

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

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

Novi, Michigan.  
Wednesday, 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

1 for a motion to approve or amend the agenda.

2 MR. LYNCH: Motion to approve.

3 MR. ANTHONY: Second.

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

6 THE BOARD: Aye.

7 CHAIR PEHRSON: Anyone opposed?

8 We have an agenda.

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

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

18 MR. MIGRIN: Good evening. My name  
19 is Karl, K-a-r-l, last name Migrin, M-i-g-r-i-n. I  
20 live at 49450 West Nine Mile Road, Novi, Michigan. I  
21 just have a question more than anything. I noticed in  
22 past public hearings when the residents submit their  
23 comment sheets, the secretary doesn't always have the  
24 time to read all the comments, and I can understand  
25 for time sake that would take a lot of your time to

1 read all the comments. They are public records once  
2 they are mailed to the Planning Commission and the  
3 City. I'm wondering if there's any way that they  
4 could be -- that the staff could scan in those  
5 documents and put them as an attachment to the meeting  
6 minutes, because when you read the meeting minutes,  
7 there is no comments or no -- from any of the  
8 residents on the response form, and it's pretty easy  
9 just to scan them all in and put them as an attachment  
10 to the meeting minutes.

11 CHAIR PEHRSON: Okay.

12 MR. MIGRIN: Thank you.

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

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

19 CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you. Anyone  
20 else?

21 With that we'll close the first  
22 audience participation.

23 Correspondence?

24 MR. LYNCH: Just for the public  
25 hearings.

1 CHAIR PEHRSON: Committee reports?  
2 City Planner Report? Ms. McBeth.

3 MS. MCBETH: Thank you. Good  
4 Evening. Nothing to report.

5 CHAIR PEHRSON: Very well. We'll  
6 go to our first public hearing. Item Number 1 is  
7 Erhard BMW of Novi Zoning Map Amendment 18.719. It's  
8 a public hearing at the request of Rogvoy Architect,  
9 P.C., for Planning Commission's recommendation to City  
10 Council for a Zoning Map amendment from NCC  
11 (Non-Center Commercial) and OS-1 (Office Service) to  
12 GE (Gateway East). The subject property is comprised  
13 of two parcels totaling 9.48 acres and it is located  
14 on the southwest corner of Grand River Avenue and  
15 Meadowbrook Road in Section 23.

16 Sri, good evening.

17 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Thank you. The  
18 subject property is located at the southwest corner of  
19 Grand River Avenue and Meadowbrook Road. The  
20 development area is comprised of two parcels as  
21 mentioned earlier. The northern parcel is zoned NCC  
22 (Non-Center Commercial), and the southern parcel is  
23 zoned OS-1 (Office Service.) The property is  
24 identified as TC Gateway on our Future Land Use Map.  
25 The applicant is requesting to rezone the property to

1 Gateway East, which is supported by the future land  
2 use map recommendation.

3 A pre-application meeting was held  
4 for the proposed development on October 3, 2017. At  
5 that time staff recommended the applicant to apply for  
6 a straight rezoning. If the rezoning is approved, the  
7 applicant intends to propose an auto car dealership  
8 and a service center for BMW at that location, which  
9 could be considered as a Special Development Option in  
10 the GE District. As this is not a PRO (Planned  
11 Rezoning Overlay), the applicant is not bound to  
12 develop a specific plan until after the rezoning has  
13 been approved.

14 The property consists of some  
15 regulated wetlands and woodlands. The wetland is  
16 associated with a drain that runs from west to east  
17 along the south side of the site and appears to drain  
18 to Bishop Creek located east of Meadowbrook Road. The  
19 mapped regulated woodland areas are indicated along  
20 the southern section of the site. The applicant is  
21 working with the City staff to determine the exact  
22 boundaries for wetlands and provide an accurate tree  
23 survey at the time of preliminary site plan.

