

REGULAR MEETING - PLANNING COMMISSION

CITY OF NOVI

August 23, 2017

Proceedings taken in the matter of the PLANNING COMMISSION, at City of Novi, 45175 West Ten Mile Road, Novi, Michigan, on Wednesday, August 23, 2017.

BOARD MEMBERS

Mark Pehrson, Chairperson

David Greco

Robert Giacobetti

John Avdoulos

Michael Lynch

Ted Zuchlewski

ALSO PRESENT:

Barbara, McBeth, City Planner

Thomas Schultz, City Attorney

Kirsten Mellem, Planner

Sri Komaragari, Planner

Rick Meader, Landscape Architect

Darcy Rechten, Engineering

Certified Shorthand Reporter, Diane Szach

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Novi, Michigan.
Wednesday, August 23, 2017
7:00 p.m.

** ** *

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We'll call to
order the August 23rd, 2017 Planning Commission
meeting.

Sri, can you call the roll, please.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Good evening.

Member Anthony?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Absent,
excused.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Here.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: 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,

1 could we rise for the Pledge of Allegiance, please.

2 Member Lynch, could you start us,
3 please.

4 (Pledge recited.)

5 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you,
6 sir.

7 With that we'll look for a motion
8 to amend or approve the agenda.

9 MR. LYNCH: Motion to approve.

10 MR. GIACOPETTI: Second.

11 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a
12 motion and a second. Any other discussion?

13 All those in favor?

14 THE BOARD: Aye.

15 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Anyone
16 opposed? We have a motion.

17 We do have several items on the
18 agenda, but there are no public hearings at this time,
19 so this would be your chance at our first audience
20 participation. If there's anyone in the audience that
21 wishes to address the Planning Commission on one of
22 the matters for consideration, please step forward at
23 this time.

24 MR. ZACK: Good evening. My name
25 is Gary Zack. I live at 359 South Lake Drive.

1 Although I appreciate this project, I object to many
2 aspects of the project. The whole project in some
3 ways appears to be poorly thought out. It destroys
4 precious green space and prime picnic recreation are
5 in Novi's only natural park. And such a large
6 building intended for municipal use is really
7 inappropriate in a park as well as in a lake front
8 residential area. In addition, very few Novi citizens
9 are aware of this project, and most of those who are
10 object to it.

11 I object to the variances for setbacks,
12 landscaping, allowed parking, wetland setback and tree
13 placement. The City Council promised repeatedly that
14 they would respect all ordinances and the neighbors.
15 Our ordinances were put in place to protect us from
16 inappropriate development and to maintain adequate
17 buffers between buildings. The park is 380 acres,
18 therefore there is no justification for any variance.
19 How can we expect to enforce these variances on
20 developers in the city if we do not follow them
21 ourselves. Allowing these variances sets a dangerous
22 precedent and is disrespectful to the neighbors. If
23 the building were relocated to another property or was
24 4800 square feet as shown in the conceptual plan
25 presented by the city prior to the August 2016 ballot,

1 these variances would not be needed.

2 I object to the addition of any
3 unnecessary traffic on residential South Lake Drive.
4 South Lake Drive is a unique and very dangerous
5 situation. You have a road bisecting residents' lake
6 front front yards, many residential driveways, and a
7 path with bikes and pedestrian traffic including small
8 children and animals, all of this on an already
9 severely overloaded residential road. The goal should
10 be to decrease the traffic on the road, not increase
11 it by any amount. I also question -- object to the
12 traffic study. The numbers in the study do not make
13 sense. If there are 318 trips per average day and you
14 divide by 24 hours, you get 13.2 trips per average
15 hour. How can the maximum peak traffic hour add only
16 13 additional vehicles per hour? Even with the
17 conservative assumption that traffic is evenly spread
18 out over 24 hours, these numbers simply do not add up.

19 I object to the lighting plan for
20 this development. The large amount of parking lot
21 lights right next to houses is unacceptable as is the
22 installation of high maintenance bollard lights on
23 pathways in a park that is closed at dusk. I
24 appreciate the dark sky and I'm not in favor of
25 unnecessary light pollution in a dark area such as a

1 natural park.

2 I object to the fact that the
3 pavilion recently constructed for handicapped access
4 will now be located a significant distance from the
5 nearest parking. Previously parking was located
6 adjacent to this pavilion.

7 I also object that the majority of
8 individual picnic sites available for families using
9 the beach are now located in the rear of the park far
10 from of the beach and separated by pavilions and paved
11 parking areas. Thank you very much.

12 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.
13 Anyone else? Any other audience participation?
14 Please step forward.

15 MS. TAO: Hi, good evening. My
16 name is Lian Tao. I am the homeowner of 45257 Sedra
17 Court, Novi, and I'm trying to express my concern with
18 regard to the Taft Knoll III that was proposed.

19 I'm writing to say that I object to
20 the request to develop this property, and because I'm
21 concerned about the burden that might be placed on the
22 public at large and the nearby homeowners in Taft
23 Knolls I and II, in particular with respect to
24 construction traffic, safety to the children playing
25 in the subdivisions, home security due to construction

1 contractors entering our subdivision, and tree removal
2 and timely completion. I mainly want to talk about
3 the first three points here.

4 In the recent months vehicles
5 related to preliminary work on the property -- on the
6 proposed property have accessed the property via Jacob
7 and the Danyas Way. The subject property has an
8 established driveway off Taft Road, therefore there is
9 no reason why construction traffic needs to access the
10 property by our subdivision. The proposed site plan
11 developer must be required to use the existing
12 driveway off Taft Road as its construction entrance.
13 I request a No Construction Traffic sign be posted at
14 Jacob Drive and a No Construction Parking sign be
15 posted at Danyas Way and Sedra Court respectively.
16 Traffic violation tickets should be issued if
17 construction vehicles access or park within our
18 subdivision.

19 Furthermore, the weight of
20 construction vehicles will put additional burdens on
21 our streets which will cost unnecessary wear and tear
22 on the road surface.

23 And the primary reason for our
24 concern regarding the usage of our streets to access
25 the development is that they put the children of our

1 subdivision, of our neighborhood at risk
2 unnecessarily. The additional traffic of nonresidents
3 will increase the likelihood of accidents of which we
4 cannot accept.

5 The construction vehicles and high
6 volume of unknown contractors entering the
7 two-completed communities, that's Taft Knolls I and II
8 also puts our properties at risk. In the first four
9 months of 2017, there have been already nine daytime
10 home break-ins occur within the City of Novi.

11 Allowing construction vehicles to enter our
12 neighborhoods would give the potential burglars the
13 opportunity to pretend to be a contractor, and then
14 break into a house when he observes homeowner
15 schedules and knows when the homeowners are not at
16 home. We are not open to the possibility of such
17 risks.

18 In the past when the subdivision
19 was in the process of being finished for Taft Knolls
20 II, that is our subdivision when it was being
21 developed, we had already experienced increased
22 traffic to our existing homes by both contractors
23 using our -- using our water and electricity without
24 asking, and the potential buyers walking through our
25 yards as if we are model homes. This type of activity

1 in addition to the recent home break-ins puts us at an
2 unnecessary risk.

3 I think in terms of tree removal on
4 the properties and in terms of my concerns for the
5 timely completion of the new phase of the neighborhood
6 I expressed to Sri.

7 So the owner of the property, of
8 this proposed property is the same person who
9 completed Taft Knolls II. After numerous extension
10 and the broken promises, we all had very painful
11 experiences in just getting the developer to complete
12 his obligations, and those range from things within
13 our homes to the completion of common areas and the
14 sidewalks. I am confident that you can find numerous
15 examples of issues the City of Novi has had with this
16 developer. As past history indicates, we are sure
17 this developer will have the same issues with this new
18 development. With that being the case, we do not want
19 to have any association to this development or have
20 our community be used in this development.

21 Our families deserve to be left in
22 peace with our neighborhood that has finally been
23 completed. It is quite possible for the builder to
24 continue his work, but not in a fashion that connects
25 our homes to his new development. The request to

1 utilize our subdivision for construction traffic and
2 to align the new development to our subdivision is an
3 unnecessary burden and risk that we strongly object
4 to.

5 Thank you.

6 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

7 Is there anyone else?

8 MR. THOMOPOULOS: Good evening. My
9 name is John Thomopoulos. I live at 425 South Lake
10 Drive. So I live just east of the park, and I would
11 like to talk to you tonight about the project for Lake
12 Shore Park.

13 So clearly living right next to it
14 I think it's safe to say that I'm probably most
15 affected with the proposed new building. I know that
16 there is a lot of concerns that neighbors have raised
17 previously, some that are speaking tonight. I agree
18 with those concerns, but rather than rehash the same
19 concerns, I wanted to focus on specific plans that you
20 have in front of you tonight, even though I'm opposed
21 to the size and location of the building.

22 Having said that, I do want to
23 thank Rob Petty and Jeff Muck. They did stop by my
24 house to look over the plans and answer some questions
25 that I have. So thank you, gentlemen. I appreciate

1 that.

2 The areas that I've got in
3 particular of concern would be the current plans show
4 new power lines going up right on the property line
5 basically five feet from my house. I looked at the
6 DTE and the NESC guidelines, and they recommend a
7 minimum of 15 feet. So if there is something we can
8 do to address that, I'd really appreciate it. Best of
9 all, if you can bury the power lines, that would be
10 even better, but having them five feet from my house
11 seems like an unsafe situation.

12 I've asked that the existing trees
13 between my house and the proposed building do not get
14 taken down regardless of whether it looks like they
15 might be diseased or not. They provide a lot of
16 cover. I've got a two-story home and then a
17 third-story lookout. Basically when I look west, I'm
18 going to be looking at this building. So if we can
19 leave the existing trees, that's beneficial for me,
20 and that shouldn't be any cost to the city.

21 Given that when I'm in my kitchen,
22 in my bedroom, on my deck, if I look west, I'm going
23 to be looking at this building. You know, I
24 originally built the house, it was next to a beautiful
25 park. I think we all could agree that that's a very

1 desirable thing to have. We're looking at a 9400
2 square foot building replacing the park next to my
3 house. If we can use a combination of solid fencing
4 similar to what is there right now for the volleyball
5 court with some new plantings, that can help alleviate
6 sitting on the deck or sitting in the kitchen and
7 watching people pulling in and out with their cars.

8 Because of the size of this
9 building and the size of the parking lot, there is
10 going to be quite a few cars coming in and out during
11 the day seven days a week. It's a large building that
12 is large because you're expecting a lot of people to
13 use it. So there is going to be a lot of traffic
14 there.

15 And then lastly, the key point that
16 I wanted to bring up is with this large parking lot,
17 there is probably going to be some new water runoff
18 dynamics from what is currently there. It's not all
19 asphalt right now. I know that there is plans to have
20 some retention ponds. If we can make sure that those
21 things are adequate so that my backyard doesn't start
22 flooding because of the new grading, that would
23 appreciated.

24 So if you do proceed with the
25 proposed building, that once again if I could push a

1 button and make it go away I would, but if you do
2 proceed with that, I'd like you to take these into
3 consideration with the final plans.

4 Thank you.

5 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you,
6 sir.

7 Anyone else?

8 MS. CHAKRABORTY: Good evening. My
9 name is Debejyo Chakraborty. I am a resident of 45252
10 Sedra Court, and I have some concerns about the Taft
11 Knolls III construction project.

12 My main concern is the construction
13 traffic would probably try to access it through Danyas
14 Way or through the access through Sedra Court, and we
15 want to be assured that this will not happen and the
16 construction traffic goes off of Taft Road and there
17 would be a No Construction Sign in Taft Knolls I and
18 II because we have a lot of small kids and they're
19 always playing. I wanted to raise this to Council and
20 have this documented at the meeting tonight.

21 Thank you.

22 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

23 Anyone else? If you guys want to
24 line up towards the side just to expedite the stuff.

25 MR. DUNESKE: Good evening. My

1 name is John Duneske. I live at 357 South Lake Drive.
2 I would like to address the issues concerning the Lake
3 Shore Park new building.

4 So it's kind of I know some of this
5 has been said before, but I just wanted to kind of
6 recap at least a little bit of a timeline going back
7 to 2014 when the conceptual plan was put together and
8 the footprint was going to be 2400 square feet, two
9 stories, being 4800 square feet together. Then July
10 of 2016, a couple years later, the consultants M.C.
11 Smith came by and the building was originally in 2014
12 on the west side. Now it's been moved to the east
13 side of the park. And they were -- the original
14 building was to be built for a party, day camp,
15 programming classes, polling. That's what it was set
16 up for. They took it out just before the election in
17 August of 2016, they took out the word parties in
18 there, and the rest of it remained the same.

19 January 2017 City Council, I just
20 watched the video again today, Mayor Gatt and Council
21 members were looking at concerns that this building
22 was not going to be big enough for weddings and big
23 events, and that's in contrast to what the city
24 charter is in Section 15.12 saying they can't use it
25 for banquet facilities, parties, weddings, big events

1 like that. So it's in contrast to what it's supposed
2 to be used for. The mayor was concerned about --
3 not so much concerned where it was located, being at
4 the front where the lake is at, his concern was
5 bigger, he wanted it bigger. He was concerned about a
6 building that was going to be built, 50 years from
7 now, 100 years from now is it going to big enough for
8 what the needs for a bigger rental like that.

9 The conceptual plan now is -- that
10 you are looking at right now in August here that I
11 just had a chance to look at just over the weekend
12 here briefly, I was looking now that you're moving one
13 of the shelters, and again I live close to the park
14 where there is vegetation, I look at where the trees
15 -- well 42 percent of the trees or 46 percent of the
16 trees are being moved and relocated to other parts of
17 the park like this. Right now there is a natural
18 barrier along the fence line on the east property line
19 between the homes, and you're going to be moving one
20 of the shelters, and it's going to be moving it closer
21 to the retention basin where now it's going to be more
22 going right into -- the parking lot is going to be
23 going right into our homes and looking into our
24 bedrooms, kitchens and dining rooms and so forth like
25 that. So the relocation of the parking lot so close

1 to the property line where our house is at is a very
2 big concern and I would like that to be addressed
3 also.

4 I understand that the building was
5 asked to be for polling. It's -- you don't need a
6 building that is 84 -- well, almost 10,000 square feet
7 to do polling for Precincts 11 and 12 when you're only
8 getting at general and primary elections about
9 600 people a day for both precincts. I mean, that's
10 like 46 people an hour. So the necessity to have a
11 large facility for polling, it's not necessary to have
12 10,000 square feet, nor is that big -- a need of a big
13 building like this for the library. I was speaking to
14 the director at the library, you need about 100 square
15 feet. You've got a library kiosk and a vending
16 machine drop box, it takes less than 100 square feet
17 to put in a library. So again, the size of the
18 building -- the needs don't justify the needs or the
19 size of the building at all.

