1. Roll Call

2. Approval of Agenda

3. Audience Participation and Correspondence

4. Discussion Items

   A. Rezoning request from RA (Residential Acreage) to R-1 (One-Family Residential)
      Review and provide comments on the rezoning request for a 51-acre property on the east side of Napier Road and north side of Nine Mile Road (Section 29, 30)

5. Adjourn
The applicant is requesting a Zoning Map amendment for a 51.19-acre property on the east side of Napier Road and north side of Nine Mile Road (Section 29,30) from RA (Residential Acreage) to R-1 (One-Family Residential) utilizing the City’s Planned Rezoning Overlay (PRO) option.

The Planning Commission held a public hearing on November 08, 2017 to consider the proposed empty-nester development. At that time, the applicant proposed a 56 unit development with a density of 1.43 units per acre. The applicant requested to rezone from Residential Acreage that allows 0.8 units per acre density to R-1 One-Family residential that allows up to 1.65 units per acre. The Planning Commission recommended denial to the City Council based on the following motion:

In the matter of Villa D’este JSP 17-52 with rezoning 18.718, motion to recommend denial to the City Council to rezone the subject property from RA (Residential Acreage) to R-1 (One-Family Residential) with a Planned Rezoning Overlay Concept Plan, based on the following:

a. The proposed rezoning is not consistent with the recommendations of 2016 Master Plan for Land Use.

Following the Planning Commission’s recommendation, the applicant has reconsidered the concept plan, and made modifications as detailed below. For this review, the applicant requested Planning staff’s input as the changes mainly include reduction of density and changes to the layout. The proposed changes indicate lesser impacts to regulated natural features. Staff has not distributed the plans for review by all of the City’s staff and consultants, but collected general input from everyone. A more detailed review by all of the staff and consultants will take place as the proposal moves forward.

Traffic and Engineering suggested proposing shared driveways for some units around the cul-de-sacs to reduce multiple curb cuts on the main drive. Landscape agreed as the having shared drives would provide more space for required street trees. Overall, the new drive layout and the radii have improved the sight distances throughout the site.
CHANGES PROPOSED WITH THE REVISED SUBMITTAL

The applicant has provided a revised conceptual layout with reduced density. The applicant requested the Master Planning and Zoning Committee's input prior to going back to Planning Commission for reconsideration. The following changes have been made to the layout since Planning Commission last reviewed it:

1. Number of units is decreased from 56 to 44.
2. Proposed density is reduced from 1.43 to 1.12 dwelling units per acre.
3. The development proposes three unit types with different sizes as opposed to one. Width of units is increased from 45 feet to 60 with a minimum of 50 feet.
4. Changes are proposed to the road layout to improve sight distances and better turning radii.
5. An additional cul-de-sac is introduced to break the long length of the proposed internal road.
6. Three pocket parks are proposed for passive recreation.
7. Guest parking has been reduced from 20 spaces to 10 spaces.
8. Proposed land to be donated to the City has been increased from 18 acres to 20 acres.
9. It appears that the impacts to regulated woodlands have been reduced.
10. The revised concept plan overlays the revised plan in color over the previous layout. This helps us to assess how the revisions have reduced the impacts.
11. Minor changes have been to Public benefits, which require some clarification and co-ordination between staff and the applicant prior to Planning Commission meeting.

DEVIATIONS REQUESTED

The list of deviations sought with the current revised submittal is same as before. However, the extent of the deviations has been reduced; staff is in support of most of the deviations except the deviations sought with regards to woodland replacement plantings.

Planning Deviations:
The applicant is proposing a layout that does not meet the minimum dimensional standards for a single family development. Staff identified that deviations will be required for lot size, lot frontage, setbacks and lot coverage etc. It is hard to identify the deviations as they are not consistent throughout the site. The Planning Commission may choose to approve the concept plan as shown subject to following conditions:

1. The proposed unit boundary (building footprints) shown on the concept plan is to be considered the maximum allowable footprint. Any accessory uses such as hot tubs, patios, etc. will be provided within the footprint shown on the plan.
2. A minimum of 15 feet shall be maintained between two buildings.
3. A minimum of 30 feet is provided between the front façade and the back of the curb.
At one point, the applicant indicated that two of the units could be combined into one. Staff recommends getting a clear understanding that on the maximum unit size if that is a possibility. Currently, the maximum footprint proposed is 60 ft. x 100 ft. with 15 ft. deck.

**Landscape Deviations:**
In general, the landscape plan conforms to the requirements. There are a couple of deviations that staff recommends in order to protect the existing natural features. For example, a deviation to not provide street trees in front of the wetland, and a deviation to not provide the required buffer screening or berms within the wetland or wetland buffer, in order to not disturb the wetland.

**Engineering Deviations:**
- Absence of stub streets to the property boundary at intervals not to exceed 1,300 feet along the perimeter.
- Not providing non-paved eyebrows.
- Absence of sidewalk along the portion of the south side of Villa Drive and the east side of Villa D‘Este Blvd.
- Blocks longer than 1400 feet.

**Traffic Deviations:**
- The sidewalks should be located a minimum of 15 feet from the back of curb
- The applicant has horizontal curve radii throughout the site that fall below the minimum required horizontal curve radii. The new alignment has improved the extent of the deviation.

**Woodland Deviations:**
The applicant is seeking the following deviations to the Woodlands Replacement Ordinance. Landscape Design Manual does not allow additional credits for upsizing the woodland replacement trees. Staff does not support this deviation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree Type</th>
<th>Credit requested</th>
<th>Credit allowed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6’ - 8’ Evergreens</td>
<td>1 Credit</td>
<td>0.67 credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10’ - 12’ Evergreens</td>
<td>2 Credits</td>
<td>0.67 credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4” Deciduous Trees</td>
<td>2 Credits</td>
<td>1 credit allowed for 2.5” or more deciduous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcanopy</td>
<td>1 Credit</td>
<td>1 credit allowed, if the replacement planting is from recommended list</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Allow offsite woodland replacement planting credits adjacent to Garfield Road, Nine Mile Road on ITC easements in the vicinity of the proposed project entrance and for screening on adjoining neighbor’s property. **Staff believes that it is not practical to propose woodlands replacement**
in off-site locations as proposed. An off-site conservation easement is required for any off-site woodland replacements. Staff does not support this deviation.

- Due to the ITC transmission lines, poles and screening for the existing homes on Nine Mile, a deviation from the woodland replacement diversity requirements is requested to allow a higher use of evergreens relative to species of impacted trees. The current submittal did not include a tree survey. Without knowing the existing tree species or proposed tree replacement types, staff is unable to support this deviation. In addition, the landscape design manual recommends a similar proportion of woodland replacements to those removed by species. For example, if 20 percent of red maples are removed, the replacement should include a similar percentage of red maples. It is staff’s understanding that there are not many existing evergreens that are being removed on site to justify the replacement evergreens proposed. Staff does not support this deviation.

Façade Deviations:
The applicant is seeking a deviation from similar dissimilar façade ordinance allowing a minimum size of 2200 square feet. The applicant’s intent is to include a certain set of architectural standards into Master Deed. Future residents will have the ability to choose from a variety of options to customize individual facades. The applicant would like to reserve the right to regulate the façade standards within the development.

The Similar/Dissimilar Ordinance requires a variation in appearance in the front elevations of adjacent homes (Sec. 3.7.2), and requires that homes within the larger development be consistent in design quality based on certain criteria; size (square footage), types of material, and overall architectural design character (Sec. 3.7.1).

Staff recommends a slight adjustment to area within which the square footages are compared. With respect to the square footage requirement of the Similar Dissimilar Ordinance, staff can take the measurements only within the proposed development boundary. This would exclude the larger homes nearby, and thereby allow the square footage that is currently being proposed. The measurements are typically taken outside of the project if it is a Site Condominium and within the project if it is a Platted Subdivision. This would be a minor deviation from this precedent, that staff believes would be consistent with the intent of the basic Ordinance. With respect to the requirement for dissimilarity in architectural, we believe the applicant intent is to comply.

COMMITTEES INPUT
With the current revised submittal, the applicant is requesting an increase of 0.32 Dwelling Units per acre (about 40 percent more) than the maximum allowed density for RA (0.8 DUA). The maximum density proposed is 32 percent less than the maximum allowed for R-1 (1.65 DUA). The applicant has made considerable changes to the layout which resulted in less denser development. Even though it is less dense, it is more than the maximum allowed by the Master Plan, but the design changes provide visual
relief and create an interest. Proposed density is reduced from 1.43 to 1.12 dwelling units per acre. Number of units is decreased from 56 to 44.

Staff is requesting the Committee to consider the applicant’s request and provide input to direct staff with further reviews. The review letters from the last Concept Plan review are also attached to this memo for reference. Minutes from November 08, 2017 Planning Commission minutes are also attached.

Please do not hesitate to contact me at 248.735.5607 or skomaragiri@cityofnovi.org for any questions or clarifications.
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PRO CONCEPT PLAN (Current Revised)
(Full plan set available for viewing at the Community Development Department.)
PRO CONCEPT PLAN
(From November 08, 2017 Planning Commission Meeting)
Proposed Site Plan
Villa D' Este - Novi, Michigan
December 12, 2017

City of Novi
45175 W. Ten Mile Road
Novi, MI 48375

RE: Villa D' Este

Dear Ms. McBeth and Ms. Komaragiri:

Attached is our revised site plan for Villa D' Este. We are requesting a pre-application meeting with the Master Plan and Zoning Sub-Committee for January 8th, 2018.

We have reduced the density by 12 units to a total of 44 units. The density has changed from 1.1 units per acre to .86 units per acre. This change preserves more open space and increases the amount of land donated to the City of Novi. We have increased the width of the units from 45' to 50'. Eight of the units we have increased the width to 60'. Minimum distance between the units remains the same at 15'.

The public benefits are significant.

- Donate approximately 20 acres of land to Novi for existing park system. This donation is conditional that Novi cannot sell parcel, or develop parcel, or the property reverts back to original owner.
- The Developer proposes to build a comfort station for ITC Trailhead ($200,000.00 cap).
- Reduce cost for City of Novi to transport soils from installation of sanitary sewer on Nine Mile. Allow the City to place uncontaminated spoils on property at Garfield and Nine Mile Road.
- Remove debris and shut down wood chip operation on property and increase property values in the area.
- Increase tax base by $40,000,000.00 dollars. Many Novi residents have children in Northville Public Schools. This project raises funding for schools and has no negative impact to the school system. Single Family homes would increase tax base by $20,000.00 dollars and have an impact on school system.
- Provide an outstanding high quality development with extensive landscaping.
- Generate $224,000.00 dollars in sanitary sewer tap fees to help pay for the new sanitary sewer.
- Property values near Cambridge Developments see significantly higher increases compared to other developments.
- Pave and upgrade the Nine Mile Road and Garfield Road intersection.

In conclusion, there are many benefits that support this development. There is a need for this housing type in the City of Novi. Empty nester housing makes sense on this site and we are offering significant community benefits. Villa D' Este is an eco-friendly development as it protects more wetlands and woodlands and creates more open space than conventional zoning. This will be a one of a kind development in the City of Novi, making this potentially award-winning development truly unique.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Mark F. Guidobono

Villa D'Este/Pre application meeting request
REQUEST FOR DEVIATIONS
DEVIAITON REQUESTS

- The site will be a true condo. The land will be a common element. There are no lots, only units. No front, rear or side setbacks, only unit setbacks (30’ from curb, 15’ between units). No % of lot coverage, no area requirements, and no depth to width ratios as there are no lots. **A deviation is requested for all units as one deviation due to the form of development compared to typical lots. The development pattern and condominium documents are to be considered as one deviation in whole.**

- No similar/dissimilar review needed, **a deviation from this requirement is requested.** **Talked to Doug and we could agree to Similar dissimilar with language allowing minimum size of 2200 square feet.**

- Stub streets are not provided due to environmental constraints. **A deviation from this requirement is requested.**

- With regard to placement of sidewalks through the roadway approach, **a deviation from this requirement is requested.**

- A sidewalk is not proposed on the south side of Villa D’Este Drive due to grading constraints and proposed screening with landscape materials at this location. A sidewalk is proposed on one side of Villa Boulevard in order to protect trees. Therefore, if required, **a deviation is requested.**

- General Traffic Flow (d) - **A deviation is requested** for the minimum radius requirement of 230’ for internal roadways. The pavement radius in the vicinity of Unit 27 has been revised, as requested.

