drive for 25 years, this is my area of town. On my motorcycle I have felt every crack in that road. But I don't think it's that this development is responsible for the fact that Novi Road needs to be improved. Novi Rd is a major thoroughfare for us, for your community – whether we go down to Northville, to Guernsey to grab ice cream, or going north up to the highway. What I do like about this is that the multi-family to the north is consistent with what is even north of that. The multi-family is quieter, actually, than the commercial industrial park that we see to the east.

Member Anthony said the thing I like about this, really the best, is the preservation of natural features that are directly on the corner. So I even go through and I line up where the home is to the west of Novi Rd where these come in and I like that across the street from that, we've preserved natural features.

It's tough, right near my neighborhood we have an area where a business is coming in and it's hard to look at these transitions and I assess it in the same way, so that where we do have a rough border with residential we maintain preservation. Where we do have the development that it's consistent with the area that's around it, and though there are a lot of exceptions and that is partly the difficulty of that corner, it's only exiting on Nine Mile Road not Novi Road, which will somewhat help on traffic. If the site is going to be developed, this is consistent with that area. And so for myself, I hear your concern and I feel those but this is the type of development that I would support.

Member Lynch said can we go back, I'd like to talk about the bullet point slide because I thought that was pretty good and it basically summarizes all of my questions about the deviations. RM-1, if they were to max out, would allow how many units?

Planner Komaragiri said I think 40 is the maxed out number of units for that site.

Member Lynch said I thought it was more for the 9 acre. I thought the RM-1 allows somewhere in the neighborhood of 50-something. Not the proposal, if it were RM-1 zoning, which it is zoned.

Mr. Anderson said based on bedroom, it goes from 5.4 to 10.9, so about 11 units per acre.

Member Lynch said so the zoning right now allows something in the neighborhood of 70 to 80 units. So it allows 70 to 80 units in the zoning that we're in right now. With the proposal, we're cutting that basically in half with 40 units. I looked at all the deviations and quite honestly when I see all of those deviations, my first thought is you've got to be kidding me and that's why I want to understand this better because I do think that this is a good project.

Now, basically to get it down to 40 and to preserve all that wetland and all that stuff in the one entry, we're just giving up the 45 degrees orientation and some setbacks, that doesn't bother me too much. So that's basically what we're looking at here, in order to decrease what could potentially be there which is 70-80 homes to 40, we're looking at varying some of the setbacks. I think that would be a reasonable trade-off, especially listening to the last homeowner concerns. But I was wondering, the taper lanes, why is that there?

Mr. Anderson said the taper length is the difference between the back of curb to your sidewalk and you have an ordinance that states that it needs to be ten feet. In our multi-family cross-sections, our back of curb to our sidewalk is 7.5, so I can only have a 7.5 foot taper. By ordinance, it has to be identified and I have to get a variance to allow for 7.5 foot driveway taper for all of these units.

Member Lynch said ok so basically you're saying you can't do it?

Mr. Anderson said I can't.

Member Lynch said it sounds like Rick and you have made some sort of progress on the landscaping and the trees and things like that.

Landscape Architect Meader said yes.

Member Lynch said so it's really not an issue anymore?

Mr. Anderson said the street trees thing is always interesting because the utilities want to be up between the sidewalk and the curb, and Rick and normal practice design want your street trees there. So if I have to be angling utilities, sometimes I have to move that street tree back so inevitably I end up with some type of variance because of the utility conflict and where we want to put our trees. And we worked back and forth with Rick and his team to say that this works for us, and it works for your DPW folks for their water and sewer and where these trees are going to be in 20 years. So it's a constant balance.

Member Lynch said I'm glad you did this because it gets everything out in the open so that the public can look at it to see why there are all these deviations. And my understanding from the presentation is that the south side of the site has the higher quality trees and you're preserving the wetland, the northern side of the site that you're developing has lower quality trees and kind of scrub-type trees.

Mr. Anderson said generally, yes. The other part is the berm, you guys require a berm everywhere and at times it won't make sense to put a berm. The lower half, like I said, we have four acres where it's kind of open and it doesn't make sense to put a berm. So we use logic when we're doing case by case analysis. By ordinance, it might need a variance to not put a berm down there, but I think we would all agree that we probably don't want a berm down there.

