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CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: I'd like to call
to order the September 13, 2017, Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission.

Sri, can you call the roll, please.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Good evening. Member
Anthony.
MR. GRECO: Absent.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos.
MR. AVDOULOS: Here.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco.
MR. GRECO: Here.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch.
MR. LYNCH: Here.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Here.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Zuchlewski.
MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Here.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: With that, could
we rise for the Pledge of Allegiance.
(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: I need a motion
to approve the agenda modified.
MR. AVDOULOS: Motion to approve.
MR. GRECO: Second.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a motion and a second. Anyone opposed? We have an agenda.

Previous to our first audience participation, we do have three public hearings that you're welcome to speak to at that time, but if anyone has anything that they wish to address to the Planning Commission on, other than those public hearings, please step forward.

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

Correspondence?
MR. LYNCH: Nothing at this time.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you. Any committee reports? City Planners report, Ms. McBeth.

MS. McBETH: Thank you. Good evening. I just wanted to introduce our new planning
assistant -- if you don't mind standing, Hannah -Hannah Smith, who's just started to work with us this week.

She grew up in the Novi and Northville areas and graduated from Northville High School. In April of this year, she graduated from the University of Michigan.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: From where?
MS. McBETH: University of Michigan. With a bachelor's degree in environmental studies, a minor in sustainability and a specialization in environmental policy.

She most recently worked doing environmental policy research and assisting in editing as scholarly research through the university.

Hannah has an interest in city planning, and we believe that this experience that she'll gain as planning assistant with the City of Novi will be a very good place for her to start.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Very good.
Thank you. Welcome aboard, Hannah.
That brings us to our first public
hearing and it's the City of Novi, DPS Gun Range Additions, JSP 17-42.

Hence, a public hearing at the request of NSA Architects, Engineering, Planners for approval of special land use, preliminary site plan, woodland permit, and stormwater management plan.

Subject property is located in Section 14 west Meadowbrook Road and north of Eleven Mile and is zoned $I-1$, Light Industrial.

The applicant is proposing a classroom addition of approximately 2,750 square feet at the Public Safety Gun Range and a garage addition of approximately 40,422 square feet at the Department of Public Services building.

Sri.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: The subject property
is located north of Eleven Mile Road east of Meadowbrook. It is surrounded by $I-1$ and it is zoned I-1, Light Industrial. The future land use map indicates public for the subject property. The properties to the west are Industrial Research development and technology, and to the east are
indicated as office commercial, and to the south are TC gateway. The site contains considerable woodlands and a few wetlands.

The applicant on behalf of the City of Novi is proposing to update our Department of Public Services Building and the Police Gun Range on Lee BeGole Drive. The proposed plan includes approximately 40,700 square foot of new garage for 56 heavy- and light-duty trucks, and a 2,750 square foot session classroom for about 28 students. The site amenities include additional parking, a new entrance to the gun range that can be secured separate from the DPS facilities and bioswales. There are no proposed changes to the recycling facility at this time. A municipal use in $I-1$ district require special land use permit. Hence, the public hearing today.

This site plan was reviewed as a
combined preliminary and final site plan. All reviews recommended approval for preliminary and final except for Planning, Engineering and Traffic. All three of them recommended for preliminary but not for final. Therefore, once

Planning Commission makes their decision, the applicant will be submitting a revised final to address the comments in the review letters. Planning did not recommend approval earlier as there was not sufficient justification provided for minimum required parking, among a few other comments. The applicant has provided clarifications and a community impact statement since then. Planning is currently recommending approval.

Engineering approved the preliminary site plan and is in general agreement with the stormwater design. The applicant will submit a revised final as the previous submittal did not include the level of detail that is required for final engineering.

Landscape review noted that two waivers that are needed for absence of wall or berm adjacent to the freeway right-of-way, and for lack of street trees along Lee BeGole Drive. Landscape recommends approval with items to be addressed with electronic stamping sets.

A traffic study was not required by
the consultant as the number of trips will not increase with the proposed modifications to the site as the proposed building expansion is to primarily store City maintenance vehicles and will not ne adding any more addition traffic of the general public. The plan is in general conformance with ordinance requirements. However, traffic did not recommend approval for the final site plans as detail plans were not provided, but they are approving the preliminary.

The current plan indicates one relatively small area of impact to City-regulated wetlands and 25-foot wetland setback/buffers. The impact to this small emergent wetland is point . 03 acres is for the construction of the proposed Firearms Training Center building addition. Additional wetland areas are located on this site, including in the northwest, west and east portions of the site. A total of 81 trees are proposed to be removed that would require 120 replacements all of which are proposed to be planted on-site.

Facade review noted that the minimum percentage of brick is not provided on the south
and east facades, the percentage of painted brick and flat metal exceeds the maximum amount allowed by the ordinance on the south and east facades, and the percentage of fiber cement siding exceeds the maximum amount allowed by the ordinance on the south and west facades. A Section 9 waiver is required for these deviations and are supported by our facade consultant.

Fire is recommending approval with additional items to be addressed with electronic stamping sets.

The Planning Commission is asked tonight to hold the public hearing concerning approval of the special land use, preliminary site plan, woodland permit and stormwater management plan. The Planning Commission should consider the specific factors listed in 6.1.2.C for conformance with special land use conditions.

The applicant, staff, and consultants are here to answer any questions you may have regarding the project.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, Sri, appreciate it.

Anyone from the City wish to address the Planning Commission?

MR. PETTY: Good evening, Planning Commission members. My name is Rob Petty, I'm the CIO for the City of Novi.

We were tasked with a couple items on this building and it's a long time coming up for it. One was to bring all of our vehicles inhouse, heavy duty and light duty, to extend the investment that we've made in those vehicles.

We also were tasked with upgrading the locker room facility and the restroom facility within the building, and creating a workflow environment in the office area that better serves the citizens.

In addition, we have added the component to the gun range. This is just a classroom, along with the necessary restrooms that would go along with that and a small kitchenette. We are here with Frank Ray from NSA and we will standby for any of your questions.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, Mr. Petty, appreciate that.

This is a public hearing. If there's anyone in the audience who wishes to address the Planning Commission at this time, please step forward.

Seeing no one, we'll close that portion, and I think we have some correspondence.

MR. LYNCH: Yes, we do. The first one is an objection, and this is from JFK Investment Company, and it's so light I can't read it, but we'll put it into the public record.

The next one is a support by Floyd Peterson, 42525 W. Eleven Mile Road, Novi.

The next one is a support from Kevin Stolzenfeld, 26200 Town Center Drive. Apparently he's with the same company, JFK Investment, so we have one opposed and one for from the same company.

And that's the last one, that's basically it.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you. With that, we'll close the public hearing on this matter and turn it over to the Planning Commission for their consideration.

Member Zuchlewski.
MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Just a question for
Rob.
Rob, I think you mentioned that the addition here is purely a classroom and supportive restroom services; is that right?

MR. PETTY: To the police gun range, that is correct. Is your question in regards to the comments that were just read into the record?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Well, the comment really was just for clarification, because originally I had heard and thought that there was going to be an addition to the gun range also as far as the number of lanes, if you will, but that's not happening?

MR. PETTY: That is not happening.
MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: And I just wanted to clarify that.

MR. PETTY: You are correct.
MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Because there were some comments about additional noise and a lot of additional traffic and all that sort of thing. So it's just a classroom and restroom?

MR. PETTY: Right, and Mr. Valarde went out and visited one of the neighboring businesses and clarified that with them. That may be the reason you have one opposed and one for.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Thank you.
MR. PETTY: You're welcome.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you. Member Lynch.

MR. LYNCH: Am I correct, we're just approving the preliminary site plan along with the special land use permit?

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Yes, request special
land use for the public building in the $\mathrm{I}-1$ district.

MR. LYNCH: Okay, but we're not approving the final?

MS. KOMARAGIRI: No.
MR. LYNCH: Second, to the City. You're also putting in a locker room to this? Well, you've got a classroom.

MR. PETTY: There's not a locker room, there's a storage area for their -- I call it their gun video game equipment, but FIPS, I
believe, is the proper term.
MR. LYNCH: Okay. So we're not going
to build another Vic Tanny?
MR. PETTY: No, not at all.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.
Member Greco.
MR. GRECO: All right. I've had a chance to review this. I don't have any additions with the addition of the gun range, and with that, I'd like to make a motion.

In the matter of the City of Novi, DPS Gun Range Additions, JSP 17-42, motion to approve the special land use permit based on the following findings: Relative to other feasible uses for the items set forth in A through $G$ and the motion sheet, and 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.

MR. AVDOULOS: I second.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a motion by Member Greco, second by Member Lynch.

Are there any other comments?
Sri, can you call the roll, please.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Thank you. Member
Avdoulos.

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco.
MR. GRECO: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch.
MR. LYNCH: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Zuchlewski.
MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes 5 to 0.
MR. GRECO: I'd like to make another motion.

In the matter of the City of Novi, DPS Gun Range Addition, JSP 17-42, motion to approve the preliminary site plan based on and subject to the items listed in A through $F$ of the motion sheet, and G, and because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Article 3, Article 4, and Article 5 of the Zoning Ordinance and all other applicable
provisions of the ordinance.
MR. AVDOULOS: Second.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a motion by Member Greco, second by Member Avdoulos.

Any other comments?
Sri, please.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Thank you. Member Lynch.

MR. LYNCH: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Zuchlewski.
MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos.
MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.
MR. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco.
MR. GRECO: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes 5 to 0.
MR. GRECO: I would like to make another motion. In the matter of City of Novi, DPS Gun Range Additions, JSP 17-42, motion to approve the woodland permit based on and subject to the findings of compliance with ordinance
standards and staff and consultant review letters and the condition and items listed in those letters being addressed on the revised final site plan, and because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Chapter 37 of the Code of Ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the ordinance.

MR. AVDOULOS: Second.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a motion by Member Greco, second by Member Avdoulos.

