



# PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

CITY OF NOVI  
Regular Meeting

**September 10, 2025 7:00 PM**

Council Chambers | Novi Civic Center  
45175 Ten Mile Road, Novi, MI 48375 (248) 347-0475

## CALL TO ORDER

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

## ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Pehrson, Member Lynch, Member Dismondy, Member Avdoulos, Member Roney

Absent Excused: Member Verma

Staff: Elizabeth Saarela, City Attorney; Lindsay Bell, Senior Planner; Rick Meader, Landscape Architect; Humna Anjum, Project Engineer

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

## APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion made by Member Lynch and seconded by Member Avdoulos to approve the September 10, 2025 Planning Commission Agenda.

**VOICE VOTE ON MOTION TO APPROVE THE SEPTEMBER 10, 2025 PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA MOVED BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER AVDOULOS. Motion carried 5-0.**

## AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

Chair Pehrson invited members of the audience who wished to address the Planning Commission during the first audience participation to come forward. Seeing no one, Chair Pehrson closed the first public audience participation.

## CORRESPONDENCE

There was not any correspondence.

## COMMITTEE REPORTS

There were no Committee reports.

## CITY PLANNER REPORT

There was no City Planner report.

## CONSENT AGENDA - REMOVALS AND APPROVALS

There were no consent agenda removals or approvals.

## PUBLIC HEARINGS

### 1. JSP25-02 CAMELOT PARC TOWNHOMES

Public hearing at the request of Avalon Park Development, LLC, for recommendation to the City Council for Concept Plan approval under the Planned Suburban Low Rise Overlay provisions. The

subject property is located on the east side of Wixom Road, north of Eleven Mile Road (Section 17). The applicant is proposing 22 townhome units in five two-story buildings.

Senior Planner Lindsay Bell stated the subject property is located east of Wixom Road, south of Grand River Avenue and the Novi Promenade shopping center, and north of Stonebrook Drive in Section 17 of the City. The site is currently zoned R-1 Single Family with a Planned Suburban Low-Rise overlay. The overlay is denoted by the blue boundary and angled hatch on the Zoning Map.

The property on the north-west is zoned the same, with I-1 light industrial on the northeast, I-2 General Industrial with PSLR to the east and south, and R-1 Single-family residential on the west side of Wixom Road.

The Future Land Use map shows Suburban Low Rise for this property and those adjacent to the north and east. Community Commercial is shown to the north for the Novi Promenade retail center. Wildlife Woods Park is south of Stonebrook Drive. Single family uses are shown west of Wixom Road.

Planner Bell stated the applicant is proposing Low-rise multiple family residential units utilizing the PSLR overlay option which are otherwise not permitted under R-1. In the PSLR Overlay, low-rise multiple family residential uses are permitted as a special land use up to 6.5 dwellings per acre. As stated in the Ordinance: "The intent of the PSLR, Planned Suburban Low Rise Overlay district is to promote the development of high-quality uses, such as low-density multiple family residential, office, quasi-public, civic, educational, and public recreation facilities that can serve as transitional areas between low-intensity detached one-family residential and higher intensity office and retail uses while protecting the character of neighboring areas by encouraging high-quality development with single-family residential design features that will promote residential character to the streetscape." The PSLR district requires a Development Agreement between the property owner and the City of Novi, which may be approved by City Council following a recommendation from the Planning Commission. This is the same type of development agreement that the Villas of Stonebrook was approved under.

The subject property has regulated woodlands and wetlands on the property. The applicant's wetland report identified two other wetland areas that are not shown on the City's maps. A total area of 2.4 acres are identified. Of those, 0.37 acre are being impacted. A mitigation area of 0.61 acre is proposed in the northern portion of the site, which meets the City's wetland mitigation requirement. There are a total of 153 trees surveyed on site, 65 of which appear to be regulated woodland trees. 20 woodland trees, approximately 30%, are proposed to be removed, with all required replacement tree credits to be paid into the tree fund. City of Novi wetland and woodland permits will be required for the proposed impacts. Most of the trees along the existing berm on the southern property boundary are proposed to remain and supplemented with additional plantings.

The applicant is proposing 22 for-sale townhome units in 5 two-story buildings. The subject property is approximately 8.24 net acres, so the density is 2.7 dwelling units per acre. The concept plan indicates a walking path through the preserved woodland area. The main entry is through a driveway accessed from Stonebrook Drive. A secondary emergency access is provided to the west connecting to Wixom Road. Sidewalk connections to Wixom Road and Stonebrook Drive are proposed.

Planner Bell stated the Planning Commission may recall that this property had previously been proposed for a development a few years ago that included 46 apartment units in 3 buildings. One of the big concerns at that time was the open parking areas. The current proposal eliminates much of the surface parking by providing 2-car garages for each unit. The number of units has also been reduced by more than half. The access easement to the property from Stonebrook Drive was a condition of approval in the PSLR Agreement for the Villas at Stonebrook in order to limit the number of driveways with direct access to Wixom Road, in the interest of safety.

Planning recommends approval as the plan is in general conformance with the Ordinance requirements but would like to note that the design is deficient in active recreation areas to benefit future residents and other benefits to the public. However, a significant area of the site is proposed to remain wetland and

woodland areas, which limits the ability to add more active recreation. Preservation of those areas in conservation easements could be advised. Inclusion of benches for seating and a small trail loop are provided, and proximity to off-site connections to the City's Wildlife Woods Park and trail networks make up for passive and active recreation to some extent. The proposed layout minimizes the impact on natural features compared to previous layouts that proposed more units.