- Proposed deviations to the Woodlands Replacement Ordinance, **a deviation is requested.**
  
  See below:

  a. 6’ - 8’ Evergreens = 1 Credit
  b. 10’ – 12’ Evergreens = 2 Credits
  c. 4” Deciduous Trees = 2 Credits
  d. Subcanopy = 1 Credit

- Allow offsite woodland replacement planting credits adjacent to Garfield Road, Nine Mile Road on ITC easements in the vicinity of the proposed project entrance and for screening on adjoining neighbor’s property, **a deviation is requested.** Conditioned on approval by landowners.

- Due to the ITC transmission lines, poles and screening for the existing homes on Nine Mile, a deviation from the woodland replacement diversity requirements is requested to allow a higher use of evergreens relative to species of impacted trees, **a deviation is requested.**
- Allow the reduction of tree lawn minimum width for planting of large deciduous trees from 8’ to 5’. We will need to be able to park a car between the sidewalk and the front of the home, **a deviation is requested.**

- No berm on westerly Nine Mile Road frontage – **a deviation is requested.**

- Defer tree survey to preliminary site plan submittal – **a deviation is requested.**

- 1400’ block length, **a deviation is requested.**

*We believe this covers all of the requests for deviations that are in our response letter.*
Excerpts from DRAFT MINUTES
(November 08, 2017)
REGULAR MEETING - PLANNING COMMISSION

CITY OF NOVI

November 8, 2017

Proceedings taken in the matter of the PLANNING COMMISSION, at City of Novi, 45175 West Ten Mile Road, Novi, Michigan, on Wednesday, November 8, 2017.

BOARD MEMBERS

Mark Pehrson, Chairperson
David Greco
Tony Anthony
John Avdoulos
Michael Lynch
Ted Zuchlewski

ALSO PRESENT:

Barbara, McBeth, City Planner
Elizabeth Saarela, City Attorney
Rick Meader, Landscape Architect
Sri Komaragiri, Planner
Darcy Rechtien, Plan Review Engineer
Certified Shorthand Reporter, Diane Szach
Novi, Michigan.

Wednesday, November 8, 2017

7:00 p.m.

** ** **

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: I'd like to call to order the regular Planning Commission meeting of November 8th 2017. Sri, can you call the roll, please.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Good evening.

Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Here.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Here.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Here.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Here.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIR PEHRSON: Here.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Here.

CHAIR PEHRSON: With that, if we could rise for the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Pledge recited.)

CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you. Look...
for a motion to approve or amend the agenda.

MR. LYNCH: Motion to approve.

MR. ANTHONY: Second.

CHAIR PEHRSON: A motion and a second. All those in favor?

THE BOARD: Aye.

CHAIR PEHRSON: Anyone opposed?

We have an agenda.

We have several audience participations on the agenda today. We've come to the first one. If you're here and wish to speak to the Planning Commission on something other than one of the matters for public hearing, please step forward at this time.

Please come to the podium, state your name and address, and you'll have three minutes to be heard.

MR. MIGRIN: Good evening. My name is Karl, K-a-r-l, last name Migrin, M-i-g-r-i-n. I live at 49450 West Nine Mile Road, Novi, Michigan. I just have a question more than anything. I noticed in past public hearings when the residents submit their comment sheets, the secretary doesn't always have the time to read all the comments, and I can understand for time sake that would take a lot of your time to
read all the comments. They are public records once they are mailed to the Planning Commission and the City. I'm wondering if there's any way that they could be -- that the staff could scan in those documents and put them as an attachment to the meeting minutes, because when you read the meeting minutes, there is no comments or no -- from any of the residents on the response form, and it's pretty easy just to scan them all in and put them as an attachment to the meeting minutes.

CHAIR PEHRSON: Okay.

MR. MIGRIN: Thank you.

CHAIR PEHRSON: Ms. McBeth, can you maybe enlighten us? Is that --

MS. McBeth: We will look into that. There are certain protocols for the minutes, and so we will see what we can do to share that information.

CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you. Anyone else?

With that we'll close the first audience participation.

Correspondence?

MR. LYNCH: Just for the public hearings.
deceleration lane as discussed in the review letter.

MR. LYNCH: Second.

CHAIR PEHRSON: We have a motion by Member Anthony, second by Member Lynch.

Any other comments?

Sri, can you call the roll, please.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Sure.

Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIR PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes 6 to 0.

CHAIR PEHRSON: All set. Thank you, sir.

MR. SWEET: Thank you all.

CHAIR PEHRSON: Next on the agenda
is Villa D'Este JSP17-52 with Rezoning 18.718. It's a public hearing at the request of Cambridge of Novi, L.L.C. for Planning Commission's recommendation to City Council for a Planned Rezoning Overlay Concept Plan associated with a Zoning Map amendment to rezone from RA, Residential Acreage, to R-1, One-Family Residential. The subject property is approximately 51 acres and is located east of Napier Road and on the north side Nine Mile, Sections 29 and 30. The applicant is proposing a 56 unit single-family housing development for sale.

Sri, good evening.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Thank you. The subject property is located north of Nine Mile east and west of Garfield. It is currently zoned residential acreage and is surrounded by residential acreage on all sides except for R1 on the north.

The Future Land Use Map indicates single-family residential for the subject property and the property surrounding it. The property to the north is designated as public park.

The property has a significant amount of natural regulated wetlands and woodlands on the property.

The rezoning category requested by
applicant is currently not supported by the Future
Land Use Map because of which the plan was presented
before the Master Planning and Zoning Committee on
August 23rd for input. The plan received favorable
recommendations for the type of development from the
committee except for the density proposed. On
September 13, 2017, Planning Commission held a public
hearing and postponed the recommendation to allow the
applicant additional time to address the concerns
raised by the staff, public, and Planning Commission
at that time.

Since then, the applicant has
acquired a fifth parcel, the development area is now
measuring 51 acres. The number of units have been
increased from 53 to 56. The pool and other amenities
proposed earlier have been eliminated as they were
recommended -- based on the recommendations from their
market study. The applicant indicated that the
residents will have an option to add a loft space or
an attic, or an indoor pool in lieu of these site
amenities. The site entrance is moved further west to
align with Garfield Road. The applicant took a
suggestion from the last public hearing and held two
open houses to communicate with the neighbors. A
comparable plan developed at R1 density is overlaid on
the proposed concept plan to identify additional woodland impacts. However, it did not compare additional impacts to site and deviations from development standards. The applicant mentioned they he'll expand on these issues at the presentation tonight.

The applicant is requesting an increase of .63 dwelling units per acre, about 78 percent more) than the maximum permitted density for RA, which is .8. It is 14 percent less than the maximum allowed for R-1 which is at 1.65 dwelling units per acre. Staff continues to request the applicant to strongly consider reducing the density in order to provide wider setbacks between the units.

The PRO Concept Plan shows two on-site detention ponds in the northwest corner of the site and on the eastern side. One boulevard access point is proposed off of Nine Mile Road. An emergency access road is proposed off of the proposed cul-de-sac to Nine Mile Road. The development is proposed to be built in two phases.

Impacts to the surrounding properties as a result of the proposal would be expected as part of the development of any residential development.
The woodland study plan notes that 35.38 acres of the 51 acre development site is existing tree canopy based on the City's Regulated Woodlands Map. As such, the current plan notes that 10.51 acres, about 30 percent of the regulated woodlands located on-site will be impacted. Proposed impacts to individual trees have not been described or quantified. The applicant is requesting multiple deviations for woodland replacement plantings such as off-site replacement, additional credits for upsizing, and to waive the diversity requirement. A tree survey is not included as the applicant is requesting to defer the survey to the time of preliminary site plan approval. Staff does not support the deviation at this time without a tree survey and it's recommended that the applicant provide one so that staff can make an informed recommendation or the applicant can conform to the requirements at the time of preliminary site plan.

The current plan proposes a total impact of .07 acres to the wetlands and .45 acre impact to the buffers.

Proposed concept plan proposes to connect to the City's sewer. City does not have a set time line for the construction of this public sewer.
line. In the event that the project, the City's sewer project is not available prior to approval of final site plan, the applicant is recommended to submit an alternative plan for the full review process.

The City's traffic consultant, Sterling Frazier, who is here today, has reviewed the rezoning traffic impact study. The senior adult housing under the PRO produces less trips than both the 40 single-family homes development and the 32 single-family homes development for the AM peak hour and the PM peak hour and daily trips. It does not appear to impact traffic patterns in the surrounding area. The applicant has now aligned the proposed Villa D'Este Boulevard with Garfield Road.

The applicant is seeking a deviation from similar/dissimilar facade ordinance. Staff does not support waiving the requirement altogether, but can support a slight adjustment to the area within which the square footages are compared. This would be a minor deviation from their precedent that staff believes will be consistent. The applicant agrees.

The applicant is proposing a layout that does not meet the minimum dimensional standards for a single-family development. Staff identified
that deviations will be required for lot size, lot frontage, setbacks, lot coverage, but is currently unable to identify the extent of deviations sought. The Planning Commission may choose to approve the concept plan as shown subject to conditions listed in the letter.

The concept plan deviates from engineering and landscape requirements as listed in the motion sheet, which are supported by staff subject to minor conditions.

The applicant has offered several public benefits. Donation of approximately 18 acres of land to the north is a significant one. He also proposed to build a comfort station for ITC Trailhead subject to them understanding scope of work or contribute cash up to $200,000 to the sanitary sewer installation costs on Nine Mile, or Novi can allocate funds per our discretion. Staff does not agree with the rest of the benefits proposed, noting that the above two mentioned are significant benefits.

All reviews except woodlands are currently recommending approval. While the applicant has addressed some of the concerns highlighted in the staff and consultant letters, there are a number of ongoing concerns by staff, primarily the density
proposed with the housing pattern so closely spaced, the provision of a comparable plan as requested by the Planning Commission, details of likely woodland impacts, which the applicant wishes to address at the time of preliminary site plan review, and the deviations requested with regard to the woodland ordinance.

The applicant Mark Guidobono is here with his landscape architect and planner Steve Deek, as is our wetland consultant Pete Hill and traffic consultant Sterling Frazier and the rest of the staff. Thank you.

CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you. Does the applicant wish to address the Planning Commission at this time? You'll be allotted ten minutes for presentation.

MR. GUIDOBONO: All right. I need your help, Sri. Thank you.

Good evening everyone. My name is Mark Guidobono, owner of Cambridge Homes. I've been a Novi resident for 14 years, lived in this area for about 30. I've been a builder developer for 37 years. Some of the communities that you're probably familiar with in the area that we've developed are Woods of Edenderry in Northville Township. Bellagio and
Tuscany Reserve in Novi. We've also built custom homes in Hilton Head, South Carolina. We've also done about 30 commercial projects as a general contractor.

In 1998 I was president of the Home Builders Association of Southeastern Michigan, and in 1999 Woods of Edenderry won Development of the Year in southeastern Michigan, and in 2005 Bellagio won Development of the Year in southeastern Michigan as well.

Here we have the area concept plans similar to what Sri showed. This is the 51 acres as she mentioned surrounded with blue. We have frontage on Nine Mile Road at two locations with four lots that we surround that are on Nine Mile Road. We also added this acre and a half right at the end of Garfield to the north of Nine Mile that we thought enhanced this development. Also we have the ITC tower lines, the transmission lines abutting our property to the east. You can see that in orange. Also you can see the city-owned park land with our donation that will allow the city to connect those two parcels of park land, the 18 acre green area at the top of our site. The yellow area is where we would be doing our development at that location.