Any other comments?
Sri, please.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Thank you.
Chair Pehrson.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Zuchlewski.
MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos.
MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco.
MR. GRECO: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch.
MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes 5 to 0 . MR. GRECO: And finally, in the matter of City of Novi, DPS Gun Range Additions, JSP 17-42, motion to approve the stormwater management plan based on and subject to the findings of compliance with ordinance standards and the staff and consultant review letters and the conditions and items listed in those letters being addressed in the revised final site plan, and because it is otherwise in compliance with Chapter 11 of the Code of Ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the ordinance.

MR. AVDOULOS: Second.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a motion by Member Greco, second by Member Avdoulos.

Any other comments?
Sri, please.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Zuchlewski.
MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos.
MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco.
MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch.
MR. LYNCH: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes 5 to 0. CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: All set. Thank you, gentlemen.

Item No. 2 is Feldman Automotive, JSP 16-31, and it's the public hearing at the request of Feldman Automotive for Planning Commission's approval for special land use, preliminary site plan, wetland permit, woodland permit, and stormwater management plan.

The subject property has split zoning of $\mathrm{P}-1$ Vehicular Parking on the south and $B-3$ General Business to the north and is located in Section 23 on the south side of Grand River Avenue between Novi Road and Meadowbrook Road.

The subject property is approximately
1.67 acres and the applicant is proposing to improve the parcel for parking for sale of new, unlicensed motor vehicles and outdoor space for exclusive sale of new and used automobiles.
tell you a little bit about this.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you. MS. McBETH: The subject property is located on the south side of Grand River between Novi Road and Meadowbrook Road in Section 23 consisting of about 1.67 acres.

The current zoning is split between P-1 Parking to the south and B-3 General Business to the north. The future land use map indicates TC Gateway for the subject property, multiple family to the south, TC Gateway to the east and north of Grand River Avenue, and TC commercial to the west.

The natural features map shows that the property has 0.07 acres of wetlands and 87 regulated woodland trees on the site.

The Planning Commission may remember that this matter was brought before the Planning Commission at two previous meetings. One year ago a request for rezoning was considered for . 9 acre of the 1.67 acre site to rezone from RM-1 LowDensity Multiple Family to P-1 Vehicular Parking.

The request was approved by the City Council last October. The rezoning was not a PRO, Planned Rezoning Overlay. Therefore, the applicant was not bound to develop a specific plan.

Last December the Planning Commission held a public hearing for a site plan for special land use request to allow the applicant to store new, unlicensed vehicles in the $P-1$ and $B-3$ zoning districts. At the meeting last December the applicant requested that the Planning Commission hold a public hearing, but hold off on making a decision regarding the special land use until further changes could be made to the site plan to respond to the comments in the review letters. The Planning Commission agreed with that request and postponed the matter, the decision, at that time.

The applicant has now submitted a revised site plan seeking to address the prior comments of Planning and Landscaping. Updated review letters were prepared for Planning, Landscaping and Fire with all reviewers now recommending approval subject to Planning

Commission waivers for certain standards and one Zoning Board of Appeals variance.

Additionally, a public hearing has been scheduled for the requested special land use seeking approval for the parking for the sale of new, unlicensed motor vehicles and parking of licensed, rental and loaner motor vehicles.

Planning staff recommends approval of the special land use and site plan with favorable recommendations for the waiver from the requirement to provide a noise impact statement. Staff is also in favor of the requirement for a waiver of the full height of the required 10-foot berm adjacent to the southwest and west property lines due to the irregular shape of the lot and lack of available space, a partial berm is provided there.

Landscaping recommends approval subject to the following three Planning Commission waivers:

First, a waiver for the lack of a berm along Grand River.

Second, a waiver for the lack of
street trees along Grand River.
And third, a waiver for parking lot perimeter canopy trees.

Wetlands recommends approval and notes that the plan proposes to fill a small wetland and the associated 25-foot wetland setback in its entirety to accommodate the parking lot addition. This includes the filling of Wetland A with an area of 0.07 acres as well as the wetland buffer consisting of about. 18 of an acre.

Woodlands recommends approval and notes that most of the existing woodland trees would need to be removed to accommodate the proposed parking lot improvements. 83 of the existing 87 regulated trees are proposed to be removed requiring a total of 116 replacement trees. 30 trees are proposed to be replaced on site and another 86 trees would be paid into the City's Tree Fund.

Engineering, Traffic and Fire -- I'm sorry, Engineering, Traffic Engineering and Fire recommend approve with additional items to be addressed at the time of final site plan review.

The Planning Commission is asked tonight to consider the request for site plan and special land use approval. The applicant is present and available to add comments or answer questions. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, appreciate that.

Does the applicant wish to address the Planning Commission at this time?

MS. DALLON: Good evening, my name is Shiloh Dallon, I'm with Alpine Engineering, we're the civil engineer and surveyor for the project, and I am here with Don Valley from Feldman Automotive. We will be here if you guys have any questions.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.
This is a public hearing. Is there anyone in the audience who wishes to address the Planning Commission on this matter?

Any correspondence?
MR. LYNCH: No.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: With that, we'll
close the public hearing and turn it over to the

Planning Commission for your consideration.
Who would like to start?
Member Avdoulos.
MR. AVDOULOS: Personally, I have no objections to this and I will give my approval on any motion that's provided.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Member Greco. MR. GRECO: We've had a couple of hearings on this and I think the applicant has sufficiently satisfied the Planning Commission and the City on the requirements and I think we dealt with some neighbors on a previous one.

With that, I'd like to make a motion in the matter of Feldman Automotive, JSP 16-31, motion to approve the special land use permit, based on the following findings listed in A with the bullet points and in the motion sheet and 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.

MR. AVDOULOS: Second.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a motion
by Member Greco and a second by Member Avdoulos. Any other comments?

Sri, please.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Thank you.
Member Lynch.
MR. LYNCH: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Zuchlewski.
MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos.
MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco.
MR. GRECO: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes 5 to 0 .
MR. GRECO: Next motion. In the
matter of Feldman Automotive, JSP 16-31, motion to approve the preliminary site plan based on and subject to the items listed in the motion sheet $A$ through $F$, and because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Article 3, Article 4, and Article 5 of the Zoning Ordinance and all other applicable provisions of the ordinance.

MR. LYNCH: Second.

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

Sri, would you call the roll, please.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos.
MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco.

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch.
MR. LYNCH: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Zuchlewski.
MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes 5 to 0 .
MR. GRECO: All right. Next, in the
matter of Feldman Automotive, JSP 16-31, motion to approve the wetland permit based on and subject to the findings of compliance with ordinance standards and the staff and consultant review letters and the conditions in items listed in those letters being addressed on the final site
plan, and because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Chapter 12, Article 5 of the Code of Ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the ordinance.

MR. AVDOULOS: Second.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a tie,
but I heard Greco make the first and Avdoulos, and then just a little bit before Lynch.

Call the roll.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: I'm confused.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Member Greco and Avdoulos.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Okay, thank you.
Chair Pehrson.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Zuchlewski.
MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos.
MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco.
MR. GRECO: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch.
MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes 5 to 0 . MR. GRECO: Next, in the matter of

Feldman Automotive, JSP 16-31, motion to approve the woodland permit based on and subject to the findings of compliance with ordinance standards and the staff and consultant review letters and the conditions in items listed in those letters being addressed on the final site plan, and because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Chapter 37 of the Code of Ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the ordinance.

MR. AVDOULOS: Second.

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

Sri, please.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch.
MR. LYNCH: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Zuchlewski.
MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos.

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco.
MR. GRECO: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes 5 to 0 .
MR. GRECO: All right. Finally, in
the matter of Feldman Automotive, JSP 16-31,
motion to approve the stormwater management plan based on and subject to the findings of compliance with ordinance standards and the staff and consultant review letters and the conditions in items listed in those letters being addressed on the final site plan, and because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Chapter 11 of the Code of Ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the ordinance.

MR. AVDOULOS: Second.

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

Sri, please.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Zuchlewski.
MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos.
MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco.
MR. GRECO: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch.
MR. LYNCH: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes 5 to 0 . CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

Thank you very much.
Item Number 3 is Villa D'Este, JSP 17-52, with rezoning 18.7.18.

This public hearing is at the request of Cambridge of Novi, LLC for Planning Commission's recommendation to City Council for a phased rezoning overlay concept plan associated with the zoning map amendment to rezone from RA, Residential Acreage, to R-1, One-Family Residential.

Subject property is approximately 49 acres and is located east of Napier Road on the north side of Nine Mile, Section 29 and 30. The applicant's proposing a 53 unit single-family ranch housing development.

Sri, please.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Thank you. I'd like to start with a note.

CHAIRPERSON: Sure.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: We were notified by a resident about an error in the public hearing notice. The project boundary that is proposed to be rezoned included three tax map parcel IDs on the submitted plan. It turns out the public hearing notice that was published also referred to those three.

It turns out there's this little strip of land that actually belongs to a fourth parcel that was left out of the notice.

Staff requests the Planning Commission to hold the public hearing today, but to postpone the decision to another public hearing possibly on October 11.

I would like to provide a brief overview of the project to provide background for the public who are here today and for the Commission.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: So there will be
no decision made today, we'll hold the meeting later on. Very good. Thank you, Sri.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: The subject
properties all totaled together total about 49 acres and they're located east of Napier Road and north of Nine Mile. They're currently zoned residential acreage, RA. The applicant is requesting to rezone from residential acreage to R-1, one-family residential, utilizing the City's planned rezoning overlay to provide additional density on-site. The future land use map recommends a maximum of .8 dwelling units per acre for the proposed project area.

The concept plan proposes ranch-style condos in a general condominium development that is targeted towards empty nesters. The request was presented to Master Planning and Zoning Committee on August 23 rd as it is not consistent with the recommended maximum density permitted on the future land use which is .8. The density that is bring proposed is 1.42.

The PRO concept plan currently proposes 53 units, one boulevard access point is
proposed off of Nine Mile Road. An emergency access road is proposed off of the proposed cul-de-sac to Nine Mile Road. The concept plan also proposes community amenities: A swimming pool, lawn bowling, dog walking area and outdoor kitchenette, et cetera. The development is proposed to be built in two phases.