24 The City's traffic consultants  
25 reviewed rezoning traffic steady provided by the

1 applicant and indicated that the proposed use of an  
2 auto dealership is projected to produce 2,638 fewer  
3 trips than the existing zoning would allow per day.  
4 It also produces 11 and 15 additional peak-hour trips,  
5 respectively for A.M./P.M, than the maximum allowable  
6 density for land-uses under the existing zoning.  
7 Traffic requested that the applicant should perform a  
8 full-scale Traffic Impact Study at the time of  
9 Preliminary Site Plan submittal due to the projected  
10 increase in peak hour trips.

11 Staff recommends approval of the  
12 rezoning request for reasons stated in the review  
13 letter and also as it is consistent with Future Land  
14 Use map recommendations. Our traffic consultant  
15 Sterling Frazier and our wetland consultant Pete Hill  
16 are here if you have any questions in that regard.  
17 The Planning Commission is asked tonight to hold a  
18 public hearing and make a recommendation to City  
19 Council.

20 The applicant Ken Widerstedt is  
21 here with his architect Mark Drane if you have any  
22 questions for them. Thank you.

23 CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you. Does  
24 the applicant wish to address the Planning Commission  
25 at this time?

1 MR. DRANE: Good evening. My name  
2 is Mark Drane. I'm with Rogvoy Architects. My  
3 address is 32500 Telegraph Road, Suite 250, Bingham  
4 Farms, Michigan. And I think Sri did a very nice job  
5 outlining our proposal and I'm here with Ken to answer  
6 any questions.

7 CHAIR PEHRSON: Very good. This is  
8 a public hearing. If there's anyone in the audience  
9 that wishes to address the Planning Commission at this  
10 time, please step forward on this matter.

11 Seeing no one, I think we have some  
12 correspondence.

13 MR. LYNCH: Yes, we do. I  
14 summarized all three of the objections, and they're  
15 primarily concerned about traffic and de-valuation of  
16 the property values. The first one is an objection  
17 from Jimmie Cranford, Jr., 24963 Bloomfield Court,  
18 Novi. Jacob C. Oommen, 41336 Clermont Avenue, Novi.  
19 And then Kristie J. Block, 41252 Clermont Avenue in  
20 Novi. I have one support from a Joe Haddad, 41490  
21 Grand River Avenue in Novi.

22 CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you. With  
23 that we'll close the public hearing on this matter and  
24 turn it over to the Planning Commission for your  
25 consideration.

1 Member Anthony.

2 MR. ANTHONY: Thank you. You know,  
3 this is really two parcels when you look at this, and  
4 the top parcel, which is the corner of Grand River and  
5 Meadowbrook, you know, it makes sense being consistent  
6 with the Future Land Use Plan and there being a type  
7 of commercial or retail there. That portion of the  
8 property I really don't have a problem with this  
9 request on the rezoning. Where I really start to  
10 question it and I struggle with a little bit is on the  
11 portion that's the OS-1. And part of why I question  
12 that is when you take a look at that neighborhood, for  
13 instance the neighborhood for Cherryhill, you can see  
14 that -- you know, and we've run into this in some  
15 other projects as well, is that whenever we look at  
16 single-family neighborhoods, we like to have a buffer  
17 around us, and that buffer being a multi-family, being  
18 office, single-story office with similar roofs. And  
19 so when I look at this area and I see that we have on  
20 Cherryhill single family, and I look at how the buffer  
21 has been working, other than what really pre-existed  
22 quite a while ago over towards the railroad tracks  
23 where you have some industrial, we've done a good job  
24 of doing a buffering zone. If you were able to look  
25 at an aerial, you'd see towards the north of that

1 neighborhood we have multi-family, and we see that  
2 behind the main street area, again followed by  
3 multi-family, condo, apartments. We just approved  
4 another multi-family right on Grand River, which is a  
5 nice apartment complex, roofs are matching the theme,  
6 they're going with that. But now you take the next  
7 step over, and that OS-1 really provides a buffer and  
8 it continues that buffer for those neighborhoods, both  
9 the neighborhoods on the Cherryhill side and on the  
10 Clermont side. And with an office space, if you look  
11 at some of the single nearby offices that were  
12 approved near there, you know, they have similar  
13 roofs, they really do look like they conform.