Two landscape waivers are requested for the absence of a landscaped berm and street trees along Wixom Road. These are supported by staff as providing the berm would require the removal of additional woodland trees and wetland impacts, which already provide the intended screening. And the existing pathway prevents planting of the street trees.

The City's façade consultant found the elevations provided are in conformance with the façade ordinance. Fire does not have any objections and will review for conformance at the time of site plan review.

All reviews are currently recommending approval with other items to be addressed with preliminary site plan submittal. If the PSLR plan and Agreement is approved by City Council, the site plan would require Planning Commission's approval for special land Use, preliminary site plan, wetland permit, woodland permit, and storm water management plan at a later time.

The Planning Commission is asked tonight to recommend approval or denial of the Planned Suburban Low-Rise (PSLR) Overlay Concept Plan to the City Council. The applicant Mr. Jim Polyzois and engineer Jared Kime and their team would like to talk briefly about the project. As always, staff will be glad to answer any questions you have for us, and our environmental consultant is also present.

Planner Bell stated the City Attorney would like to say a few words.

City Attorney Beth Saarela requested through the Chair to give the background on the access drive.

Beth Saarela stated the access drive was a requirement of the Villas of Stonebrook and will also serve this development. There is a public easement over the access drive to Wildlife Woods Park which allows anyone in the general public to use it to access the park. It was stated there is an existing oil well to which the owners of that site use the access drive to access their site.

Beth Saarela stated the background on why this road exists is that the Villas of Stonebrook, like this development, is a discretionary Planned Suburban Overlay Development. The Villas of Stonebrook is a discretionary development because it does not meet many of the standards of the City's Zoning Ordinance. It was noted the development required ten deviations from the Zoning Ordinance in order to be approved. Examples of the deviations include allowing buildings to front on approved private driveway, modifications to the front and side setbacks, reduction of the minimum distance between buildings by five feet, allowance of full time access drives to be connected to a section line road, to allow placement of street trees between the sidewalk and buildings, and several other deviations that do not meet the standards of the Zoning Ordinance. If it doesn't meet the standards of the Zoning Ordinance it cannot be approved unless there is a discretionary option. Pulte was the developer of the Villas of Stonebrook and utilized the Planned Suburban Overlay, which requires in exchange for deviations for the development to provide a public benefit. In order for there to be approval of a discretionary development the developer must show a public benefit. For this development there was no public benefit other than the granting of the public access road to the public park. The road is the only public benefit of the development without which the development could not have been approved. It was also a condition that the adjacent property would be required to use that same private driveway to access Wixom Road so there would not be another cut onto Wixom Road for health, safety, and welfare purposes.

Chair Pehrson invited the applicant to address the Planning Commission.

Jared Kime with Atwell stated approximately two years ago they came before the Planning Commission for a recommendation of approval of a 46-unit apartment complex. Once that recommendation was granted the project went before the City Council. Mr. Kime stated the City Council had different thoughts on how this area of the City should be developed, primarily moving away from rental units and toward a for sale product. He noted they listened to the City Council and retooled the layout. The project before the Planning Commission this evening is a for-sale townhome product with private garages for each of the residential units.

Mr. Kime stated the Villas of Stonebrook is to the east, Target borders the property to the north, and Deerfield Elementary to the south. He displayed a comparison of the existing and proposed conditions and noted they have worked the development around existing conditions to preserve the natural features as much as possible. The impacts to the woodlands and wetlands have been limited as much as possible and all of the mitigation for the impacted wetlands is occurring on the site itself.

Next, Mr. Kime summarized several highlights of the plan features. He noted they are well below the allowable density permitted on the site at 2.7 dwelling units per acre. The plan includes 22 units which is less than half of where they were at previously with the rental unit layout. The proposal includes for sale two-story townhomes with private garages. Additionally, 2.69 acres of open space with walking paths and trails along with bike racks is shown on the plan. From a traffic standpoint, the number of peak hour trips generated in both the A.M. and P.M. are well below the City's thresholds to perform a formal traffic study. He noted an update to the previous traffic study was completed to represent what those peak hour trips would be. The study showed there are a total of seven trips in the A.M. peak hour and a total of 10 trips in the P.M. hour. With the recent completion of the Wixom Road project which installed the left turn lane, there are no additional recommendations for the low amount of traffic that will be generated from the development.

Mr. Kime stated they recognize they are sharing and impacting a portion of the existing road that was developed and belongs to the Villas of Stonebrook homeowners' association. He stated they are proposing a proportionate share contribution towards the maintenance cost of Stonebrook Drive based on length of road that is shared up to the Camelot Parc entrance and the proportionate share of units that utilize the road. This equates to a 7% contribution toward the maintenance cost of Stonebrook Drive, which the developer is willing to participate in an agreement with the Villas of Stonebrook homeowners' association.

Mr. Kime touched on the architectural features of the buildings, noting four- and five-unit buildings are shown on the site plan. The elevations reflect a range of architectural materials and textures utilizing common residential products. He noted the townhomes will be a typical two-story residential product. Mr. Kime shared a rendering which illustrated the view of the townhomes that would be visible as you drive down Stonebrook Drive. He noted the townhomes will not be towering and there is great screening. A second overall view showed the connectivity to the ITC Corridor Trail through Wildlife Woods Park which provides connectivity for active recreation. Mr. Kime thanked the Planning Commission and stated he would be happy to answer any questions.

Chair Pehrson opened the public hearing and invited members of the audience who wished to speak to approach the podium.