And here is a view from Nine Mile
Road looking north at that -- the view from the west side of the property looking in. This is an area that we'd like to leave natural. We would like to fill it in with trees and vegetation. We will be putting in a sidewalk along Nine Mile Road as required. We do not want to put a berm at this location, we want to keep it as natural as possible and keep zero visibility from Nine Mile Road.

This is moving into the open area farther north from that last picture. That's about where our road would go with units on each side.

Here is an example of we'll call it a lot, even though it's really not a lot, it's a unit where a home would go, and you have the woodlands in the perimeter. And most of those would be staying. Most of these units would be backing up to woodlands.

Here is another view of another site with the woodlands in the perimeter. Most of these we would be attempting to save.

This is moving farther east. This is the Lamp property off of Nine Mile Road more in the center of the site. This is part of Phase 2. All of Phase 2 is out in the open impacting very little woodlands. Here is Mr. Lamp's home right here, and some outbuildings that Mr. Lamp has behind a garage.
We'll be removing all this, all these things.

Also there is currently a wood chip operation going on there, so we have trucks hauling in wood and removing wood chips on a weekly basis at that location.

This is farther east. This is the home east of Mr. Lamp's property, a view from Nine Mile Road. That is very close to where the road -- it would be just on the other side of that home. So it would be on the north side of that home.

Now we're moving farther east along Nine Mile Road. This is the ITC transmission lines that are directly to the east of our property that butt our property at that location.

Now we're looking across Nine Mile Road. This is an area along across the street on Nine Mile that we would like to have vegetation to block out the -- as best as possible the transmission lines. We're not going to be able to totally block out the towers. But the more vegetation that we can add, evergreens and trees to enhance Nine Mile Road will be a benefit and also block out the ITC lines. We don't consider those an asset, so we would like to beautify that area.

Here is a view from the Lamp
property looking towards Nine Mile and Garfield. The intersection, that's an intersection we would like to improve. We would like to pave it. We would like to add landscaping in that area and upgrade the light that was just placed there recently. So we would like to upgrade that intersection.

Here is a view to the southwest from Garfield looking down the ITC trail.

And -- oops, went one too far.

Here is a view to the northeast on Garfield looking down the ITC corridor. Again we would like to add some landscaping here. We do have lines that are in the way, so we're thinking more ornamental type trees at this location in the right of way again to distract the eye to the beauty of the plantings versus attracting your eye towards the ITC power lines is our objective there. And then directly to the south of that is the Michigan Flower Farm, a very nice place. I get flowers from there for my wife all the time.

Villa D'Este is our plan. It's an empty-nester, a gated empty-nester community. It is -- I feel it could be a very special place. It's a place where you could go and you would feel like you're up north. You're surrounded by a woodland area. And it's -- I'll admit it's a very sensitive
woodland and wetland area on this property. It's -- the 51 acres is really the last developable piece on Nine Mile Road, and so it needs to be developed in a way that we keep the environment in mind. And by putting these homes closer together, you'll see that it's saves a lot more trees than if we went with single-family zoning. 57 percent on this site is going to be preserved as open spaces. So that's all those green areas, that's 57 percent of the site that's going to be preserved.

We did move our entrance across from north of Garfield. It's a better traffic detail. Also by putting it in a woodland area there, we're able to hide it, and that helps us give it a more rural feeling to the development.

The other thing as mentioned earlier, we removed the pool. Our market studies showed us that the empty-nester here wasn't going to use it. So it really turned out to be an amenity they didn't care for. They preferred to keep their monthly dues down, it was more important to them. Most of them -- a lot of them will be retired or going into retirement. A lot of them have second homes, and they're more concerned with just keeping their costs down and not having a pool and the cost to maintain
that at that location.

We did create three pocket parks, one at each cul-de-sac, and one just to the left of the T-intersection at our entrance road just to the left of that. So we have benches, we've created dog park areas there, and there is some additional parking for the residents at three locations.

And this -- what makes it so special, this plan, no one has that. No one has this plan. This plan doesn't exist in Novi. Something like this -- this doesn't exist in Oakland County. It will be something that would be very unique to Novi. It would be very special. You can't really compare it to anything that I've seen in Oakland County. So it would be a very, very special plan for the empty-nester user and for a world-class community like Novi.

It is an environmentally sensitive site, so I kind of highlighted here the woodland study plan. You can see the areas in white are pretty much open field. To the east you can see, that's Phase 2, that's pretty much all out in the open. There is a little bit of woodland removal at that location. To the west almost half of Phase 1 is out in the field area. And the main woodland area that we have to
disturb is in the center. There is really no way to
develop this site because we have to get from the
right side to the left side, we have to put a road
through there. To do that we're going to have to
remove trees.

We do have a single-loaded road
here, and the difference between this and
single-family lot, we would be removing more trees
with single-family lots than we will with the
empty-nester project. So our main disturbance for the
woodlands will be right in that yellow-hatched area.

Here is the plan that was
previously submitted to the city. It never got to the
Planning Commission. It was reviewed by the staff by
the previous developer. We were discussing possibly
buying this from the previous developer. That deal
dfell apart. When we came up with the idea of Villa
D'Este I did want to do it -- we did do an overlay
showing the differences between our plan and that
plan, and then also an RA zoned plan.

Our plan would be in the area of
the white. The Mercato plan would be removing
woodlands in the red areas. Those woodlands would all
be coming down. That has 40 half-acre sites. And if
we did go to one-acre sites, then we would --
obviously we wouldn't have 40 units, but as a developer we'll try to use all the upland area, the wooded upland area that we can, and that represents all the candy-cane area that is marked on the plan. Now, because of the shape and the wetlands, we wouldn't be able to use all of that area in our design for larger lots if that's the way the city decides they want to go.

The tree canopy as mentioned was 35 acres. We're showing 24 acres of upland woodland on the site right now. That previous Mercato plan was almost removing 16 acres. Our plan is 10 acres. We know we wouldn't remove all the upland area if we were going to go in with one-acre sites, but -- and that's 8 acres of candy-cane we're talking about, but let's say conservatively that we could use half of that area for lots over and above what that -- if we went to one-acre sites. That would be 20 acres of disturbed woodland for large lot zoning compared to Villa D'Este would be a half of what would be disturbed. And when we do -- when we put in lots that are wooded, this is an example of some lots in Tuscany that we developed, and homeowners, single-family homeowners don't want woods up to the back of their home, they want a clear woods in these areas to make play areas for their
kids, for grass, they want to add pools, they want to add a lanai or hot tub and things of this nature. Of the 12 sites that were wooded in Tuscany, we cleared a significant amount of trees for the consumer, they paid the -- obviously the replacement tree costs. But the single-family home really is best used in large lots in cornfield areas on sites that are less sensitive. Empty-nesters actually by putting these homes closer together is a better way to save the natural features of the site.

Here is -- we're going to move to traffic now. We're showing average daily trips based on the traffic study that was created. And you can see the Mercato plan at 40 units had 378 trips per day, 32 single-family units, which is near what the current zoning would allow is 302 trips per day. And then I showed a comparison of 56 empty-nester units are 239 trips per day, and that's very comparable to 26 single-family homes just to look at it from a traffic standpoint, because you know the empty-nester, they don't have kids to run around, they don't have to -- you know, a lot of them don't go to work, they have homes in other locations, and all of these reasons are why these traffic numbers are less for the empty-nester. Also you can see here at peak hour that
for 40 units, at peak hour there's 30 trips going on per hour, at 32 units it's 24, and we go all the way down to the empty-nester at 56 units, there's 13 trips per hour. The empty-nester avoids the high traffic times to drive. They don't want to get caught in that scenario.

We're getting a lot of feedback from the homeowners that we've met with. One of the important things for them is to keep the rural feel that is currently at the Nine Mile location all the way up and down Nine Mile. And originally we showed this type of entrance for our subdivision, and this is not keeping with the rural feel, so we decided to make this adjustment. We eliminated this boulevard. This is way too grand of an entrance for that location. It doesn't meet the rural feeling that I think we all want to see at that location. So what we're proposing is something that is a lot quieter, that's hidden in the woods now that lines up with Garfield Road, which is a still very elegant feel if it's done right, and it can come across as almost hidden, you drive right by it and you wouldn't even know it's there is how we're trying to set this up.

Here is the drawing of the entrance. We are moving it as far to the east as we
can because Karl's property is just to the west of this. So we're trying to preserve as much of the woodland area as we can at this location. We're kind of hugging the we'll call it the drain to the right, but there is a lot of trees in that drain, and it's acting as a buffer for us to hide the entrance way.

We have minimal impact to wetlands, just a little bit right at our entrance and at the road crossing up at the top of your screen. Those are the only two places that we're impacting wetlands on the entire site. Everywhere else we're not touching them. There's a total wetland impact of .07, and that's just for road crossing.

Okay. Here is the eastern part of the site. You know, one of the reasons we're asking for full credits on the evergreens and larger and credits for going with larger trees, we're trying to block out this view along those power lines. So we want to create a berm, we want to load this up and basically create a 4-acre woodland right there between these units and the property to block out the ITC trail. Also what it does, it encapsulates or encloses these units so you don't have visibility from Nine Mile Road. That is our objective that you can drive right by this and not see the units. We want to keep
that rural feel.

Here, the western side, we met with these residents as well. And we're trying to keep this as natural as we can on this side, just putting plantings where there is room to do it. We don't want to just clear cut this area, we want to leave the natural feel that this has, but we want to put plantings here, especially evergreens so they help to block the view when the leaves are down. We'd also like the ability to plant on some of these homeowners' sites at this location with evergreens where it might be a little thin vegetation, because we don't want them to see these units, we want their privacy maintained as well. So we want them to feel comfortable in their backyard that they don't have to see anything and they still maintain their privacy.

Here is Kirkway Place. I put this in there for a couple of reasons. One, it was a site that was environmentally sensitive. There was significant woodlands, wetlands on this site. This proposal was brought to the city maybe 20 years ago plus or minus, I don't know, staff would know, and it was an empty-nester community, homes were put together. We drive by it all the time on Ten Mile -- I mean on Beck between Ten and Eleven, and we never
notice it because it's just so quiet there because
it's empty-nesters, and we just don't have enough of
these communities in Novi. It's something the city
definitely needs.

I also show to give you an idea,
these units I think are mainly story and a half, they
are first floor masters, but there is a second floor
to this, it's just all under roof. It gives you an
idea of setback. I think ours are setback five foot
farther. These are side-entry garages like ours.
These have 15 feet between units, which we see no
issue with. It conserves land, it conserves
environmental features, and the people that are living
here don't want big yards. There is no need for it.

The other big difference here is
all these homes look the same. Our elevations are
going to look different. We're going to allow
different type of brick colors, we're going to add
stones in these elevations. These homes will be
unique, so you'll be able to personalize your interior
and your exterior, and that way you won't get confused
as to which house is yours on this type of site. So
it would be unique, and not a lot people would do it
that way, but we kind of like to be cutting edge on
these sorts of things and we'll create a new trend.
CHAIR PEHRSON: If you can summarize, sir, please.

MR. GUIDOBONO: Are units as you can see, very dramatic. Starting price 595. Very open concepts here. You've got your porch. Here is the master plan. We meet the master plan in so many areas. Diverse housing site. You can see the check marks, more open space, and in accordance with land and in accordance with their character. Conserve natural resources, all these things. Less traffic. We don't meet density. What is density? We're at 1.1. Quail Hollow at Links of Novi was approved at 1.35 gross. We're comparing gross. Most people would say this is the way to control the intensity of the use at a location to reduce traffic, minimize noise, preserve woodlands, wetlands, create open space, prevent overcrowding. Our proposal addresses all these.

Community benefits, I think that we've gone over those. There is a lot of community benefits here.

The benefit to the City of Novi, I don't have time to go over those.