14 When we look at -- when we look at  
15 a dealership, I think when we look at the front of it  
16 we think of it from Grand River and we think, okay,  
17 you know, from the front of, Grand River, it fits, it  
18 conforms with what we have on Grand River. But if you  
19 now go to the back side and you look at that,  
20 dealerships are traditionally a large parking lot that  
21 is filled with cars. That really seems to be a  
22 dramatic departure from what we're seeing. Even in  
23 Meadowbrook Commons you have common roof patterns that  
24 match the residential neighborhoods. The parking lot  
25 areas, and they're substantial parking lot, but yet

1 they're low intensity, they're integrated with a park  
2 like setting. It's not this high density area. And  
3 so you really see more of a -- you get the feeling of  
4 a mixed use that is walkable. And now when you  
5 integrate the high density parking lot that occurs on  
6 the OS-1 portion of the property, it really seems to  
7 be a dramatic departure and nonconforming from that  
8 area.

9                   And I also think back to about a  
10 month ago we were looking at trying to help a  
11 transition between industrial-zoned property and  
12 single-family residential, and we really looked at  
13 trying to grab on to what ordinances that the zoning  
14 allowed us to use when we created that buffer, and I  
15 think we did the best we could considering that. But  
16 that was because we were absent of any zoning buffer  
17 that would have been between a higher intense use and  
18 neighborhoods. And here my reluctance is that in  
19 removing the OS-1, we are removing that buffer and  
20 we're removing that transition zone. And when we do  
21 that, we're always talk about property rights. And we  
22 talk about property rights that we have to function  
23 within that. My concern is that if we remove that  
24 OS-1, we're not considering the rights and reasonable  
25 expectations of all of the people, whether they're the

1 people that live there in the multi-family or in the  
2 single-family. So I'm very hesitant in approving the  
3 change on the OS-1 portion.

4 CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you. Anyone  
5 else?

6 Member Avdoulos.

7 MR. AVDOULOS: I had similar  
8 concerns, especially that piece of the property, the  
9 rear piece let's say, the OS-1, and then across the  
10 street where the residential, if you took that  
11 property line and you line it up, you know, it's at  
12 the halfway point. And I'm looking at an aerial I  
13 guess that a little better depicted. It's on one of  
14 the write-ups, I think it's Page 4 of 5, and it's  
15 right next to where it says Natural Features. But you  
16 could see the R-2 development below that.

17 And if I could ask a question of  
18 the architect. I know that there is no concept plan,  
19 but if you were to do a layout of this, would we  
20 basically have a building up front on Grand River, and  
21 the rear would be parking, and then do we know like  
22 that corner piece as it shows here, I don't know if  
23 that's a wetland that would also act as a buffer to  
24 the residential.

25 MR. DRANE: I think the answer to

1 all of those questions are yes. And we do have a  
2 concept plan. But I think the answer is that there is  
3 a wetland and a buffer, a natural buffer there  
4 already. The grade slopes down from high to low from  
5 Grand River down to, I'm sorry, I don't know what the  
6 back street there is.

7 CHAIR PEHRSON: Cherryhill.

8 MR. DRANE: Cherryhill. And our  
9 plan, our concept plan doesn't have any development  
10 within from the Cherryhill property line going north  
11 125 feet. We have all open area. It's going to be  
12 stormwater management, wetlands and landscape  
13 buffering.

14 MR. AVDOULOS: Okay.

15 MR. DRANE: So the land itself  
16 really has its own natural buffer. And I do  
17 understand about having that zoning buffer, but our  
18 plan doesn't have any buildings back there. Like you  
19 said, it's low intensity parking.

20 MR. AVDOULOS: And I thank you for  
21 that. I had the same concerns. I drove by there and  
22 then I saw that when I was there and then looking at  
23 the plan. And then transitioning from that piece of  
24 property to the, you know, multi-use property, you  
25 know, I don't feel it's going to be that detrimental.