Mr. Charles Bilyeu at 26548 Anchorage Court stated he is not opposed to development and was very active in the prior proposal. He noted he would like to give the developer credit as they have made significant improvements to what was proposed prior. However, there are still some significant shortcomings. Firstly, at the last City Council meeting there was a lot of discussion regarding how much involvement there was with Island Lake and Villas of Stonebrook. He stated there was not any involvement with the surrounding communities. The developer has not reached out to either one of the associations. Secondly, relating to the density, it was stated the density is still excessive for what the intent was of the PSRL. If you look at what is being proposed with the buildings, there are still some things with the character that do not match up with Island Lake or the Villas of Stonebrook. In particular the five-unit buildings are

not seen at Island Lake or Villas of Stonebrook. Island Lake is a combination of two-, three-, and four-unit buildings. Villas of Stonebrook consists of two-unit buildings. This creates a lot more density in the area as it is only five useable acres. They are trying to push as much as they can in there. This creates a lot of the deviations they are asking the Planning Commission to approve. If they were to narrow this down and simply make it four- and three-unit buildings, it would fit most of the code requirements and most of the deviations would go away. He noted that is the direction that needs to be taken. Finally, it was stated that this is being marketed as for sale townhomes but there is no plan for what the governance or oversight will be going forward. The neighboring communities all have strong oversight and governance. Without a plan, do we have a series on townhomes where everyone is on their own to keep up with it, what does this mean to the neighboring communities. In summary, Mr. Bilyeu stated this proposal is much closer but is not where it needs to be. He stated the developer needs to come back and talk to the neighboring communities, adjust the density, and fit the character of the PSLR.

Ms. Michelle Duprey at 48566 Windfall Road stated her presentation was done well in advance of the developers' comments this evening. At that time the presentation was prepared it was not known that the developer would be making a 7% contribution toward the road. With that being said, Mr. Duprey stated that she has been a 40-year resident of the City of Novi and has seen many changes in the development of the City. The Villas of Stonebrook offered a little bit of the idyllic setting that originally was remembered as Novi being. It was stated this was a little piece of land that was peaceful without a lot of traffic. I oppose the Camelot Parc development as it stands today. While the changes made from the previous submittal are appreciated the density is still too much for the lot size. However, the primary concern is the use of the private road. History tells us that Pulte made an agreement with the City that the road would provide the only entrance to Wildlife Park. Ms. Duprey stated the City took advantage of Pulte's offer. It was stated the pickleball courts have been so successful that the City has doubled the number of courts and provided more parking spaces. There are also two baseball diamonds, two soccer fields, and on any given weekend there is increased traffic and a buzz of activity on Stonebrook Drive. Traffic has increased threefold to the park with residents accessing the park through a private road that is maintained by the Villas of Stonebrook. It was stated the residents are responsible for the wear, tear, and maintenance of the private road. As it is private, there is no police protection to enforce speed limits or other safety issues. The lighting which paves the way to the park is paid for as well as maintenance of the grassy areas and landscape which beautifies the road. Now the developers would like to use the private road to accommodate the proposed Camelot Parc. There have been no formal talks to my knowledge of shared responsibility. I believe it is only fair and right to compensate the Villas of Stonebrook for the use of the private road. The road is only 25 feet wide and can narrowly accommodate two cars traveling side by side. Earthmovers and construction traffic traversing the narrow road will put an unfair burden and responsibility on the residents of the Villas of Stonebrook. I would ask the developers to consider the benefit of the private road and how they would like to be good neighbors in offering assistance in the maintenance of the road. Mr. Duprey stated at this time she rejects the current proposal due to the numerous road issues and the density on a small parcel of land.

Ms. Deborah Domke at 48801 Windfall Road stated there was an earlier version of this proposed development in 2023/2024 called Avalon Park Apartments and the developer was Wixom Road Development. The current 2025 version is called Camelot Parc Townhomes, and the developer is Avalon Park Development. It was stated the footprints of the two plans is identical. The area that was to be developed initially is the same area that is to be developed now. This means that the environmental problems that we have been dealing with all along are still going to be there, such as trying to build in the wetlands and woodlands. The reasons that the City Council denied essentially the same plan in January of 2024 are the same reasons I believe you should deny the plan now. The PSLR Development Agreement and the PSLR concept plan will not result in a substantial benefit to the ultimate users of the project and to the community given the density and scope of improvements. In relation to the underlying zoning the proposed type of density will place an undue burden upon the subject property, surrounding land, nearby property owners, and the natural environment due to proposed impacts to existing woodland and wetland natural features. In relation to the underlying zoning and the potential use as contemplated in the City's Master Plan the proposed development will cause a negative impact upon surrounding properties due to the proposed impacts on woodland and wetland natural features.

Ms. Domke stated there is an existing viable exit onto Wixom Road in the northwest corner of the property. The white farmhouse to the north has two existing curb cuts onto Wixom Road, this southernmost curb cut is not shown in the drawings. There is no need for an exit onto Stonebrook Drive that would involve cutting a sixty-foot wide opening out of the ten-foot berm already present.