The Silver Tsunami report, we need empty-nester housing for the City of Novi. That's in
the goals of the master plan. We just need to give
the city a mechanism to get this done.

In summary, there's a lot of
benefits as I've discussed, but I'll tell you this, I
came here 18 years ago with an idea, a creative idea
that required five variances from the City of Novi,
and the Planning Commission, City Council had enough
belief in Cambridge that they approved that
development, and that development today we know as
Bellagio, and we delivered on that. We'll deliver on
this. Villa D'Este, an empty-nester community in a
private, tranquil setting, this will be an
award-winning development.

I'd be happy to answer any
questions.

CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you, sir.

This is a public hearing. If
there's anyone in the audience who wishes to address
the Planning Commission, please step forward at this
time, state your name and address. If there are a
number of you that wish to, kind of head over to that
side so we can keep people moving through. You'll
have three minutes to address the Planning Commission.

MR. REGGISH: Good evening, ladies
and gentlemen. My name is Gary Regghish. I'm the
owner of Remerica United Realty in Novi. We're a real estate office that has existed in Novi for over 30 years. I'm an immediate past president of the Michigan Association of Realtors and a liaison to the president of the National Association of Realtors.

When I was first presented with this project, I was asked if it made sense, if I liked the project. My initial reaction was I thought it was a great project. Now, but with that I'm very analytical by nature, so what I did was I went back to the chief economist of the National Association of Realtors, and I met with him in Chicago last week, and here's what we came up with, because I asked him, what are the buying habits of the empty-nester. And, you know, some things that I found was the empty-nester of today is uniquely different than the empty-nester of 20 years ago or even ten years ago. I mean, largely the empty-nesters of today are comprised of baby-boomers, and here is what I found out. 84 percent of the baby-boomers and the empty-nesters are looking for detached single-family residential homes. Only 4 percent are looking for condominiums. They're looking for first floor bedrooms and bathrooms, so they're looking for ranches. More specifically, two bedrooms with flex space, so a library, a study, or a
hobby room. Easy to maintain landscaping. They're trading larger lawns for living patios such as lanais. Subdivision setting and quality of neighborhood is important. Empty-nesters, largely the boomers, are interested in up and coming neighborhoods and are interested in a more sophisticated style and luxury. They're interested in more efficiency, better lighting, bigger windows, top of the line amenities and wireless home networks. They do not want to renovate. 67 percent are looking for ranches between 2,000 and 3,000 square feet, and they like their green space.

This project meets every single bullet point. So I then went back and looked at the market in Novi to see if there are any other solutions that Novi currently offers. Here's what's interesting. I found three in the last year. Not three developments, three houses. In the last five years, 18.

I speak in support of this project. This is a void that this project fills. I thank you for your time.

CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you, sir.

MS. OHLGREN: My name is Theresa Ohlgren. I've lived at 21666 Garfield Road for the
past 20 years. I'm opposed to the rezoning from RA to
R1 on Nine Mile Road north of Garfield for the
following reasons. The setbacks are too narrow in the
Villa D'Este plan, only 15 feet between the
structures. They are even less than the setbacks
required for R1. It reminds me of a trailer park. I
especially enjoy the setbacks of RA zoning with 150
feet of road frontage. I've lived most of my life in
a rural area. I bought into a rural area thinking the
City of Novi would protect this way of life since they
were denying variances at the time I bought, and all
the other developers had to adhere to the RA plan.

We are able to walk down the road
and ride our bikes. With the increased traffic we'd
be taking our life in our hands. Most of our streets
is now empty-nesters, and they still all work. So we
still have people going to work. There is not a
sidewalk on Garfield and there isn't any room for one.

There would be increased traffic,
litter, noise from vehicles all day long, not just
during peak hours, peak commuter times, since this is
an empty-nester community, not to mention the wear and
tear on the road that was never meant to last. Nine
Mile was chip paved the same the north end of Garfield
was approximately seven years ago. It lasted three
months. The north end of Garfield was rechipped a
year or two ago.

I see this rezoning as interfering
with the quality of life on Garfield Road. I'm not
opposed to development, just rezoning and
concentration of buildings in such a small buildable
space.

My husband has written something
that he wants me to read. Due to his illness he
cannot speak for himself. My husband is Kurt Ohlgren.
He lives at 21666 Garfield Road. I oppose the
proposed Villa D'Este JSP17-52 development and zoning
map amendment 18.718 for the following reasons.

I'm not opposed to development, I'm
opposed to the high-density development requested by
Cambridge Homes. One, current rezoning in RA includes
one-acre minimum lot size, 150 minimum width, and
setbacks of 45 foot front, 20 foot side, 50 foot
combined, and it's a 50 foot rear from the lot line.
Requested zoning change to R1 includes a half acre
minimum lot size, 120 feet minimum width, and setbacks
of 30 foot front, 15 foot side, 40 feet combined, and
35 feet rear from the lot line.

Cambridge Homes has requested a
development for every setback to maximize density beyond
that of R4 zoning. Cambridge is requesting to rebuild
100 by 45 foot on a 60 foot wide space. This is a 20
feet narrower than the current city of Novi R4 zoning,
detached condo units on common land. There is no
reason to have density greater than a '70 era trailer
park. Come to think of it, the layout does remind me
of a double-wide trailer park.

Two, the Novi residents living on
Garfield Road bought into RA zoning in the area to
raise our families. This development and the
requested zoning change compromises the rural
environment that we bought into. This development
also compromises the environment that Cambridge Homes
is using as a selling point for his own development.

Three, Mr. Guidobono stated in the
last public meeting that he has a rapport with the
Garfield Road neighbors. Yes, he does, but it's not a
good rapport. The people of Garfield Road often go
out as a group and as individuals to pick up all the
trash, fast food wrappers, construction debris, beer
and liquor bottles left behind by the workers from
Cambridge Homes. Not the kind of relationship I would
like to continue with Mr. Guidobono. Kurt Ohlgren.

CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you.

MS. TEDESCO: Before I give my
comments, I just want to establish the relationship of my parcel.

CHAIR PEHRSON: State your name, please, and address.

MS. TEDESCO: My name is Sarah Tedesco and I live 22830 Evergreen Court. It's this parcel -- it's this parcel right back here, and it is also the one where the water main connection is over here, and the grinding station, which this development may be using as a preliminary waste water hookup is also located right here between myself and my neighbor on the back of end of the court.

So Mark shares a story about providing senior homes for our area. I would like to share with you another story, one that the current residents are likely to experience during the development of this property. Currently there is low traffic volume on our rural unpaved road with our neighbors walking dogs along side joggers and bikers all enjoying the natural beauty and relative safety. With this plan there will now be the intrusion of bulldozers, cement trucks and tractor trailers hauling supplies in and debris out. Day in and day out for several years the heavy traffic will continue to beat upon are already rutted and relatively flooded dirt
These trucks after the first month or so of construction will duly note the chip seal along Garfield as a smoother route. As it's not marred with washboard and potholes like Nine Mile currently is, Garfield residents will soon hourly trips of construction traffic up and down their road and be forced to witness the chip seal that they all banded together to obtain for their road go to waste as heavy construction vehicles obliterate its surface. Will Cambridge being paying for the replacement of the chip seal and the added cost of enforcement patrols in the area to enforce the no-construction traffic rule that they are proposing. That's my first question.

A more personal story is the one of my family, which I was using the visual aid to establish our location on. Not only did my husband and I begin our careers as engineers in one of the worst automotive downturns in history, we experienced the pleasure of losing a lot of home value during the real estate market crash shortly after the purchase of our first home together. After much saving and sacrifice we were able to achieve our dream, a secluded lot in the quiet corner of the town where we were both born and raised in. All this so that we in
turn can raise our own children in peace and solitude, and so that they can also enjoy the experience of nature that we had growing up.

Part of the locations appeal is access to the city's water supply. Growing up along Beck Road right across from Maybury I personally know the inconveniences associated with a power outage on a well and septic system. It happens. We chose our lot for the city water access. We also knew when buying it that it that came with a grinding station just adjacent to our driveway on our front yard. We are downwind from it, and at certain points in the summer, we're reminded in a fragrant manner of its function. We did not walk into this situation lightly. We know it is a price that we pay for the privilege of our city water services. We are fully expecting the aromatic experience to increase as the rest of the seven lots on our court are developed. However, we are not looking forward to the 112 flushes every morning and again every evening that will be processed through our grinding station if this project gets approved.

As of right now the gravity sewer is planned for Nine Mile, but it's neither projected in its time lines nor is it funded by the city. To me
with all my knowledge of how infrastructure projects work, this looks like five to ten years until fruition. If I were Cambridge Homes, I would not be holding out for the city to place the sewer along Nine Mile before I made accommodations for my customer's waste water. If I were Cambridge, I would do exactly as Mark has proposed, wisely connect to the Evergreen Court grinding station off the western end upwind portion of my property.

Since the grinding station is not currently designed to handle the effluvia of 56 households, the station will have to be enlarged including a larger holding tank, larger motor, pump and grinder. The one we currently have already smells like a latrine in the summer, and it sounds like a semi tractor trailer starting up once a day for the three houses already on our court. I leave it to your imagination what kind of smells and sounds my family will with our two small children, my son has severe asthma I might add, we will be subjected to that with the additional burden of the 56 two-person households that Cambridge is proposing.

CHAIR PEHRSON: If you can summarize, please.

MS. TEDESCO: Yes, I'm coming to my
conclusion. Thank you.

Will the Cambridge company be paying for the additional upgrades to the grinding station until the sewer project is installed along Nine Mile. Will they also be paying for the projected 10 percent degradation in property value that my family will personally experience on our hard-earned investment, my increased asthma and noise on our front lawn. Will Cambridge also be paying for the remediation work necessary for a driveway and landscape that will be associated with this upgrade?

Until this is settled, I cannot approve of this development. Thank you.

CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you.

MR. DAZY: Good evening, my name is Mike Dazy. I live at 21791 Garfield Road about 4/10 of a mile to the south on the west side on what is known as Garfield Pond, about an 8-acre pond that has seen its history of the effects of dewatering on a temporary basis and unknown effects of permanent dewatering.

I don't know that we fully understand that the densely populated 23 acres of complete undrainable other than the advent of storm sewers to alleviate ground water from that area, that
will have to be a permanent dewatering taking place there on that concentrated 23 acres to my estimation, which is going to basically make that a 23 acre dry pond that will I believe dewater our pond on Garfield Road in the long term.

Secondly, I disapprove of the development from the standpoint of both asking for the rezoning from RA to R1, and then asking for countless deviations from that requested zoning.

The last thing I would like to talk about is the increased traffic on Garfield Road. It is a 25 mile per hour limit without sidewalks. There is a lot of residents and nonresident visiting areas walking dogs, and when we had the construction on Beck Road recently, it was really pathetic what the speed limits did. Even with the City of Novi there on an hourly basis probably five, six hours a day, they could no sooner write a ticket then turn around and write another ticket, turn around and write another ticket. And with the 56 units, it's going to see the majority of the traffic. The would-be residents of this subdivision are going to go to Northville in most cases. They're entrance is going to be right at Garfield Road. They're going to take the paved road to Eight Mile. Our traffic is going to increase more
so than the traffic study alludes to in my opinion. And I guess I would just like to second every that Kurt and Terri Ohlgren said. I agree and I'd like to go on record saying I agree with everything they said so as not to burden this panel with more testimony.

So in summary I disapprove of the development.

CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you, sir.