20 Day camp, I have been involved in
21 the city for 40 years with scouts working with at
22 church doing day camps. I've done day camps at Proud
23 Lake and all the parks around town here, and when you
24 do a day camp out there, you don't need an indoor
25 facility. Whether you're at Proud Lake or whatever

1 park you're at, Maybury, whatever it is, shelters work
2 fine. If necessary when kids -- when children come
3 out, and my children did it 30 years ago, too, come
4 out to day camp, if there's going to be inclement
5 weather, you bring a raincoat for that day, otherwise
6 you're outside. And if it was windy or sunny -- windy
7 out that day, you have a drop cloth or a canvas that
8 you roll up and roll down to help protect from the sun
9 on the shelters like that.

10 So a lot of the concerns that we
11 have right now -- and you're asking removal of the
12 trees, there is a lot of variances that are being
13 asked to be waived.

14 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Sir, if you
15 can summarize, please.

16 MR. DUNESKE: Okay. Just one
17 minute. A lot of the variances that you're being
18 asked to be waived I'm asking not to waive.

19 So we're asking the Planning
20 Commission please go back and review what the
21 community needs are instead of what some people want.
22 Needs or wants. Lake Shore Park is not meant to be a
23 community civic center building out there. Please do
24 not approve the variances requested for the Preliminary
25 Land Site and just go back and review what that is

1 there and possibly either move it back into the
2 property where it's not going to be affecting the
3 residents.

4 Thank you.

5 MS. ZACK: My name is Maureen Zack.
6 I live at 359 South Lake Drive, and I've lived there
7 since 1992. I object to the excessively large
8 building that is being planned for Lake Shore Park.

9 In July 2016 a conceptual design
10 based on the park's recreation and cultural services
11 capital needs assessment determined that a building
12 was needed for 4,800 square feet mostly for the kids
13 camp. In August 2016, one month later, the voters
14 approved a capital improvement millage which also
15 included many other city projects.

16 The vote, the city-wide vote was
17 very close. The yes vote was 50.66 percent versus no
18 of 49.34 percent. So it just barely passed city-wide.
19 Now, the park where the new building is going is in
20 Precinct 11, and in Precinct 11 this millage was
21 overwhelmingly voted down, it was voted a no vote in
22 Precinct 11 by 61 percent of the voters.

23 So here we are in August 2017, and
24 I'm looking in the packet, and the building size has
25 mushroomed from 4,800 square feet back in July 2016 to

1 9,400 square feet. It has nearly doubled in size.
2 Consider the cost to the taxpayers. Consider the cost
3 of building maintenance that will go on year after
4 year.

5 The new plans called for only two
6 changing rooms for the swimmers, one in the women's
7 restroom and one in the men's restroom, totally
8 inadequate for the crowds on the beach.

9 This new building as planned is not
10 very park oriented other than for the kids camp. It
11 functions more as a civic community center than a park
12 building with all its multi-purpose rooms. According
13 to the packet, the new building would have a 309
14 maximum calculated occupancy. This change in function
15 from park-oriented to civic center community oriented
16 will substantially increase traffic on South Lake
17 Drive. South Lake Drive, a residential street,
18 already has a dangerous mix of high traffic, drivers
19 looking at the lake or speeding, and numerous
20 pedestrians and bicyclists including children all
21 using the very narrow, supposedly one-way bike lane,
22 because there is no one-way bike lane on the other
23 side of the street, and there is no block you can go
24 around. So everybody is on the same narrow bike lane
25 which is not very wide, and it's separated from the

1 traffic only by a painted line.

2 Now, the reason for this building
3 has been morphing around, and one of the reasons now
4 given is for a polling location. Now, this new
5 building is planned for Precinct 11. I live in
6 Precinct 11, and as I said before, I've been there
7 since 1992. Since then I have voted at an assisted
8 living on West Park Drive, an elementary school on
9 Novi Road between Thirteen and Fourteen Mile Roads,
10 Brightmoor Church on Thirteen Mile Road, and where we
11 are presently voting at Cross Point Meadows Church on
12 Meadowbrook Road. So there are plenty of places
13 nearby to vote, and we've never had any long lines
14 ever the whole time I've been there.

15 As for senior citizens programs,
16 frankly I'm a senior citizen and I'm not feeling the
17 need. We have Meadowbrook, we have the city hall
18 here. And a library presence, again, not needed. We
19 have a wonderful library right here. And we even have
20 a nicely decorated book box in the park. So this
21 excessively large building and the many trees that are
22 being removed according to the plan will destroy the
23 up north vibe that people love at Lake Shore Park.

24 Furthermore, this building project
25 is not very well-known and there is no sign in the

1 park about it, which is depressing citizen input. Few
2 people would be inclined to look on the city website
3 to discover, oh, there is a building going in.

4 And as far as like non-building
5 issues --

6 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Ma'am, if you
7 can summarize, please. Thanks.

8 MS. ZACK: Please do not put in a
9 large building, and please there is the newly built
10 pavilion that is near the restroom presently, it's
11 very nice. There is handicap parking spots by it
12 right now, and this new plan has moved the handicap
13 spots, parking spots way away from the building, which
14 is a problem for people who having trouble walking.

15 Thank you.

16 MR. ADAMS: My name is Mark Adams.
17 I'm a resident, 1721 East Lake Drive. So this project
18 won't directly affect me, but I'm here to support my
19 neighbors.

20 I guess, you know, my biggest
21 problem with this project is the process. And you
22 say, well, we're the Planning Commission, da-da-da.
23 We were supposed to have informational meetings on
24 this project so the residents could provide their
25 input, and that never happened. So you know, who

1 knows what is included in this project.

2 So I would encourage, you know, the
3 Planning Commission to table this and have some
4 informational meetings for the public or you're going
5 to screw it up.

6 You know, I agree with all my
7 neighbors, this building is probably twice as big as
8 it should be. And I thinking on the way over, imagine
9 this for just a second. If you went to Village Oaks
10 Lake, the city has some property, and if you drop a
11 10,000 foot building inside of that subdivision, the
12 residents would go nuts, you know.

13 The biggest problem is going to be
14 traffic on South Lake Drive. It's a residential
15 neighborhood, it's narrow, and you're going to pump
16 all this additional traffic through. I've served on
17 probably ten committees for the City of Novi, and one
18 of the biggest problems we had with that area was the
19 traffic on South Lake Drive, you know, it's been a
20 battle for decades.

21 So I can probably keep you here all
22 night, but I do think the building is about twice as
23 big as it should be, and if I had to give you a
24 constructive suggestion, have two buildings, put one
25 at ITC park and make this one about half as big.

1 Thank you.

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

5 MR. BELL: My name is Adam Bell. I
6 live at 1309 East Lake and I'm in a very unique
7 situation here. Not only am I a local resident, but
8 Lake Shore Drive, the Lake Shore Park was my design.
9 I did the drafting design for it. I used to be a
10 contractor for PEA. I'm good friends with Steve
11 Sorenson who is here tonight. I've also been in
12 discussions with park director Jeff Muck.

13 When I did this design, I took
14 every tree and every green thought into my mind. Now,
15 I don't frequent that park, and to be honest with you,
16 the first time I went to that park was to do a site
17 walkdown. I'm sorry, I'm a little anxious right now,
18 I'm not a good public speaker. Nonetheless, the first
19 thing that caught my eye were these big cottonwood
20 trees, and I told my boss we've got to save these
21 trees. We've got to save as many trees as we possibly
22 can to keep the neighbors happy.

23 I worked on that -- I worked at PEA
24 for approximately seven months. I think I billed
25 160 hours to the project. So Not only again am I a

1 resident, but this is partially my design. I did the
2 drafting. The blueprints that you see, the
3 preliminary design was done by me. I have 18 years of
4 drafting and design. I originally started doing power
5 plants. PEA subcontracted me out. I started doing
6 parking lot design. I said, hell, if I can design a
7 power plant, I can sure as hell design a park.

8 Now, I have no knowledge about park
9 design. The neighbor to the west, Ms. Iszler I
10 believe is how you pronounce her name. She's the
11 parks director for Wayne County. I strongly suggested
12 to my boss that we get Ms. Iszler involved, because
13 that's what she does for a living. She's been doing
14 it for a numerous amount of years.

15 Mr. Thomopoulos, you were correct,
16 this man here has the biggest concern. His line of
17 site is going to be so impacted by that current
18 30 foot, 34 foot setback. That's what I still don't
19 understand even though that I did the design.
20 According to code it's a 75 foot setback. It's
21 30 feet, maybe a little more. That's ten yards.
22 That's a first down. He has an amazing home,
23 absolutely beautiful.

24 I agree that the building is a bit
25 large. I haven't looked at the blueprints for this

1 building. I've been focused only on site design and
2 parking lot layout and drainage and grading.

3 Now, as far as my biggest concern
4 is, yeah, there is what did we do, 129 lots, 129
5 parking spaces, and -- can I approach you with a
6 sketch?

7 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: No, it's
8 okay.

9 MR. ADAMS: Okay. Well, the City
10 of Auburn Hills, the City of Bloomfield Hills, one of
11 their standard parking designs is called double
12 striped parking. That's basically where you have 10
13 feet center to center, and within that 10 feet is a
14 two-foot row, two foot of four-inch parking stripe,
15 and that essentially allows an extra buffer. So
16 parking spaces are tight. People go to this park in
17 big trucks, minivans, SUVs, and they have kids and
18 they're bringing toys, beach balls, lawn chairs,
19 bicycles. Think of how many door dings you're going
20 to have. Think of how many car incidents you may
21 have. If you increase that 9 foot spacing, which is
22 City of Novi ordinance, to a 10 foot center to center,
23 you reduce the parking spaces by approximately
24 10 percent. So instead of 129 you might have 113.

25 Again, I'm in a tough spot. I've

1 kept quiet during many City Council meetings because I
2 had a conflict of interest. I no longer work for PEA,
3 but nonetheless I'm still a resident and I value the
4 concerns of my neighbors and my friends. So this guy
5 here in my opinion has the biggest voice amongst all
6 of us. Respect his lot, respect his view, respect his
7 neighborhood.

8 I am more than willing to answer
9 any other questions. I worked on this job again for
10 quite a while, and I did so many conceptual layouts
11 that my boss says why are you doing that, that's not
12 what I told you to do. I said, well, we need other
13 options. I actually looked at a back door entrance
14 down Dixon cutting through the bike trail, and it can
15 be done. It would be about a half-mile of paved road.
16 Yeah, it might intervene with the bike trails, but the
17 bike trails can work around that. And by doing a back
18 door entrance, you could reduce traffic influx.

19 A lot of hard work has been put
20 into this. I know there have been a lot of voices and
21 concerns, and there has been a lot of good thought by
22 very high-skilled professionals. So it all goes back
23 to my big concern is a 34 foot setback from the front
24 versus 75 foot which is by code, and the pure scale of
25 the building. I agree that it could probably be split

1 into two buildings. We did look at putting the
2 building in the soccer field area. It wasn't very
3 accessible, but nonetheless it could be done.

4 So I guess my other complaint, it's
5 not necessarily towards you folks, but just it seems
6 like the City of Novi has not been very transparent on
7 this project. I didn't learn about this project until
8 today through a Facebook posting. So I went to the
9 city website and I looked up legal notices, and
10 nothing appeared. The latest post was actually dated
11 August 24th, which is tomorrow, about noxious weeds.

12 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Can you
13 summarize, sir, please.

14 MR. ADAMS: That's all I have to
15 say. Thank you.

16 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Anyone else?

17 With that we'll close the first
18 audience participation and move on to the agenda at
19 hand.

20 Correspondence?

21 MR. LYNCH: Okay. First -- most of
22 them have to do with Taft Knolls III, and to save
23 time, I think Ms. Tao basically read her letter here.
24 I also noticed that there is another very similar
25 letter from Ms. Amy Wang that will be put into the

1 public record, but I don't think I can do it justice.

2 I think that Mr. Tao explained the concerns.

3 There is another letter here from
4 Jeff Gedeon, 25458 Danyas Way, Novi. He supports the
5 landowner's right to develop, however the concerns are
6 construction traffic, tree removal, and then the
7 timely completion. There was some words in here about
8 a different construction entrance and a very
9 well-written note that will be put into the public
10 record.

11 And then I have -- I believe that's
12 all of them. Amy Wang and Ms. Tao basically have the
13 same thing.

14 Oh, I do have one from Finhas
15 Hasan, 25293 or 45293 Sedra Court basically in support
16 of Jeff Gedeons' letter. All this will be put into
17 the public record.

18 Oh, I do have one more, and this is
19 for Taft Knolls. It's by Wendy Mutch, 24740 Taft
20 Road. A note with concerns about traffic, the number
21 of homes that are going to be proposed, and then
22 infringement on the wetlands and woodlands, and this
23 letter will be put in the public record also.

24 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you,
25 sir.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Committee reports?

City Planner report, Ms. McBeth.

MS. MCBETH: Thank you. Good evening. Nothing to report.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

We come to our first item which is the consent agenda, and I'll just read it. It's A123, also known as Fountain Office Park, JSP17-21. It's a consideration at the request of Etkin, L.L.C. for the approval of a traffic waiver for same-side, opposite side driveway spacing. The subject parcel is located in Section 15, west of Cabaret Drive and south of Twelve Mile Road, and is zoned OST, Planned Office Service Technology. The applicant is proposing to develop the 31.25 acre parcel for two buildings, one office/lab space of 128,936 square feet, and the other for an assembly building at 53,469 square feet including associated site improvements.

MR. GIACOPETTI: I'll make a motion to approve the consent agenda.

MR. LYNCH: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: There's a motion by Giacometti, second by Member Lynch.

Any other comments?

Sri, can you call the roll, please.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?
MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacopetti?
MR. GIACOPETTI: 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 6 to

0.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.
Next is Matters for Consideration.

Item Number 1 is Lake Shore Park Building JSP17-43.
It's the consideration of NSA Architects, Engineering,
Planners for the approval of the Preliminary Site Plan
and Stormwater Management Plan. The subject property
is located in Section 3 west of Old Novi Road and
south of South Lake Drive and is zoned R-4, One-Family
Residential. The applicant is proposing an update to
Lake Shore Park in the City of Novi including a
community center, parking lot, pavilion, and a bike

1 lane to connect to mountain biking trails.

2 Good evening. How are you,
3 Kirsten?

4 MS. MELLEEM: Good. How are you?

5 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Good.