Mr. Marty Hannigan at 48744 Windfall Road stated he objects to the proposed concept plan. It was stated the access easement dated August 7, 2023, was improperly created and wrongfully filed. Pulte was no longer the developer of the Villas of Stonebrook as of March 1, 2023. Pulte's construction and sales period set forth in the Master Deed and condominium documents and the rights reserved to create an easement expired on March 1, 2023. Therefore, Pulte could not have legally granted any access easement after their rights had expired. It was stated the co-owners of the Villas of Stonebrook will now have to file a quiet title action in circuit court if the property title shall be cleared of this encumbrance. Additionally, the location of Camelot Drive and the sixty-foot access easement for the road encroaches on the fifty-eight feet of existing open space preservation easement that exists on our property. The preservation easement was given to permanently protect the area from disturbance or destruction and shall be perpetually preserved. The Camelot Drive access road must be moved fifty-eight feet to the east to move it out of the preservation area. It was stated there is no recorded utility easement. The concept plans point to a sixty-foot access easement which is incorrectly labeled as a sixty-foot existing access and utility easement that is recorded in the liber 58854 page 508. When you read that access easement which is dated August 7, 2023, Pulte chose to grant an access road easement area only for road purposes. There is no mention of granting an easement for public or private utilities in that recorded easement or in the Master Deed. Lastly, we did not negotiate or agree to any such Stonebrook Drive maintenance contribution agreement or to a shared access plan as the developer has implied by including such language in the concept plan. The developer, by including the maintenance contribution calculation and narrative and the shared access on the concept plan, is simply attempting to accomplish access to Stonebrook Drive which cannot be done through the August 7, 2023 access easement. Mr. Hannigan requested that the Planning Commission reject the JSP25-02 concept plan.

Ms. Kelly Iguchi at 48674 Windfall Road stated she is in attendance tonight out of love for the community and is deeply concerned about what the proposed townhome development will take away. It was expressed when the home was purchased it was not just a financial decision. The home was a promise to family of safety, peace, and a childhood for her daughter surrounded by nature and a strong sense of community. It was stated a premium was paid for the location because of those values and now that promise feels threatened. Ms. Iguchi said one of her greatest joys is watching deer wander through the yard, hearing birds in the morning, and feeling connected to the natural world. If this land is cleared the beauty and wildlife that make this place special would disappear. The development will also have an impact on our schools. She stated families move to Novi for the quality of education, but overcrowding will hurt every child's experience. It was expressed that this is unfair to families who have already invested so much in being here. There will be disruption with the construction traffic and permanent loss of privacy and peace. We chose this neighborhood because it is safe and quiet. Finally, it was noted that Novi has plenty of open land. The question was posed as to why we are building in such a way that it destroys an established community and its natural surroundings. Ms. Iguchi asked the Planning Commission to protect what makes the neighborhood special and vote against this development.

Ann Nelke at 48646 Windfall Road stated to start she is not anti-development. She noted underneath the photos of the Mayor and the City Council are several goals both short term and long term. The first of those goals is to review woodland and wetland ordinances and make any necessary revisions to ensure we are balancing the protection of natural resources with development. Secondly, establish an environmental sustainability committee to study all aspects of environmental sustainability in the City and at a minimum develop an environmental sustainability action plan. Thirdly, review and update current board and commission structure and add new boards and commissions as appropriate to maximize opportunities for resident engagement and input to the City staff. It was stated that at times deviations are warranted. An example is where an area of former industrial blight is mitigated to allow something of value and enhancement to Novi and its residents, this is the Villas at Stonebrook. Ms. Nelke stated it is understood that an easement was granted for the Wildlife Park which was for public benefit. Ms. Nelke

stated she would gladly help Novi achieve the City Council's short- and long-term goals and serve as a resident member of the stated board commission on its commitment to thoughtful, sustainable, harmonious housing which ensures protection of our new residents as well as for future generations.

Ms. Grace Wilfong at 48672 Rockview Road stated she has been a resident of Novi for a long time. She expressed a few things that have been noticed which need to be addressed. First, there is no room for a backyard. Secondly, one of the buildings is in the middle of a wetland. This building will separate the wetlands and interfere with the existing wetlands. It was expressed there is no reason seen as to why one of the two curb cuts on Wixom Road cannot be used as opposed to using Stonebrook Drive.

Mr. Steve Potocsky at 48849 Rockview Road stated he is currently serving as the president of the Villas of Stonebrook homeowners association. First, he inquired if the units would have basements. It was confirmed that the units will have basements. Mr. Potocsky stated that the issue of lack of communication needs to be addressed. It was noted at the last meeting when Avalon Park was approved by the Planning Commission that the City Attorney requested the developer contact the board of the Villas of Stonebrook as well as Island Lake. Mr. Potocsky stated it has been two years, and no correspondence has been received. The document which refers to a seven percent contribution toward the road should be discussed if the development comes about. He expressed that they are not anti-development but are in support of safe and fair growth. This proposal as it stands fails that test.

Mr. Mike Kasnick at 26391 Fieldstone stated he is the Island Lake Arbors president. He inquired what the price point of the townhomes will be. He expressed that many HOA's do not have a rental cap built into their documents. It was stated the Arbors is struggling with the number of rentals. There is concern that the townhomes could be purchased by investors and turned into rentals which is not the intent of this property. It was asked if consideration might be made in the original documentation of the by-laws to create a rental cap as rentals are not treated the same as units in which the owners reside in.

Seeing no others, Chair Pehrson requested the correspondence received be read into the record. Member Lynch stated there were 160 objections primarily from Island Lake and the Villas of Stonebrook.

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

Member Lynch stated he voted against the original proposal due to the apartment buildings not fitting into the area. He noted he is glad to see when it went before the City Council that decision was supported. It was stated the developer has come back with a much better project of townhomes. Most of the deviations are for the reason of protecting the wetlands and woodlands. Member Lynch expressed he would like to see it encumbered by a conservation easement.

Member Lynch stated based on the renderings, the townhomes are about 1,800 to 1,900 square feet above grade. He inquired if there will be a finished lower level.

Mr. Polyzois stated finishing of the lower level will be an option. Additionally, the units will have a covered patio.