MR. MITTS: Good evening. My name is Tim Mitts, 22125 Garfield. I was here at the first meeting that you gentlemen held for this proposal. After that Mark offered an informational meeting at the library which I did attend. I was very pleased when I left the meeting to hear so many of you talk about the density count that realistically should be 26 homes on one acre, not 56. So I was relatively pleased, okay, there is going to be something corralled here and brought into real life, but I was very, very disamazed to see the secondary plan with 56 homes instead of 53. As the meeting went on I found Mark to become a little less informative and a little bit more insistent upon if I don't do this, I'm going to rip out more trees. If I don't do this, this is going to happen. I found it a little strange to use
the bullying tactic. Even though he was very polite about it, he -- you know, it wasn't like it was a knock-down, drag-out fight or anything like that, but I looked at it is I really expected to come back and instead of seeing 53 homes, something with maybe 38 homes or just something to knock it down, to bring it down to within reason. Empty-nesters, whether it's an empty-nester or single-family, something is going to go in back there, but there should only be so much allowed in there. RA is what I had to conform to and all my neighbors had to conform to. I don't think there should be much of an adjustment made up and beyond that.

Tuscany is a very nice place, the rest of them are very nice, business is business, but we have to take into consideration what everyone else had to play with when they were building.

Also, as far as his road coming directly out onto Garfield, it's not so much as connecting to Garfield, it's just that it does give a straight shot, it's going to give a straight shot for construction trucks, and it's going to give a straight shot for the construction. So I really think the entrance where he used to have it makes more sense as far as divvying up traffic and giving an alteration.
But I think something much more has to be done with Nine Mile and Garfield as far as before we increase that traffic any more. Thank you.

CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you, sir.

MS. COOK: Hello. My name is Colette Cook. I live on Milan Court in Bellagio. I'm a current empty-nester looking for a down-sizeable home, and I support this. I think to have Cambridge in there and to have premier homes is a huge asset to the community. I don't think this will look anything like a trailer park. And I just basically want to say that I highly support it and I would love to have a unit in there. Thank you.

CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you.

MS. CHEROSA (Ph): My name is Alicia Cherosa, and I live in Bellagio on Florence Drive. The developer has done an amazing job, trees, beautiful. I mean, I'm so happy. Now I'm looking to downsize. I've been looking since January for a ranch. They don't exist, they're nowhere around. And this is a great, great project. I would love to have a home there, too.

CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you.

MR. SHAGINE: Good evening. My name is Dan Shagine. I live at 4900 West Nine Mile
Road. I've just moved here about a year ago. And the first thing I'd like to say is that I'm really empathize with everything I've heard people say to today. I have the same concerns as everybody else does that are in this room, and I'm addressing my neighbors more than -- just as much as I'm addressing the board where I say if it's up to me and nobody wants to buy this property and not let it ever be developed, I would choose that right now, and I would never support Mr. Guidobono moving forward if you can say that.

The reason that I'm, and I'll say it up front, I do support this is for a couple of reasons. It's the lesser of the two evils from what I've seen. What we're looking is we're looking at traffic on Garfield and traffic on Nine Mile, which none of us like. What we're looking at is people throwing stuff out the windows and going 40 miles an hour in a 25, which we all hate. You know, we want this to stay exactly how it is, but unfortunately unless the City of Novi can come up with some money, it's not going to happen. So what I'm looking at for my neighbors and for the Board is to assess a few things. Is this actually something that is going to better for the people in five and ten years from now
than somebody else coming in, following the zoning, and then having astronomical sized homes on large lots and cutting down the woodlands and destroying the wetlands.

When I look at this, I look at a few things. I like the fact that they're preserving more wetlands, they're preserving more woodlands, they're giving back some acreage to the city, which we can all use, which we know that most of us won't, but we could if we wanted to. And I'm seeing that people that are above the age of 55 hopefully will be more courteous to their neighbors and who won't be doing 45 miles an hour down Garfield and won't be doing it down Nine Mile. I mean, I'm right on Nine Mile, so I see a lot of this traffic. And somebody mentioned when Beck was closed it was a highway. It was horrifying.

But what is going to happen? What is going to happen if the next guy comes in here or the next lady comes in here and throws up 40 homes but has an average of four cars in that -- on their property or in their parking structure or parking garage. I just moved from Farmington Hills where we had a single-family, lived on good sized lots, and I'll tell you what, it wasn't the 40, 50 and 60 year old people that were flying down my street, it was the
16, 17 and 18 year olds.

So I'm not here to try and sway the
Board or sway the people, but be careful what you ask
for, folks, because if we get the single-family
development, it's might not be as great as you think
it is. And I don't know, Sarah, I looked at your
situation, I think somebody needs to help you out.
That is a really bad situation for them to be in right
next to the pump. But, folks, they're giving you more
land back, they're saving the wetlands, they're saving
the woodlands, and less traffic. Less traffic is what
I want.

So I'm going to support it unless
somebody can come in and offer something better. And
if it's the City of Novi saying that they're going to
buy it and keep it as is, I'll vote for you. But
until that, let's go with what is going to be best for
the people in the area. Thank you.

CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you.

MR. SCOTT: Good evening. My name
is Richard Scott. I live at 49590 Deer Run right off
Garfield. I was at the first meeting when this was
presented, and just some comments I wanted to make
tonight. One thing I do like about the new
presentation is the rural entrance concept. I like
that quite well over what I saw last week. I don't think this in general, though, addresses the additional traffic on Garfield. Again, with no sidewalks on that road, it's a little shaky road already. I run and bike on that road all the time. It's not too dangerous. Nine Mile is a disaster to do any of that on. You can hardly get two lanes of traffic going. I think it's a horrible area for this kind of development just with the traffic in both those roads. If you all have driven down it, you know exactly what I'm saying.

I think -- I'm not opposed to the development in general, but I think this is kind of an overload for this area for -- it really will disrupt the rural environment. Again, I like the new concept at the entranceway, but I'm really very sympathetic with all the Garfield Road residents and what this -- the change in what their life could be with this. And not to mention the great variety of wildlife in this area which I see all the time.

So lastly I think there are too many deviations requested, and I do not support this. I do not think it should be approved. Thank you.

CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you, sir.

MS. HUDSON: Good evening. My name
is Suzanne Hudson. This is my husband, Michael Hudson. This is a joint statement by us. We live at 22111 Garfield Road just down south of what this proposed development is.

As with all developments, there are pros and cons to each. There is lot of good things that Mr. Guidobono is proposing. I don't have any doubt that he would do a quality development. However, after review of this proposal, we have several concerns that have not been fully addressed.

Number one, the target population. You're calling it empty-nesters. What exactly does that mean? He's talked about the over 55 community. However, the majority of people who are 55 are still working until the normal retirement age of 66. So the idea that they're all retired and they're not going anywhere to work is a false statement. That's an assumption. So what are the provisions in buying into this community of empty-nesters. In the proposal it says that 80 percent will be empty-nesters. So who is going to be the other 20 percent that are going to buying into this? Are there going to be any laws that says, oh, my adult son or sons, a lot of us who are empty-nesters have known about the returning of the adult child to the home for a while. What is that
going to do that to community, and is there going to
be something, a police force to prevent them from
coming back. What happens if my daughter gets
divorced and comes back with her three kids if she's
got no place else to go. As her mother, I'm not going
to turn her out in the street. What is that going to
do to the traffic patterns? So how is this
empty-nester concept going to be enforced, controlled,
regulated.

Traffic studies. So this traffic
study was generated using the Institute of
Transportation Engineers senior adult housing. We
read through those studies and read up on some more.
A lot of that is aggregate data that is not just from
detached housing, but from senior communities. And so
they said, well, empty-nesters they don't have as many
cars, they're not going so many places. Well, let me
tell you about the senior housing population. As we
get older and we want to house in place, those people,
the affluent people who will be buying into this, what
are they going to do, they're going to hire homecare,
and they health aide to come in, my PT person to come
in, my homecare nurse to come in to visit me because I
can afford that if I'm living in this community. So
we're not talking about less trips up and down the
road, up and down into this community. So I think that traffic study is partially based on assumptions that are invalid.

MR. HUDSON: I would like to add to that that in my research of the ITE Senior Adult Housing, they make two major assumptions under that code. The first is most of the people are retired. The second is virtually none of these people have any children of any age living with them. So when you take that kind of aggregate data, it tells you, yeah, the average couple there, they do a quarter trip every morning. Yes, that's if you're not working. If you change the code to condominium townhouse, the traffic study would show that the numbers that we were presented with would double.

MS. HUDSON: His development that he's proposing --

CHAIR PEHRSON: If you could summarize, please.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Mr. Guidobono went 20 minutes over. I think we deserve our time. This is affecting our road.

CHAIR PEHRSON: Excuse me, sir.

If you could summarize, please.

MS. HUDSON: I won't address the
impact to Nine Mile Road. Other people have addressed that. I won't talk about the impact on Garfield Road, other people have addressed that. But let's call this development what it is. It's condominiums because they are common areas, and they talked about the setbacks which really aren't setbacks because it's all common areas. So I do have concerns about calling it what it actually is.

We talked about the woodlands impact. They have not presented a woodlands study. Before we ever could do anything, we had to get somebody out there to say what trees we had, what were being taken out, and that had to be done before we could move forward with anything.

So he also talks about units being combined into one unit. What does that mean? What is the impact on the development if I want to buy two of those units.

There are unanswered questions here. The main thing with this is the area is currently designated RA by the master plan. By your Council it's RA. And I don't know what the overwhelming reason is. He has a great concept here. I don't disagree that we need that in Novi, just not here. We're trying to put a square peg into a round
hole and with all these deviations. I really think that needs to be relooked at. I would love empty-nester housing as he defines it in the City of Novi, I just don't think this is the best site for it. Thank you.

MR. HUDSON: Thank you.
CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you.

MS. HOGAN: Good evening. My name is Lisa Hoag and I live at 21850 Garfield Road. First I want to say that I am opposed to the rezoning change for a couple of reasons. First, I applaud Sri and the amount of deviations that she reported earlier that this new development is seeking to have deviations approved against.

This is zoned RA, and I'm not going to talk about the marketing, I'm not going to talk about the polls. That's not my area of expertise. I'm sure that Mr. Guidobono has done his research well. He knows this is going to be a viable prospect for him as well as for his target of customers. What I would like to talk about, though, is about what RA means. In the options that we saw, RA is a minimum one acre. I didn't see any options for anything greater than one acre. You can still build beautiful fall homes as demonstrated by Mr. Guidobono himself on
one acre and greater lots preserving the natural
beauty of the area. So I'd be welcome to see that as
part of the suggestion here.

Also I would like to see just an
explanation of the rural. I heard the selling pitch
about rural, the tranquility, the things you want to
keep. There's beautiful views when you look down Nine
Mile and across Nine Mile. I'd like to take you on a
journey down Garfield Road as you come from Eight
Mile. As you travel going south on Garfield Road you
see some beautiful houses to the left and the right.
You see smaller, quaint houses historic reminiscent of
the history of the area. You see beautiful homes that
are over 4,000 square feet. You see ponds, you see
wildlife, you see open spaces, you see horses. If you
continue down that road, you see more open spaces,
offset houses, houses close to the road, all with real
nice distances, some not, some that are closer
together, but it's a true community. You walk down or
you drive down or walk or ride at the very end of
Garfield Road, and you see this beautiful proposal for
a park to the left. You see beautiful woodlands. You
see the house on the right. It's a beautiful area,
it's tranquil, it's nature, it's community reminiscent
of days gone by when you were truly a rural community
working with each other, combining with each other, collaborating, making sure everybody moved together in the community in a healthy way.

If you now take the proposal, the one view we didn't see was the view coming down Garfield Road and looking straight into this gate, a gate. Do not enter unless you know the code. That's what I'm opposed to. I love my community because I can reach out to all my neighbors and I can chat with them. Nobody is putting a big sign up that says don't come here, I'm unique. We're a community, we're there for each other. That's what disappoints me in your proposal. That's what I would like to see.

So I'm asking you to please oppose the current proposal, stay true to your intent and your outlook for an RA zoning to maintain that history and that feeling in that area. There are not that many areas in Novi that still have that. Thank you for your time.

CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you.

MR. ASHGARD (ph): My name is Bill Ashgard. I live in 48923 Benito Drive. Currently I live in one of Cambridge development community, and I support the plan because Cambridge always put community first and build a quality lifestyle and
makes our city more beautiful, organize the Nine Mile stretch between Garfield and Beck Road. Cambridge is all about preserving environment and keeping the eco system in place. Thank you.

CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you.

MS. MARCOTTE: Hi there. My name is Robyn Marcotte, and I'm at 49425 Deer Run. I'm right on the corner of Garfield and Deer Run, and I'm just going to overall object or reject the proposal for all the reasons all my neighbors have said, but I just -- I suggest that you check into one data point, and that is from a traffic standpoint it was an absolute fact that while Beck Road was closed, our street was a runway, and I don't think it was 17-year-old kids. I know for a fact, because my house was the place where all the police pulled them over. There was probably six to ten cars pulled over per hour, and I think you can get that data from the records associated with all the tickets given during that time period. I just really think you should check into the accuracy of the traffic pattern. That's it.

CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: They were clocked at 65 miles an hour.
MR. HOAG: Hello. My name is Scott Hoag. I live at 21850 Garfield Road. My background is as an engineer, so I love data. So one of the things I picked up on is the traffic count. I did my own little uneducated but professional analysis. In my analysis I would expect that a single-dwelling home in an RA zoning would have about a 20 percent reduction in traffic as opposed to the proposed development that we see here. I am opposed to the rezoning from RA to R1. It's inconsistent with the community. It constitutes a spot zoning which is inconsistent with how we are supposed to regulate the areas in the communities as they are developed, as the people who are property owners have complied with the zoning and have invested in our community.

I am newcomer to the neighborhood as opposed to most of the neighbors here. We've only been here 20 years, but it has been maintained and preserved that way for that period of time. And we're asking that you support us consistent participating members of the community that is part of the Novi community. Thank you.

CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you, sir.

MR. IORGA: Good evening everyone. My name is Silviu Iorga. I live at 49450 Deer Run.
This is in the northwest corner of Garfield Road and Deer Run. I am fortunate enough to have some fantastic neighbors, and I know they very deeply care about our community. So I take this opportunity to express my opinion on this, and I too object to it, and this is why I think we should not approve this.

This proposed rezoning, it's basically a typical case for spot zoning which normally is not allowed. This development will contradict the character of the neighborhood and run in the face of each one of its immediate neighbor properties. If the city approves this spot zoning, it will give an arbitrary, unpredictable, and unreasonable special treatment for this parcel of land which is at the expense of all the other parcels of land in this area.

This proposed rezoning change will kind of demolish the city master plan for this area and pretty much make it obsolete for this specific area, and we'll have to, you know, put it back forward and carefully redo it. It's basically an attempt to -- I mean, the development itself is an attempt to increase the city population density in this area, and of course is going to increase the tax paying revenue of the city, which is good in itself, but the density
in itself for this area is not quite suitable.

From what I saw on the maps, this proposed rezoning will create a future link between properties located north of the property, of this area which are R1 zones, and the Nine Mile Road itself. So this will be an R1 corridor from north all the way down to Nine Mile of R1 zoning, and what this is going to do is going to make all the surrounding RA zoning properties pretty much irrelevant and they'll grasp for air. It will totally disrupt the rural environment and the wildlife habitat. The size of the project and the density is what makes the development not suitable for this neighborhood.

The new development residents will definitely have many visitors every day, friends, friends of friends, relatives, caregivers, mail, parcel delivery, landscape, maintenance equipment, phone, cable, electricity, gas company vehicles and so many more people will show up. This will definitely translate in heavier traffic on Garfield Road, and this road will pretty much become dangerous to walk or cross as we currently saw, not that much safe for kids waiting for the school bus. And you've we got to remember there are no sidewalks.

To summarize it, I'm not that much
against the development itself, it's just too high dense. And the rezoning, I don't think it's the right way to do it here.

Lastly but not least, I will like to remind the City Planning Commission as a taxpayer and a resident of Novi, I pretty much want to be part of this city and have my good wishes for the city taking into consideration. Thank you very much and have a beautiful day.

CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you, sir.

MR. SARKAR: Good evening everyone. My name is Shyamal Sarkar. I live at the property at 49500 Nine Mile Road in the City of Novi. I support this development due to following. The first thing is I'm sure like we are upgrading a plan to upgrade the sewer system along the Nine Mile Road, and I'm sure there must be a plan to pave Nine Mile. So for that we need revenue. So revenue, this project will help with a lot of those revenue.

Then there is a better use of the land, and we are fortunate that we have a top line developer like Cambridge Home. They've done fantastic work, and I think as a city we should encourage the top line developers.

Now, the project is very
interesting, it's for the home nester, for the home empty-nester. Now the home empty-nester, a lot people asked what does home empty-nester mean. I'm a typical home empty-nester. I haven't been working maybe four or five years. My daughters both graduated from Novi school, and went to University of Michigan. Now they are all gone away, they are working, and they visit me maybe four or five days or six days in a year. So I don't have a lot of traffic and I don't create a lot of traffic. And so -- and since I'm in Novi for 26 years, a project like this with home-nesters is great for not only me, people like me like who goes into retirement or about to go into retirement, time to go, I'm going to go and find a place like this, not with a lot of land and backyard and others. And another advantage, this one is not creating any pressure for the school. With so many homes, there's no pressure with the school, to increase the school. Just imagine 40 homes, 50 homes, there will be 100 kids or so many more, you have to think about school, we have to upgrade the schools.

And as empty-nesters like me, when I'm not going to work, I don't travel. When I was young of course I still go out four times, five times with the kids, so many kids, so many cars.
And this type of project brings prestige to Novi. Like Bellagio, the other great projects, it brings prestige, and it helps other people, affluent people or well-to-do people to come to Novi, and they contribute because they got spending power, they contribute to the business and the business thrives. And just for example, some area like the business is not thriving, going down because the affluency or whatever you call it, at the end of the day we need money to come and spend on the business.

CHAIR PEHRSON: If you can summarize, please, sir.

MR. SARKAR: Yes. And there's one more thing. You know, like any particular area, I mean you think this particular square mile will generate so much in revenue to support the infrastructure and all the costs. Now when we look at the Nine Mile, I'm not sure when you look at per square mile how much or revenue we generate to support that area. It's possible that some other area is kind of helping them to maintain the support. So bottom line is everybody has to do their fair share, you have to see the model, okay, where the revenue comes from to support this particular area.
Finally, I'm very thankful to all the Council. I've been here 26 years. Both daughters went to Novi School, University of Michigan, and it's a great place, you've done an awesome job in controlled development and everywhere I hear everyone says Novi is premier and a great place to live. Thank you again for the great work.

CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you, sir.

MR. SCHULTZ: Hello. My name is Nick Schultz. I live at 50367 Fellows Hill Creek in Plymouth, Michigan. I have to first admit that I am not emotionally attached to this project. I am a loyal, 45-year resident of Plymouth. I'm an empty-nester. I retired, sold my business, my kids have moved out. I'm familiar with the Cambridge products, and they're five star. He will do above what he represents he will do just based on Bellagio, based on Tuscany, Woods of Edenderry. He has a track record and he's a man of his word. I am anxious to be the first customer in this trailer park, and I will gladly send my tax revenue your way. I'm in full support of this project and I think that he will not disappoint. Thank you.

CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you, sir.

MR. SMITH: Good evening. My name
is Dan Smith. I live at 968 McDonald Drive in Northville, and I'm also a business owner in the City of Novi. I'm 57 years old and I'm thinking about retiring soon, in the next five years. And I'm also in the mortgage banking business, and I know what the elderly people are looking for, and Cambridge Homes, the product that they're putting forth, and I think what Gary Regghish said is absolutely true. This is the kind of project that people are looking for.

My family moved to Plymouth in 1965 to get away with the growing metropolis of Wayne, Michigan. And the reason we came to Plymouth is because west of Sheldon Road was exactly what the Garfield people had. South of Joy Road was exactly what the people on Garfield are talking about. It's now called Canton. North of Plymouth if you went up a two-lane road called Sheldon, there was this town called Northville that had horses that actually cross the road in front of you while you're stopped at the stop light at Seven Mile. I thought that was pretty cool. So 20 years ago -- and also north of Novi was this beautiful field called Novi.

The point being is we moved to Northville because we liked the ambiance of Northville, and I don't want to go anywhere else. And
I think one of the reasons that Mark and his projects have been so successful is people want to live in nice communities, and that is what Northville and Novi both represent. And I'd also be willing to tell you that a lot of people don't want to leave Novi or Northville, they want to stay in the communities. So I think Mark's project hits it out of the park from that standpoint.

25 years ago my parents bought in an empty-nester gated community in Plymouth called Plymouth Homestead Estates, and they're the classic people we're talking about today. Two people 25 years ago wanted to plan ahead, get a first floor master. They bought in there, all five of the kids never lived there, none of us went back to it. For 25 years they lived in this gated community. They had a home in northern Michigan and a home in Florida, and I think on average they spent two months a year in this condominium, which I think kind of gives you an idea of how much infrastructure they're using, how much of police services they use, they fire services. And, by the way, they're pretty expensive, so the taxes went to the community, and, you know, they weren't getting the benefit of that, because -- well, they already got the benefit, and I'm a result of it.
But the point being is what I will say to the people on Garfield, I know there's concern out, and I think the other gentleman on Nine Mile said it best, be careful what you wish for, because you might get something other than a Mark Guidobono. And you guys all know his projects. I own one of his homes. I'm a personal friend of his, I think the world of him and everything he does. Nick said it best, he's a man of his word. I think you can work through all the issues here, but I'm all in support of the project. I'll probably be a homeowner in there somewhere down the road. And next we need to work on getting those taxes down on this place.

Anyway, I support it, and I think if you go along with what we said today, his ideas and change the zoning, I think that's a good thing, and whether it's Cambridge doing this project, something is going to happen here, and I can't think of a better person representing the Novi community and this project than Mark Guidobono. Thank you.

CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you, sir.

MR. BODRIE: Nick Bodrie, 21940 Garfield Road. I've been a resident on Garfield Road for 25 years. I know Mark. He's a very good builder, no doubt about it. He's builds one of the
best products out there. The biggest problem with
this project is the infrastructure does not support
it. If his product went out on Beck, went out on
Eight Mile, went out on a road that would support the
traffic, I wouldn't be here. Mark would get it done.
But when we have a situation where it's zoned RA, and
Mark has done a tremendous job with his traffic report
and stating that you can get 25, 26, 40 homes on this
property. Myself as a developer, you would never get
that many homes on there because of all the
regulations and all the frontages if you lived there.
You'd lose all kinds of acreage with the roads, you'd
lose all kinds of acreage with the wetlands and the
woodlands. And then he requests, well, let's just not
count them or at least not for this consideration.
Why should Mark even though he's such a wonderful
person, and I'm a builder and developer, why should he
be afforded that advantage to just say just trust me.

Myself, my home is going to be on
his entry to his condominium project, bottom line. I
want it to be a nice community, I want it to be a
community that I can take my dog and walk it through
his property. Just like Deer Run, they became our
neighbors, they became our friends. We have hayrides
on Halloween so the kids can travel all the distance
of the rural road. That's what we have as a community, and when you take a gated community with people that are not invested, they just want a beautiful setting. Well, we can find a beautiful setting somewhere else. We're trying to cram way too much density into a piece of property with insufficient infrastructure to support the traffic.

One thing Mark hasn't considered. He says most of the traffic is going to be not at rush hour. Guess what, I don't walk my dog at 8:30, 7:30, 5:00, because there's too much darn traffic. I don't want to get run over. Now his customers as he stated are going to be driving when I want to walk. If I want to utilize the ITC walkway, I have to walk down Garfield Road. I can't do that, we don't have sidewalks, which is fine, that's what I bought. I bought RA. We're expecting you, the Planning Commission, to protect the people that reside on the master plan of an RA zoning.