6 MS. MELLEEM: The subject property
7 is located west of Old Novi Road and south of South
8 Lake Drive in Section 3. The applicant is proposing
9 an update to Lakeshore Park including a 9,400 square
10 foot community center, 129 parking spaces, a large
11 pavilion, a shed addition to the existing toilet
12 facilities, and a bike path.

13 The subject property is currently
14 zoned R-4, One Family Residential. The properties to
15 the west and east are also zoned R-4. To the north is
16 Walled Lake.

17 The Future Land Use Map indicates
18 Public Park for the subject property. The properties
19 to the west and east are indicated as single family.

20 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Can we get
21 the images on the monitors in front of us if that is
22 possible, please. Thanks. Sorry.

23 MS. MELLEEM: The site contains
24 woodlands and wetlands, but not in the areas of the
25 proposed development.

1 The proposed project is focused on
2 South Lake Shore Drive. Three structures are
3 proposed:

4 One is a 9,400 square feet
5 community center with rooms to support Lake Shore Park
6 daycamp and to serve as a voting location for two
7 precincts.

8 Two is a new, large, open-air
9 pavilion for visitors to picnic and host events.

10 Three is a shed addition to the
11 existing toilets building near the south end of the
12 park to store maintenance equipment.

13 Site amenities include an
14 amphitheater and covered porch adjacent to the
15 community building, 129 parking spaces including
16 7 barrier free, 46 bike parking spaces, several new
17 playgrounds and active recreation spaces, rain
18 gardens, and a bike path.

19 The applicant is seeking four
20 waivers from the Planning Commission and two variances
21 from the ZBA:

22 1, a landscape waiver for lack of
23 berm along South Lake Shore Drive.

24 2, a landscape waiver for lack of
25 street trees along South Lake Shore Drive.

1 3, a landscaped waiver for
2 relocation of foundation plantings away from the
3 foundation.

4 And, 4, Section 9 facade waiver for
5 underage of brick and overage of standing seam
6 metal.

7 The first ZBA variance was for
8 reduced building setback from the front yard.

9 The second ZBA variance is for
10 reduced building setback from the east side yard.

11 The Planning Commission waivers are
12 all supported by staff. The first landscape waiver is
13 due to topography of the site and maintain the beach
14 access. The second landscape waiver is due to not
15 enough room between the street and right-of-way to
16 place the street trees. The third landscape waiver is
17 supported because the foundation plantings will appear
18 to be at the foundation when planted across the
19 pathway and meet the intent of the ordinance.

20 The Section 9 facade waiver is
21 supported because the underage of brick is due to the
22 extensive use of stone which is visually equivalent to
23 brick and the use of materials provides well-balanced
24 proportions and composition of materials.

25 The site plan was reviewed as a

1 combined Preliminary and Final Site Plan. The
2 majority of viewers have recommended the Preliminary
3 site plan, but have not recommended the Final Site
4 Plan. Therefore, once the Planning Commission makes
5 their decision, the applicant will be submitting a
6 Revised Final Site Plan to address the comments in the
7 review letters.

8 The Planning review noted that the
9 building does not meet the setbacks of the district as
10 it pertains to non-residential buildings in
11 residential districts, which requires a 75 foot
12 setback from all parcel lot lines. The building is
13 deficient on the north and east sides and requires ZBA
14 variances. The bicycle parking location is further
15 than 120 feet from the main entrance and the applicant
16 in the response letter has stated that they will move
17 the racks closer to the building entrance and
18 alleviate this required waiver. There are some items
19 that need to be addressed on the Revised Final Site
20 Plan submittal.

21 The Engineering review had minor
22 comments, which most of them pertain to the Final Site
23 plan requirements.

24 The Landscape review noted the
25 three waivers that are needed. In addition, the

1 Landscape Architect is requesting additional landscape
2 screening along the east side of the building between
3 the proposed building and the residents on the east.
4 The applicant has responded in the response letter
5 that two of the items the Landscape Architect noted as
6 potential waivers will no longer be needed as they
7 will meet those standards.

8 The Traffic review did not identify
9 any waivers required and only had minor comments,
10 which pertain to the Final Site Plan submittal
11 requirements.

12 The Facade review identified the
13 need for a Section 9 facade waiver for the underage of
14 brick and overage of standing seam metal, which is
15 supported by the consultant. The underage of brick is
16 because the applicant has proposed a mostly stone
17 facade, which is visually equivalent to the brick.
18 The overage of the standing seam metal is because of
19 the roof lines. Overall, the building exhibits
20 well-balanced proportions and composition of
21 materials.

22 The Fire review is the only
23 reviewer that is not recommending the Preliminary Site
24 Plan due to deficiencies that are required to be on
25 the site plan. The applicant has stated in their

1 response that the three items will be addressed on the
2 next site plan submittal.

3 The Planning Commission is asked
4 tonight to consider the Preliminary Site Plan and
5 Stormwater Management Plan. The applicant, staff, and
6 consultants are here to answer any questions you have
7 regarding this project.

8 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

9 Who from the city would like to
10 review this with us? Please come up.

11 MR. RAY: Good evening. My name is
12 Frank Ray. I'm president of NSA Architects,
13 Engineers, Planners. I'm here tonight to just give a
14 brief introduction of the project, and I'm also
15 representing our entire design team which is sitting
16 here behind me, and Jeff Muck is going to be answering
17 any questions related to programming and operations of
18 the building.

19 Can I get the colored site plan up
20 there?

21 MS. MELLEEM: It should be on your
22 desktop.

23 MR. RAY: It's on here, but it's
24 not on there.

25 MS. MELLEEM: You can switch the

1 computers.

2 MR. RAY: Thank you. What I would
3 like to do, planning did a really good job with some
4 of the details. What I would like to do is talk a
5 little bit about the background on our approach to the
6 design and how we came to the plan in front of you.

7 First and foremost, this is a park,
8 and our approach to this has always been every step of
9 the way is how can we enhance the park experience for
10 the residents. It's not just about a building, it's
11 not just about a playground, it's about the experience
12 for the residents.

13 Our approach was to sort of step
14 back, take a look at the master plan of this end of
15 the park, and there was a couple of objectives that we
16 identified early. Again, we had a programmatic
17 requirement from the city, who is our client, to
18 provide a certain amount of space to function in the
19 building, and we can talk about that in a moment.

20 The thing that was really a concern
21 to us is the amount of green space on the property and
22 how we can make a cohesive site plan and take
23 advantage of any natural features that we have on the
24 site and maybe organize the site a little better than
25 what we had before.

1 The existing site plan, you know,
2 we had dirt access road that kind of bisected the site
3 and separated the green spaces on the site, and one of
4 the major decisions that were made was to relocate the
5 access road to the west side of the site and
6 reconfigure the east green space to allow more
7 continuous green space for the residents. You know,
8 we're adding a new pavilion and we're adding a small
9 maintenance garage in addition to the existing
10 restrooms on the south side of the site. One of the
11 reasons we put the maintenance garage down there was
12 also to minimize noise and disruption on the north end
13 of the site. And so in order to maximize that green
14 space, we decided that locating the building on the
15 north side of the site would be really important to
16 maximize that green space, maximize the green park
17 experience.

18 The other thing that we were
19 dealing with is stormwater management. The park
20 really had no stormwater management. So, you know, we
21 want to follow current ordinances, we want to do
22 responsible, sustainable design. We added two
23 detention ponds on the site. All the water is going
24 to be going through those detention basins and
25 filtered and exit into Shaw Lake. So that was a real

1 important goal for us to maintain and update the park
2 accordingly to today's sustainable and responsible
3 design standards. And the City of Novi has some very
4 good, current, modern standards that apply, and we
5 really tried really hard to achieve all of those
6 standards.

7 The roadway itself goes through the
8 entire site. It has parking along the entire roadway
9 adjacent to this green space. So there is convenient
10 parking for the entire park adjacent to the parkway.
11 On the east side of that roadway we identified a bike
12 lane, provided extra space for the bike lane, it
13 connects the south shore down into the mountain bike
14 areas to the south. There is no pedestrian crossings
15 there, there is no vehicle crossings there, it's a
16 very safe route for the bikers.

17 So, you know, our goal was to
18 provide a new park and to bring modern conveniences
19 and modern technology and modern solutions and
20 sustainable solutions to the park. It's a
21 comprehensive plan. There is a lot of nuances in the
22 plan. We located the building to the north on the
23 north end. The building itself is 9,400 square feet.
24 There's 8,400 in that program area. We can discuss
25 the interworkings of the plan if you'd like to.

1 The inspiration behind the design
2 of the building was for a park setting, and our
3 inspiration was related more to national park
4 solutions, state park solutions, you know, how can we
5 identify the building as a park-like building and not
6 a municipal building. That was not our intent. We
7 don't see it as a municipal building, we see it as a
8 park/camp building.

9 The main use space is a camp of
10 approximately 4,000 square feet. It's an
11 inside/outside space. To the east we're providing a
12 patio area. It's not quite an amphitheater, it's more
13 of a patio area. There is some steps and just a
14 simple patio, and that's really for day campers during
15 the day to utilize the outdoor space and to play
16 outside. It's a park, we want to enhance that.

17 One of the biggest design
18 challenges we had is working with the existing road
19 into the park and the pedestrian bridge or pedestrian
20 tunnel underneath the road, and maintaining grades.
21 And we're servicing the lake users with a restroom
22 that is inside the building. One of the other goals
23 that we had is to make that as convenient as possible
24 for the lake users. So there is two sets of restrooms
25 in this building, they're each about 500 square feet.

1 It's 1,000 square feet just for restrooms, and the
2 square foot adds up quickly in buildings. So there is
3 an outside access directly into these restrooms, you
4 do not have to go through the building to utilize
5 these restrooms. There is a graded walkway without
6 any steps or any railings. It was designed to
7 accommodate, you know, everybody, handicap accessible.
8 Again, it's there for the lake users.

9 That parking that is adjacent to
10 the building is designed for the building. It's also
11 designed for lake users. It is convenient to the lake
12 users. The reason for the variance that we're asking
13 for on the north side is primarily due to some very
14 significant grading challenges that we have on the
15 north side of the site, and that northwest dimension
16 that we have between the roadway and Shaw Lake is very
17 tight, and even as it is we have a six-foot retaining
18 wall on the south side of that parking lot. So for
19 every five feet we move that building south, that
20 retaining wall gets another five feet higher. So that
21 was a real challenge for us, and that was one of the
22 main reasons we're asking for zoning variance for the
23 front yard setback.

24 That side yard setback, we're still
25 working on it. We're trying really hard. We want to

1 accommodate our neighbor to the east. We think we're
2 going to make that work, and that's something that we
3 can discuss in detail. You know, we're really close
4 to a permanent solution that will not allow that
5 variance, so we're happy about that. We have a little
6 more flexibility east and west than we do north and
7 south.

8 With that I'd just like to turn it
9 over to you for questions. And again you can feel
10 free to give us any input that you can to make this
11 project a success. Thank you.

12 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

13 With that we'll turn it over to the
14 Planning Commission for consideration. Who would like
15 to start?

16 MR. GIACOPETTI: I'll start. I
17 have a lot of concerns about this project. Some of
18 them were expressed by the community members, some of
19 them are -- they're not -- we're not in the business
20 of reviewing programmatic needs, and we understand
21 that and it's helpful to understand how the project
22 was to come together, but my concern is that we're
23 trying to squeeze I guess a square peg into a round
24 hole here where we're trying to build a facility in a
25 space that can't accommodate it with -- under our

1 current ordinances without some variances. That is my
2 primary concern really. And we probably could -- with
3 a greater budget we probably could accommodate this
4 project and accommodate all the other concerns as to
5 why you placed it there. And I think -- you know, I
6 respectfully disagree with our facade consultant.
7 Again, it seems like budget was driving the facade and
8 the design of the building as opposed to holding
9 ourselves up to the same standard that we hold
10 developers to. And we've had this discussion before
11 about the pavilion restrooms. So I'm -- did you look
12 at other sites for the building, or was it just cost
13 prohibitive to accomplish that?

14 MR. MUCK: So, no, we did not.
15 This has mainly been driven as far as the north end
16 enhancements to the residents on the north side.
17 We've heard repeatedly over the years we've turned
18 away kids from our daycamp. We have 60 kids a day on
19 average at the daycamp, and at times we have 60 kids
20 on the waiting list.

21 MR. GIACOPETTI: I'm sorry, let me
22 clarify, Jeff. Did you look for other sites within
23 the park, not elsewhere in Novi? It's an enormous
24 park.

25 MR. MUCK: Actually we did, and I

1 believe as Frank mentioned earlier, we looked at
2 placement in the back of the park. That was in fact
3 brought up by council members at one point. But as we
4 dove further into that, it was going to increase
5 costs. We were going to have to build a second
6 building at the front of the park anyway to
7 accommodate beach users. Now you're going to need two
8 parking lots, you're going to move the building
9 farther away from the beach, so the camp kids or any
10 programs that might be in that building wanting to use
11 the beach would be much farther away, so --

12 And then the thought process of
13 going through doing an entrance through 12 1/2 and
14 Dixon, the amount of trees you would have to take
15 down, the rerouting the mountain bike trails was going
16 to be extremely disruptive, not to mention the
17 utilities cost to put the building in a different area
18 of the park.

19 MR. GIACOPETTI: Sure. What about
20 a structure that was multiple levels as opposed to
21 flat?

22 MR. MUCK: Well, we originally were
23 planning a two-story building. As it's referenced,
24 our capital needs assessment in 2014 indicated that,
25 and we had a conceptual plan that we would place that

1 in the existing driveway. As we moved through the
2 process and even went to City Council and talked about
3 a two-story building, there was debate about whether
4 one or two stories was appropriate. And as we got
5 feedback from council and park commission and
6 residents, it didn't appear that there was that type
7 of desire for a two-story. So now we went down to a
8 one story.

9 I could address the issue about a
10 4,800 square foot original building. That was before
11 the election in November when we had some voting
12 issues at our precincts, and that's what really
13 necessitated some of that increase in size.

14 But mainly we were still looking at
15 large rooms in that building, because we needed it for
16 daycamp licensing. There are very strict rules
17 regarding daycamp licensing as to the amount of square
18 footage you can have per number of kids. So in order
19 to get -- accommodate up to 100 kids in that large
20 room, we would need it to go to that square footage.

21 MR. GIACOPETTI: That's very
22 helpful. And I just want to say I appreciate the
23 city's efforts to frugally use our tax dollars, but on
24 the other hand, it's not my role here today at the
25 table, which is to review these with the same

1 standards that we hold commercial developers to. So
2 like I said, I'm struggling with it, but I'm looking
3 forward to feedback of the other members of the
4 commission.