Member Lynch said ok this is what I wanted to get at. Because quite honestly, when I saw these variations initially when we first got the packet I went out to the site to try to understand it myself. So, really, the landscaping is not an issue, there's a reasonable reason for some of the engineering deviations so what we're being asked for, in a nutshell, is to deviate from some of the setback orientation requirements and the trade-off is that this site could be 70 or 80 units and we know that traffic, density is always an issue here in Novi.

So I'm going to make that concession for this particular project that going from the 70 or 80 down to the 40 and conceding some of the ordinance requirements – the 45 degree, some of the setbacks – based on the topography of the land. I think that makes sense and I think if we're explaining the rest of the reasons for the deviations it makes sense. Also, there is one other thing that I found odd. I've never seen this in a packet before where it specifically says "no vinyl siding." What was the reason – was there a proposal to use vinyl siding?

Planner Komaragiri said there was a proposal so we just wanted to make sure that it's clarified at the next submittal.

Member Lynch said so we know we're not using vinyl siding?

Mr. Anderson said yes.

Member Lynch said I guess those are all of my questions, I'm certainly in support of this. I think you did a good job based on the topography and the constraints that you had. I think in general this project will reduce potential traffic and will improve that particular location. I am concerned about roads and things but you're not putting an entrance out on Novi Rd, so I do like the fact that you're coming out on Nine Mile Rd. And based on the traffic in the area, I just can't see 80 units. The alternative is 80 units and I don't agree with that. So I guess I am in support of this.

Mr. Anderson said I wish I could tell you that we got here quickly but we've been working at it for almost a year.

Member Lynch said I do appreciate your patience with staff and I appreciate the thorough analysis the staff has done. I think this is a good project.

City Planner McBeth said we just want to clarify one or two things about the density questions. As you recall in the multiple-family districts, the density is partly based on the number of rooms in the units. And as the applicant has indicated, these will all be three-bedroom units. So really they're just about at that density that they would be allowed based on the size and the number of rooms in the units. If they had proposed one- and two-bedroom units, they might be able to get a few more but not close to the 80 that we're talking about.

Member Lynch said ok, so this is at the three-bedroom unit. But in RM-1, you can put the one- and two-bedroom unit?

City Planner McBeth said you can put one-bedroom with a maximum of 20% of the units being one-bedroom. Two-bedroom, you can have those as well with the three-bedroom, so the combination of all of those together doesn't seem likely that they'd get the number that you were talking about.

Member Avdoulos asked has this been presented before to the Planning Commission?

Planner Komaragiri said this is the first time it has come before Planning Commission.

Member Avdoulos said, I'm in agreement that when I see a lot of waivers I have a little bit of angst. The biggest one and I know this is a Zoning Board of Appeals item that they have to take a look at, but going from 75 feet to 27 and 75 feet to 37. So you're basically required to have 150 feet of side setback and we're providing 64. So that to me is, I know it's pushing the boundaries, but I'm not comfortable with that. I know it's a ZBA issue though.

The other thing is, we didn't have elevations to look at. And I didn't see anything in our packet, I didn't see anything referenced yet we have a façade ordinance review and that's where the question came up about vinyl siding. But in our packet, there are no exterior elevations and I don't feel comfortable approving a Preliminary Site Plan with a façade ordinance review without a façade or anything in the packet to identify what these are going to look like, because I did not know whether they were two-story, three-story. I drove by the site and I looked at the existing apartments to the north, but I couldn't picture what we were getting.

Joe Skore with Pulte Homes said yes, and these elevations don't really do it justice because these are essentially aged and ancient elevations. The elevations that we're proposing are identical to the Emerson Park elevations that were reviewed and approved and that we worked closely with staff on. But it is our fault that they weren't included.

Member Avdoulos said I'd like for them to be included. We have two new Planning Commissioners that may have not been privy to that.

Mr. Skore said that's true, that's fair.

Member Avdoulos said and it does get confusing trying to approve an entire package without all the information in there. So I'd like to see that as part of that submittal. Those are my thoughts.

Member Maday said so I'm going to trust that because I have not seen those facades that you have all seen them.

Member Avdoulos said and I don't recall them.

Member Lynch said we saw Emerson Park, but they weren't included anywhere in this.

Member Maday said but you saw Emerson Park?

Member Lynch said yes.