The applicant is requesting an increase of . 62 dwelling units per acre, about 78 percent more than the maximum allowed density for RA. The maximum density proposed is 14 percent less than the maximum allowed for $R-1$, which is 1.65.

The concept plan proposes a development which can be reviewed against either single-family development as it proposes individual units or multifamily as the layout aligns with a multifamily development with minimum setbacks and common areas. At the time of pre-application meeting, staff recommended R-1 would be more suitable rezoning category because it is surrounded by low-density residential development and $\mathrm{R}-1$ would be more compatible with
the surrounding zoning. It proposes single-family detached units targeted for elderly who wish to downsize from larger houses. It aligns with our current master plan goals -- one of our current master plan goals. The extent of deviations required from $R$-1 standards will be significantly lower than those required from RM-1.

The current plan notes that 9.98 acres of the 33.7 acres of the regulated woodlands located on-site will be impacted, which means about 29 percent are proposed to be impacted. The proposed impacts to individual trees have not been described or quantified with the current submittal. It proposes a total impact of . 07 acres to the wetlands and .23 acres of impacts to the wetland buffer area.

The concept plan also proposes -currently is proposing to connect to the proposed city sewer project. The City does not have a set timeline for the construction of this public sewer line. In the event that the City's project is not available, is not completed, prior to the approval of the final site plan, the applicant has
recommended to consider an alternative option for sewer collection. Traffic review did not identify any significant impacts to the traffic patterns. A traffic study was provided. All reviews except planning, wetlands and woodlands are currently recommending approval.

The applicant offered several public benefits, one of which is a donation of approximately 18 acres of land in the north end part of the site, which is a significant one. The applicant also proposed to provide a comfort station on the southeast corner of the property up to a maximum value of $\$ 200,000$. While it is an appropriate benefit for that location, if City Parks is successful on their ongoing efforts to acquire a location nearby down Garfield south of Nine Mile, we may have to find an alternate benefit instead of this. Some of the other benefits are not feasible or would require coordination with other agencies. Applicant has suggested to work with the staff to further redefine them.

> Staff has asked the applicant to
revise the concept plan to address the following with the revised submittal: Maybe density can be reduced to provide wider setbacks between units; units can be clustered more definitely to provide additional open space at multiple locations in addition to the clubhouse amenities provided; to modify the layout to minimize impacts to the regulated woodlands; and quantify the proposed impacts to the trees by providing a tree survey. Staff was also unable to determine the deviations required from our own standards due to the nature of the layout. The applicant was requested to provide more information and clarifications to identify those deviations required. Applicant has recently submitted a revised concept plan for staff's review. Staff did not get a chance to complete the review prior to the meeting. The response letter provided in the packet, however, corresponds to the revised submittal.

The applicant, Mark Guidobono, is here tonight with his team if you have any questions for him or his team. As mentioned earlier, the

Planning Commission is requested to hold a public hearing tonight, but postpone the decision to October 11th where another public hearing will be held and advertised so that to allow time for staff to advertise correctly and to review the revised submittal. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, Sri.
Would the applicant wish to address the Planning Commission at this time?

MR. GUIDOBONO: Good evening, my name is Mark Guidobono. I've been a Novi resident for 14 years. I live in Bellagio. I have lived in this area for over 30 years and I am owner of Cambridge Homes. I've been in business for over 37 years.

Two of the projects that most of you are familiar with that $I$ developed in Novi are Bellagio and Tuscany Reserve, two communities that are well regarded in the area.

Sri, none of those buttons are working here.
(Adjustment to projection equipment.)
MR. GUIDOBONO: Okay. And then on the
screen we show the property highlighted in the blue line right there in the center of the area concept plan. And just identifying some of the parcels around there, the City of Novi owns quite a bit of parkland. They own this piece here, they own this piece here, and they own this piece over here. And the City, it is my understanding, they're in the process of purchasing this piece and this piece here as well.

Directly to the north of our parcel, this piece right here is the Links of Novi currently zoned $R-1$. There was a proposal for a development back ten years ago, and with that proposal that developer was proposing on donating this land to the City, and I would expect some day that proposal will come back up again.

With our proposal, we are proposing to donate this 18 acres here which will allow the City to connect their two parkland areas there. Also notable on this plan is the ITC transmission lines which abut our eastern boundary right there, and it's also the location for the ITC trail that is being put in over time at the City.

Previous to us getting control of this property, the previous developer was proposing this single-family plan right here, 40
single-family units called Mercado. We did talk to that particular developer on the possibility of buying this project. I liked it at the time, and my wife looked at it and she told me, "Mark, I see empty-nester units there. I don't see single-family at this location, I see empty-nester units." And my first reaction was over a RA zoned area, empty nesters are just -- I kind of, you know, I don't want to say ignored it, but I said okay. And she brought that up to me probably -and she didn't bug me about it, she handled it very well, but she brought that up to me a few more times and said, "I really see empty-nester idea."

So I decided to look into that idea, and the more $I$ looked into the empty nester idea, the more it made sense to me compared to the single-family development. So the more I studied it and we came up with a plan that $I$ think is very special and has a lot of benefits compared to a
single-family development at this location.
The plan we're calling the project Villa D'Este. And what I like about this plan is we're -- these are mainly ranch homes and story and a half homes, they're geared toward the empty-nester community, and what we've done is put them closer together which allows us to preserve a lot of the natural features that this site has. It's a special site. It's really a beautiful site.

Well, this plan 58 and a half percent of this site would be considered open space with this plan, and a third of these units are walkouts, a third of these are daylights, and a third of these are on flat sites, and you can see a majority of these units all back up to the woods. They all back up to the woods so it makes them very, very private and a very quiet setting, and we're able to preserve a lot more of the natural features of this site.

What I like about this also is that it has the potential to be more special than Bellagio or Tuscany Reserve, and those are two very special
communities in Novi that $I$ think we -- hopefully we all like those communities, but I think this even has the potential to be more special than that because there's really nothing like this that I can see in Novi or even in Oakland County. I mean where could you go and look out your back door and you feel like you're up in northern Michigan and yet you're a couple miles away from some great shopping, great restaurants, great medical facility, and you're close to your kids or your family, you're able to -- you've got an option or an opportunity to stay in the community you live in when you want to downsize because you're in a larger house. And where do you go today? And there aren't a lot of opportunities right now in Novi.

Some people like to live in downtowns, some people like to go the budget route, and some people just like peace and quiet, and that's what this site offers, a lot of piece and quiet.

I think it's important that we keep the rural feeling. This is a rural area, Nine Mile Road, okay, it's been rural and it has that
feeling. And the way this is set up I believe it will keep that feeling because the way we've set this up, the visual is not to see any units from the road, okay. You won't be able to see any units from the west side off of Nine Mile and on the east side, of course we have those transmission lines, but with our plan, and we'll get into that more when we give our full presentation, we're planning on putting berms and landscaping to totally encase this so it's almost like a hidden place. The only thing you'll really be able to see is the entrance. That's the objective with this because we do want to maintain the integrity of the area and keep the rural feeling that we have at that location.

Also, this site will be built to the types of standards that we have done in the past, and I think everybody can see what we've done with Bellagio and Tuscany Reserve.

Some of the amenities that we're going to put is going to be resort quality. We're going to be put a pool in, we're going to put a hot tub in, maybe a fire pit, and create some sort of a
lanai in an area to grill. This is something that the residents could use that live here, and this would be great for the grand kids. They could come over, have a birthday party and we've got a spot to hang out besides the house. We've got a place to go swimming, we've got a place to barbecue, and it's all right there for you, and it would be done to the highest standards.

Next I'd like to introduce Carmine Avantini with CIB Planning to talk about zoning, then I'll come back.

MR. AVANTINI: Thanks, Mark. Good evening, Carmen Avantini of CIB Planning, 17195 Silver Parkway, Fenton, Michigan, and just a little background.

The reason I'm talking about senior
housing in particular is that my firm is the lead consulting firm for MEDC and the redevelopment ready communities program of which the City is applying to become certified and is going through that process. And one of the other things that I do for that program is I do the training of two of the modules, and to be a part of the -- to be
certified, you have to send representatives to the training. And I teach the session on zoning and on development review process, and the things that I focus on in that session are things like streamlining ordinances and your project reviews to make sure that they go through in a more efficient fashion, which I know from a recent article $I$ saw that the City is really concerned about that and is doing a nice job of moving in that direction. The other thing is to be able to encourage new types of development while maintaining the quality level that the community is looking for.

Actually here is -- if you look at this, this is from the training that $I$ do, and the diagram there is actually found in your master plan also. And what I talk about is how there's such a shortage of certain types of housing, and this is across the country, it's not just here, it's called middle housing, missing middle housing.

For decades our ordinances have supported and we have developed two types of
housing, basically: Large lot, and what I mean large lot $I$ mean they don't have to be huge, but large lot, single-family, detached residential, and multiple-family residential, and our ordinances have supported that.

Well, now not only do we have baby boomers who are aging, but we also have millennials who don't necessarily want to live in the traditional single-family housing that we've become accustomed to. So we have this shortage and it's going to be a growing shortage of middle housing.

In fact, if you look at the City of Novi, half of all your housing units here are single-family, detached residential units on what we'd consider large lot residential. So you've got a pretty large population of folks who are going to be looking for alternate housing types if they want to stay in the community.

Your master plan, you've done a really nice job with your master plan. You've addressed empty nesters, you've addressed the need to be able to provide for different types of housing.

Here's a couple of examples here. You said that you've estimated 50 to 60 percent of the new units will be oriented towards active adults, and you've also indicated that six out of ten people in this group generally desire smaller units than are typical of Novi at the present time, many of which would be single-family units with small or zero lots. So once again it works its way into your action plan. You've done a real nice job of addressing the need and the desire to be able to accommodate different types of empty-nester housing similar to the one and including the one that we're talking about tonight.