5 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you,
6 Member Giacometti.

7 Member Greco.

8 MR. GRECO: A question before I
9 speak to you, Jeff, for the consultant or the
10 architect or the engineer. You indicated that with
11 regard to the neighbor to the east, I believe that's
12 the gentleman right there, you indicated that we may
13 be able to work with the appropriate setbacks so a
14 variance is not necessary?

15 MR. RAY: Correct.

16 MR. GRECO: What is it going to be?

17 MR. RAY: Well, what we're looking
18 at is making the patio area a little smaller, and
19 we've been working at a redesign at the transition
20 from the under road pathway up to the building. And
21 there was a little bit of green space that we picked
22 up in that redesign, so we thought we'd move the
23 building over and accommodate that requirement.

24 MR. GRECO: What about the plans
25 for the trees? Looking at some of the -- I mean, the

1 photographs that we see aren't often the best because
2 they're taken from the side, and I've been out there,
3 but there is a tree line, right, between his property?

4 MR. RAY: Yes.

5 MR. GRECO: Are we removing the
6 trees, replanting them, leaving them there? What is
7 the plan?

8 MR. RAY: There is no work
9 happening in that area of the site other than the
10 overhead line. We can talk about that a little bit.

11 MR. GRECO: Right.

12 MR. RAY: The plan is to leave
13 those trees alone. There is nothing on the plans to
14 touch any of those trees at all. And then we're going
15 to enhance that area actually by walking the site and
16 physically locating trees and bushes wherever we need
17 to to screen that view to everyone's acceptable level.
18 I mean, it's going to be -- the minimum is the 80/90
19 requirement for screening, and hopefully we'll make
20 that better. But we're going to hand work that area.
21 And there is no real construction happening right
22 there.

23 MR. GRECO: Okay.

24 MR. RAY: And by moving the
25 building a little more, you know, we're trying to be

1 as sensitive as we can, and we're working as hard as
2 we can, and we're pretty sure we'll be able to
3 accommodate that.

4 MR. GRECO: And what about the
5 power line issue that was raised by the resident? He
6 indicated it was 5 feet now and it should be 15.

7 MR. RAY: There is an existing
8 power pole that is on his property on the property
9 line that is where the service from this area that
10 we're relocating comes from. We have to tie into that
11 pole at some point. We have to work with DTE, okay,
12 so it's hard for us to stand and say this is what we
13 can commit to. So we have been going through the
14 process right now working with the service planners.
15 We've started that process. We want to get all those
16 options in front of us, and we're going to select an
17 option that satisfies everybody. So until we can work
18 with DTE and see what exactly the options are, it's a
19 little hard to commit either way.

20 MR. GRECO: Make a representation.

21 MR. RAY: I do know -- I can say
22 this from just past experience is that they will not
23 build a line 5 feet from his house. So there are --
24 he's right, there are setback and easement
25 requirements. We just can't be that close to a

1 structure. So when they do that planning, they
2 themselves will probably automatically move that line
3 over. But we won't know until we work with their
4 service planners, and that takes a specific process
5 and a specific amount of time. So we're working
6 through that process. It's their process, it's not
7 our process. We have to work with them.

8 MR. GRECO: Got it. Thank you.
9 I'd like to speak with Jeff again.

10 You know, looking at the project,
11 you described both the plans, and I think you
12 indicated that the size of the building has increased
13 for two reasons, number one, the daycamp issues; and
14 number two, some polling issues, polling place issues
15 that have come up. Is that the reason for the size of
16 the building moving from -- well, doubling in size?

17 MR. MUCK: Well, so the original
18 4,800 square feet, we didn't do any type of interior
19 planning for that. So as we move through this, I
20 think one of the things we mentioned is we now added
21 interior and exterior bathrooms to this. You don't
22 want to mix your beach goers with your activities
23 within the building both from a maintenance
24 standpoint, and then just from a functionality
25 standpoint. So we added two sets of bathrooms,

1 indoors and out, so that did increase the size of that
2 as well. We did add room for the library as well. So
3 there were multiple things other than just voting and
4 the camp space that added to increasing the size.

5 Again, I would reference that the
6 capital needs assessment, that is a conceptual plan.
7 I mean, that is very basic what you put on paper when
8 our consultant first recommended and took a look at
9 all of our parks in 2014.

10 MR. GRECO: So the plan for the
11 city, at least from your perspective, is to get this
12 built and construct it this way and to be utilizing it
13 almost immediately when it's ready?

14 MR. MUCK: Correct. In fact, we are at a
15 point that we want to get shovels in the ground
16 because we don't -- we would like to have this
17 ultimately up next summer so that we're not looking at
18 alternatives for our park users and for our camps.

19 MR. GRECO: Thank you. That's all
20 I have.

21 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.
22 Member Avdoulos.

23 MR. AVDOULOS: Thank you. I first
24 saw the plan at a Walkable Novi committee meeting, and
25 I thought the layout was done very nicely. I think

1 the positioning of the building looking at it
2 initially I had no issues with I think where it's
3 positioned and then having sidewalks leading to the
4 existing sidewalks so that beach goers can get to it
5 relatively easily. The way the parking lot is laid
6 out is my nicely done, too, because you do have some
7 handicap access and then you have a walk that cuts
8 through it.

9 Then as we start looking at
10 concerns of those who are around this, especially the
11 neighbor to the east, and I'm looking at a site plan
12 here where I see a 75 foot setback, and it looks like
13 the building is encroaching into that setback by about
14 10 feet or so. And it was indicated that if we can
15 look at maybe reducing the size of that amphitheater
16 and pushing that building further west to give a
17 little bit more buffer, I think that would be
18 appreciated.

19 Is there any way that we can, you
20 know, reduce the building size at all by 10 percent?
21 The only reason I ask that is is the parking
22 associated with the square footage of the building, or
23 is the parking associated with the anticipated use of,
24 you know, maximizing for people to park at the park?

25 MR. RAY: I believe in planning's

1 analysis based on those standards the required parking
2 is at 83. We provided 129. But we're spreading this
3 parking out throughout the park, and in that -- in
4 those two parking lanes, that second lane closer to
5 the park services the park as well, and it services
6 lake goers. So it's not 100 percent due to the
7 building size. I don't know if we made the building a
8 little smaller if we would reduce the parking. In
9 order to have an effective potential for redesign, we
10 would have to eliminate one whole row of parking.
11 It's not two spaces, it would be the entire row.

12 So reducing the building 10 percent
13 and overlaying ordinance requirements isn't
14 necessarily going to help us. You know, there is a
15 lot going on here, there's an overlap of uses, and we
16 tried to overlay all the uses, and there's a lot of
17 nuances. So that was part of the challenge that we
18 had and why ultimately we decided to ask for a
19 variance.

20 MR. AVDOULOS: And the reason I ask
21 is because if we can move the building to the west,
22 then I'd also like to see if we can move the parking a
23 bit, almost for the parking, edge of parking to align
24 with the edge of the building so that the parking is
25 not sort of overhanging into the setback, and then

1 light pollution going into the neighbor's lot.

2 MR. RAY: Yeah, I understand the
3 concept. Our -- when you look at the plan, and if you
4 overlay the grading, that driveway approach into that
5 parking is already close to a maximum standard. If we
6 move that parking closer -- and if we eliminate
7 parking, we eliminate four rows each 9 foot you move
8 it, you can make the parking lot smaller east and west
9 and ultimately gain it, but we'd lose a significant
10 amount of parking. Now we're doing a pretty good
11 amount of screening on the east end of that parking
12 lot.

13 MR. AVDOULOS: Yes, I see that by
14 the landscape plan.

15 MR. RAY: And the elevation is up
16 quite a bit higher as well. We feel pretty confident
17 we're not going to have any hardships to the neighbor,
18 and we'll work with them to do whatever we can to make
19 sure that that's not going to happen. But space is so
20 critical and the grades are so critical to this area,
21 and you'd lose program in order to make it happen.

22 MR. AVDOULOS: The 9,400, is that
23 the square footage of the usable space? Does that
24 include the --

25 MR. RAY: That's gross outside,

1 gross outside walls.

2 MR. AVDOULOS: So where the columns
3 are and the overhang?

4 MR. RAY: It's the footprint of the
5 perimeter walls of the building. It does not include
6 the patio areas where those columns are and the
7 overhangs that are generated there.

8 MR. AVDOULOS: So then the
9 footprint is a little bit bigger, so probably 12,000
10 square feet?

11 MR. RAY: From a -- if you take
12 into consideration the overhangs, roof overhangs, it's
13 a bigger footprint, yes.

14 MR. AVDOULOS: Okay. In all
15 honesty I have no issue with the look of the building.
16 I think it parallels the design of looking at, you
17 know, more park buildings, national park buildings.
18 So that wasn't as big of a concern. And I can't
19 remember if I did see this before or not. But I think
20 taking into consideration those that are around there
21 and then trying to understand the program and seeing
22 if there is anything that could be, you know, reduced
23 out of that project to sort of help with the size of
24 the building and make sure that it's right sized. I
25 mean, I'm looking at it to see if there was an

1 opportunity to rotate it 90 degrees so that you can,
2 you know, maybe maximize some of that setback. But
3 then again I think it looks better in this
4 orientation. I don't mind it being up close to the --
5 so I don't mind the front setback as much as the side
6 setback. I think being respectful of the neighbors
7 are the most important issues.

8 And then the electrical line that
9 was being discussed, is that an overhead line from the
10 new building to the power pole?

11 MR. RAY: There is an existing
12 overhead line that basically bisects the building,
13 comes onto the site to a pole, and then goes over east
14 behind the building. It's like an L-shaped
15 configuration. It's right in the middle of
16 the building.

17 MR. AVDOULOS: Okay. Only because
18 if there's any opportunities that I work on on
19 different projects, we try as much as we can to bury
20 the lines. So that, one, I think it's a safer
21 situation, especially with any kind of inclement
22 weather, you're not worried about that landing on the
23 building. But whatever we can do to work with DTE and
24 whatever utilities.

25 MR. RAY: When we get the options

1 from DTE, we'll present it to the city and maybe the
2 building moving over more will give an opportunity.
3 We do not want to bury a line in that tree line. So
4 that was the other concern, not to effect that tree
5 line in any way. It's hard to control DTE once you
6 start them.

7 MR. AVDOULOS: But I think if we
8 can really work to push that over and sort of mitigate
9 some of the concerns on the east side, that would be
10 appreciated. For the citizens who spoke, you know,
11 that's greatly appreciated.

12 The site and the project itself,
13 you know, addresses all the concerns with AD
14 accessibility and all code-related items, and looking
15 at how traffic is in and out, I like the fact that it
16 was all pushed to the west and it comes in nice and
17 clean. The added parking along the drive is a great
18 amenity also. But again looking at maybe what was
19 thought to come to this location and then what has
20 been presented might be a little bit of a concern that
21 the citizens had with transparency and understanding
22 where this project was headed and where it came from,
23 and, you know, for us, too, there are times a lot of
24 the projects, we see them for the first time, so we're
25 just looking at the information and reacting to it and

1 trying to make the best decision, you know, for
2 everybody all the way around.

3 MR. RAY: I would like to clarify
4 actually two things. The location of the building
5 is -- it's a real tight dimension north and south, and
6 the other concern we had with that positioning is the
7 grades drop off pretty severely as you move south, and
8 positioning that finished floor so that it had the
9 correct relationship to the road, because if we move
10 that building, as we move it south it goes down, and
11 driving by and looking at the roof of the building is
12 just not attractive to us. That's one of the --

13 MR. AVDOULOS: Yes, I think the
14 north/south I have no issue. It's more the east and
15 west.

16 MR. RAY: The other comment related
17 to the past, what was shared and transparency.
18 Because we did the concept design for the vote last
19 year, and that concept design was a two-story 10,000
20 square foot building, it was not 4,800 square feet.
21 That was the original needs assessment the year or two
22 before. And I want to just add that time line and
23 correct that time line in terms of what was presented
24 to the voters with the bond vote, okay. Because the
25 4,800 was the needs assessment, but when they came to

1 us and asked us to do a concept design to see what
2 could fit on the site and work with this bond program,
3 we designed -- we did a quick little study based on
4 the current needs that the rec department had and
5 ended up with a two-story building that was about
6 4,800 square feet each floor. So I want to make sure
7 we're clear on how that all came to fruition with the
8 city.

9 MR. AVDOULOS: Thank you.

10 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you,
11 Member Avdoulos.

12 Member Zuchlewski.

13 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Just two comments
14 I guess. Edison, wonderful people Edison people. You
15 know, I feel like Trump here talking about Edison.
16 Anyways.

17 MR. RAY: They're one of our
18 clients, too.

19 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: I had thought
20 about the idea of putting in another pole and they can
21 run their service over to that pole and then run under
22 ground to where we need it to be and come up with a
23 transformer or whatever near that building. So I know
24 that's very doable, you've just got to get them in
25 real early.

1 MR. RAY: Right.

2 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: So Edison I think
3 will work with us. I like the idea very much of not
4 touching the landscaping to the east, not taking any
5 of that down, and then working on site for individual
6 blockage and whatever to maintain those elevations. I
7 think the plan is beautiful.

8 The only question I have about the
9 interior of the plan, if we were looking to cut a
10 little bit of square footage maybe, is it necessary
11 that we have those family restrooms? What dictates
12 that I guess? You know, each building dictates
13 certain function and whatever restrooms and whatever,
14 whether it's a restaurant or hospital. What dictates
15 the family restrooms, because that would cut out half
16 the restroom space.

17 MR. RAY: There's code
18 considerations, building code considerations here, but
19 also you have to consider the usage of the building.
20 This building services the youngest to the oldest.
21 It's not a commercial office building where we can
22 make an argument that a family restroom wouldn't be
23 logical. We make design decisions based on usage, not
24 minimum code or not to save square footage. So family
25 restrooms in this type of facility as a camp building

1 is absolutely the right thing to do. There is a lot
2 of families that are going to be using this facility,
3 parents picking up children, and, you know, our vision
4 throughout the park, the analogy we always use was
5 that parent with a stroller with a newborn picking up
6 a five-year-old, you know, how do they accommodate the
7 families going through that process, and that was
8 really the logic behind that.

9 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: And the existing
10 restroom facilities that are there now, they're going
11 to remain, correct?

12 MR. RAY: No.

13 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: They're coming
14 out?

15 MR. RAY: They're coming down.

16 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Okay. Thank you.

17 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Member Lynch.