Member Maday said because I don't think I ever saw those. I guess I'd have to second what everyone else has said that the deviations, my head was spinning because I'm new to this. So I'm glad, technically, you explained everything because there's a lot going on. Just based on the location of the property and the type of development being proposed, there's going to be some controversy. But I look at it, I mean you're a reputable company. I'm assuming that since you've been working with the City for so long that you'll continue to do what's right for the City and continue with that relationship to make the development as best as possible.

Mr. Anderson said that's absolutely true. And again, the perimeter setbacks that are there

in this infill condition, we know what we have to the side of us and we're actually creating a 20-foot berm for landscape. We know what's to the north of us and we're comfortable and we have a retaining wall and landscaping, as well.

So we're very comfortable with this setting and again, we're excited about this product. It's a three-bedroom, two-car garage, attached product for sale. And there's not a lot of it, and we're very excited about it for Novi. But it's a little bigger and probably doesn't fit in your traditional RM space.

Member Lynch said before I make a motion, Member Avdoulos brought up a valid concern. I remember Emerson Park but we do have two new Planning Commission members who didn't have a chance to evaluate that. I could go ahead and make the motion and we could vote against because we haven't seen the architectural drawings.

City Attorney Schultz said there's a public hearing, but it relates to the woodlands and wetlands issue. The use is permitted by right, the indication in Mr. Necci's letter is that they are going to conform with the ordinance. So while the Commission could table it to see just for your information what that façade would look like, the fact that they're going to comply and that there won't be any deviations means you're not being asked for a façade waiver. So we will make sure it does comply because they're not asking for that deviation.

Member Lynch said ok, but in the future we are going to receive those elevations.

City Attorney Schultz said yes, and it should've been provided.

Member Lynch said with that, I'd like to make a motion.

Motion made by Member Lynch and seconded by Member Anthony.

ROLL CALL VOTE TO APPROVE PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER ANTHONY.

In the matter of Woodbridge Park JSP 17-67, motion to approve the Preliminary Site Plan based on and subject to the following:

- a. Landscape waiver from Sec. 5.5.5.A for not meeting the minimum requirements for length for the proposed berm along the eastern boundary to avoid conflicts with the existing fire access drive and also because the adjacent use is currently a legal non-conforming commercial use (sit-down restaurant) and not industrial. The proposed landscaping will provide significant visual screening from the existing building, which is hereby granted;**
- b. Landscape waiver from Sec. 5.5.5.A for not meeting the minimum requirements for height (6ft. to 8 ft. required due to the existing commercial use), which is hereby granted. The provided berm is approximately 3 feet above the residential building's Finished Floor Elevation and 6 feet above the neighboring property's elevation;**
- c. The applicant shall revise the landscape plans indicating the proposed berm, landscape screening and easements as shown in the exhibit shared via e-mail dated May 14, 2018;**
- d. Landscape waiver from Sec. 5.5.3.B.ii and iii for lack of berms along sections of Novi Road and Nine Mile Road in order to preserve the existing vegetation and topography, which is hereby granted;**
- e. Landscape waiver from Sec. 5.5.3.B.ii and iii for lack of greenbelt trees (deciduous canopy/large evergreen trees and sub canopy trees) along sections of Novi Road**

and Nine Mile Road in order to preserve the existing vegetation and topography, which is hereby granted;