Now, the one thing that I did notice in the master plan, there seems to be an emphasis on concentrating the empty-nester units, and I hate to call it urban because it's really not urban, but when you're talking about like the Town Center area and Grand River, and locations where you're in close proximity to like the shopping center and other community facilities, those are what I call more urban housing types.

As Mark indicated, though, that not
all of the Novi residents are going to want to look to be in what we call urban locations. There are some folks who are used to the peace and quiet of large lot neighborhoods and they're going to want to locate in different housing types into quieter more rural settings.

So what we're discussing tonight is being able to offer that empty-nester housing in a different location than might have already been identified. And the thing is if we don't provide different types of housing like this, then you're giving those folks the only option they're going to have is to move out of the community.

And you're not the only ones facing this, communities all across the country are facing this, so this not a unique situation, but at least you've done a great job of addressing it in your master plan.

Now when you jump over to zoning which reflects what you have in your master plan, there are really a couple ways of handling empty-nester housing like this. Some communities go to specific districts identified for this type of
housing, others use things like foreign-base codes or conditional uses. Here you've decided to use a flexible overlay district. In this case, it's the PRO district. It's similar in some respects to maybe a plan unit development or another way of handling it is an overlay with design standards.

The challenge we're having here is because it's an overlay and we're working with your existing zoning districts, you have to pick one that you fit into, we're either picking large lot single family and doing an overlay or picking multiple family and doing an overlay. So what that does is it brings challenges with it because this type of a project does not neatly fit into either one of those zoning districts or zoning categories even though it's a type of use that you've identified in your master plan.

So the way you deal with it in your ordinance, in the PRO ordinance is you have deviations, I call them waivers, they're basically the same thing. But what that does is gives you the ability to provide flexibility and it can lead to higher quality, as Mark indicated with his
current development in Bellagio, and it can lead to higher quality development than you get under the current zoning districts.

Now, the challenge we've got on here is there's a natural tendency when you say deviation or waiver to consider that to be the same thing as a variance, and they're two very different things, okay. A variance is where you're departing from the requirements of the ordinance, you're not meeting the requirements of the ordinance, but there's something very unique and special about that property that's different than all the other properties around it that you have to grant some level of relief. This is very different than that.

A waiver or a deviation basically says that we're going to use this as a flexible tool to come up with a different type of quality development, okay. It's not something that's necessarily bad or you try to chase away. It's a tool that you use to be able to come up with, in this case, an empty-nester project. And you're going to necessarily have with this PRO, you're
going to necessarily have a number of waivers or deviations in order to accomplish what we're looking to accomplish. If not, then it basically takes away the creativity that you have with this tool with the PRO ordinance and requires the project to just be another R-1 type development, and that's not what we're looking for here. So I just want to make sure that we're clear on that because, once again, there is a negative connotation sometimes associated with waivers and deviations when, in fact, they're not. It's very different than a variance and it's not something that necessarily is harmful to the community, it's actually a positive thing.

So with that, I'm going to turn it back over to Mark. He's going to talk about some of the features of the houses.

MR. GUIDOBONO: On the screen here, is an example of an elevation. One of the things that is different about this community is the houses are going to look different. It's not going to be one color brick and you can't tell which house is yours type of community. Each
house is going to have its own identity. We're going to use all masonry on the outside, a combination of stone and brick.

This home here on the screen, it could be a ranch home, it also could be a story and a half, the story and a half where you could have rooms under roof in this area here, and you see that dormer which will allow you to have a bedroom, for instance, at that area, so that could be a story and a half or a ranch. The nice thing about it is the consumer will be able to personalize the elevation just like they did in Bellagio or Tuscany. Same with the floor plan; they will be able to pick between a two- or a three-car garage. They can do sun rooms. They can do different amounts of bedrooms, anywheres from one to five, whatever they want, really. And the plan up there is 2500 square feet, a little over, without the lanai in the back. It's a very open concept there, but again the flexibility is one of the things that made Bellagio special, Tuscany special. It will help to make this project special as well.

Here is an example of two great rooms.
This could be done in these homes. People alike don't need the square footage but they like the feeling of space, and one way to do that is to increase ceiling heights. You could go from 10 foot to 12 foot flat or 14 foot or you could do some cathedrals, but this is a very open concept in a great room, two different concepts.

Here's a couple of kitchens, one a 10foot ceiling, one a 12; white's been popular lately with the consumer.

Here's another kitchen, transitional style, clean lines. We're seeing a lot of that today. That seems to be very popular right now.

Here's a couple different styles of bedrooms, typically the master. It doesn't have to be, but the model that I did show earlier had the master in the back, all glass in the back because you have that beautiful view of that beautiful woodland behind the home.

And here is -- this picture kind of depicts that floor plan. The consumer today likes the kitchen open to the great room. So you can
see the kitchen to the left. There it's facing the great room, you've got about 12-foot flat ceilings here. So you've got the kitchen, you've got the great room, and then the great room overlooks the open space behind you, so you've got all glass there, and you might have a screened-in porch or you could have a sun room, or you just have a deck off the back, but this kind of depicts the floor plan that I showed you on that first slide.

Here's an example of a screened-in porch. You can just do a deck, you can do a deck with a lanai. You could do the screened-in porch which I would recommend because you're in the woods and at night the mosquitos come out, or you could turn this into a sun room, you can have the fireplace grate at night, sit there and have a glass of wine and relax.

This is a community that if we are approved, it's a place $I$ intend to move. It's a place I believe many residents in Novi would be very interested. Quite a few have expressed interest in moving here.

We believe this addresses the goals of the master plan. We believe this is a more environmentally-friendly approach to developing this site than large lot single family. It's well known that empty nesters create half the traffic that single families do because of the kids and the schools and all that that goes with it. We are offering significant community benefits that we'll get into at the next meeting. We believe this will be a high-end award-winning development that the City will be very proud of.

And then the last picture, $I$ just put this up there for my wife, she didn't want me to do it, but she was the one that kind of got me off the single family and I believe she was right. And this picture was actually taken at Villa D'Este. I took her to Italy for her birthday three years ago, and Villa D'Este is a home that was built for a pope back in the 1500s, and in the 1800s it was converted to a hotel that's on Lake Como in Italy. It's a beautiful place. They have beautiful gardens. So if you ever get a chance to get there, I would recommend it. And that
concludes our report.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.
Turn it to the public. If there's anyone in the audience who wishes to address the Planning Commission at this time, please step forward. You'll have three minutes to make your comments. Also realize that we will have another public hearing in October.

Anyone wish to address the Planning Commission?

MR. MIGRIN: Start the timer. My name is Karl Migrin, I live at 49 -- that's K-a-r-l, M-i-g-r-i-n as in my smile -- I live at 49450 Nine Mile Road. I'm the house that is right at Nine Mile and then you look at the Villa D'Este home behind me and then you see the woodlands.

I object to this proposed development and the zoning amendment map for the following reasons: The proposed land use includes a development of 53 senior detached homes with 15foot side yard setbacks. This community would be age restricted to homeowners that are 55 and older. It will be targeted specifically for the
active adult empty nester.
The 2016 Novi Master Plan for land use has recently been updated and approved and identifies four areas in the City: City West, Town Center West, Grand River Corridor, and Pavilion Shores Village as empty-nester housing communities.

The majority of the existing homes in Sections 29, 20, 31, and 32 are single-family homes built on 1 -plus acre properties, and condominiums built 15 feet apart are too dissimilar to fit in this area.

Second, the subject property parcel next to me, 49550 West Nine Mile, is missing from the City of Novi planning. The hearing notice is incorrectly displayed on the developer's concept plan. Until a strip of land is split from its parent parcel, developer cannot complete the Villa D'Este Drive roadway or complete the number of housing units shown in their proposal because this strap of land would cut across his roadway, okay. Third, all wildlife residing in the wooded wetlands surrounding the proposed
development would be adversely effected by any disturbance of the core wildlife reserve in Sections 29, 30, 31, and 32. The core reserve is home to several Cooper's hawk, which are a protected species of bird throughout the United States. An excerpt from the 1993 City of Novi Wildlife Habitat Plan states that this core reserve could not sustain any intrusive human intervention without some loss of diversity and quality. Intensive intrusion or development in this area would reduce the chances of the presence of interior sensitive species.

And lastly, all three subject parcels
could still be developed under existing residential acreage zoning, and a fair and reasonable concept plan would require developer to improve Garfield Road for 1,275 feet with highwaygrade asphalt and improve Nine Mile for 2,400 feet, estimated, with higher-grade asphalt also. This section of Garfield is presently chip sealed and will not support the additional traffic generated when developing these parcels. Chip seal is a service topping, is not considered
a pavement.
I think I made my three minutes.
Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.
MR. JEROME: My name is David Jerome, I'm appearing on behalf my friend and client Robert Henry Lamp. You know him as Hank. You see him back there in the wheelchair.

Hank owns the property at 49300 W. Nine Mile. It's part of the parcel. We are highly in favor, Hank is highly in favor of this. This is a property that he's lived on all of his life. He was born there. He thinks that this development is probably the best use that they can possible have for it.

The property has been on the market since 2005 with nobody interested in it except for the prior developer who fell through and this current developer. Hank is now transitioning into assisted living and this whole thing would be beneficial to him.

From a personal standpoint, based upon the example that Mark gave, this is what my wife
and I are looking for, okay. I don't want to call it empty nesters, maybe active elders. I'm not sure what the right word is, okay, but we highly endorse and support the program. Thank you. CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you. MS. HUDSON: Good evening, my name is Sue Hudson, I live on 22111 Garfield Road. I am a neighbor around the corner from this parcel. I just heard about this yesterday that this is even taking place.

First off, I do think there is a need for active elders or whatever you want to call them. However, at the price break that he's talking about I'm not sure how many of the retired elders could afford it.