18 MR. LYNCH: Just my two cents
19 worth. I agree with the comments of my commissioners,
20 but the only thing that I have heartburn about is on
21 the east side, and my position is either shrink the
22 building or somehow find a way to make that setback
23 the way it should be. The north doesn't bother me,
24 but I put myself in the homeowner's position over
25 there, and think about it, if you were there, that

1 won't be fair. And you think that you can do the
2 setback?

3 MR. RAY: We're pretty sure.

4 MR. LYNCH: Okay. But just so you
5 know my position, if you can't do the setback, I won't
6 approve it just on that side, because I don't think it
7 makes sense.

8 MR. RAY: We would welcome that
9 condition.

10 MR. LYNCH: Okay. But other than
11 that, I think you guys did a great job with the space
12 that you had to work with. And with the task you were
13 given, I do like what you've done, but I am cognizant
14 if I put myself in that individual's situation, you
15 know, and we should do that as a city representative,
16 and I think it can be done, but if it can't, then
17 we've got to change the building.

18 MR. RAY: Right.

19 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.
20 Member or if I might just for two seconds.

21 Ms. McBeth or Mr. Muck, walk
22 through for me what the city did relative to community
23 awareness of the overall project going forward from
24 maybe this time and going backwards? Where did we
25 start and how did we get to this?

1 MR. MUCK: I can start at the very
2 start. Before we had the CIP vote, there was a CIP
3 informational meeting held at Lake Shore Park to
4 discuss this project with the entire CIP. I can tell
5 you that one resident attended that. That moved then
6 into the --

7 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Notification
8 for that kind of meeting occurs how?

9 MR. MUCK: That was all on social
10 media. That was through all the city's regular
11 communication avenues as part of the CIP vote.

12 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Okay.

13 MR. MUCK: We move then into July
14 2016. We did have a Parks Commission meeting where
15 our finance director did a presentation on the CIP.
16 This was a top focus of discussion at that.

17 In October of 2016 I actually
18 presented at the Lakes Area Homeowners Association
19 annual meeting on this. Got a lot of feedback at that
20 meeting.

21 January 9th, 2017 we had a City
22 Council meeting presentation. That's where a lot of
23 the discussion came in about rentals and size of the
24 building, everything along that line.

25 The next meeting after that Council

1 did actually get more citizen input. We had quite a
2 few residents put their comments on record.

3 In May we had -- and then
4 continuing throughout that it was spoken about at Park
5 Commission meetings.

6 And then June of 2017 our Park
7 Commission, we reinforced that this was not a banquet
8 center.

9 June 19th the city manager did a
10 report to Council.

11 June 23rd we did some more web
12 updates, city web pages, because throughout this whole
13 process we were in design and having these discussions
14 about size-ability and placement and pathways and
15 everything.

16 I've done additional presentations
17 in July at our Rotary Club to update people on that.
18 And the City has continued to put things out on their
19 social media including a couple recent videos by Mayor
20 Gatt, myself, and the City Manager Auger updating the
21 status of this program or this project.

22 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Is that a
23 fair summary, Ms. McBeth?

24 MS. MCBETH: That's an excellent
25 summary.

1 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: So the point
2 of that is that while I can appreciate people's
3 discussion of this from the public standpoint, ample
4 opportunities -- I just want it to be known that this
5 was not done in a vacuum, this was not done behind
6 closed doors. This was done with every intent of
7 being transparent to the general public, the community
8 at large, and I heard social media, I heard meetings,
9 I heard presentations. So I don't know what other
10 means or methodologies could be employed. But I
11 applaud the City for the effort that they've gone
12 through in going through and making this and
13 communicating it to the citizens. I don't want it to
14 be understood by anybody as they leave this meeting or
15 if they're watching that this was done last week and
16 here we are with a plan and we're going to look at it
17 going forward. So I applaud what you've done to
18 promote and educate the community.

19 The other item that I would like to
20 address is the traffic on South Lake. So coming from
21 the east to the west you're coming uphill over a
22 curve. And I read the traffic study. I will say that
23 I agree with the study, but I've also seen every study
24 that has come in front of us. There seems to be a
25 lack between what is written in paper and what you

1 often see at an intersection when you're trying to get
2 from Point A to Point B at rush hour. And knowing
3 that traffic is the number one concern, I think just
4 about every topic that we talk about in the city,
5 programmatically when you're having mom and dad drop
6 off Billy and Sue and whoever and trying to get back
7 in and out of the building back onto South Lake, is
8 there the potential for egress further west to
9 alleviate some of the traffic?

10 And then I guess I'm concerned
11 about somebody making a left-hand turn going west out
12 onto South Lake, and it's a 25 mile an hour road at
13 that point, and having someone coming from east going
14 west and looking at someone in a bathing suit on the
15 lake, and -- you know, so I'm troubled by the fact
16 that the traffic consultant did his job, but there
17 just always seems to be a difference or a delta
18 between the paper study and actually what we see. Is
19 there any relief that we can provide with a turning
20 lane or anything like that on South Lake?

21 MR. MUCK: I would have to take
22 that back to our consultants.

23 If I could make one comment,
24 though, on the traffic flow. When we're looking at
25 programming that building and you're talking about the

1 main heavy uses are during the summer 7:00 a.m. to
2 6:00 p.m., that is just -- that is not 7:00 a.m. 100
3 cars coming in. It is flow of traffic, ones and twos
4 in and out throughout the day. You're not going to
5 see a heavy, steady flow of 50 cars trying to get in
6 that building at any one time, so that helps.

7 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: So we just
8 went through with the funeral home proposal at Eleven
9 Mile and Beck, we went through that same discussion
10 with them relative to concerns of the citizens with a
11 funeral that is going to happen concurrently with
12 busses meandering through that intersection. They
13 made the offer, and I think we accepted and made it
14 part of the motion that they were going to work with
15 and try to alleviate as many of those conditions,
16 nightmare conditions as possible given the road
17 condition at Eleven and Beck. So is it your intention
18 that that same kind of thinking can happen with this
19 space?

20 MR. MUCK: Absolutely. When we
21 look at recreation programming, we're not programming
22 in peak traffic times. People don't want to come to a
23 yoga class, they don't want to come to a senior
24 program at 5:00 p.m. Our programs are going to be
25 6:00, 7:00, not 7:00 a.m., 8:00 a.m. We try to

1 program outside of that, because working parents can't
2 hit those heavy -- they're stuck in traffic.

3 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: And lastly I
4 agree, I want to see us maintain the setback on the
5 east side to at least the city minimum. I'm not too
6 worried about the north and south. I agree with
7 Member Avdoulos that if there is a way -- if it has to
8 be moved or if the building has to shrink by 10
9 percent, I think that's a benefit.

10 Overall I think you did a wonderful
11 job in trying to assess the needs of what the city
12 wants to try to provide for the north end. There is
13 always that little bit of a dichotomy between the 96
14 split and what happens on the north end and what
15 happens on the south end or the south side of the
16 city. I think this is the city reaching out and
17 saying here is what we're trying to do to provide
18 amenities that to this point hadn't ever been
19 considered. So for the citizens that agreed for the
20 CIP budget, good on you, I think you're seeing the
21 results of this good work going forward, and I think
22 this building addresses a lot of the needs that if I
23 lived in that area I would want to see rather than
24 having to make the move down to the public library
25 down here at Ten Mile. It looks like you have another

1 comment, Mr. Ray?

2 MR. RAY: I would like to just
3 clarify. With regard to the east setback, we feel
4 very confident that we can do that. So if you want to
5 conditionalize the approval, we would be -- I just
6 want to make sure it's clear we do feel pretty good
7 about it. It's a good thing.

8 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: I was going
9 to ask Mr. Petty about wi-fi, but I'll assume that's
10 going to be part of the programming.

11 Other than that, those are my only
12 comments. Any other comments?

13 Member Greco.

14 MR. GRECO: Yes. I would like to
15 make a motion. In the matter of Lake Shore Park
16 Building JSP17-43, a motion to approve the preliminary
17 site plan based on and subject to the matters listed
18 in the motion sheet A through G with the exception of
19 taking out Item F which is requesting recommendation
20 for a variance on the side yard, so removing that.
21 And also with the traffic issues to be addressed on
22 the final site plan. And this motion is made because
23 the plan is otherwise in compliance with Article 3,
24 Article 4 and Article 5 of the Zoning Ordinance and
25 all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MR. AVDOULOS: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a motion by Member Greco, second by Member Avdoulos. Any other comments? Kirsten, can you call the roll, please.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: No.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: The motion passes 5 to 1.

MR. GRECO: I would like to make another motion in the matter of Lake Shore Park Building JSP17-43. Motion to approve the Stormwater Management Plan based on and subject to the findings of compliance with the Ordinance standards in the

1 staff and consultant review letters, and the
2 conditions and items listed in those letters being
3 addressed on the Electronic Stamping Set; and because
4 it is otherwise in compliance with Chapter 11 of the
5 Code of Ordinances and all other applicable provisions
6 of the Ordinance.

7 MR. AVDOULOS: Second.

8 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a
9 motion by Member Greco, second by Member Avdoulos.

10 Any other comments?

11 Kirsten, please.

12 MS. MELLEEM: Member Lynch?

13 MR. LYNCH: Yes.

14 MS. MELLEEM: Chair Pehrson?

15 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

16 MS. MELLEEM: Member Zuchlewski?

17 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

18 MS. MELLEEM: Member Giacobetti?

19 MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

20 MS. MELLEEM: Member Avdoulos?

21 MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

22 MS. MELLEEM: Member Greco?

23 MR. GRECO: Yes.

24 MS. MELLEEM: Motion passes 6 to 0.

25 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you,

1 gentlemen.

2 Next item on the Agenda is Emerson
3 Park JSP17-10, and it's a Zoning Map Amendment 18.717.
4 It's a consideration at the request of Pulte Homes of
5 Michigan, L.L.C. for Planning Commission's
6 recommendation to City Council for a Planned Rezoning
7 Overlay Concept Plan associated with a zoning map
8 amendment from OS-1 (Office Service) to RM-2 (High
9 Density Multi-Family Residential). The subject
10 property is approximately 24 acres and is located on
11 the west side of Novi Road and north of Ten Mile in
12 Section 22. The applicant is proposing development of
13 120 multi-family attached condominiums with frontage
14 and access to Novi Road.

15 Sri, good evening.

16 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Good evening.

17 The subject property was formerly
18 referred to as Princeton Park. They changed the name
19 to Emerson Park since you last saw it. The Planning
20 Commission held a public hearing on May 10th and
21 postponed their decision to a later time. It is
22 located west of Novi Road and north of Ten Mile in
23 Section 22. It is currently zoned OS-1 --

24 MR. LYNCH: Sri, can we hold on
25 just for a second just so -- I can't hear that.

1 MS. KOMARAGIRI: No problem. I can
2 wait if you want to take a small break or stretch.

3 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: No, that's
4 okay.

5 MS. KOMARAGIRI: The subject
6 property is located west of Novi Road and north of Ten
7 Mile in Section 22. It is currently zoned OS-1 and is
8 being used as a vehicle storage lot and is a
9 long-standing legal non-conforming use. All
10 properties east of Novi Road are zoned and developed
11 as I-1 and I-2, industrial uses. They are all master
12 planned for industrial as well. Properties to the
13 north are zoned OS-1. The future uses for these
14 properties are very unlikely to change. The property
15 on the south is currently vacant and can be developed
16 with existing allowed office uses or rezoned to master
17 planned commercial uses. The property to the west is
18 zoned R-4 and is developed as a single-family detached
19 housing development. The property contains few
20 regulated woodlands and a large portion of wetlands
21 with an open body of water to the south which is
22 proposed to be preserved.

23 The applicant is proposing a 120
24 3-bedroom multi-family unit for sale residential
25 development with frontage and access to Novi Road.

1 The PRO Concept shows two detention ponds on either
2 side of the proposed entrance boulevard. The
3 applicant is proposing private drives, public water
4 and sewer, and emergency access off of Novi Road.
5 Pocket parks and pedestrian walks spread throughout
6 the development for active and passive recreation.
7 This is not a gated community. The applicant is
8 proposing to complete the construction in two phases.

9 The plan was presented to Master
10 Planning and Zoning Committee on March 28 of 2017.
11 Planning Commission held a public hearing on May 10th
12 of 2017. The applicant has been working with staff
13 since then to modify the plan to address staff's
14 concerns. The revisions did not result in significant
15 reduction in density. It was reduced from 6.6
16 dwelling units per acre to 6.2 by eliminating about
17 nine units. However, the applicant has agreed to
18 include the proposed maximum density, maximum building
19 height, and the total number of units as conditions of
20 the PRO agreement. Changes include providing
21 additional screening from residents to the west and
22 post office to the north, changes to the alignment of
23 the private drive, addition of common parking spaces,
24 and increasing the distance between driveways near the
25 buildings.

1 In the past staff has expressed
2 concerns about the density and the compatibility of
3 the proposed development with the surrounding planned
4 and development uses. Some of the concerns still
5 remain, but staff notes that the applicant has made
6 significant progress, made some changes to the layout
7 which have alleviated most of those concerns.

8 A minimum of .09 acre of wetland
9 impacts are proposed. About 20 percent of the total
10 regulated trees on site are being preserved. The
11 traffic review study finds that a reduction of 1,402
12 trips per day is estimated based on the proposed
13 zoning change from office to residential.

14 The conceptual elevations provided
15 appear to deviate significantly from the requirements
16 of the Facade Ordinance. In the response letter the
17 applicant agreed to meet the minimum requirements at
18 the time of site plan approval.

19 The proposed concept plan would
20 require other multiple deviations from planning,
21 engineering and landscape requirements which are
22 listed in the motion sheet which are supported by the
23 staff. The list of deviations did not change since
24 the Planning Commission last reviewed the plans on May
25 10 except for a few minor modifications. All reviews

1 are currently recommending approval of concept with
2 additional comments to be addressed at the time of
3 Preliminary Site Plan review.

4 One item of concern, as part of the
5 public benefits, the applicant has proposed to donate
6 \$90,000 for pedestrian enhancements along Novi Road to
7 encourage pedestrian connectivity from the development
8 to Main Street and the Novi Town Center. The provided
9 conceptual plan illustrating potential improvements
10 along Novi Road along with an estimate. The applicant
11 has contacted Scott Sinikowski, a Permit Engineer from
12 RCOC for preliminary input and have received favorable
13 response. Staff has expressed concerns about soft
14 costs for design and permitting and maintenance costs
15 after construction. In the response letter, the
16 applicant agreed to donate an additional \$14,000
17 towards design and permitting and to include the
18 appropriate funding towards future maintenance in the
19 HOA master deed. Staff still anticipates that there
20 may be some resistance to the improvements once
21 details such as corner clearance, existing topography
22 offset from the road are proposed from RCOC. In the
23 event that the proposed improvements are not approved
24 by RCOC or any other unforeseen circumstances, the
25 applicant has indicated that the city may redirect the

1 funds for another appropriate public infrastructure
2 improvement project in the project vicinity. The City
3 may wish to consider other alternative benefits to the
4 public land, such as the historic city cemetery north
5 of the subject site or other public land in the area.