Member Lynch stated regarding the covered patio and associated deviation his preference is to see the preservation of the wetlands over expansion. He expressed appreciation to the developer for going back and modifying the proposal. It was inquired of the developer if trees could be planted on site as opposed to a contribution to the tree fund.

Mr. Polyzois stated he is willing to work with the City's landscape architect regarding the planting of trees on the site.

Member Dismondy inquired if the density of 2.7 dwelling units per acre includes the wetlands.

Planner Bell confirmed it does include wetlands.

Member Dismondy stated one aspect that was overlooked with the PSLR is the public benefit and inquired what the public benefit is.

Planner Bell stated the public benefit was not a large part of this review and the offer of a conservation easement could be considered.

Member Roney stated he was not in favor of the previous proposal. He expressed this plan makes more sense and noted this is well within the scope of what could be built as it does conform to the PSLR. He noted he appreciated Member Lynch's comments regarding the conservation easement. There are a good number of deviations but most of them are in order to preserve the wetlands and woodlands. He stated he is in support.

Member Avdoulos stated he appreciates the residents coming forward and expressing their concerns. It is not something that is negated, we listen and try to understand both sides. As indicated, no one is against development, but our charge is to ensure the developers that come forward are following the ordinance. The current property has a PSLR overlay which is existing, similar to the Villas of Stonebrook. It was noted the project has a limited amount of impact on the site and most of the development is planned to the south with a large portion of the property left as is.

Member Avdoulos shared that he was on the board when the Villas of Stonebrook came forward and felt that development was more dense than he personally would have expected but it was following the ordinance. He noted having the lower density as mentioned is appropriate and positive. Looking at the sketches, the architecture blends in with the aesthetics of the Villas of Stonebrook as well as the Island Lake townhomes. It was asked of the developer what the price point will be.

Mr. Polyzois stated the price point will be north of \$500,000.

Member Avdoulos conveyed that some have indicated that these developments may have an effect on property values. From what has been observed, these developments next to other developments actually help property values go up, especially if the quality is there. He expressed appreciation for what they have done.

Chair Pehrson stated there was a comment made about property titles.

City Attorney Beth Saarela stated she would like to clarify the requirements of the original PSLR agreement and the private road. The original PSLR agreement for the Villas of Stonebrook not only required the public road it also stated the developer shall provide an access easement on the north side of the proposed entry drive as shown on the PSLR concept plan for future connection capability to neighboring properties to eliminate multiple exits onto Wixom Road. Not only was the public access required, private access for this property was also a requirement of that development. The development would not have been approved without it. There was a question about not being in the property title which is also not accurate. When all the units were sold, the property owners would have been given the Master Deed. It is the document that controls all of the title restrictions on the property. The Master Deed incorporated by reference the PSLR agreement that is being discussed with all the requirements. Owners of the units in the Villas of Stonebrook may go back to the Master Deed document and reference sections 4.6, 4.8, and 6.5 to see that the PSLR development agreement is incorporated into the Master Deed. This notifies that all the easements will be granted by the developer. If there was a quiet title action that cleared an easement what the City would then have to do is go back and get the same easement from the condominium association because it is a requirement of the development agreement and the site plan. If it wasn't granted there would then be a site plan violation that could be taken to court.

Chair Pehrson stated there was mention of a rental cap.



City Attorney Beth Saarela stated that the rental cap would be discretionary with the developer.

Chair Pehrson inquired of the developer if a rental cap had been considered.

Mr. Polyzois stated he had not considered a rental cap due to the price point of the units. When the unit is treated as a non-homestead the taxes will be considerably higher. He stated it is something that can be looked into further, but it is not something he is looking to impose.

Chair Pehrson stated he agrees with the additional tree planting on the property and the record will reflect the desire for those additional plantings as well as the conservation easement. He noted the other point that was brought up several times is the lack of communication between the developer and the neighboring communities.

Mr. Polyzois stated when the journey with this property began three to four years ago the Planning Department provided Mr. Potocsky's contact information. Mr. Polyzois expressed he reached out to Mr. Potocsky and a meeting was coordinated. Several residents from both the Villas of Stonebrook and Island Lake attended the meeting. Mr. Polyzois stated he told them what the vision was for the property. There was communication up to and through the approval at the Planning Commission meeting for the apartment complex and rejection at City Council. After which there was not a need to engage until earlier this year when it was communicated that the plan had been changed to twenty-four for sale townhome units. Mr. Potocsky expressed he was still not in favor and would prefer duplex units similar to the Villas at Stonebrook. Many months later the plan was revised down to twenty-two units, and a text was sent notifying Mr. Potocsky that the plans had been revised.

Chair Pehrson stated he appreciates the ability to reach out. He noted in a case like this we could always do a better job communicating. He is in agreement that the revised plan fits the area with much less density and believes this is a viable plan.

Motion to recommend approval of the Planned Suburban Low-Rise (PSLR) Overlay Development Agreement Application and Concept Plan to the City Council made by Member Avdoulos and seconded by Member Lynch.