I do have concerns in regards to the traffic. As you know, northbound Beck has been closed for all summer and so that traffic has got to go somewhere. I will laud the City of Novi Police Department for policing our 25-mile-an-hour road, and I'm sure they've gained a lot in revenue this summer because of the diverted traffic to that road. And so $I$ don't know when the traffic
study was done, but with the addition of the Ten Mile and Napier Road intersection being closed, there's been a lot of traffic on Nine Mile. I've lived there 25 years, and one morning I was going to leave to go to work and waited five minutes to be able to pull out into traffic on Nine Mile and Garfield. So I'm really concerned about your traffic study.

I realize the elderly will not be traveling as much as somebody with family, but Nine Mile needs to be looked at because every subdivision is put in there is increasing more and more traffic and somebody is going to get hurt. That is my concern. If you look at Nine Mile, there's a big curve there, there's a lot of trees. You can't see somebody coming around at 50 miles an hour, and believe me they do, okay, even though the signage says 25.

So I laud the community, we need something like that in Novi. I'm not sure if the type of house in there from an economic standpoint would be feasible, but my biggest concern is the safety of the neighborhood and the traffic
concerns. Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.
MS. DALLON: Good evening, my name is
Muin Rumman. I go by first name as MJ, Michael Jordan. I own the property at 49280 W. Nine Mile Road and I live on Lancaster Court in Novi. I love the city.

I think the project that Mark is proposing is an excellent project and it's desperately needed for the City of Novi. As you know, we have an aging population in the United States and we desperately need a project like this.

They have people with wheelchairs that would feed a project like this, people who are handicapped, people who like to live in a nice environment, and the project that Mark has proposed is one of the best projects I've ever seen. As a matter of fact, I'm thinking about moving there myself because I'm getting there in age.

I think in terms of the affect on the surrounding areas, I think everybody's house is
going to increase in value in the area. I don't think it's going to affect that much traffic, and you guys may have to better believe it, that area is going to be developed sooner or later. The question is which is the best development, and I think what Mark has proposed in terms of the project that he's proposing is one of the best projects that I have ever seen.

And so I'm in support of this project 100 percent, and I hope you will approve that project. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, sir.
MR. METZ: Good evening, my name is Tim Metz, address is 22125 Garfield. I built the house in 1990, enjoyed living there my entire life, raised two children here.

My whole thing is people say why are people so passionate at Nine Mile and Garfield about the area? Well, 1990 when you consider what it took to build a house as far as rules and regulations and what $I$ had to follow to be able to get my occupancy permit, it kind of disturbs me when people come in and think that they should
just be able to buy their way through what is going on.

As far as saying Tuscany as far as being well respected, I would like to thank the gentleman for the traffic, the construction that I have had to jump out of the way of, literally, with my family. I think it's absolutely ridiculous what goes down Nine Mile and Garfield because it's still a dirt road. It is still a road that is not ready for more construction.

As far as paving the first 1,000 whatever feet there is that's chip tar, no, the rest of the road is a dust-control road. If you gentlemen remember when the wetlands project was put on, that flat top was just put in there at a 4-inch base to control dust. It was either they were going to oil it every day or it was black topped. Well, it was black topped and it's worked out pretty good. It's held up okay. It's not a permanent road. So how do we handle this?

There's no sidewalks on Nine Mile, there's no sidewalks on Garfield. They don't have room to build either one of those, so what do we
do with it? You can't keep just adding to this without looking to the future of the traffic control.

As far as the ITC corridor, when the bike path was down there, $I$ was told the bike path was put down there because Garfield could not handle a sidewalk down there, so there's no room for that. So you're already answering the question of, well, we can't put a sidewalk down Garfield so where are the people supposed to go.

I would like to also address the question as to behind the complex where they're building, or want to, there is a very large wetland mitigation. Where's the water going to go? I've heard the elevation of the project is going to be raised quite a bit. We're on that there on Nine Mile. We're kind of a low-lying area. What happens when my house gets flooded out and they say, "Well, sorry, Tim, that's just the way it is?"

I don't know if there's any
retribution behind that because when Nine Mile and Beck was built, Beckingham, I lost a well and
everyone said, "Well, that's just the facts of life, you know. That just happened. How do we know the de-watering there did it to you?" Everyone says, "Oh, well, it just happened. You know, you're just one in a million."

There's too much here in this study
that still needs to be proven. The gentleman says, "Grandma and grandpa is going to have a retirement home with a pool to come swimming in." Oh, now we went through the 12 to 15 cars a day that they're talking about to 30 to 40 cars a day. CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Sir, if you could summarize, please. MS. DALLON: Absolutely I will, I apologize. But what I'd like to say is that we need to look at taking care of the neighbors, the people that have been in the neighborhood paying taxes for all these years before we consider letting somebody else into the neighborhood. Thank you.

> (Audience applause.)

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: If you could
refrain, please, from applauding. Thank you.

MS. TEDESCO: Good evening, my name is Sarah Tedesco, I'm a homeowner off of Evergreen Court on the western border of the parcel in question.

My concerns are the following: Gated communities are inappropriate for the area. Nine Mile is a scenic beauty road which would be spoiled with the amount of pavement on Nine Mile from Garfield to the gated entrance. With its clubhouse facility and roads, it will require a large amount of lighting and would only add to the light pollution in the area. Already the LED light at Nine and Garfield is overly bright for the area.

Current parcels show 40 width lots. RA allows a minimum of 120 -foot lots. This is three times the density currently allowed and is an enormous departure from the area's current character and spacing. Privacy would be obliterated as our previous gentleman has noted for the homes along Nine Mile and the road passing directly behind their back yards. The area's longest time residents will have little
consideration for their privacy with this current plan. We would need to determine whether privacy on the western boundary of the property will be maintained or if setbacks will be generous enough to protect existing woodlands, a particular interest to me.

The current plan's 75-foot lot depths means there is high risk for excavators and such running over tree roots and killing trees along the western boundary. I know this personally. We've lost a tree or two when our property built.

No tree counts have been done as yet. The protected woodlands would be affected and the full survey is needed to determine replacement tree credits and we must be careful to ensure trees are properly planted and cared for. That's taken some effort for some of my friends in the Edinborough sub off of Beck south of Ten.

Also, there is no guarantee that these high-end, baby boomer, age-in-place ranches will garner enough market interest to fill the sub. The subdivision could go defunct as it did with Montcouray in Northville. A Pinnacle/Pulte/Toll

Brothers buyout would not look fitting on Nine Mile and further erode the naturalized character of the area.

The storm drain in the northwest portion of the property is also a concern. The basin is right in the middle of mature woodland growth and one of the higher elevations of the property. Do so many mature trees need to be destroyed for a concrete storm basin?

We also need to ensure any storm basins are properly integrated into the landscape. Doing like the one at Seven and Haggerty's Home Depot with endless cement and prominent iron grates would greatly detract from the naturalized appeal of the neighborhood.

Also, as appealing as the donation of the northeast corner of the parcel's FEMA floodplain may sound to Novi, it really is only a play upon the City's interests to increase the likelihood of approval for this project. Truly that land was unbuildable in the first place. 100-year floodplain, people have to buy flood insurance. Kind of a no-go. The developer here
is merely giving away what's ultimately of no use to themselves.

Finally, an additional backup plan was submitted in April for five homes on the easternmost parcel of the subject property. This kind of small court-based community is more in keeping with the areas natural beauty and feel and one that I think residents in the area may be more willing to accept and adopt along with the remaining portions of the parcel. Truly I am not a nimbi. These parcels will eventually be developed. The need for senior housing is there, yet I'm just personally requesting that these parcels be developed in a manner consistent with the naturalized feel of the area and in a manner respectful to privacy of the homeowners already in residence. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you. MR. OWENS: Hello, my is Stefan Owens. I lived in the Novi-Northville-Canton area for about 23 years. Right now my main residence is in Sunny Isles Beach, Florida. Yeah, go figure, right?

Anyway, we're empty nesters and I'm here -- well, let me back up. We've been there about five years. And when we come back here about three months out of the year, we normally stay in a hotel because we haven't been able to find a place that we feel comfortable with. So when we heard about the development, I mean, it was, like, perfect for us. And as far as I keep hearing this about traffic, traffic. I mean there's so much more to life than traffic to try to get to Nine Mile or 696. You've just got to leave a little earlier.

I don't think there's no other contractor can actually pull this off than Mr. Guidobono. I mean, I'm a contractor, I do underground. I don't do any work in Michigan. All my work is in Denver and Florida so there's no ties, but if it could be done, I mean, he's the person. I would move there in a heartbeat. That's it.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, sir. MS. TEDESCO: My name is Bill Ashkar. I've lived in Novi for the past 17 years. Right
now I live in Tuscany. I saw what Cambridge can do in such an area. They do a great job.

If we do not approve his plan, what's the alternative? If you take a drive from Nine Mile and Beck to Nine Mile and Garfield, what do you see? Haphazardly houses built too close to the road? That's dangerous for the kids when drive by that dirt road, and I think it's wise to approve such a plan to organize all these homes to be in a nice subdivision.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.
MR. COOK: Good evening, my name is John Cook. I've been a Novi resident for ten years now, and I live in one of Mark's homes and very happy with the home $I$ have now.

We are in that stage of empty nesters. I'm not going to say I'm that age yet that we've been throwing around, but we're in that stage of empty nesters and we are looking, and one of the things that we don't want to do is leave Novi, and right now there really isn't a lot of option for us and we feel that this is a great option for us and a great option for the future.

There's traffic everywhere. Hopefully
this will free up some additional traffic
somewhere, but we do feel in full support of doing this with Cambridge.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.
MR. WILLIS: Good evening. My name is
Jim Willis, and I am the managing broker for a real estate office in downtown Northville, and we currently have 65 agents that are very active in the community, and every day I hear the same story: Where can I go? I'm looking for the exact product that Mark is proposing. So as far as the demand sake, the demand is there, price is fine. I can speak for the demand issue and put everybody's ears at rest that that will not be a concern.