Out of Mark's words, one thing he said is there is no way to develop the site without all these variances and without this. If you go down Nine Nile, you go down Garfield, you have 120, 150 foot lots, large acreage lots. That's what you have now. These homes that are on there can be torn down,
but beautiful estate size homes, they can be split
within the RA zoning. It would be much better for
conformity of the neighborhood.

Now, Mr. Guidobono has asked for
23 variances to maximize his density. Basically
maximize density, people make this economically
feasible.

One thing I'd like to remind is for
variances, this is right off of the Zoning Board of
Appeals, standard two, it cannot be self-created.
This whole situation is self-created. Strict
compliance, the property owner using the property for
permitted purpose or will be rendered -- basically
they won't be able to use it for permitted purposes.
That is not true. The property is being used for a
permitted purpose. He's asking for multiple
variances. It's not the minimum variance necessary.
And there is a strong adverse impact on surrounding
areas. Every person that's come and -- almost every
person that's come in favor of this presentation, for
this development and has said I'm going to live in a
Mark Guidobono community. If I could afford to, I
probably would, too. But this is the wrong parcel to
put it on.

In summary, we have a wonderful
neighborhood. We're relying on you, the board members, to not create a conflict with the zoning and having to offer more variances. Not only changing the zoning to R1 from RA, but then on top of that offering variances on top of that to cram more zoning in. I respectfully ask to maintain the RA zoning and not succumb to the threats of, well, if we do that, we're going to tear down more trees. That's what you guys are for, you protect our trees, you protect our wetlands. Developers should not say I'm going to tear down more if you don't do what I say. Thank you very much.

CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you, sir.

MR. MIGRIN: My name is Karl Migrin. I live at 49450 West Nine Mile Road, and, Sri, I need some help with -- I have a three-minute power presentation with ten seconds between slides, so I can't run over, and I can't go back, too.

I decided to put together a presentation on what it would look like to actually walk down the Villa, the proposed Villa Drive in my backyard there. There is the overlay of Villa Drive, the old one. I didn't update to new one to show the new entrance on the lot next to me.

There is what it looks like from
the air. The entrance is just moved over here now.

There is my house right there. I built it myself. I'm an empty-nester. I still owe 190,000, so I'll be there a while.

The best way to determine what it looks like is to walk on the ground. Nobody that I know of has walked the actual area that is going to be developed. This is looking out my backyard here. I have my 19 foot well there. The turkey like to fly up and sleep in these locusts up there. When I built the house, I transplanted some silver maples I got with the city woodlands and transplanted. That's a 30-year maple I transplanted when I built it.

This is standing in the middle Villa Drive looking at house numbers 21 and 22, just to give you an idea of the trees that would be wiped out to make this development here. This is looking east toward Hank Lamp's property. There again there is a lot of old growth trees there that are approximately seven, eight years old.

This is looking west. These are -- these trees are in the old original Garfield Drain. There used to be a nice stream that ran there in 1940, and then Garfield Drain was built in 1957.

This is looking south towards my
house. These trees are on my property, so I will at least be able to keep up three or four trees that they can't touch.

Like I say, this is the old Garfield Drain here, the original one there. That's wetlands and flood plain. This is looking up through the tree canopy. This is what the Cooper's hawks and the other wildlife need when they fly low for their prey, they fly underneath the canopy. That is going to be wiped out.

The park land we're getting, the 18 acres, it's passive, it's useless, it's wetland. It's not going to go anywhere. If it was important, someone would have bought it already.

These are the wetland -- some of the wildlife you'll lose there, the Cooper's hawks. They're protected, but nobody really seems to care except for me I guess. I enjoy watching them hunt in the backyard and teach their young. There's still a coyote. I haven't seen him for a few months, but he's still around the area there. And there's always wild turkey. And you're going to lose all that, because once you take the trees down, you take away their habitat, and they have no place left to hide, no place
to nest.

Thank you.

CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you, sir.

Anyone else?

MR. SERVOS: My name is George Servos. I live on Garfield Road, 21620, 35 years now. Garfield Road, we need to stay to the master plan, and for the biggest reason of all. Garfield Road is a dead end street. It goes to Nine Mile, it stops. This development, we are their driveway. It's a rural area. Stick to your master plan, short and sweet. You've got to think of Garfield Road as their dirt driveway.

Garfield Road was asphalt. And the only reason they put asphalt down is because of the I-5 Freeway. So that road, it's not built for this. The asphalt isn't made to handle the road for the cars. The way it is, who is going to replace it, who is going to repair it. It's up in the air. You've got to understand this road dumps right into the new sub. Keep the master plan as is. Thank you.

CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you.

Anyone else?

Seeing no on else, I think we have correspondence, Mr. Lynch?
MR. LYNCH: Yes, we do. Okay. Let me begin here, there is quite a few. I guess we'll put it in the public record. Did you ever figure out how people can view these things? How do they do it right now, because I'm not going to read through all these. We'll be here to midnight. I can summarize them if you like.

CHAIR PEHRSON: Just summarize the objections and read the names.

MR. LYNCH: Okay. These are all objections to begin with. Kristin Howard, 49000 West Nine Mile Road.

Another objection, Christina Purslow I think, 50265 West Nine Mile Road.

Elizabeth Wylie, 21760 Garfield Road, Northville.

Larry Edson, 21880 Garfield.

Karl Migrin, 49450 West Nine Mile Road.

Brian Benton, 21820 Garfield Road.

Gregory and Nancy Cragel, no address.

Kyle Freitag, 50233 Nine Mile Road.

Richard Scott, 49590 Deer Run.

Michael Dazy, 21791 Garfield Road.
Janet Thurber, 21668 Garfield Road.

Robyn Marcotte, 49425 Deer Run.

Gordon Marcotte, 49425 Deer Run, Northville.

Zachary Bonafiglio, 21940 Garfield Road. I apologize if I butcher people's names.

Linda Bodrie, 21940 Garfield.

Remie A. I'm not going to even try to pronounce it, 21975 Garfield Road.

James Bodrie, 21940 Garfield Road.

Timothy Wagner, 22155 Garfield, Northville.

Deborah Wagner, 22155 Garfield, Northville.

Scott Hoag, 21850 Garfield Road, Northville.

Scott Bartley, 49050 Nine Mile Road, Novi.

And Joseph DelCampo, 22140 Garfield Road, Northville.

For the supports, Muin Rumman, 49280 Nine Mile, Novi.

Patti Mullen, don't see an address.

Kevin Macaddino, don't see an address.
David Galdes, Timber Ridge.

Jim Eathorne, 979 McDonald.

Ronald and Beverly Valente,
49100 Nine Mile Road.

George and Elizabeth Smith,
41340 Fox Run, Novi.

Mr. Sarkar, Arundhati Sarkar,
49800 Nine Mile Road, Novi.

Shyamal Sarkar. This is a parcel number. 50-22-30-601-023.

That is all the correspondence.

CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you. With that, we'll close the public hearing at this time and turn it over to the Planning Commission for their consideration. Who would like to start?

Member Avdoulos.

MR. AVDOULOS: I'll start. A lot of concerns, a lot of good comments. One thing I wanted to address, it was brought up a couple of times, and it was related to the zoning request, and to a lot of people it seems like this is spot zoning. It feels that way, but it's a zoning change request, but it's under a planned rezoning overlay. So there are some stipulations that have to be agreed with the Planning Commission and then the City Council in order
for it to happen. So there are issues that are
addressed and taken into consideration. So it's
not we're just zoning this from RA to R1. So that's
not what the request is. So that's just a bit of
information.

With this particular project, I
don't think anybody is doubting or debating the
quality of the project that would be delivered. I
think that the development in concept when it was
first originally presented was interesting and brought
forth a lot of different ways to develop areas that
are more rural in nature. So this particular
development just by the fact that it's trying to
maintain as much of the natural environment as
possible is helping to maintain the existing rural
residential character of the area.

There is 51 acres that is part of
this project, and at a density of 0.8, which is what
RA is, that would give you 40, 41 units, and that is
based on what we have right now in the master plan and
in the zoning ordinance. So 51 acres is going to
allow you to have 40 units on a piece of property. It
may not be able to be developed to the 40 units
depending on wetlands, woodlands and whatever other
issues that has to be taken into consideration. So
that might drop down to 30 possible units. The
Mercato plan I believe showed 40 units, and was
that -- that was RA or was that R1?

MS. KOMARAGIRI: They were proposing to rezone to R1.

MR. AVDOULOS: Right. And then the max that they could get based on the R1 layout was 40 units, okay.

So if we took the RA, and then did R1, then in doing it in a typical subdivision manner, you would get 40 units. So the biggest concern that I have and a lot of the comments that were had at the last Planning Commission meeting was the density. And we were concerned with 53 units, and we thought, okay, let's have this discussion, let's see where it goes. And then we were presented with the packet and we're at 56 units. So instead of going down, we went up. And as I indicated, I'm really not opposed to condensing units, condensing homes to create a more natural environment so long as it makes sense, but not at the point of we're increasing, you know, the density by 50, almost 60 percent, and that is something that I'm really uncomfortable with.

The concerns with traffic, I'm personally not as concerned as a lot of you are.
AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: You don't live there.

MR. AVDOULOS: I live on Nine Mile. I live about a quarter of mile from this development. I've lived there for 25 years. I don't think -- and what I'm thinking of is 40 to 50 homes is not going to generate the amount of traffic that we had when Beck Road and when Ten Mile and Napier were closed. That was just a weird anomaly. It doesn't matter what kind of development gets there. So if you have a 51 acre parcel of land that gets developed, you're going to have construction traffic whether it's 56 units or 40 units or 30 units. So that's just a fact. So the big thing is that the density is just not fitting in with the rural character of the site.

I have like I said no issue with the concept, I have no issue with the size of the units, I have no issue with how they're going to be laid out. I know that the city has concern with some of the setbacks, and that was with all these deviations that were coming into play. And it's just something that I feel is getting shoehorned. The property when it was at 53 and then it came at 56, you know, you're looking at the plan again, and you saw that the drive got shifted over and it's in line with
Garfield Road. For some people that doesn't make sense because it's a straight shot down Garfield. I take Eight Mile from work to Garfield down to Nine Mile and to get home, and I understand the concern with people driving 40, 50, 60 miles an hour. But if we have the drive to a particular development that is going to be offset, then you're going to be creating issues where cars are turning, and the wheels as you're turning in and out of things that are in an L-shape are going to even ruin the road even more. That has to be studied a little further.

I think that a development like this will enhance the community if it's done in an appropriate manner where we maintain the rural character of the community and look to be in line more with the density that's already there. I would look at if we had 51 acres and it was at the 0.8 and that gives you 40 to 41 units, then I would look at that instead of doing RA trying to get a subdivision in there, and, you know, getting 30 units. So I could take that into consideration. But going up instead of down based on the comments from the last Planning Commission is a bit disheartening, and I don't know if the message that Mr. Guidobono delivered as he was discussing things to the residents maybe didn't, you
know, sink in, or maybe at that point I don't know if the development grew in size from 53 to 56. Those are right now the comments that I have, and I'm waiting to hear from the rest of my Planning Commission.

CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you Member Avdoulos.

Member Anthony.

MR. ANTHONY: Thank you. I guess overall I've had the same concerns, same intuitive concern is the density. The density seemed to be higher. There is a lot of benefit with the amount of land that is preserved that's been tied into our park system. I'm seeing within Novi that areas that weren't serviced originally by water or by sewer were RA simply because the density needed to be less in order to be able to handle septic fields and drinking water wells, but as we've been able to develop utilities out to that area, that we do see the movement from RA to R1 because now the property is capable of handling both drinking water and sewer in a more efficient manner.

With that, though, as we look at changing zoning and as we look at the -- whenever we do these moves, we also try to look at equivalency,
not wanting to move too far from where we were before. For instance, we looked at R1. I think we looked at it's maybe capable if you don't account for roads and for wetlands of being capable of handling in the high 40's, maybe up to 50, but once you account for that, we can see in the other development that we were looking at 40 units.