**In the matter of Camelot Parc Townhomes JSP25-02, motion to recommend approval of the Planned Suburban Low-Rise (PSLR) Overlay Development Agreement Application and Concept Plan based on the following findings, City Council deviations, and conditions:**

- 1. The PSLR Overlay Development Agreement and PSLR Overlay Concept Plan will result in a recognizable and substantial benefit to the ultimate users of the project and to the community. *[The applicant proposes a walking trail through a 0.77acre area of woodland to be preserved, which is 0.05 acre short of the 10% site area requirement. There is also a requirement for 200 square feet of private open space per unit that is not fully provided, but each unit will have a covered porch of about 125 square feet. There are benches in separate locations as enhancements of the common open spaces shown on the site. Since so much of the property is wetland area and wetland mitigation to be preserved in Conservation Easements, it is difficult to achieve some of the "active" open space requirements. The site would have a connection to Wildlife Woods Park, the extensive pathway system within Ascension Providence Park hospital campus to the east and ITC Trail.]***
- 2. In relation to the underlying zoning or the potential uses contemplated in the City of Novi Master Plan, the proposed type and density of use(s) will not result in an unreasonable increase in the use of public services, facilities and utilities, and will not place an unreasonable burden upon the subject property, surrounding land, nearby property owners and occupants, or the natural environment. *[The estimated number of daily vehicle trips is 132, which is less than the 750 trip threshold for a Traffic Study. Peak hour trips also do not reach the threshold of 100 trips (Estimated: 5 peak hour AM trips, 10 peak hour PM trips). The proposed use is expected to have minimal impacts on the use of public services,***

- facilities, and utilities over what the underlying zoning would allow. The proposed concept plan impacts about 0.37 acres of existing 2.41 acres of wetlands and proposes removal of approximately 20 of the regulated woodland trees. The plan indicates appropriate mitigation measures on-site and payment into the Tree Fund for the replacement credits.]*
3. In relation to the underlying zoning or the potential uses contemplated in the City of Novi Master Plan, the proposed development will not cause a negative impact upon surrounding properties. *[The proposed buildings are buffered by landscaping and preserved natural features. The multi-family residential use is a reasonable transition from the two-family and one-family developments to the west, east and south and the commercial shopping center to the north.]*
  4. The proposed development will be consistent with the goals and objectives of the City of Novi Master Plan, and will be consistent with the requirements of this Article [Article 3.1.27]. *[The proposed development could help provide for missing middle housing needs that are walkable to the commercial areas to the north, which is recommended in the City's Master Plan for Land Use. The area was included in the PSLR overlay in the Master Plan and Zoning Ordinance, which permits multiple-family uses as a special land use. The proposed arrangement of buildings and site layout minimizes the impact on existing natural features.]*
  5. City Council deviations for the following (as the Concept Plan provides substitute safeguards for each of the regulations and there are specific, identified features or planning mechanisms deemed beneficial to the City by the City Council which are designed into the project for the purpose of achieving the objectives for the District as stated in the planning review letter):
    - a. Deviation from Sec. 3.21.2.A.i to allow development to front on an approved private drive, which does not conform to the City standards with respect to required sixty foot right-of-way, as the road was previously approved for the Villas at Stonebrook development, and because the shared access reduces the number of curb cuts on Wixom Road;
    - b. Deviation from Sec. 3.21.2.A.ii.d. to allow two buildings to be a minimum of 25 feet apart (minimum 30 feet required) as the remaining buildings are properly spaced, and the 5-foot deviation is relatively minor;
    - c. Deviation from Sec. 3.21.2.A.iii.c. to allow parking spaces to be within 8 feet of a building (15 feet minimum required), as they are no closer than the driveway parking permitted;
    - d. Deviation from Sec. 3.21.2.A.v to allow a reduction in the minimum required private open space (4,400 square feet total required, 2,750 square feet provided), as constructing additional private open space would cause greater wetland and woodland impacts;
    - e. Deviation from Sec. 3.21.2.A.v to allow reduction of minimum percentage of active recreation areas (50% of open spaces required, approximately 29% provided), and less than 10% of the total site (9.4% proposed), as the development proposes connection to Wildlife Woods Park, which contains connections to the Providence and the ITC trail systems, and providing additional active recreation would cause greater wetland and woodland impacts;
    - f. Deviation from Sec. 3.21.2.A.iii and Sec. 5.5.3 to allow absence of required landscaped berm along Wixom Road north of the emergency access drive due to resulting woodland impacts and there is no development proposed in that area. In addition, the berm south of the access drive is not long enough to provide undulation.
    - g. Deviation from Sec. 3.6.2.M to allow deficiencies in the required 25-foot wetland buffers north of Avalon Drive, with the condition that the developer install signage and plantings to prevent mowing and other disturbance.
    - h. Deviation from Sec. 5.5.3.B(10) to allow a deficiency in street trees along Wixom Road, as the existing utility easements and pathway do not provide room for them.
    - i. Deviation from Sec. 5.10.1.B.ii to allow a minor drive to exceed 600 feet, because the anticipated traffic for 22 units is low and a major drive would require wider road

width and not permit perpendicular visitor parking, and would be unnecessary for this small site and cause greater impacts to natural features.

- j. Deviation from Sec. 4.04, Article IV, Appendix C-Subdivision ordinance of City Code of Ordinances for absence of a stub street required at 1,300 feet intervals along the property boundary to provide connection to the adjacent property boundary, due to conflict with existing wetlands and woodlands.
- k. Deviation from Design and Construction Standards to allow sidewalks to be placed adjacent to the curbed roadway, as to locate them further from the road would cause greater impacts to natural features, and traffic volume and speeds are low.
- l. Deviation from Code of Ordinances, Section 11-256, to allow an absence of sidewalks in some areas north of Avalon Drive, as there are no buildings adjacent to those areas, and building the sidewalks would cause greater impacts to wetlands.
- m. The findings of compliance with Ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters and the conditions and the items listed in those letters being addressed on the Preliminary Site Plan.