6 The Planning Commission is asked
7 tonight to make a recommendation on the proposed PRO,
8 Planned Rezoning Overlay, and the Concept Plan to City
9 Council. The applicant Joe Skore from Pulte Homes is
10 here with his Engineer Bill Anderson. Staff is
11 available to answer any questions you have for us.

12 Thank you.

13 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you,
14 Sri.

15 Does the applicant wish to address
16 the Commission?

17 MR. ANDERSON: Good evening. Thank
18 you. My name is Bill Anderson. I'm with Atwell.
19 We're the engineers and planners for the project. And
20 as Sri said, Joe Skore with Pulte Homes is here as
21 well.

22 Again, we are proposing a 120 town
23 homes off Novi Road as she indicated. The plan is
24 sitting there. We were in front of you about three
25 months ago, and we've gone through quite a bit of

1 changes working with your staff getting to the
2 position where we have a full recommendation for
3 approval from your staff.

4 Briefly, that is just the location
5 there on Novi. We have residential to the south. We
6 have a nice wetland immediately to our south, and
7 wetland city property to our north next to the post
8 office across from Michigan CAT if you're familiar
9 with the property. Again, that's the existing
10 property as it sits. It's about a third wetland on
11 the south side. It's used for storage of recreational
12 vehicles and such currently. So we're looking at a
13 nice redevelopment use.

14 Just briefly to recap, since we
15 were before the commission in May, we've reduced the
16 unit count from 125 to 120 town homes. We've added
17 about 40 additional four season plantings along that
18 western buffer that will give a better screening year
19 round for that buffer area. And we've shared -- we've
20 been to the site, shared those plans with the adjacent
21 community. We've added a wood fence. We've added
22 benches to the playscape and really expanded that area
23 adjacent to the pond. So we think we've got a really,
24 really nice play area and vista off to our wetland
25 complex to the south.

1 We've added more parking throughout
2 since there seems to be a shortage through this type
3 of use in the community, and we've made driveway
4 improvements, modified the emergency access way into
5 the site, secondary access, working with your fire
6 chief, and we've modified the road geometry quite bit,
7 that north east-west line to improve the vista and
8 drive through there. We've also offered to upgrade
9 our garage doors. We're proposing to have windows
10 throughout our garage doors and will really improve
11 that internal circulation and view throughout the
12 community. Again we're proposing a PRO RM-2 underlay.

13 As far as the Novi Road
14 enhancements, we've talked to the county about what
15 could be acceptable. You saw a sample of the plan we
16 could propose and do out there. As long as there is
17 improvements on the Novi Road which is identified in
18 your Master Plan, something we're interested in the
19 project, again we're proposing to make a \$104,000
20 contribution, that's a \$90,0000 contribution, and to
21 cover the design costs, an additional 15 percent, so a
22 \$104,000 contribution to the Novi Road enhancements.
23 And again, we did a design and budget to show what you
24 could illustrate. Everyone wanted to kind of see what
25 would we get for that money, and it really illustrated

1 that. We've talked to the Road Commission. It seemed
2 to be something acceptable.

3 If the city wants to do something
4 different on that Novi Road corridor, you own property
5 immediately north of our site. Maybe there is an
6 amenity you want to do there. Or there's a city
7 cemetery just downtown, between our property and town.
8 If there's an art piece or something you want to do
9 there, we're fine with that donation, that that money
10 be used for that use improving the Novi Road corridor.
11 So that's what we're proposing, and I just wanted to
12 be clear, I know you just wanted to confirm what is an
13 appropriate option and what that money might cover.

14 Again, from our perspective, just
15 to recap quickly, when we started we were at 140 units
16 in our original concept plan. When we went to
17 pre-application and the Master Plan Zoning Committee,
18 we looked at all the natural features and all those
19 setbacks and everything, we had very positive
20 feedback, but we went down to about 129 town homes.

21 When we were in front of you in
22 May, we thought we had a pretty favorable feedback
23 from you. We had the building separation, and one of
24 the big things we negotiated with the city was finding
25 the balance of what that corridor through the town

1 home development is, how much green space in front
2 between sidewalks and the road or between -- behind
3 the buildings, and that really impacted us, but that's
4 what we brought to you in May, 125 units and kind of
5 defined what that road corridor was going to be.

6 And then for the last three months
7 we've been really fine tuning the amenities on site
8 and again tweaking that northern road geometry, and
9 that's taken us down to where we are today at 120 town
10 homes.

11 I have all the slides from May if
12 you want to hear it, but we're open for questions as
13 well.

14 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you,
15 appreciate that.

16 With that I'll turn it over to the
17 Planning Commission for their consideration. Who
18 would like it start?

19 Member Lynch.

20 MR. LYNCH: Yes, thank you. That's
21 what I wanted to see. So we started at 140, just kind
22 of shoe-horning stuff in there. We got down a little
23 bit, you know, ten units. This last design though, I
24 do kind of like this one. You changed the orientation
25 of the buildings it looks like?

1 MR. ANDERSON: Since May?

2 MR. LYNCH: It just looks
3 different. It looks like it's more open, although
4 we're only losing five units, right?

5 MR. ANDERSON: Yes, we've lost five
6 units. And on the southern road where we had the
7 playscape, we lost a couple of units, we opened that
8 up, added a couple parking spaces right there and some
9 additional benches. So you have really nice vista off
10 to the south. And then on the north we put some more
11 dramatic curvature into that road so as you go through
12 the community, it would feel better.

13 MR. LYNCH: Yes, I like that.

14 MR. ANDERSON: Then we offered the
15 upgraded garage door, and that was again working with
16 your staff just fine tuning the details. But, you
17 know, every detail has a unit impact as well.

18 MR. LYNCH: No, I understand, I
19 understand. And hopefully you took that as
20 constructive feedback, but right now we've got a bunch
21 of RVs parked out there, and this is certainly more
22 attractive than that. And at the same point, we want
23 to make sure that what we do here, we're not going to
24 do anything that we wouldn't do anywhere else in the
25 city. I think it's an appropriate use for that land.

1 The traffic I think really is governed by that light
2 that's in front of the post office. There is a light
3 right there in front of the post office on Novi Road.
4 So the ingress and egress into that subdivision
5 shouldn't be --

6 MR. ANDERSON: We don't anticipate
7 a problem. It will be significantly less than what it
8 is zoned for.

9 MR. LYNCH: Yes. I guess overall I
10 like what you've done. I appreciate your working with
11 us. I know it's been a long, arduous process, but I
12 think that this latest design I think I can certainly
13 support based on what I've known about since the
14 beginning of this project. So thank you very much for
15 bringing this. I appreciate what you've done.

16 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.
17 Anyone else?

18 Member Greco.

19 MR. GRECO: Yes, thank you, through
20 the chair. With such experienced applicants,
21 including Pulte Homes, which does a great conceptual,
22 great product, great plans, everything does look
23 great. My only problem is is that I don't think a
24 condo complex belongs there on Novi Road. I don't
25 think -- I appreciate the enhancements, I appreciate

1 all the work that has been done. When I saw this in
2 May I believe for me it may have been about the first
3 time that I saw it, I believe I expressed I didn't
4 think that it fit there. It is close to the Panera
5 Bread and the downtown area. I don't think it's a
6 walkable type of situation. I mean, yes, there are
7 sidewalks on Novi Road and you can walk out the
8 entrance and walk north on Novi Road, but it's not a
9 downtown type area, you've got to cross that bridge
10 over the train tracks.

11 So while it's as usual a beautiful
12 product, it's over the bridge. I mean, you know, it's
13 a beautiful product, beautiful plan, but with respect
14 to the rezoning of the area and basically a commercial
15 area on that Novi Road, I don't think it fits. Those
16 are my comments.

17 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

18 Anyone else?

19 Member Giacometti.

20 MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes. I just want
21 to say that I think this -- I'm going to support -- I
22 initially felt that way. I think this project has
23 come a long way, and I appreciate your hard work for
24 working with us to do that. It did strike me at first
25 as being out of place, but I can't see really any

1 other use immediately or even in the near term going
2 into this location, and it's a dramatic improvement
3 over the sort of blighted property that is there now,
4 and the offset from Novi Road seems to be enough. I
5 wish the sub to the west had a connection, but there's
6 nothing we can do about that now because there is
7 nothing there. I hope that the city which owns the
8 property to the north takes advantage of an
9 opportunity to create some sort of transitional
10 development, and so that's on I guess us. So thank
11 you.

12 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Member

13 Avdoulos.

14 MR. AVDOULOS: I, too, struggled
15 when I first saw this, and continued to go up and down
16 Novi Road just to see what makes sense or if this
17 makes sense. And, you know, looking at what is -- you
18 know, trying to look at what is across the street,
19 what is going to happen in the future, but I think in
20 all honesty the work that has been done and what could
21 end up being there, this might be the appropriate
22 development, and then hopefully this will spur on a
23 different type of chain reaction to something. And
24 I'm hoping that the city does take advantage of this,
25 and then dovetails off of it. So I appreciate it.

1 The one thing I am struggling with
2 is also the road -- Novi Road enhancements that were
3 presented, and is that something that is going to
4 really work or do we need to further develop so that
5 these enhancements can also sustain themselves or be
6 sustained, because you're not going to I believe have
7 as many people walking up and down here initially. If
8 it gets developed further, that might be the point.
9 So what I was also trying to do is I went to Twelve
10 Mile between Novi Road and West Road where we have
11 Dick's Sports on one side and then we have
12 condominiums on the other side, and then we have
13 office building and a little medical clinic and then a
14 bank building and then some more condos. So I could
15 see where if we can start establishing that kind of a
16 rhythm, then this might be the genesis of beginning
17 that type of development along Novi Road.

18 I had some concern with the
19 traffic, but I do think that it will be less than what
20 is currently zoned, so that's helping me with my
21 decision. So just like Commissioner Greco, I'm
22 teetering, but I think for what has been presented and
23 how they worked with the city in reducing it down to
24 something that is a little bit more manageable and
25 more palatable, I think that I can support the

1 project.

2 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

3 Mr. Zuchlewski, any comments?

4 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: I think it's -- I
5 think I commend the applicant in the way you've worked
6 with us and cut down 20 units. That's substantial in
7 capital on the outlay of this. I know there is always
8 a little fluff in there, so I don't feel too bad about
9 it.

10 And I think like John had
11 mentioned, I think it's going to be a start, and I
12 think we need this. We're trying to get more people
13 to be downtown and walk downtown and everything, and I
14 know it's not the exact spot that we want, but, you
15 know, if you start here or start here, I don't know
16 what the difference is as long as it in-fills. I
17 think this is a real opportunity and it's much better
18 than what is there.

19 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you,
20 sir.

21 Member Giacobetti.

22 MR. GIACOPETTI: With that I'd like
23 to make a motion. In the matter of Emerson Park
24 JSP17-10 and Zoning Map Amendment 18.717, motion to
25 recommend approval to the City Council to rezone the

1 subject property OS-1, Office Service, to RM-2, high
2 density multi-family residential, with a planned
3 rezoning overlay concept plan.

4 The recommendation shall include
5 the following ordinance deviations for consideration
6 by the City Council as outlined in the motion sheet
7 Items A through L.

8 Two, applicant complying with the
9 conditions listed in the staff and consultant review
10 letters.

11 Three, if the City Council approves
12 the rezoning, the Planning Commission recommends the
13 following conditions be required of the Planning
14 Rezoning Overlay agreement listed in the motion sheet
15 Items A to C.

16 Four, while the applicant has
17 offered a public benefit for improvements along Novi
18 Road, details of the actual improvements being offered
19 need to be further evaluated and resolved through
20 discussion with the Planning Commission and the City
21 Council with regard to the types of improvements and
22 the overall costs of any easements, installation and
23 maintenance of such improvements.

24 This motion is made because, A, the
25 applicant has presented a reasonable alternative to

1 the Master Plan for Land Use recommendation of
2 Community Office for the parcel as indicated in the
3 applicant's letter dated March 20th, 2017, noting the
4 appropriateness of a residential use for the site
5 given the close proximity to Main Street and Town
6 Center, and the ability for additional nearby
7 residents to add vibrancy and support for local
8 businesses.

9 B, the proposed plan meets several
10 objectives of the Master Plan, as noted later in this
11 review letter, including Items i through iii in the
12 motion sheet.

13 C, proposed density of 6.2 units to
14 the acre in attached town house format provides a
15 reasonable transition between the existing recommended
16 density of no more than 3.3 units to the acre on
17 single-family detached residential property to the
18 west and the non-residential uses proposed and
19 existing along Novi Road.

20 D, the development plan will remove
21 a long-standing nonconforming outdoor storage yard use
22 on th property.

23 E, the city's traffic engineering
24 consultant has reviewed the rezoning impact study and
25 found that a reduction of 1,402 trips per day, 264 for

1 the a.m. peak hour and 225 trips for the p.m. peak
2 hour is estimated based on the zone change from office
3 to residential.

4 And F, submittal of a concept
5 plan and any resulting PRO agreement provides
6 assurance to the Planning Commission and to the City
7 Council of the manner in which the property will be
8 developed and offers benefits that would not be likely
9 to be offered under standard development options.

10 MR. AVDOULOS: Second.

11 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a
12 motion by Member Giacopetti and a second by Member
13 Avdoulos.

14 Any other comments?

15 Sri, can you call the roll, please.

16 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Thank you.

17 Member Greco?

18 MR. GRECO: No.

19 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

20 MR. LYNCH: Yes.

21 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

22 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

23 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Zuchlewski?

24 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

25 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacometti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes 5 to
1.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: All set.

Thank you.

MR. ANDERSON: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Item Number 3
on the agenda is Taft Knolls III JSP16-67. It's a
consideration request of 25150 Taft Road, L.L.C. for
Preliminary Site Plan with Open Space Preservation
Option, Site Condominium, Wetland Permit, Woodland
Permit and Stormwater Management Plan Approval. The
subject property is located in Section 22 South of
Eleven Mile Road and East of Taft Road and is zoned
R-4, (One-Family Residential). The applicant is
proposing to construct up to a 15 unit single-family
residential development (site condominium) utilizing
the Open Space Preservation Option.