- f. Landscape waiver from Sec. 5.5.3.F.ii.b.(1) to allow additional sub-canopy trees in lieu of deciduous canopy or large evergreen trees provided the applicant limits the percentage of proposed sub-canopy trees within 25 percent of total required canopy trees, as it will provide additional visual and species diversity to the site, which is hereby granted;
- g. Landscape waiver from Sec. 5.5.3.F.ii.b.(2) to allow placement of street trees between the sidewalk and the building as opposed to between the sidewalk and curb in areas where there are conflicts with proposed utility layout, which is hereby granted;
- h. Planning Commission waivers (staff supported) for variance from Design and Construction Standards Section 11-216(d) for 141 feet provided between same-side commercial driveways where 150 feet is required, which is hereby granted;
- i. Planning Commission waivers (staff supported) for variance from Design and Construction Standards Section 11-216(d) for 188 feet provided between opposite side commercial driveways where 200 feet is required, which is hereby granted;
- j. City Council approval of vacation of existing landscape berm easement on the property; In the event the adjacent property is redeveloped as an industrial use, the owner or developer of the adjacent property shall provide the required berm along the property line;
- k. City Council variance from Subdivision Ordinance, Appendix C, Section 4.04 for lack of secondary connection at interval exceeding one thousand three hundred (1,300) feet;
- l. City Council variance for reduction of minimum required Taper depth. (7.5 feet provided, a minimum of 10 feet is required);
- m. A Zoning Board of Appeals variance from Section 3.1.7.D to allow reduction of side setback (75 ft. required, 27 ft. provided);
- n. A Zoning Board of Appeals variance from Section 3.1.7.D to allow reduction of exterior side setback (75 ft. required, 37 ft. provided);
- o. A Zoning Board of Appeals variance from Section 3.1.7.D to allow reduction of rear setback (75 ft. required, 40 ft. provided);
- p. A Zoning Board of Appeals variance from Section 3.8.2.D for not meeting minimum building orientation requirements (45 degrees required, 0 degrees provided);
- q. The findings of compliance with Ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters and the conditions and the items listed in those letters being addressed on the Final Site Plan.

This motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Article 3, Article 4, and Article 5 of the Zoning Ordinance and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance. Motion carried 5-1 (Avdoulos).

Member Avdoulos said so when we have applicants submit, and this is just for my knowledge – I know what the answer is – if we have a site plan submitted for Preliminary Site Plan approval, we have requirements: site plans, floor plans, etc. Exterior elevations, they're not part of this. So that's the problem I'm having. Because yeah, it's going to look like whatever, but now what we're saying is that it's basically cookie-cutter. What is specific to this site? And I'm not seeing what is specific to this site. So I personally have an issue with that, and that's my comment.

Planner Komaragiri said I'm just wondering, can we provide the elevations as an FYI after the meeting in this specific case? In the future, we'll make sure they're included.

Member Avdoulos said yes, specific to what is going on this site. I've never gone through

and approved a site plan without seeing what the building is going to look like. I mean, we always comment on the building, look at the building heights, we look at everything. I trust our façade ordinance reviewer, but it's not part of the package.

Planner Komaragiri said we will definitely note that for future submittals, we'll make sure it doesn't happen again. But in this case, we can provide you with color renderings and elevations for all units after the meeting.

ROLL CALL VOTE TO APPROVE THE WETLAND PERMIT MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER ANTHONY.

In the matter of Woodbridge Park JSP 17-67, motion to approve the Wetland Permit based on and subject to the findings of compliance with Ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters, and the conditions and items listed in those letters being addressed on the Final Site Plan. This motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Chapter 12, Article V of the Code of Ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance. *Motion carried 5-1 (Avdoulos).*

ROLL CALL NOTE TO APPROVE THE WOODLAND PERMIT MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER ANTHONY.

In the matter of Woodbridge Park JSP 17-67, motion to approve the Woodland Permit based on and subject to the findings of compliance with Ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters, and the conditions and items listed in those letters being addressed on the Final Site Plan. This motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Chapter 37 of the Code of Ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance. *Motion carried 5-1 (Avdoulos).*

ROLL CALL VOTE TO APPROVE THE STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER ANTHONY.

In the matter of Woodbridge Park JSP 17-67, motion to approve the Stormwater Management Plan based on and subject to the findings of compliance with Ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters, and the conditions and items listed in those letters being addressed on the Final Site Plan. This motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Chapter 11 of the Code of Ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance. *Motion carried 5-1 (Avdoulos).*

MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION

1. MAIN STREET VILLAGE CLUBHOUSE ADDITION JSP 17-03

Consideration at the request of Singh Main Street Village I, LLC, for approval of Preliminary Site Plan and Stormwater Management Plan. The subject property is located in Section 23 south of Grand River Avenue on Main Street and is zoned TC-1, Town Center-1. The applicant is proposing an addition of 994 square feet to the existing clubhouse on site to allow for a new gym. A new dog park is also proposed. Pool renovations include addition of gazebo structures and cabana area within the rear compound of the clubhouse.