From the integrity of Mark and his projects, I can speak highly of them. I've known Mark a long time, and I look forward to selling his products at every occasion. So I would support this project, and I appreciate your time. CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you. Mr. Berman: Good evening. My name is

Len Berman, I've lived in the City of Novi for a little over 30 years now, actually. Never in any of the Cambridge homes. We live over at Eleven Mile and Taft, and our youngest of three left for college last week, and as we sit and talk about places that we might want to go, I have to compliment the City of Novi over the last 30 years because the City, in large part, has really built a lifestyle that fits almost everybody right from having a great hospital to phenomenal schools to great, what I'll call, bedroom or family communities, and then, you know, my mother-in-law now is at Fox Run, even that end of it is covered. But as my wife and I look at where we want to go next, and it's not leave Novi and not take the tax dollars out of the schools, we need something like an empty-nester community or $I$ like better an active couples community like this project and like this product. And I understand that there are still areas of Novi that are very rural and that have not been what I call developed yet.

But time marches on, and I would trust
the City to cause Cambridge to build this project in a manner that would protect roads, protect traffic, and protect the interests just like the City has done in almost every other development they've done, but the time's come to fill now this need and continue with what the City has done in the last 30, 40 years that we've been here and make sure that it's a place that people want to stay, and I think a product like this helps accomplish that objective. Thank you for your time.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, sir. MS. SLANENA: Hello, my name is Linda Slanena and I live at 48762 W. Nine Mile Road. I will apologize in advance for not being organized in my comments, but $I$ just found out about this meeting this afternoon.

I have knowledge as a long-time Nine Mile resident, as an empty nester, and an empty-nester home buyer, okay.

So I moved to Nine Mile Road 39 years ago; it was zoned R-1A. At that time they said that means you can build a home here, and if you
have an acre of land, you can have a horse. They also said that the land behind you will never be developed because it is woodland/wetlands.

Now, when $I$ look at the plans of this development, it looks like maybe that property still is woodland/wetland, so that property it was suggested would be given to the City which would make the housing development even higher density, but I question the fact is that buildable land or is it woodland/wetland? I think it would be something to look at.

When I moved in, and kind of like today, most of the people on the road own one- to 10-acre parcels. And if you look at the map from Garfield all the way to Beck, I bet you there probably aren't more than 53 houses in that whole distance, and so we're talking about a big change in density for 53 homes, condos. I didn't understand because $I$ always thought condos were more they looked alike, and these sound like they're individual homes that you would build yourself.

Also, as an empty nester, $I$ can't
believe that you would be, like they were saying, wanting four or five bedrooms. All the empty nesters that $I$ know want two bedrooms, $a$ den and a high ceiling great room with an open kitchen floor plan.

So also empty nesters and millennials were thrown in, too, so I didn't understand that because if it was supposed to be for older people, why are the millennials in there? But millennials and people who are older and want to downsize, they want a house that cost $\$ 250,000$. Now that's just about impossible to find in Novi unless you were going to live in a traditional condo. If you want to spend a lot of money and have a nice view, you could live in Island Lake. You get the water, too, so that's nice.

Let's see. So I think that I'm concerned about the woodland/wetland. Where I live right now, I have deer come on my property every night at dusk and eat the apples from the trees. I have the wild turkeys every morning. I have a ground hog who lives there. I have a chipmunk who lives there, other critters that
maybe I don't want, moles and boles. But Nine Mile is dirt.

I talked to somebody in the City of Novi between five and ten years ago about future plans. It was when there was federal funds available and the plan was to repave Taft from Beck over to Novi Road.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Ma'am, if you could summarize, please.

MS. SLANENA: Okay. What the City told me, that there is no plans to do anything for Nine Mile Road for the next 25 years, and that means that dirt road certainly can't take traffic, certainly can't take any more homes, and it's very hard to get down Nine Mile Road. I agree with the woman, too. If I try to go home, somebody's behind me on my tail telling me $I$ should turn into my driveway faster because they want to go really fast on Nine Mile Road.

Anyway, I guess my comments are: Are these really homes for empty nesters or are they homes for anybody? Is it really woodland/wetland that we are preserving or is it not? Are there
just not going to be any improvements except for the developers who are going to pave about two-tenths of a mile so they can get onto Garfield and then people won't have to get their car dusty or muddy?

Okay, that's all I have to say.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you,
ma'am.
MR. BARTLEY: Hello. My name is Gail Bartley, I live at 49050 W. Nine Mile Road. I own the property directly to the east of this proposed development.

I'm in agreement with most of my
neighbors who have spoken up to object to this development. I object to this development strongly. My concerns mainly are safety, traffic, the road. With the temporary construction on Beck Road and on Napier Road right now, we've seen a huge influx of traffic down Nine Mile Road, and it's gotten to the point I -- we have lived here for 15 years -- it's gotten to the point now where we cannot walk our dog down Nine Mile Road, our kids can't ride their bikes. We used to have
cross-country teams, like, run up and down Nine Mile Road, they cannot do that any more. I understand that that -- I'm hoping that that is temporary because of the construction going on. If this development takes place, it's going to be even worse. So I have great concerns about the safety of that area.

In addition, I have concerns about what will happen to our well. There's already going to be de-watering taking place for the proposed sewer development going in or the proposed sewer plans that are going in. What is this community going to do to the residents' wells in the area?

And as far as Nine Mile Road in and of itself, with it being dirt, I've been told there's issues with paving it. I don't necessarily think that it should be paved because people do speed down it now and it would make it a lot worse if it was, but the wear and tear on the road as it is now is significant with the increased traffic and congestion at Nine Mile and Garfield, it's going to make it even more so. We are constantly
repairing vehicles. There's potholes all the time. I'm talking about dirt control, everything is covered with dirt. It's going to become almost unbearable.

So I strongly object to this, and I don't feel, in addition to my neighbors, that this price point of I've been told is somewhere around $\$ 700,000$ per house is going to attract those empty nesters. I hope to be able to afford that when I'm an empty nester. I don't think that's going to happen.

Anyways, $I$ just wanted to let you know that I do object to this development. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.
MS. McGLOWAN: Good evening, my name is Kathleen McLallen. I live at 21066 Cambridge Drive here in Novi. I'm a 31-year resident. I'm also a 25-year realtor in the community, and I had the privilege of sitting where you sit for many years.

I support this community and this project. I think it's outstanding the partnership between the City and this particular developer
finding an innovative way to deliver a product that is totally unique. The City has an extremely long history of very strong environmental protection and keeping the citizens apprised of what is going on, and it's that kind of a partnership together with the quality of development that Cambridge represents that will deliver something that in the end will be a benefit to everyone. Thank you.

MR. SEKAR: Hi, my name is Shamo Sekar. I'm living in Novi for the last 25 years, and we've got also an investment around Nine Mile, but first thing let me tell you, where I work everybody wants to move into Novi. Not a single one $I$ heard saying $I$ want to go out of Novi. So congratulations to you guys. You created that environment. There's so much a demand move into Novi.

So when I'm looking into the
investment, you know, if you go back 50 years, a lot of things were empty, but we have to have economic development to move forward. So same thing I look at it, especially with projects like

Bellagio, it brought prestige to Novi.
So with this project what Mark is proposing, I'm like, you know, we know his reputation and a lot of prestige, and it will help us get also a lot of tax dollars and those tax dollars will help in school, will help in, like, police, or will help in our other environment. And the same thing with me because personally $I$ think the value what $I$ invested it will go way up.

So I definitely support what Mark is proposing, and $I$ think it's an excellent project. In fact, I'm looking at maybe if something great comes up, and if $I$ can afford it, I'll move in there also. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, sir. MR. VALENTI: Hi, my name is Ron Valente and this is my wife Beverly. We live at 49100 W. Nine Mile Road, and we are both proud retirees of the City of Novi. We've been here since 1988. I've been involved with Novi Parks and Rec volunteer programs, St. James CYO, Novi Motion A basketball, I'm currently involved with the Novi girls high school basketball program. So
we're committed to this community and its success.
Our property abuts the proposed
development. We're just here to express our support for the development. And the reasons are the proposed project provides for intentional and purposeful preservations of the woodlands. We agree with that. The proposed plan rehabilitates some properties that, quite frankly, have become rundown and so we're especially supportive to the beautification and improvement to the area. And then development we feel meets the need of the City for empty-nester, baby-boomer housing as our generation gets older and retires and starts looking to downsize. You give taxpayers with significant disposable income and leisure time additional options to stay in the community.

And we feel about the traffic
situation, we feel that the traffic generated from this proposal we think will be considerably less than an RA single family because with the residential you'll deal with children, school buses and more young drivers. We just feel that the overall appearance of the development will be
just a natural fit for the area. Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.
Anyone else?
MR. BRENTON: My name is Brian
Brenton, I live at 21820 Garfield Road. I've been there for 20 years. I faxed my comments in earlier so you can disregard those.

My concern as voiced by a number of folks is the increased traffic on Nine Mile and Garfield Road. Particularly on Garfield Road the way the houses are situated on Garfield Road is they're very close to the road. As it's been noted, there's no way to put sidewalks in there and there'd be no way to avoid the traffic.

I'm concerned that when the construction is complete on Beck Road and Napier Road that people will become habituated to driving Nine Mile and having these houses located here would increase that traffic in the future.

I'm not at all opposed to the development. I haven't ever come to one of these meeting before and say anything about any of the other developments that have been put in around
us. It's the density of this development and the fact that it is a large swampy area and $I$ have concern about wildlife and also about well de-watering.

As Tim had mentioned earlier, when the construction was done at Nine Mile and Beck, I lost my well and well pump at that point in time when that was done.

Other than that, I voice similar opinions with the rest of the folks in the neighborhood. I would also find it a little peculiar that there isn't anyone that lives near it that's supportive of it. The only folks that are supportive of it are those folks that stand to profit from it or that are, perhaps, affiliated with the developer. Thank you much for your time.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, sir.
MS. GRONACHAN: Good evening, my name is Cindy Gronachan. I'm a 30-year resident of Garfield Road. I'm also a member of the Zoning Board of Appeals. I'm here strictly as a resident.