Sri.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Thank you.

The subject property is located on
the east side of Taft Road north of Ten Mile Road in
Section 22. The property totals about 9.6 acres.

1 The current zoning of the property
2 is R-4, (One-Family Residential), on north, east and
3 south as well. The properties on west across Taft
4 Road are zoned Residential Acreage. The future land
5 use designation for the property and surrounding
6 properties on north, east and south is single family
7 as well. Educational facility is indicated on west.
8 The site has substantial portions of regulated
9 wetlands along the front and rear property lines. It
10 also has a considerable amount of woodlands along the
11 east boundary.

12 The applicant is proposing a 15
13 unit single family residential development utilizing
14 the Open Space Preservation Option with entrance off
15 of Taft Road. Staff identified two existing easements
16 which were not included in the site plan at that time.
17 The Planning Commission held a public hearing on
18 May 10, but postponed their decision to a later
19 meeting so that the applicant can work with the staff
20 to identify the actual location of the two easements
21 in relation to the site plan and evaluate its
22 potential impacts.

23 The existing drainage easement is
24 1.53 acres and the preservation easement is 1.51
25 acres. A twelve foot wide strip of land was excluded

1 from the easement to allow for driveway access from
2 Taft Road to the existing home. The applicant is now
3 proposing to dedicate a total of 5.2 acres of land
4 into open space preservation option and is also
5 requesting a 60-foot right-of-way through the
6 easement. In other words, if the submitted plan is
7 approved with the proposed easements, the applicant is
8 proposing to dedicate an additional 2.16 acres to the
9 city be preserved.

10 A bonafide plan was provided with
11 the application which identifies how the property will
12 be developed under conventional development standards.
13 It is included in the plan which indicates 16 lots
14 that can be developed under conventional standards.
15 Staff determined that a maximum of 15 lots can be
16 proposed eliminating Lot 11 or Lot 10 which is not
17 feasible.

18 The feasibility of both the
19 bonafide plan and the proposed Open Space Preservation
20 Plan is dependent on Council's inclination to modify
21 the easements. Staff has shared a memo with the City
22 Council explaining the issues with the easements.
23 Staff had not received any comments at that time, and
24 has proceeded to review the plans based on the
25 assumption that Council will be willing to consider

1 the modifications following Planning Commissions
2 review of the plan. However, we received one comment
3 from one Council member this morning expressing some
4 concern about the proposed modification. Staff's
5 current recommendation for Planning Commissions's
6 approval is contingent on Council's approval to the
7 easement modifications.

8 The applicant is requesting a
9 reduction of the minimum site area from 10,000 square
10 feet to 8,000, a minimum lot width reduction from 80
11 feet to 70, and a minimum side yard reduction from
12 25 feet total two sides to 20 feet total two sides, as
13 the proposed site plan utilizes Open Space
14 Preservation option as preserving approximately 54
15 percent of open space on site.

16 The current site plan proposes an
17 extension of existing Danyas Way to provide a through
18 connection to Taft Road. Engineering review
19 identified a couple of variances that are required for
20 lack of sidewalk on one side of the street for a
21 portion of Danyas Way near the wetlands, one for not
22 meeting the minimum stormwater detention buffers, and
23 another one for not providing a stub street at 1300
24 feet intervals. While staff supports the stub street
25 variance, staff is not in support of the sidewalk

1 waiver as the proposed impacts indicated by the
2 applicant to the wetlands are not significant enough.
3 Staff is not also in support of the vegetated buffer
4 requirement as there is no precedent for the deviation
5 and the proposed buffers do not serve the intent of
6 the requirement. Landscape review identified two
7 waivers for absence of required berm and five required
8 street trees along Taft Road due to presence of
9 existing wetlands. Staff is in support of those two.

10 The distance between Danyas Way and
11 the Novi Meadows school entrance on the opposite side
12 of Taft Road do not meet the driveway spacing
13 requirements. Due to the estimated low volume of
14 vehicles expected from the development, staff supports
15 the waiver.

16 There are seven areas of wetlands
17 on site. The site plan proposes about .13 acres of
18 fill to five of these wetlands. The amount of fill
19 does not require any mitigation measures. The site
20 plan proposes to include wetland buffers on the back
21 of the properties on the north side of Danyas Way.

22 About 66.4 percent of the regulated
23 woodlands are being preserved. The proposed removal
24 would require about 27 replacements, all of them will
25 be provided on site. The removals are proposed for

1 development of lots and the proposed detention around
2 the Danyas Way towards the east span.

3 All reviews are recommending
4 approval contingent on City Council approval of the
5 variances and engineering deviations and easement
6 modifications with additional information required at
7 the time of the Preliminary Site Plan. The Planning
8 Commission is asked today to consider the site plan
9 with Open Space Preservation option, site condominium,
10 wetland and woodland permits, and stormwater
11 management plan. We have received some public
12 correspondence regarding this project which was
13 included in the packet.

14 The applicant is here tonight with
15 his engineer Mike Powell to address any concerns you
16 have. Thank you.

17 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Does the
18 applicant wish to address the Planning Commission at
19 this time?

20 MR. POWELL: Hello, Planning
21 Commission. My name is Mike Powell. I'm the design
22 engineer for the project. And I think the planning
23 staff did an excellent job in presenting the details
24 of this particular project, and as what was said, we
25 were before you on May 10th in our first presentation.

1 Since then we've been working very carefully with
2 staff to mitigate any of their concerns.

3 There are a couple of items I
4 wanted to address before the commission tonight.
5 First of all, the developer, Trowbridge Land
6 Development, is very concerned about their
7 presentation here in the city and in their
8 relationship with the neighbors. They absolutely
9 understand the neighbors' concern regarding the
10 construction that might occur through the development.
11 They are here to commit that all construction traffic
12 will come in off of Taft Road and there will be a
13 temporary buffer, and we'll coordinate that very
14 carefully with the planning and with the fire
15 department to prevent any construction traffic at all
16 from coming through the existing development to the
17 north.

18 There also seemed to be stated in a
19 couple of the letters that there was concern of the
20 previous developers of Taft I and Taft II. This is
21 not the same developer. That development was done
22 under a different developer, and by means of
23 coordinating with a bank because of some foreclosure
24 issues, and so this developer was not part of any of
25 the development in Taft I and Taft II. To set the

1 record perfectly clear, they did purchase a couple of
2 lots in there, but they were not responsible for any
3 of the development requirements, and the bank was
4 actually required to complete those improvements in
5 Taft II.

6 That being said, there are a couple
7 of requests for variations or for easement
8 modifications. As was said, we have a request before
9 the City Council for a slight modification in the
10 conservation easement just to provide access into the
11 site. Otherwise, the only access in here is through
12 Danyas Way, and we all believe as traffic and
13 planning, that the best access off of this site is off
14 of Taft Road, which requires a 60 foot easement, and
15 the city's minimum width roadway with the access
16 through Danyas Way as an emergency access really only
17 for the secondary access to the site.

18 The bigger issue is the sidewalk
19 along the wetland area. As can be seen from the hand
20 there along the wetlands entering Taft there on the
21 north side of the access drive, it was just strictly
22 my professional opinion that people have access out to
23 Taft Road down one side of the roadway. I tried to
24 minimize the disruption of the wetlands in that area
25 by making the sidewalk all on the south side of the

1 drive so there would be a crossing on the Danyas Drive
2 at the end of the homes there, just west of the homes,
3 and they would cross to the south side of Danyas Way
4 out to Taft Road, and then they could either way
5 because there is another crossing out there at Taft
6 Road. So they could turn south or go north on Taft
7 Road. So it's just a -- or it was just a
8 recommendation from a crazy engineer to try to
9 minimize the disruption of the wetlands, but we opened
10 that discussion up to the Planning Commission.

11 The other item that is a little
12 more subjective is none of the lots encroach into any
13 of the wetlands on this site. However, there are a
14 number of lots that encroach the rear yards and one of
15 the side yards, encroach into the buffer yard of the
16 wetlands, and the request from the developer is to
17 allow him to put signs along the rear yards and right
18 along that buffer line notifying those homeowners, and
19 of course it's in their Master Deed and Bylaws
20 identifying that that is a permanent buffer easement
21 for those wetlands letting them know that no
22 fertilizing, no mowing, no cutting of any kind is to
23 go beyond that 25 foot buffer line. And that probably
24 needs additional discussion with the Planning
25 Commission as well.

1 Otherwise we're asking for your
2 approval for this open space plan. As Sri pointed
3 out, the standard development can be done with that
4 15 lots. We believe the open space development
5 substantially improves the preservation of the
6 wetlands and fits the design of this lot or this
7 parcel a great deal more than the standard development
8 does. Therefore we're before you tonight to ask for
9 the open space approval as well as recommendation to
10 the City Council for the various modifications and the
11 easement requirements.

12 And I'm here certainly to answer
13 any questions and not belabor the design. I think the
14 staff did an excellent job in presenting it. Thank
15 you.

16 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you,
17 sir. One question for Barb or Sri, what would this
18 development conceptually look like without the open
19 space relative to where we would be encroaching?

20 MS. KOMARAGIRI: The one on your
21 the screen is the bonafide plan that is submitted,
22 which would be the alternate if they didn't go with
23 the open space preservation option.

24 MS. MCBETH: Just to clarify, we
25 don't believe that they would be able to get that lot

1 that Sri is pointing out right there because of the
2 difficulty of accessing that.

3 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Okay. Thank
4 you.

5 MS. McBETH: We would point out,
6 too, a couple of the homes are slightly unusual in
7 terms of the shape, but they would still meet the
8 minimum size that would be required for that district.

9 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Very good.
10 Thank you, appreciate that.

11 We'll turn it to over to the
12 Planning Commission. Member Lynch.

13 MR. LYNCH: How are you. It looks
14 like, you know, just listening to the comments of
15 homeowners and reading the letters, there's three
16 basic concerns, the construction traffic.

17 MR. POWELL: Yes.

18 MR. LYNCH: And they could pretty
19 much address that. What guarantee do they have that
20 the construction isn't going to be going through their
21 neighborhood?

22 MR. POWELL: The owner is certainly
23 willing to as I said put up a buffer there to not
24 allow the physical entrance to traffic. We'd have to
25 coordinate that with the fire department very

1 carefully to make sure that emergency access was in
2 there, but we would be able to build a permanent or a
3 physical buffer there.

4 MR. LYNCH: So no construction is
5 going to be going through the existing thoroughfares
6 that are in the existing neighbor, is that right?

7 MR. POWELL: Zero construction,
8 correct.

9 MR. LYNCH: Okay. The second thing
10 was, let's see here, was timely completion of the
11 project. I'm looking at -- that's not what is being
12 proposed what is on the screen, is it?

13 MR. POWELL: No. That's the
14 standard development plan. I think the letter is
15 stating that the development to the north, Taft II,
16 took a long time, and as Planning Commission
17 remembers, that was during the down turn in the
18 economy, and so it was lost from the developer to the
19 bank, and another bank bought it out.

20 MR. LYNCH: So that was kind of the
21 reason that --

22 MR. POWELL: Yes.

23 MR. LYNCH: And I understand their
24 concern is like, God, I'm going to have to have
25 construction going on here for 15 years.

1 MR. POWELL: Right.

2 MR. LYNCH: But if this project is
3 approved, odds are it's going to get developed
4 relatively quickly.

5 MR. POWELL: The owner has told me
6 it will be a six-month buildable build out.

7 MR. LYNCH: Then basically that's
8 the two major concerns. The tree thing, I didn't look
9 that you're going to violate any ordinances?

10 MR. POWELL: We aren't, and we're
11 replacing trees that have to come out due to the
12 construction, that is correct.

13 MR. LYNCH: Okay. The conservation
14 easement that separates I think it's Knolls II and
15 Knolls III, you just talked about a sign. I'm
16 familiar with conservation easements. Who enforces
17 those conservation easements? Does the city enforce
18 it? I mean, yes, you can put it in the bylaws, but
19 trust me, there's not a board in the world that's
20 going to go tell one of their homeowners that they
21 can't do something.

22 MR. POWELL: And I understand the
23 concern. The reality is the owner has been
24 contemplating what to do. Certainly we don't want to
25 put chain-link fence up through the development.

1 MR. LYNCH: No, no. I'm more
2 looking at an enforcement. Because what happens with
3 these things is all of a sudden this wetland area,
4 which is supposed to be this, all of sudden somebody
5 starts mowing in and mowing in and mowing in, and
6 pretty soon you've got these two places -- I mean,
7 they're right next to each other.

8 MR. POWELL: Correct.

9 MR. LYNCH: Does the city under the
10 wetland ordinance, would they have the authority -- so
11 in other words, if somebody from Knolls II although --
12 let me back up just one second. Is this all part of
13 one condominium association?

14 MR. POWELL: It is not. Knolls III
15 will be its own independent condominium association.

16 MR. LYNCH: Okay. So that makes it
17 even more interesting. Then if those Knolls II sees
18 an infringement into the conservation easement from
19 Knolls III, the city, they can contact the ordinance,
20 right, contact the ordinance officer, and they can
21 come out there and resolve that, is that how it works?

22 MR. SCHULTZ: Through the chair.
23 That is how that works. It's on a complaint basis.
24 The city doesn't have an inspection program.

25 MR. LYNCH: I'm doing this for a

1 point, because that it doesn't have it.

2 MR. SCHULTZ: Sure. But
3 absolutely, if the city -- if we're the owner of a
4 conservation easement or the benefiting party.

5 MR. LYNCH: Well, we are the
6 benefiting party.

7 MR. SCHULTZ: Right. And we hear
8 of a violation, absolutely, we inspect and take
9 appropriate action.

10 MR. LYNCH: Okay. So the Knolls II
11 people understand that if all of sudden this stuff
12 starts to migrate, they have the right to contact the
13 city to say, look, stop cutting down this conservation
14 so we can maintain that buffer. Okay.

15 So the construction traffic, the
16 primary concern, there is not going to be anything
17 going through that neighborhood. The time of
18 the stuff, odds are now since now it's out of
19 foreclosure, odds are if they can start moving on this
20 thing, within one year it's going to be done?

21 MR. POWELL: Correct.

22 MR. LYNCH: Then as far as the
23 trees go, you guys are meeting most of our ordinances
24 on the buffer plantings and all that other stuff?