1 I think it follows with the master plan, you know, for  
2 land use for the concept of what we're trying to do  
3 for that Gateway East area of the city.

4 So I do have the same concerns, but  
5 I think it's appropriate rezoning, and for the fact  
6 that when it comes in, we could look if the buffer  
7 there is going to be appropriate or if we need to  
8 enhance anything.

9 MR. DRANE: Yes. And I apologize,  
10 I didn't answer all of your questions. The building  
11 is at the corner with zero lot lines and landscape  
12 buffering, but it's very similar frontage as the  
13 Cadillac dealership.

14 MR. AVDOULOS: Right. Okay. Those  
15 are my questions.

16 CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you, sir.

17 Member Lynch.

18 MR. LYNCH: Something very quick.  
19 You know, before we -- if we were to change this from  
20 OS-1 to what you're requesting, what guarantee do we  
21 have that, you know, you're going to maintain. I do  
22 agree that there really has to be a transition there,  
23 and since we're taking the office transition off,  
24 there has to be some sort of buffer to block the  
25 lights, block the view of the parking lot, things like

1 that. 125 feet, you know, sounds like a lot as long  
2 as it has foliage in it. I mean, I don't know that we  
3 have -- I mean, what right --

4 CHAIR PEHRSON: We would have a  
5 plan to review and approve at that point in time.

6 MR. LYNCH: So we would -- we're  
7 not under any --

8 CHAIR PEHRSON: No.

9 MR. ANTHONY: Is there a way to put  
10 in there an expectation so that it's known that  
11 when --

12 CHAIR PEHRSON: We're doing that  
13 right now. Absolutely.

14 MR. LYNCH: Okay. So by approving  
15 this, we're putting in the expectation that there is  
16 going to be a significant transition?

17 CHAIR PEHRSON: They still have to  
18 come before us for the plan.

19 MR. LYNCH: Thank you.

20 CHAIR PEHRSON: Member Zuchlewski.

21 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: I have a question  
22 for Barb. Barb, the OS-1 that we're discussing now,  
23 what has been the development community? What kind of  
24 interest has there been in this property for the last  
25 30 years?

1 MS. MCBETH: So through the chair.

2 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: I mean, has  
3 anybody come to us and said, well, we want that piece,  
4 that OS-1, and if it stays OS-1, and, you know,  
5 somehow Cadillac says, well, we can make or BMW says  
6 we can make this work just for conversation, doesn't  
7 that OS-1 property, doesn't that become more of a  
8 secondary site, and isn't that going to be kind of  
9 like the Peachtree site that we're struggling with now  
10 not having any exposure, you know, just being buried  
11 in effect? And the chance of us having anything else  
12 go there, you know, is the chance that great that we  
13 have people that want to go on a secondary site like  
14 that? Is that going to stay like that for -- I mean,  
15 in your opinion? Well, is there any interest in it?

16 MS. MCBETH: So through the chair.  
17 In my 16 years as being with the City of Novi, I've  
18 known the property owner who owns both parcels who has  
19 expressed various interest over the years, but never  
20 really taken any action. When the Huntley Manor  
21 project came in, at the beginning there was thought  
22 they might join forces and do a development together,  
23 and that didn't happen for whatever reason.

24 So I think with the property with  
25 the split zoning like that doesn't really offer a

1 substantial area for any particular development, and  
2 you're right, with the frontage on Meadowbrook Road it  
3 wouldn't be as attractive as something on Grand River.

4 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Thank you.

5 CHAIR PEHRSON: Just my two cents.  
6 I agree with everyone's thoughts, and I hope you get  
7 the sense of where we're leaning to. I have no issue  
8 taking both lots and changing the zoning, because it  
9 does fit exactly what I think the master plan was  
10 looking for. And I think the expectation of anything  
11 that comes back to us would be scrutinized very  
12 diligently relative to that buffer that's trying to be  
13 between Cherryhill and the dealership. So that's my  
14 two cents.