So again I look at, you know, if RA is at 41 units, the R1 which had the development that accounted for roads and for wetlands, it seems to be an equivalent number that seems to be coming up. When I start to look at things like, and I did just a rough check of if this were R1, what would be equivalent to the lot setbacks both the rear and the sides. At initial glance in my quick little scale measurement it looks like it met that. So there might be a couple of areas where they need improvement, but for the most part it looks like there were some good attempts at meeting that. There were very good attempts at screening, I like that.

There was what I think is a minor concern about dewatering of some of the smaller lakes that are in the area. When you look at the concept of dewatering that's caused from a development, one thing that you want to look at is you want to look at the
ground water recharge areas, which obviously are the wetland areas. And the actual development that is shown and proposed here preserves those. So you are more likely to preserve the lakes in the area with this development than you would with a development like RA that developed the whole site and incorporated 41 lots. The reason why is because Novi's wetland ordinance encompasses a larger, broader definition of wetlands than the state. But when you get into the development, that portion that is the Novi wetlands ends up becoming a piece that is easily negotiated. So you would lose a good section of that wetland in an RA development, which then could potentially threaten or bring up the concern of dewatering some of the other ponds.

One area that I was really concerned with was the grinding station that was there. And perhaps I could direct the question to you, Darcy. So on the sanitary and that grinding station, just offhand hearing that it serves three homes now and already had an odor problem, and adding in even if the number of units is greatly reduced, that's still a substantial increase on that grinding station. What type of requirements would be there? Who would be responsible for it? You know, it
obviously needs it sounds like even under current operations needs some significant upgrade. What can you tell me about that?

MS. RECHTIEN: I don't think that the development is planning on tying into it at all, so I haven't reviewed that part of it of how it would go into it. I know that a previous development did. I'm not familiar with those reviews of that part.

MR. ANTHONY: Okay.

MS. RECHTIEN: I know that previous plan was looking to go into that, and I think it did show a lot of improvements and things that were going to be done to upsize it to accommodate that.

MR. ANTHONY: So we could -- that is something that if that were to be proposed, that definitely we're going to have a say in it, we're going to put requirements to where we have upgrades. Odor is clearly a sign of it not operating correctly. So that's something we would be able to jump on and ensure that that is done.

MS. RECHTIEN: Right. I think that's what we were looking at. In their current plan they want to tie into the gravity sewer project which is underway under permitting, and I think the design is essentially complete on that. And we did say that...
if -- we need to see kind of a backup plan, you know, if the city's project doesn't for whatever go through as planned, we would have to basically start over with the site plans and look at what the alternative would be.

MR. ANTHONY: Okay. Good. So if we don't go to a gravity feed, then that's clearly something that we will require a significant upgrade meeting industry standards, and which would incorporate the odor issue as well.

MS. RECHTIEN: Right.

MR. ANTHONY: Good. Thank you.

There is a lot of other nice improvements here with the parks, with the quality of the development that we would be gaining here. The grinding station, our issue, it sounds like that will be covered if that come becomes an issue. The dewatering, actually this type of layout is better for preserving the smaller lakes that are in the area.

Again, I think I'm with my colleague in that we are -- the one piece that intuitively just doesn't seem to fit with the nature is the full number of proposed units. Where we end up with those number, you know, perhaps it's something a little bit less than that, but the other pieces of the
development do seem to be in order.

CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you, sir.

Member Zuchlewski.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Just a few comments. I think the one that hit me the most was the grinding pump and the sanitary sewer. I think the developer, I would like to hear from him through plan reviews and whatever that, you know, if it's -- if the gravity system doesn't work, that he will upgrade that system and handle that. I think that's critical. I mean, no matter what kind of village you have, no matter what the price is, if the stuff doesn't flow in the right direction, it's a problem. And apparently it's a problem already for the people that are there. So let that be a flag for all of us to look at.

I have a problem with the density, with the number of units that are proposed. And I think there was discussion about self-imposed issues in looking for variances. There is an awful lot of variances here from sidewalks to setbacks to whatever trying to jam more units in. We thought it was going the other way, and I really -- I came here all fired up today to say rah-rah, this is going to go and everything, but it seemed to go in the wrong way, and I'm sorry for that. And I think the developer, I hope
he is a little bit, too, that maybe he pushed the
envelope a little farther than he should have.

But I love the layout. I love the
landscaping around it. I love the buffering around
it. I mean, if it wasn't for the gate, nobody would
even know it's there. So I am excited about that. I
know there is a need for this. I really would like
the developer to go back and take a look. And, I
mean, swimming pools have been eliminated,
landscaping, fountains and all the ambience of heaven
that we're looking to create here, I would like to see
some of that money say, okay, we've eliminated that,
let's put some sidewalks in, let's cut down some of
the density. We'll still take care of people in the
area that want senior housing, need senior housing
that will love this place. But I think we need to be
aware of the neighbors, cut down the density, and
still make it an economical project. I believe that
can happen.

CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you, sir.

Member Lynch.

MR. LYNCH: Thank you.

Yes, I looked at this project, too,
from the last time when I got here. First of all, I
mean, this is -- you've got a corner on the market
with this type of home that you're building. We'll talk about the density in a minute. But basically what you're doing is you're taking somebody from a 6,000 square foot home and putting them into 3,000 square foot detached condo and giving them the same opulence that they would get in the 6,000 home, and, you're right, there is nothing else out there.

The grinding thing, I think that one is a nonstarter. I mean, something has to be done about that.

Overall I like what you're doing, I just think the density -- and this is the reason I have such a problem with the density is we've been -- since I've been on the commission for probably too long, you know, we've been trying to work, you know, with developers and allow for additional density where it kind of makes sense and it kind of fits, and this going from what I think should be in the low 40's to the 56, we'd be setting precedent, and that's my fear the most is I don't want to set precedent with future development. And then plus with what we've done on a number of projects starting with the corner of Beck and Ten Mile, allowing a little bit more there, but not over the top. I think the density in my opinion is over the top.
I think the product that you have, I can't imagine this thing -- you'd probably sell out in a year, just my impression, because there are people that are empty-nesters that are probably in their mid 50's and are not working that I think you know the market, and I think you'd be able to sell it out in no time. I don't see this project going on for more than a year, year and a half of development. I just think that -- I can't vote in favor of it right now because of the density, and it's not because -- I think it fits in, I mean, that type of concept fits into that area perfectly. You're isolated basically. You're basically isolated from everyone. You have park land all around.

The traffic, you know, I do agree with the traffic studies that have been done in the past that retired empty-nesters don't travel as much. I know they don't. You put in 40 single-family homes, three-car garages, a bunch of kids, you're going to get a lot more traffic.

Just the grinding issue, if I think the sewer goes in, that becomes a non-issue if the sewer goes in. With that grinding station, there's no way a grinding station should smell. Something must be wrong with the station that's out there right now.
That was a concern, but the density is something I can't -- you know, I think at the last meeting we kind of alluded to the fact that 53 seemed like kind of a lot in that area, and then to go to 56, I just -- not that I don't think 50 homes would work, I just don't think -- I don't want to set precedent, and I hope you understand that I just don't want to set precedent for the rest of Novi.

So at this point in time I like the project, I think you'd do great with what you've got. There is nothing else -- I know there's nothing else out there, not only in Novi, Northville and Plymouth, I don't think there's anything like this in Michigan to be quite honest with you. I just think if you can -- I know it becomes a finance issue, you may have to raise the price point, but I think if you can get the density down to an acceptable level, I think you've got a winner here. I really do think it fits into that area, and the way you have it designed isolates a lot of the -- and I understand the concerns of the homeowners, they have the one-acre lots and they like the rural stuff, but this is going to be in its own little pocket and surrounded by woodlands. And I do like the idea of not ripping down all the trees, I do like that idea. But at this point in time
I can't support it mainly because I think the density, it put us into a very bad situation moving forward.

CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you.

Member Greco.

MR. GRECO: All right. Thank you.

I'm not going to repeat all of the things that my planning commissioners, fellow planning commissioners pointed out with the exception of a few things. With regard to Mr. Guidobono's projects, his homes, the fact that he stands by them, the fact that we've had so many people coming in to talk about the quality, clearly he's a quality builder, quality developer, and he knows how to put together a plan. He also knows how to put together something that is clearly going to sell, that is going to be in the market that is absolutely beautiful. There is no doubt about it.

However, with regard to this plan and this location, it's inconsistent with the master plan, it's inconsistent with the future land use map, the density is too high for the area, and what the residents are telling us is that it is, and we know this from visualizing the area, it is in fact uncharacteristic of the area.

Now, what Mr. Guidobono has done which is a benefit to the individuals that are there,
he has as Member Lynch pointed out put this in a pocket to kind of hide it from everyone else to put it in there. And like Member Avdoulos said, I don't know that there is going to be traffic and traffic is going to increase over time. There's going to be construction traffic no matter what goes on down there, people are going to cut through, it's going to happen. I don't know that 30 or 40 or 50 homes is going to make that much of a difference. It will increase it. However, this is a project that for now is uncharacteristic of the area and doesn't check off the boxes for us to fit it in. So it's not a project that I can support.

CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you. With that I'd like to share my comments that I, too, agree with Member Greco, at this point in time notwithstanding the reputation of the developer and I know what would come at this point, the density is just too strong for this area right now, and I think we -- there is just too many question marks relative to the development itself to allow me to vote for anything for other than a nonapproval at this point in time.

MR. GUIDOBONO: Can I approach?

CHAIR PEHRSON: Sure, you can have
a minute.

MR. GUIDOBONO: I would just like to respond to some of the comments that I heard tonight. And I'll start out with the sanitary sewer. Our plan on the sanitary sewer is if the gravity sewer goes in, we would be hooking up to that. If this did get approved and that gravity sewer wasn't quite ready to go in, but it was imminent, we could still start and do grinder pumps into each individual home to pump out to the line without going to the pump station. If the gravity sewer does die, then we would be required to upgrade the pump station. Right now the pumps aren't large enough to service what they would need to service at that location. So that's one of the things we would do.

On the density, which seems to be a key issue for the board, we're willing to go back and look at that and do our best to reduce that density as best we can to try to get it in line as best we can with what makes sense for everybody. So we would be willing to do that.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: If I could just add real quick to that. We really -- I personally would not want to see anything over 40 units, all right. So keep that in mind when you go through all
this and you come back again. Because I think the
message is loud and clear from everyone here, and
it's -- that's what we're looking for.

MR. GUIDOBONO: Yes, I understand.

CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you.

Member Greco.

MR. GRECO: With that I would like
to make a motion in the matter of Villa D'Este
JSP17-32 with Rezoning 18.718. Motion to recommend
denial to the City Council to rezone the subject
property from RA, Residential Acreage, to R1,
One-Family Residential, with a Planned Rezoning
Overlay Concept Plan, based on because the proposed
rezoning is not consistent with the recommendations of
the 2016 Master Plan for Land Use.

MR. AVDOULOS: Second.

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

Any other comments?

Sri, can you call the roll.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: No. I'm sorry,

what was the motion?

CHAIR PEHRSON: Motion to deny.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes. Sorry.
MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIR PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes 6 to 0.

CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you. And as you leave, please maintain some quiet and decorum, please, because we still have some matters to continue on.

Next is the Matters for Consideration. Introduction of Text Amendment 18.286, Restaurants in a B-1. And it's to set a public hearing for Text Amendment 18.286 to update Section 3.1.10, B-1, Local Business District principal permitted use and for the purpose of allowing restaurants in the B-1, Local Business District, throughout the City of Novi.

MS. McBETH: Mr. Chair, I have a
MR. ANTHONY: Second.

CHAIR PEHRSON: We have a motion by Member Lynch and a second by Member Anthony. I heard him. All those in favor?

THE BOARD: Aye.

CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you everyone.

(The meeting was adjourned at 10:11 p.m.)
CERTIFICATE

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 (143) pages, is a true and correct transcript of my said stenograph notes.

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

December 14, 2017.