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

**ROLL CALL VOICE VOTE ON MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE PLANNED SUBURBAN LOW-RISE (PSLR) OVERLAY DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT APPLICATION AND CONCEPT PLAN TO THE CITY COUNCIL MOVED BY MEMBER AVDOULOS AND SECONDED BY MEMBER LYNCH. *Motion carried 4-1 (Dismondy).***

**2. TEXT AMENDMENT 18.306 – PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO CAR WASH STANDARDS**

Public hearing for Text Amendment 18.306 to reclassify auto washes from Principal Permitted Uses to Special Land Uses in the B-3 District subject to new conditions, and to amend various additional sections of the ordinance as determined necessary.

Senior Planner Lindsay Bell stated earlier this year, the Ordinance Review Committee (ORC) requested Staff look into the current Zoning Ordinance standards for Car Wash facilities.

In recent years, the City has received many inquiries to develop car wash facilities. The proliferation of this use is a nation-wide trend. Today about 80% of car washes are done at a commercial facility compared to about 50% in the 1990s. In addition, the car wash model is very attractive to investors because the low labor requirements and convenient membership models bring in big annual returns. Some forecasts predict that the number of car washes in the U.S. will double by 2030.

The risk of continuing the trend to build more car washes is oversaturation of the market, with the revenue of existing car washes decreasing with each new one that opens as they compete for customers. Due to the specific design of a car wash building, if the business closes, it could be difficult to repurpose the structure for another use.

In the City of Novi, Auto Washes are a principal permitted use only in the B-3 General Business District. There are no specific use standards except for the requirement that they are completely enclosed in a building. Otherwise, they are expected to comply with the requirements of the B-3 District for building and parking setbacks, and building height (Section 3.1.12).

Section 3.10 contains Required Conditions for the B-1, B-2 and B-3 Districts, and states that overhead/service bay doors shall not face a major thoroughfare nor an abutting residential district. Car washes often must seek a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals for this condition because of the long tunnel design typical of car wash buildings with an entrance and exit door make it difficult to avoid having one overhead door facing the road. Modern car washes often have outdoor vacuum stations as an accessory use, which does require an outdoor component.

Planner Bell referenced a map on the screen showing the locations of the existing and proposed car washes in Novi. The white labels reference existing car washes, while the green labels note existing smaller car washes that are accessory to a gas station. The two yellow labels represent new car washes that have been submitted for site plan review – both are on properties zoned B-3, so the use is principal permitted, or permitted as of right (*without* the discretion for approval that a Special Land Use would allow).

Planner Bell stated staff reviewed other communities' ordinances and found there are many differing standards for car washes. Farmington Hills recently amended its Zoning Ordinance to state that in the B-3 District, vehicle washes are only permitted on properties that had a legally conforming vehicle wash as of the date of their ordinance amendment. They also have specific use standards to be met. In Farmington, automobile washes are a Special Land Use in the C-3 District. In Plymouth, automobile car washes are permitted as a Special Land Use in the B-3 and ARC (Ann Arbor Road Corridor) Districts, subject to several use standards. In Wixom, car washes are a Special Land Use in their B-3 District, and a permitted use in the FS District. There are a few use standards that must be met.

In June, the City Council's Ordinance Review Committee (ORC) discussed the draft text amendment and made suggestions for revisions. One suggestion was the condition that car wash buildings that become vacant would need to be torn down. This has been added to the draft text amendment you received tonight in the packet – as shown in italics. The Committee also increased the minimum lot size from 1 acre to 2 acres. The Committee unanimously voted to recommend the text amendment to City Council for consideration. On August 11<sup>th</sup>, City Council approved the referral of Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment 18.306 to the Planning Commission for public hearing and recommendation to City Council.

Planner Bell stated the text amendment proposed would change the use from Principal Permitted to the more discretionary Special Land Use in the B-3 District. This would not impact the smaller accessory car washes that are sometimes found at gas stations. The specific use standards car washes would include a minimum lot size of 2 acres, 40-foot minimum front yard setback, minimum 100-foot setback from residential properties, outdoor vacuum stations shall not be in front yard, with noise controlled by sound barriers if necessary to meet noise performance standards (Section 5.14), overhead doors shall not face residential-zoned properties, or must be screened by another building or wall, and any new auto wash proposed that has been approved by the Planning Commission prior to formal adoption of this ordinance shall be considered a permitted use under the adopted ordinance standards at that time. If the proposed text amendment is adopted as proposed, some of the existing car washes will become non-conforming with the new standards. All of the existing car washes are on parcels less than 2 acres. The other standards appear to be able to be met. The two proposed car washes are both on properties greater than 2 acres.

The Planning Commission is asked to hold the scheduled Public Hearing and consider making a recommendation to the City Council on the proposed ordinance amendment.

Chair Pehrson opened the public hearing and invited members of the audience who wished to speak to approach the podium.

Mr. Scott Griffin and Mr. Jamie Burke with Quick Pass Car Wash inquired if they would be negatively affected by the text amendment.

Seeing no others and confirming there was no correspondence received Chair Pehrson closed the audience participation and turned the matter over to the planning commission.

Member Lynch stated he trusts the judgement of the experts.

Member Dismondy inquired if Jax Car Wash is located at Fountain Walk.

Planner Bell confirmed that Jax was not approved by the City Council.

Member Roney had no further comment.

Member Avdoulos stated he had a question related to item eleven which states if the car wash is vacated it will have to be destroyed. He inquired if that would include the non-conforming car washes.

Planner Bell stated the way it was written it would be grandfathered in.

Chair Pehrson inquired if the current ordinance includes noise conditions for new car washes.

Planner Bell stated Special Land Use would rise to the level of requiring a noise study.