Planner Komaragiri said the existing clubhouse is located centrally in the Main Street Village development. The existing property is currently zoned Town Center 1 with RM-1 Low-Rise Multiple-Family on the east, RM-2 High-Rise Multiple-Family to the west, and I-1 Light Industrial and R-4 Single Family uses to the south. The Future Land Use Map indicates similar uses for the subject property and the surrounding properties. The current expansion

is not impacting any existing regulated natural features on site.

The applicant is proposing an addition to the existing clubhouse on site. The addition includes a 994 square foot addition to the existing 6,771 square foot two-story clubhouse to allow for a new gym. A new dog park is also proposed. Pool renovations include the addition of gazebo structures and cabana area within the rear compound of the clubhouse. This would typically qualify for an administrative approval, but the proposed improvements would require a small landscape waiver for placing the building foundation landscaping away from the building and a Section 9 Waiver for the underage of brick and overage of trim on the poolside amenities. Both of the waivers are not significant deviations and are supported by staff. The proposed expansion of the building is in conformance with the façade ordinance. The applicant has agreed to propose a minimum of two bike spaces as required by the Planning staff in the review letter.

Planner Komaragiri said the Planning Commission is asked tonight to approve the Preliminary Site Plan and Stormwater Management Plan. The applicant's representative, Todd Rankine, is here tonight if you have any questions about the project. We'll be glad to answer any questions you have for us, too. Thank you.

Todd Rankine with Singh Development Company said thank you for taking the time to hear this consideration tonight. As Sri has described, we're basically proposing a 994 square foot addition to our clubhouse. And the purpose of that is to expand our fitness center and provide some additional business areas within our existing clubhouse. We are doing this by removing the existing basketball court that is on-site, and the proposed addition would take approximately two-thirds of that and the remaining land would be used for a dog park. I'm open to any questions that you may have.

Chair Pehrson turned it over to the Planning Commission for consideration.

Member Avdoulos said I think it's a nice addition, to be honest with you. I think it blends in well, it's not that big so it's not that controversial. And then there are exterior elevations that I can look at. So with that, I will make a motion.

Motion made by Member Avdoulos and seconded by Member Anthony.

ROLL CALL VOTE TO APPROVE THE PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN MADE BY MEMBER AVDOULOS AND SECONDED BY MEMBER ANTHONY.

In the matter of Main Street Village Clubhouse Addition JSP 17-03, motion to approve the Preliminary Site Plan based on and subject to the following:

- a. Landscape waiver from Section 5.5.3.D for providing the required building foundation landscape away from the base of the building addition as the proposed alternate locations will provide greater visible benefit to users and visitors of the site, which is hereby granted;**
- b. Section 9 Façade waiver for underage of Brick (30% minimum required, 24% provided) and overage of Trim (15% maximum for Gazebos, 44% provided and 25% maximum for Pergolas, 100% provided) for the pool-side amenities as these structures are located within the interior courtyard and will not be significantly visible for public walks and roads, which is hereby granted;**
- c. Applicant shall include bike parking on the final stamping sets;**
- d. The findings of compliance with Ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters, the conditions and items listed in those letters, and with these items being addressed on the Revised Final Site Plan.**

This motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Article 3, Article 4 and Article 5 of the Zoning Ordinance and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance. *Motion carried 6-0.*

ROLL CALL VOTE TO APPROVE THE STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN MADE BY MEMBER AVDOULOS AND SECONDED BY MEMBER ANTHONY.

In the matter of Main Street Village Clubhouse Addition JSP 17-03, motion to approve the Stormwater Management Plan based on and subject to the findings of compliance with Ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters, and the conditions and items listed in those letters being addressed on the Revised Final Site Plan. This motion is made because it otherwise in compliance with Chapter 11 of the Code of Ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance. *Motion carried 6-0.*

2. APPROVAL OF THE MAY 9, 2018 PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Motion made by Member Lynch and seconded by Member Avdoulos.

ROLL CALL VOTE TO APPROVE THE MAY 9, 2018 PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER AVDOULOS.

Motion to approve the May 9, 2018 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes. Motion carried 6-0.

SUPPLEMENTAL ISSUES

There were no supplemental issues.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

There was no audience participation.

ADJOURNMENT

Moved by Member Lynch and seconded by Member Anthony.

VOICE VOTE ON THE MOTION TO ADJOURN MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER ANTHONY.

Motion to adjourn the May 23, 2018 Planning Commission meeting. Motion carried 6-0.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:21 PM.