Number one, I'm a huge fan of Garfield

Road. We worked 11 years on a wetland project that is on the -- abuts the back yards of many residents on Garfield Road. So I understand all the compassion and the heartfelt speeches that were made tonight. But as a member of the Zoning Board of Appeals, I also understand Mark Guidobono's commitment to this community as a businessman, his interest, his commitment, his longevity, so $I$ have a suggestion.

I think that this proposal needs to be looked at a little more, not by just the Planning Commission and people that have a financial interest, but by Mr. Guidobono and the residents of Garfield Road and Nine Mile.

I think that the idea of empty nesters or senior citizens or whatever you want to call us over 50 when you're emptying out your house and you want to stay in Novi but you can't, but it's not just about not being able to find a place, it's about affordability. It's about having a negative impact on a community where these residents, and I know all of them that have come up here, have lived there and have put their
heart, their soul, their blood, their hours, their financial investment into their properties. Mr. Guidobono has done the same thing for the City of Novi. So we have two passionate groups that want to better Novi, but we're at a crossroads.

Yesterday, and I said that I'm not here as a member of the Zoning Board, but I just want to share a story with the members of the audience.

Yesterday sitting as a member of the Zoning Board, I had been bombarded with a bunch of stories about a project that was happening in Novi. 90 percent of the information that $I$ got from residents was inaccurate.

I'm asking the residents and
Mr. Guidobono to meet so that there is accurate information given. I don't know that this project will fit. I haven't done enough work or study on it to see if it fits. I'm here to be informed, to make a rational and educated decision, not one based on my heart, because if it was up to me, nothing would go on on Garfield. But that's not the process and that's not the purpose and that's
not the growth of this City.
So I'm asking that, this has got to be tabled anyways, that the Planning Commission, if you can, meet with the residents again and meet with Mr. Guidobono and perhaps Mr. Guidobono could recommend a meeting for the residents so they'd be well informed. And maybe if there's things -- one of the biggest things that $I$ saw there and $I$ heard from the residents at Garfield is that this road from the new subdivision is right on top of Garfield Road.

Garfield Road is a mile long, and as a former resident of Garfield Road, the argument -and if you've lived out there or if you've been out there, if travel up there, there's nowhere to go on Garfield Road. It's a mile long. I used to have a 60-acre horse farm on Garfield Road. We used to ride our horses down to all the neighbors.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: If you could summarize, please.

MS. GRONACHAN: Sure. So I'm asking that if you take the time and have the residents meet with Mr. Guidobono, then hopefully this
subdivision can meet both sides and it can add for everybody to be a win-win situation for the residents of Garfield and Nine Mile and the developer as well. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Anyone else in the audience wish to address the Planning Commission?

Seeing no one else, I think we have some correspondence.

MR. LYNCH: Yes, we do, significant correspondence.

What I'm going to do instead of reading the detail, I'll put it in the public record, but what I'm going to do is just summarize object or approve and then the name.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.
MR. LYNCH: The first one is object from Remko -- can't read it -- A-t-t-e-v-e-l-d, 21975 Garfield Road, they object;

Brian Tedesco is an objection, didn't put an address;

Brian Brenton, 21820 Garfield Road is an objection;

Kurt Ohlgren, 21666 Garfield Road is an objection;

Elizabeth Wylie, 21760 Garfield Road, Northville, objection;

Kyle Freitag, 50233 Nine Mile Road, objection;

David Baird, 22785 Evergreen Court, object;

Karl Migrin, 49450 W. Nine Mile Road, Novi, object;

Gail Bartley, 49050 W. Nine Mile Road, object;

Janet Thurber, 21668 Garfield Road objects;

Lisa Hoag, 21850 Garfield Road,
object;
And in support, Partha Chakravartti, excuse me for butchering that, 50140 Nine Mile Road support;

Arundhati Sarkar, 47282 Scarlet Drive, support;

Shyamal Sarkar, 47282 Scarlet Drive, approve;
approve;
Joel Johnson, no address listed,
-

Rick and Gabrielle Corrent, no address, approve;

Father George Shalhoub, Basilica of St. Mary, approve;

And Richard Bayer, approve.
And then all these will be -- I mean, some of these are very well written, they'll be added into the public record.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: They will be. Thank you, sir.

With that, we'll close the public hearing and open it up to the Planning Commission for your thoughts and consideration.

Member lynch.
MR. LYNCH: Yes, just a couple questions for the developer.

Right now it's zoned RA, I understand that, but you're talking about . 92 homes per acre which is basically one home per acre, right?

MR. GUIDOBONO: It's a little over half.

MR. LYNCH: Okay. The City water and sewer, is that going to feed your subdivision or is it going to be a well?

MR. GUIDOBONO: It will be City water and sewer.

MR. LYNCH: So it's going to be City water and sewer?

MR. GUIDOBONO: That's right.
MR. LYNCH: It looks like a large
percentage of this is going to be wetland, forest, woodland, approximately 18 acres, and that will be part of this development that will live in perpetuity with this development, so that can never be developed?

MR. GUIDOBONO: Yes, that 18 acres we were going to donate to the City, the northern 18 acres would be a --

MR. LYNCH: You're going to donate to the City?

MR. GUIDOBONO: Yes, we plan on
donating that 18 acres to the City of Novi. It's one of our community benefits.

MR. LYNCH: You're going to trust the

City with 18 acres?
MR. GUIDOBONO: Well, it's -- I mean, there will be conditions attached to it that the City can't develop it, but it would become, our thought was, it would be part of the City park that the City's accumulating in that area.

MR. LYNCH: Okay. I have my own opinion on that.

I had one other question, too. These are going to be approximately 3,000 square foot, 2,500-3,000 square foot, fairly high end?

MR. GUIDOBONO: The consumer would dictate, yes, $2,500,3,000$ square foot ranches.

MR. LYNCH: And it looks just from the concept plan, it looks like it's very isolated, extremely isolated.

MR. GUIDOBONO: Yes, totally
surrounded by woodlands.
MR. LYNCH: Well, the reason I asked you about trusting the City with the woodlands is one of your selling features here is, like you showed, it's going to back out into these woodlands.

MR. GUIDOBONO: Yes.
MR. LYNCH: What makes you think the City won't come in there and do something to it?

MR. GUIDOBONO: Well, our thought was that the City wanted to keep this as park, as part of the park.

MR. LYNCH: Undeveloped?
MR. GUIDOBONO: Undeveloped.
MR. LYNCH: And so there's going to be like a PRO agreement or something like that?

MR. GUIDOBONO: It will be an
agreement that --
MR. LYNCH: It can't be touched?
MR. GUIDOBONO: -- it can't be
touched.
MR. LYNCH: By anybody, even the City?
MR. GUIDOBONO: Correct.
MR. LYNCH: Okay, that's the only questions I have so far.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.
Member Avdoulos.
MR. AVDOULOS: Thank you. I was a
beneficiary of seeing the plan a few weeks ago
presented in concept for the master plan in zoning committee, and it was an interesting concept. I didn't know what to really expect. I was expecting a typical subdivision layout.

The positives of the proposed development are, indeed, the preservation of the open spaces, the natural features. The Cambridge Home Development Company is known for high-quality development so I really don't have any concerns related to that.

The fact that over the last year or so I've been actually visiting a lot of subdivisions around the city, Beckingham and Autumn Park and Tuscany, and going in further into Northville and Novi and looking at all the developments that have been going on, and they have been kept up very nicely over the years. The ones with the wetlands and the woodlands and those that have been preserved have also been kept up very well, so that part doesn't concern me.

I'm glad that we're looking at
presenting this and then taking a chance to soak it in and take a look at a lot of the comments,
especially the comments from the residents that have presented.

What I'd like to see that would also help with some of the concerns is, we have the layout of the development that's being presented. I'd like to see a typical subdivision development, maybe something that was done prior to this, overlaid on top of this particular development so that we could see if you do a typical development, how much natural features will be wiped away, what would be left. You know, visuals really help. And one of the things that struck me with this particular development was the fact that, yeah, it is more condensed, it leaves a lot of the natural features intact, the area around the development is going to be landscaped so that it does provide more of a hidden feature, and so the thought is that that sort of helps to blend in with the rural character of the area.

And so as a lot of you, I am a
neighbor of this area. I live on Nine Mile, I'm on the other side of the driveway from the lady that spoke with the hockey jacket, because both my
girls play for Northville, and I've been a resident of Novi in that particular area for 25 years. So I've seen the area grow, I've seen how things have been developed. I have been concerned about Nine Mile. I've called the City -actually, my wife has called the City -- many, many times because of all the construction traffic so there are concerns about that.

The construction and everything that's happened has actually taken away from that rural character because you really can't ride your bike, you can't jog, you can't do a lot of things. If that all goes away and Beck Road opens up, which is supposed to happen Friday, I hear, and then Napier Road construction is done, the turnabout at Ten Mile is done, I'm certain that that will alleviate a lot of traffic. I don't think people are going to actually want to go down Novi Road unless they really like washing their car quite a bit.

And so I don't think a development of this size is going to add as much traffic as we think because at a RA development level, it's
going to be 40 homes versus a development like this that's 53. However, a lot of the comments from the City Planning, they would like to work with the developer to see if we could give it a little bit more breathing room and enhance it just a bit more. There are some features in there that we may not need based on what's going to be happening with the City.

But in concept right now, I'm just trying to do the same thing as all of you are, just soak it in, learn a bit more about it, make sure that it is the right development for the City. So if we can have some more information that helps tell the story of here's what we're proposing, but if we weren't proposing this and this was overlaid onto this, this is what would happen, because we're going to have somebody pick up these pieces of property whether they combine them all into one or try and do them individually, something's going to happen, but I personally would like to see something that doesn't have as much pavement laid down on it and keep it more dense so that we could have a lot of the open area
and natural features.
So right now, as a lot of you, you know, we're looking at it a first time. I think those who are not on a master plan and zoning committee have never seen the layout so we're not familiar with it so we're trying to soak it in.

I'm not really worried about quality.
I'm not really worried about what's going to happen with it. I think we just want to make sure that we do, as our Zoning Commissioner had indicated, that we want to just make sure we take the right steps, do the right thing, and then $I$ think we'll have a good project in the end. Those are my comments.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.
Member Greco.
MR. GRECO: I have a question for the staff. The 40 -home concept or project, was that something that was proposed years ago or something that was approved?