Chair Pehrson inquired if touchless car washes fall into the same standard.

Planner Bell confirmed that touchless car washes would still be considered a car wash and fall under the same standard.

Motion to recommend adoption to the City Council of Text Amendment 18.306 – Proposed Amendments to Car Wash Standards as presented made by Member Avdoulos and seconded by Member Lynch.

**ROLL CALL VOICE VOTE ON MOTION TO RECOMMEND ADOPTION TO THE CITY COUNCIL OF TEXT AMENDMENT 18.306 – PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO CAR WASH STANDARDS AS PRESENTED MOVED BY MEMBER AVDOULOS AND SECONDED BY MEMBER LYNCH. *Motion carried 5-0.***

## **MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION**

### **1. JSP25-09 SAKURA EAST**

Consideration of the request of Sakura Novi Residential LLC for Preliminary Site Plan and Storm Water Management Plan. The subject property is zoned TC-1 with a Planned Rezoning Overlay (PRO), which conditions development to the terms of a PRO Plan and Agreement. The applicant is proposing to develop 45 multifamily residential units.

Senior Planner Lindsay Bell stated the applicant has received approval of the rezoning to TC-1 utilizing the Planned Rezoning Overlay option, so the development is subject to the terms of the PRO Agreement.

As you'll remember from the PRO process, the site plan shows a total of 45 attached townhome units on the site. The development is accessed by one entrance off Eleven Mile Road. A secondary emergency access drive to the office development to the east is shown. Parking is provided in garages, on the garage aprons, and a few small bays of surface parking.

The Town Center districts require development amenities to be provided. There are three gathering spaces: one multi-purpose field, one open space area between the buildings, and one area with outdoor furniture, grill and a firepit on the west side. The plan exceeds the requirements for both general open space and usable open space by a significant amount. There are also no impacts to the existing wetland area proposed. Buffer impacts do need to be clarified in the Final Site Plan submittal.

Otherwise, the site plan is consistent with the deviations and conditions of the approved PRO Agreement and Plan, and all reviewers are recommending approval. Tonight, the Planning Commission is asked to consider approval of the Preliminary Site Plan and Stormwater Management Plan. The applicant Tim Loughrin from Robertson Brothers is here representing the project tonight. Staff is also available to answer any questions you may have.

Mr. Tim Loughrin stated he is here to answer any questions, they are excited to move forward, and the PRO Agreement is recorded.

Member Lynch had no comment.

Member Dismondy had no comment.

Member Roney inquired regarding the walkable paths leading to the wetland overlook.

Mr. Loughrin stated there is a wetland overlook as required by the PRO Agreement. He noted additional survey work is being done, and it is still in motion.

Member Roney stated there was a recent bond proposal that passed and the road that will be in close proximity to this property will need to be considered.

Member Avdoulos stated he is pleased with what is happening in that area.

Motion to approve the JSP25-09 Sakura East Preliminary Site Plan made by Member Avdoulos and seconded by Member Lynch.

**In the matter of Sakura East, JSP25-09, motion to approve the Preliminary Site Plan based on and subject to the findings of compliance with Ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters, and the conditions and items listed in those letters, as well as all of the terms and conditions of the PRO Agreement as approved, with any outstanding items being addressed on the Final Site Plan.**

**This motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Article 3, Article 4 and Article 5 of the Zoning Ordinance and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance, as well as the terms of the PRO Agreement.**

**ROLL CALL VOICE VOTE TO APPROVE JSP25-09 SAKURA EAST PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN MOVED BY MEMBER AVDOULOS AND SECONDED BY MEMBER LYNCH. Motion carried 5-0.**

Motion to approve the JSP25-09 Sakura East Stormwater Management Plan made by Member Avdoulos and seconded by Member Lynch.

**In the matter of Sakura East, JSP25-09, motion to approve the Stormwater Management Plan, based on and subject to the findings of compliance with Ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters, and the conditions and items listed in those letters being addressed on the Final Site Plan.**

**This motion is made because it is otherwise in compliance with Chapter 11 of the Code of Ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance.**

**ROLL CALL VOICE VOTE TO APPROVE JSP25-09 SAKURA EAST STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN MOVED BY MEMBER AVDOULOS AND SECONDED BY MEMBER LYNCH. Motion carried 5-0.**

## **2. APPROVAL OF THE 2026 PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING SCHEDULE**

Motion to approve the 2026 Planning Commission Regular Meeting Schedule as presented made by Member Lynch and seconded by Member Avdoulos.

**Motion to approve the 2026 Planning Commission Regular Meeting Schedule as presented.**

**ROLL CALL VOICE VOTE TO APPROVE THE 2026 PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING SCHEDULE MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER AVDOULOS. *Motion carried 5-0.***

**3. APPROVAL OF THE AUGUST 20, 2025 PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**

**Motion to approve the August 20, 2025 Planning Commission Minutes.**

**ROLL CALL VOICE VOTE TO APPROVE THE AUGUST 20, 2025 PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER AVDOULOS. *Motion carried 5-0.***

**CONSENT AGENDA REMOVALS FOR COMMISSION ACTION**

There were no consent agenda items.

**SUPPLEMENTAL ISSUES/TRAINING UPDATES**

There were no supplemental issues or training updates.

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION**

Chair Pehrson invited members of the audience who wished to address the Planning Commission during the final audience participation to come forward. Seeing no one, Chair Pehrson closed the final audience participation.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Motion to adjourn the September 10, 2025 meeting made by Member Lynch and all in favor said aye.

Meeting adjourned at 8:21 PM.