15 Member Greco.

16 MR. GRECO: Very good. With all of  
17 those comments, which I agree with for the most part,  
18 I would like to make a motion. In the matter of the  
19 request of Erhard BMW of Novi for Zoning Map Amendment  
20 18.719, motion to recommend approval to City Council  
21 to rezone the subject property from NCC, Non-Center  
22 Commercial, and OS-1, Office Service, to GE, Gateway  
23 East, for the reasons set forth on the motion sheet,  
24 with the understanding that the applicant will be  
25 submitting plans and will be going through a review

1 for what the Planning Commission will be expecting at  
2 that time.

3 MR. AVDOULOS: Second.

4 CHAIR PEHRSON: We have a motion by  
5 Member Greco, second by Member Avdoulos. Any other  
6 comments?

7 Sri, can you call the roll, please.

8 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

9 MR. LYNCH: Yes.

10 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

11 CHAIR PEHRSON: Yes.

12 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Zuchlewski?

13 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

14 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Anthony?

15 MR. ANTHONY: No.

16 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?

17 MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

18 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes 4 to

19 1.

20 CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you.

21 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Oh, Member Greco.

22 MR. GRECO: Yes.

23 CHAIR PEHRSON: Don't want to leave  
24 him out. He made a wonderful motion.

25 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes 5 to

1 1.

2 MR. DRANE: Thank you for your  
3 time, appreciate it.

4 CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you.

5 Next item is Speedway JSP17-63 with  
6 Rezoning 18.720. It's a public hearing at the request  
7 of McBride Dale Clarion for Planning Commission's  
8 recommendation to City Council for a Planned Rezoning  
9 Overlay Concept Plan associated with the Zoning Map  
10 amendment to rezone from Office Service Technology and  
11 B-3, General Business, to B-3, General Business.  
12 Subject property is approximately 2.03 acres located  
13 on the southwest corner of Haggerty Road and Fourteen  
14 Mile, Section 1. The applicant is proposing a rebuild  
15 and expansion of the existing Speedway fuel station  
16 including a 4,608 square foot convenience store and a  
17 5,400 square foot fuel canopy over 8 double-sized fuel  
18 dispensers.

19 MS. MCBETH: Mr. Chair.

20 CHAIR PEHRSON: Hi there.

21 MS. MCBETH: So we have the map up  
22 there that shows that the subject to about 2.03 acres  
23 of land with about 1.33 acres requested for rezoning,  
24 and it's located at the southwest corner of Fourteen  
25 Mile and Haggerty Road in Section 1.

1                   The zoning map shows that the  
2                   property is zoned OST, Planned Office Service  
3                   Technology, and B-3, General Business.

4                   The future land use map indicates  
5                   Office R & D Technology for both the subject site and  
6                   the surrounding parcels.

7                   And the natural features map shows  
8                   that the subject property has no regulated woodlands  
9                   or wetlands on the site.

10                  The Planning Commission last  
11                  reviewed the rezoning with the concept plan in  
12                  September of 2016, and recommended approval to City  
13                  Council. The City Council considered the concept plan  
14                  in December of last year and approved the rezoning  
15                  request with the Planned Rezoning Overlay Concept  
16                  Plan. A PRO agreement was prepared and signed and was  
17                  recorded earlier this year.

18                  Since that time the applicant has  
19                  decided to modify the site layout to include a cafe  
20                  style store at this location. The cafe designation  
21                  requires the construction of a larger convenience  
22                  store and includes an outdoor seating area. The  
23                  applicant has proposed a 4,600 square foot convenience  
24                  store, just slightly less than 4,000 was previously  
25                  approved, and a 5,400 square foot canopy over 8

1 double-sided fuel dispensers. This will include the  
2 raising of the 2,400 square foot existing building and  
3 the 6 double-sided fuel dispensers. Because of the  
4 changes to the concept plan, size of the building, and  
5 change in the deviations and the offered public  
6 benefits, the process for rezoning would commence at  
7 the beginning.