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Back when those proposed as a rezoning as well, they were proposing to rezone from $R A$ to $R-1$ with increased
density as well.
MEMBER GRECO: And was that approved?
MS. KOMARAGIRI: No. It went to
Master Planning Zoning Committee. The committee asked them to revise the plans to reduce the density and come back, but then it didn't move forward after that.

MR. GRECO: Right. So what we're talking about here for right now with regard to the actual zoning versus the proposed is 30 versus 53, not 40 versus 53?

MS. KOMARAGIRI: That would be right. So the current density is .8 dwelling units per acre, but then the density is calculated based on net site acreage, not the gross site acreage.

The majority of the site has wetlands that would reduce the acreage to half the density from 40 acres down to even 30 or something, so the number of units would be even less.

MR. GRECO: Even less than 30?
MS. KOMARAGIRI: If you calculate the density based on net site acreage, based on the perimeter density right now it might be less than
that.
MR. GRECO: So actual buildable on the current zoning would be something under 30 ?

MS. KOMARAGIRI: That is correct.
MEMBER GRECO: Okay. Looking at all
these projects, you know, we always have difficulty, especially in certain sections of Novi, with beautiful wooded areas, areas that have lots of wildlife. We've got the construction, the development going on on Nine Mile Road right now between Novi and Taft that $I$ know everyone or a lot of people were disappointed in, but there was nothing really that the City could do given it was a private lot and they were building within the applicable zoning. So when the ZBA person was here and talked about a lot of disinformation or the misinformation that's out there, there are some of those things that are out there.

However, with respect to looking at all these sites, particularly when we're looking at projects by -- that are proposed by or done by Mr. Guidobono and his associates and his company, they're going to look absolutely beautiful. I
mean it's going to be first class, first rate projects. The renderings are going to be beautiful, and then the actual product we know is a beautiful quality product.

However, with respect to this area, this being on a dirt Road, this being in this area where we have these projects where obviously the builder is trying to make money on the project, we have no problem with that, and making money on the project also means numbers. And when you look at the concept on the project that's being proposed to us, it really is double.

I mean we have had projects,
particularly the ones on Ten Mile and Beck on both of those corners there where those of us that have been on the Planning Commission for years know about the whole issues we had versus residential versus commercial for this project. Then we finally come in with a residential and we still had a lot of objections to it, but with the space that we were talking about there, as I recall, we were talking about, like, 60 homes versus 66, or 50 versus 56 , I can't remember exactly, but we
were talking about given the developer -- or he was asking for some homes in exchange for some things that was of benefit.

Here the product issue and the housing issue and what's available in Novi as far as the mix of housing options is an issue, but this is a situation where we're talking about double the density. Double. I mean that is a lot for that area. And even though we can have areas that you abut the whole thing and so you might not be able to see it, it's still an area where a lot of woods out there right now are individual homes. Somebody made a comment, it seemed to be kind of a negative comment because a mix and match of different homes because they're not part of a development like we mostly have in Novi, which might be the character that some of the things that the people are looking for in that area rather than a uniform subdivision.

So although we are not voting on it tonight, I'm in favor of postponing it, I do have some significant concerns regarding the zoning that is actually in place there and the number of
units that are being there.
This is not give the developer an extra 5 to 7 percent on the homes because he or the company, he or she, wants to pass back something to the community or put something back, add buffers to the residents or anything. I mean this is double, and I definitely have some concerns with that.

The traffic I think everyone is correct. The traffic on 30 versus 40 versus 50 homes when they're residential and they're families or empty nesters, I mean, that's not what's really adding to the traffic on Beck Road. You know, it's the aggregate and not the individual, all though the individual can contribute.

So that is what I am struggling with with regard to this project. That concludes my comments.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you, sir. Just a couple of comments from me and then I would look for a motion.

I want to thank everybody for coming
out and expressing your views. It's pretty much even. We often have the fear that when we see this many people in the audience, we're going to get inundated with negatives. There was actually more positives than negatives. Wherever you came from or whatever your background was, it's kind of remarkable.

Some of the things I agree with
Commissioner Avdoulos insofar as wanting to see some more graphical representation of what that 30 versus the 53-ish development plan would look like. I, too, have a problem with the density that's being requested at this point in time. No question at all relative to what kind of character that this kind of development would bring or anything relative to what we can expect out of the developer for what he's going to put in place.

But having said that, there are questions that $I$ think we still as a group need to understand relative to the roadway, the traffic, the sidewalks. Everything we've done in Novi recently has been relative to sidewalks. I want to see the plan relative to what is going to be
laid out going forward along Nine Mile, if that's case.

There were some questions about the drain basin and the elevations relative to that. I guess I'd like to see some more information from the City, from our experts, relative to the constant comments that we often hear about wells being drained, runoff, things of that nature. This is again a significant amount of homes that are being proposed that will have some impact. I'm not foolish enough to say it won't have impact. I want to know and I'd like to understand the quantification of that, if that's a real word.

And then also relative to both
Garfield and Nine Mile, Garfield cannot withstand traffic with it just being chip sealer at this point in time. That's not a method by which I think we want to see for a long term, so I guess I'd like to see what the solution is there either from the developer in conjunction with the City or the City's proposed ideas relative to that.

But I think we've probably and I hope we've provided to the developer and to the City
some ideas and thoughts. Certainly you've gotten that from the residents as to what we'd like to see to come back to us the next time around so we can make a better informed decision.

With that, I'd look for a motion.
Member Greco.
MEMBER GRECO: I'd like to make a
motion. In the matter of Villa D'Este, JSP 17-52, and zoning map amendment 18.718, motion to postpone making a recommendation on the proposed PRO and concept plan to rezone the subject property from RA, residential acreage, to $R-1$, one-family residential with a planned rezoning overlay, to the meeting on October 11, 2017.

This recommendation is made for the following reasons:

1. To allow the applicant time to consider further modifications to the concept plan as discussed in the review letters; and
2. To allow staff to advertise for another public hearing to include the fourth parcel in the public hearing notice as this was left out from the current notice due to
misrepresentation in the site plan submittal.
MR. AVDOULOS: Second.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a motion by Member Greco, second by Member Avdoulos. Any other comments?

Sri, can you call the roll, please.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch.
MR. LYNCH: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Zuchlewski.
MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos.
MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco.
MR. GRECO: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes 5 to 0 .
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.
Next on the agenda is matters for consideration. Item number one, Planning Commission meeting calendar for 2018.

MS. McBETH: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
This item relates to the Planning Commission
schedule for next year. Each year about this time the City departments are asked to provide meeting dates, so we have some suggested meeting dates here for primarily the second and fourth Wednesday of each month by the Planning Commission, assuming that we will start the meetings at 7:00 p.m. as we have for the last several years.

The calendar that was provided also includes the dates that the City Council meetings were set as well as some holidays.

So if it's okay with the Planning Commission, we will forward these dates to the appropriate department for inclusion in the City calendar.

MR. GRECO: Motion to approve.
MR. AVDOULOS: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: All those in
favor?
THE BOARD: Aye (unanimous).
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.
MS. McBETH: And, Mr. Chair, as you
know, Member Giacopetti has recently resigned and so we may bring back the committee assignment
sheet again just so that we don't have any gaps in the committees.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Okay. Thank you.

Next is the approval of the August 9th, 2017, Planning Commission minutes.

Modification, changes, approval?
MR. GRECO: Motion to approve.
MR. AVDOULOS: Second.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thanks. We have a motion by Member Greco, second by Member Avdoulos. Any other comments?

All those in favor?
THE BOARD: Aye (unanimous).
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Anyone opposed?
Matters for discussion: Supplemental issues. One thing, there is no meeting 9-27; is that correct?

MS. McBETH: I believe that's correct. We don't have any action items for that particular meeting date and so we might cancel that. We do have several items lined up for the October 11th meeting.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.
The only other thing, and it was
mentioned, I'd like to take a moment and recognize Rob for his dedication to the City for everything that he's done with the Police and Benevolent Fund, and the work -- obviously the good work he's done here with the Planning Commission. It's been our pleasure to have him part of the Planning Commission with his varied ideas and thoughts about what he'd like to see Novi become, and I want to thank him for his hard work, and we wish him all the best in Seattle, and have a cup of coffee for us.

MR. AVDOULOS: Absolutely.
MR. GRECO: I second that.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: There we go.
All in favor?
THE BOARD: Aye (unanimous).
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Perfect. And I'd look for a motion to adjourn. Or wait. We have an audience participation, I'm so sorry.

Anyone in the audience wish to address the Planning Commission?

MR. MIGRIN: Just a question. Karl Migrin again, I haven't moved.

Do the comment sheets that were sent back in, $I$ know they have to be signed, but do they have to be addressed also? Because a lot of them sound like there were no addresses to the people who signed them, how do we know -- you know, does it matter if they live in Novi or anywhere?

MS. McBETH: Through the Chair, I
think most of them did have an address on them. There were a few that were an email address. Generally those are accepted with the understanding that there's an expectation for the people to represent themselves accurately.

We do prefer the response form to be filled out, but we don't send the response to everybody.

MR. MIGRIN: Okay, but as an email? I mean that was another question. Is an email comment a part of the record, too?

MS. McBETH: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes, we received
several of those as well.
MR. MIGRIN: Okay. I don't know if
you ever want to consider changing your notice to put language like that, email comments are acceptable also, just as a general suggestion.

MS. McBETH: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.
MR. MIGRIN: You're doing a great job.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Oh, shucks, cut it out.

Anyone else? With that, we'll close the audience participation and now look for a motion to adjourn.

MR. GRECO: Motion to adjourn.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Holy cow, look
how quick he jumped on that.
MR. AVDOULOS: Second.
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a motion
and second. All those in favor?
THE BOARD: Aye (unanimous).
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you,
everyone.
(Meeting concluded at 9:04 p.m.)
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