25 MR. POWELL: That's correct.

1 MR. LYNCH: All right. Thank you.

2 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you,

3 Member Lynch.

4 Any other comments?

5 Member Avdoulos.

6 MR. AVDOULOS: Thank you. The
7 question of the sidewalk on the north side, does the
8 city have a recommendation? The only reason I ask is
9 because I know there was a concern not to disrupt any
10 wetland or anything that would sort of impede like the
11 natural flow on that side, but I don't know, if there
12 is a concern and we think it's a good idea, then I
13 would like to see it implemented. If it's something
14 that would be of benefit to the natural resource
15 there, then I'm fine with the way it's been presented.

16 MS. KOMARAGIRI: As part of the DCS
17 variance request, the applicant has provided the
18 numbers, like how much wetlands would have to be
19 impacted if they proposed a sidewalk, and they
20 expressed a concern that if those impacts were
21 approved, then they may hit the threshold, the
22 mitigation threshold requirement, but staff looked at
23 the numbers, and we don't agree that they would still
24 be under mitigation requirement threshold, and the
25 impacts are very minor, under .1 acre. So if city

1 would still -- I mean, there is a conflict between
2 impacting wetlands and providing connectivity.
3 Sidewalk is a preference because maintenance-wise it
4 is easy for the city to maintain concrete sidewalks.
5 Boardwalk is another alternative but not highly
6 preferred because it comes with its own set of
7 challenges.

8 MR. AVDOULOS: Right, which I'm
9 learning on the Walkable Novi Committee. So then I
10 would like to see the sidewalk continue across.

11 MR. POWELL: No problem then,
12 Commissioner.

13 MR. AVDOULOS: And then the --
14 yeah, as we talked, if there is signage for the buffer
15 line, that that would work out great. I've seen it in
16 other developments, and people are pretty respectful
17 with it.

18 MR. LYNCH: Depends on the people.

19 MR. AVDOULOS: Exactly. Everything
20 depends on the people. I like the idea that we're
21 developing this piece, because now it will make this a
22 more contiguous -- it's not a contiguous development,
23 but just the traffic flow and everything through that
24 makes it a lot safer, and having that dead end there
25 really doesn't make sense. And then I like the fact

1 that we've got a large amount of open space for the
2 property to the east of this. So I appreciate that,
3 and, you know, I'm in support of the project.

4 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.
5 Member Greco.

6 MR. GRECO: Yes, I would like to
7 make a motion and just a brief comment. I think the
8 development looks fine. It is zoned for what it is
9 zoned, so although I'm looking at the correspondence
10 and some of the comments that we heard from the
11 members of the community, you know, it is a school
12 time drop off traffic issue in this area, but given
13 it's zoned appropriately for this development, and the
14 way the set up it.

15 So with that, I would like to make
16 a motion. In the matter of Taft Knolls III JSP16-67,
17 motion to approve the preliminary site plan, open
18 preservation, and site condominium based upon and
19 subject to the items listed A through J in the motion
20 sheet with Member Avdoulos' addition of the signage
21 that he talked to and the continuation of the
22 sidewalk. And this motion is made because the plan is
23 otherwise in compliance with Article 3, Article 4, and
24 Article 5 of the Zoning Ordinance and all other
25 applicable provision of the Ordinance.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MR. AVDOULOS: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a motion by Member Greco, a second by Member Avdoulos. Member Giacopetti.

MR. GIACOPETTI: If I may through the chair ask counsel for some clarification of the motion as drafted.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Sure.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Item E, there is an "or" in Item E. Which one is staff recommending?

MS. KOMARAGIRI: We revised the motion, and there's an "or" for Item E and Item F. Do I understand correctly for Item F the Planning Commission is recommending to go with the first one, and so we strike after the or?

MR. GRECO: Correct.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: For Item E, staff's recommendation is to revise the plan to provide the buffers because the minimum required buffers around the stormwater retention is 25. The applicant is asking for a reduction of up to seven feet. We don't have a precedent for such a request, and we'd like to -- we would request the applicant to revise plan to meet the buffer requirement.

MR. GIACOPETTI: So a friendly

1 amendment that it stops after the or?

2 MR. GRECO: Yes, accepted.

3 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Does the
4 seconder accept?

5 MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

6 MR. GIACOPETTI: I have one last
7 question.

8 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Please, yes.

9 MR. GIACOPETTI: Are we able in a
10 recommendation to include language concerning traffic
11 control requirements, or is that outside of our --

12 MS. KOMARAGIRI: The construction
13 entrance off of Taft?

14 MR. GIACOPETTI: Correct. Are we
15 allowed to add -- is it appropriate for us to add
16 language in here that clarifies or just solidifies
17 what the applicant said?

18 MR. SCHULTZ: Through the chair, I
19 think the applicant has actually affirmatively said
20 that he would do that, and I think under those
21 circumstances I think it's appropriate. I would make
22 it subject to review by your building department and
23 engineering department to make sure they're in
24 agreement with it, but assuming they are, I think we
25 can add that.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MS. KOMARAGIRI: I think we can say that at the time of soil erosion control permit review.

MR. SCHULTZ: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Does the maker of the motion accept that friendly amendment?

MR. GRECO: Accepted.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Secunder?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MR. GIACOPETTI: It's a motion to restrict traffic on is it Danyas Road?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes, Danyas off of Taft.

MR. GIACOPETTI: That the applicant would --

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: He's got it.

MR. SCHULTZ: Construction traffic limited to Taft Road subject to confirmation with city staff at first building permit review.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Thank you. You crystalized my thoughts.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Good catch. Thank you.

With that, any other discussions?

Sri, can you call the roll, please.

1 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Thank you. And I
2 apologize, I couldn't follow --

3 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: It was Member
4 Greco, and Avdoulos was the second.

5 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

6 MR. LYNCH: Yes.

7 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

8 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

9 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Zuchlewski?

10 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

11 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?

12 MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

13 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacopetti?

14 MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

15 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

16 MR. GRECO: Yes.

17 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes 6 to
18 0.

19 MR. POWELL: Thank you, Council,
20 very much.

21 MR. GRECO: Next I would like to
22 make another motion. In the matter of Taft Knolls
23 III, JSP16-67, motion to approve the wetland permit
24 based on and subject to the applicant should consider
25 demarcation of the wetland buffers on-site behind lots

1 4, 5, 6, 7, 14 and 15 through the use of proposed
2 easement signage and potentially other means such as
3 boulders and decorative fencing along the setback
4 boundaries; the findings of compliance with Ordinance
5 standards in the staff and consultant review letters;
6 and the conditions and items listed in those letters
7 being addressed on the Final Site Plan; and because
8 the plan is otherwise in compliance with Chapter 12,
9 Article V of the Code of Ordinances and all other
10 applicable provisions of the Ordinance.

11 MR. AVDOULOS: Second.

12 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a
13 motion by Member Greco, second by Member Avdoulos.

14 Any other comments?

15 Sri, please.

16 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

17 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

18 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Zuchlewski?

19 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

20 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?

21 MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

22 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacopetti?

23 MR. GIACOPEPETTI: Yes.

24 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

25 MR. GRECO: Yes.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes 6 to 0.

MR. GRECO: Next I'd like to make a motion, another one. In the matter of Taft Knolls III JSP16-67, motion to approve the woodland permit based on and subject to the findings of compliance with ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters, and the conditions and items listed in those letters being addressed on the Final Site Plan, 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 Greco, second by Avdoulos.

Any other comments?

Sri, please.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Thank you. Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacopetti?

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MR. GIACOPETTI: 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 6 to 0.

MR. GRECO: Finally I'd like to make another motion. In the matter of Taft Knolls III JSP16-67, motion to approve the stormwater management plan based on and subject to the findings of compliance with ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters and the conditions and items listed in those letters being addressed on the Final Site Plan, 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: Motion by Member Greco, second by Member Avdoulos.

Any other comments?

Sri, please.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Giacopetti?

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MR. GIACOPETTI: 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: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Most passes 6 to
0.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Now you're
all set.

MR. POWELL: Thank you again,
Commission.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Item Number 4
is the approval of the June 14, 2017 Planning
Commission Minutes.

MR. LYNCH: Motion to approve.

MR. AVDOULOS: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: There's a
motion and a second. And I have a correction if I
might. Page 51, Line Item 20, where it refers to

1 Chair Pehrson making the motion, that should be Member
2 Anthony. Then on Page 53, Line Item 2, it refers to
3 Chair Pehrson making the motion. That should also be
4 Member Anthony. With those modifications?

5 MR. LYNCH: Okay. Accepted.

6 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: All right.
7 With that if we can call the roll, please.

8 MS. MELLEEM: Member Giacopetti?

9 MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

10 MS. MELLEEM: Member Greco?

11 MR. GRECO: Yes.

12 MS. MELLEEM: Member Lynch?

13 MR. LYNCH: Yes.

14 MS. MELLEEM: Chair Pehrson?

15 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

16 MS. MELLEEM: Member Zuchlewski?

17 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

18 MS. MELLEEM: Member Avdoulos?

19 MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

20 MS. MELLEEM: Motion passes 6 to 0.

21 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Item Number
22 5, the approval of the June 28th, 2017 Planning
23 Commission minutes.

24 MR. LYNCH: Motion to approve.

25 MR. AVDOULOS: Second.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a
motion from Member Lynch, second by Avdoulos.

Any other comments?

Kirsten, please.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Motion passes 6 to 0.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Item Number
6, approval of the June 26, 2017 Planning Commission
minutes.

MR. LYNCH: Motion to approve.

MR. AVDOULOS: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a
motion by Member Lynch, second by Avdoulos.

Any other comments?

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Kirsten.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Giacobetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Motion passes 6 to 0.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We come to matters for discussion. Does anyone have any matters they'd like to discuss? Good.

Supplemental issues? I don't think any.

And last chance for audience participation. Is there anyone in the audience that wishes to address the Planning Commission, please step forward and state your name.

MR. ZACK: Yes. Sorry to come up here again, but I just want to make a few comments.

1 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: That's okay,
2 we're here all night.

3 MR. ZACK: My name is Gary Zack at
4 359 South Lake Drive, and I have to say I understand
5 the challenges that are faced in putting ten pounds in
6 a five pound sack, and that's essentially what NSA has
7 tried to do to meet the city requirements, and I
8 applaud their effort. I mean, it is a nice design
9 given what they have to work with.

10 However, I respectfully disagree
11 with Mr. Ray's statement that the July 2016 concept
12 plan was 10,000 square feet. Perhaps he was privy to
13 plans like that, but if you look on the city's own
14 Lake Shore website, Lake Shore Park website today, you
15 will see a 2016 July conceptual plan, and it is
16 clearly two-stories, 2,400 square feet per floor for a
17 total of 4,800 square feet. And I don't know what --
18 you know, people see different things, so I don't
19 know.

20 In regards to the transparency, I
21 heard a lot of comments about all the social media in
22 this. I'd like to know why we don't just use the good
23 old-fashioned sign in the park that says this is
24 coming and we'd like your input. That I think would
25 get maybe more response. People are pretty busy. I

1 encourage you if you're Novi residents to ask your
2 fellow neighbors if they're aware of this. I think
3 you'll find very few or none of them are.

4 I'd also like to state that I've
5 been at many of the city presentations and reviews on
6 this, and the response has been overwhelmingly
7 negative to this plan. There's been a few people that
8 maybe said a positive thing or two trying to say you
9 did a nice job given what it is, but we wish we didn't
10 have it, that kind of thing. I think everybody wants
11 the kids' camp to have space, but this is a very big
12 building with a lot of parking on a very small part of
13 the park. Thank you.

14 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you,
15 sir. Appreciate it.

16 Anyone else?

17 MR. DUNESKE: John Duneske,
18 357 South Lake. Just a couple quick comments again.
19 The building is beautiful. I'm just not sure if it's
20 the right building at the right spot. And I
21 appreciate you taking into consideration the setbacks
22 especially on the east side of the park. I know that
23 questions were asked today about what was the
24 purpose -- you know, the cost seems to be driving the
25 size of the building here, where it was two stories

1 and now it's one, and two stories cost more. Again
2 the question was polling, library and camp lake shore,
3 and when you're using the park eight weeks out of the
4 year, Camp Lake Shore is eight weeks out of the year,
5 that's 7 percent of the time, to justify that big
6 building is hard to understand and no one has
7 clarified that. I know Director Muck says that -- he
8 has said it's not going to be used for a banquet
9 facility, but if you go back to the minutes and the
10 video of January 19th, 2017 of this year, the mayor
11 has said this is for weddings, this is for big events,
12 it's for rental, we need it. And I don't know who
13 would be in violation of the charter which says no
14 development of Novi property for -- inside of parks
15 for banquet facilities. So please take that into
16 consideration.

17 I know there is going to be --
18 there is lots of trees that were not on the planning
19 of the maps that were shown today, yet where the
20 park -- where the new shelter is going to be located,
21 and there's openness going into our lots, the plans
22 aren't very clear, not sufficient as far as what the
23 barriers go, but they said also there was going to be
24 fence -- retaining wall and fences, and the city says
25 we don't need that in one of the sections in your

1 packet that you have there.

2 I think finally the amphitheater
3 that you're going put there on the west side of the
4 building is going to -- there is no sound barriers
5 there for that when they have their concerts there,
6 and there will be concerts. You're going to have --
7 concerts will be at the park there, they'll move them
8 first from the pavilion and they'll be over there, and
9 it's going to be very loud over there in the evenings
10 like that.

11 And again I know you're looking at
12 the lighting and everything else in a park like this,
13 but the park closes, and who is going to be
14 maintaining the security of it, the kiosk, the
15 security of building, who is going to be maintaining
16 those. These are the cost factors that I don't even
17 know if it's been addressed yet. And again, I don't
18 know who is responsible for putting the brakes on it,
19 the idea of having this building built as the majority
20 of it is going to be rental for most of the time for
21 events, large events. Call it what you want, parties,
22 weddings, graduation parties, whatever you want to
23 call it, still that's what it's going to be used for,
24 it's been said by the mayor himself and other Council
25 members.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Thank you for your time. I
appreciate it.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you,
sir. Good luck with the hip.

MR. DUNESKE: September 25th won't
come fast enough.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: With that,
if there's no one else in the audience, we'll close
the audience participation and look for a motion to
adjourn.

MR. LYNCH: Motion to adjourn.

MR. AVDOULOS: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: All those in
favor?

THE BOARD: Aye.

(Meeting adjourned at 9:33 p.m.)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, Diane L. Szach, do hereby certify that I have recorded stenographically the proceedings had and testimony taken in the above-entitled matter at the time and place hereinbefore set forth, and I do further certify that the foregoing transcript, consisting of (121) pages, is a true and correct transcript of my said stenograph notes.

Diane L. Szach

Diane L. Szach, CSR-3170
(Acting in Wayne County)
Oakland County, Michigan
My Commission Expires: 3/9/18

September 11, 2017.