8 As part of the redevelopment, the  
9 existing gas station's driveways would be shifted  
10 further away from the intersection of 14 Mile and  
11 Haggerty Road. Speedway is proposing to dedicate  
12 about 10 feet of right of way along 14 Mile Road and  
13 is offering the installation of a "Welcome to Novi"  
14 sign along the Haggerty Road frontage, and will be  
15 providing an off-site extension of the sidewalk to  
16 connect to existing and proposed sidewalks on 14 Mile  
17 Road.

18 Planning recommends approval of  
19 their request because the rezoning fulfills two  
20 objectives of the Master Plan for Land Use, fostering  
21 a favorable business climate, and strengthening an  
22 existing business. The rebuild and extension of the  
23 site provides an update to the visual aesthetic of an  
24 entryway to the city, modern fuel dispensers and a  
25 convenience store, and replacement of underground

1 storage tanks. The plan improves existing  
2 non-conforming, minimum site size, and improves the  
3 driveway locations away from the intersection, and  
4 provides and upgraded stormwater management plan.

5 The traffic engineering review indicates  
6 that the submittal of the rezoning traffic impact  
7 study is required. The applicant has indicated that  
8 the study will be completed in the near future and  
9 that the intention is to comply with this requirement  
10 when the concept plan returns to the Planning  
11 Commission for consideration. Additional review of  
12 the taper lane associated with the new driveway  
13 location on Haggerty Road also continues to be under  
14 study by the applicant.

15 The facade review recommends  
16 approval of a Section 9 Facade Waiver which may be  
17 addressed in the PRO agreement for the overage of flat  
18 metal panels and the overage of asphalt shingles. The  
19 underage of brick on the canopy columns will be  
20 addressed on the next submittal.

21 Engineering staff states that there  
22 will be a negligible impact on utilities with this  
23 rezoning. However, at the time of the concept plan  
24 review, Engineering was not recommending approval due  
25 to the deficiencies with respect to the stormwater

1 management system, which may need to be addressed on  
2 the next submittal, or at the latest at the time of  
3 preliminary site plan submittal.

4 The public hearing has been  
5 scheduled for this evening, and the Planning  
6 Commission has asked to hold the public hearing in  
7 order to receive any comments, but we are requesting  
8 to postpone action on the recommendation to City  
9 Council until a later meeting in order to allow the  
10 applicant time to address the remaining comments in  
11 the staff and consultants' reports.

12 The applicant, Robert Sweet, and  
13 his team are present this evening to provide a few  
14 comments and answer any questions that you may have.  
15 Thank you.

16 CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you,  
17 Ms. McBeth.

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

20 MR. SWEET: Good evening. My name  
21 is Rob Sweet. I'm with McBride Dale Clarion, 5721  
22 Dragonway, Suite 300, Cincinnati, Ohio 45227.

23 I have been in the car for the past  
24 five hours and am a little sore, but I appreciate you  
25 all taking the time to hear us tonight.

1 I couldn't have said it any better  
2 than what Ms. McBeth said already. We were here about  
3 a year ago, received approval for a smaller  
4 convenience store. During that time in between  
5 December, whenever we got our PRO approval, and now,  
6 we figured -- Speedway figured, you know what, we want  
7 to try our new prototype here, this is a good lot for  
8 us. So we are coming in with a larger building. We  
9 feel that a lot of these comments can be addressed in  
10 the next submittals, and we are working as she said to  
11 get a traffic study pulled together as well as  
12 investigating what we can do along Haggerty Road to  
13 address traffic engineering's concerns.

14 I'm happy to answer any other  
15 questions that you all may have. I look forward to  
16 hearing your decision. Thank you.

17 CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you, sir.

18 This is a public hearing. If  
19 anyone in the audience wishes to address the Planning  
20 Commission at this time, please step forward.

21 Seeing no one, is there any  
22 correspondence?

23 MR. LYNCH: No correspondence.

24 CHAIR PEHRSON: With that we'll  
25 close the public hearing and turn it over to the

1 Planning Commission for your consideration.

2 Member Zuchlewski.

3 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: I have a couple of  
4 questions for Rob.

5 MR. SWEET: Sure.

6 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: First off, Ohio?

7 MR. SWEET: I actually live in  
8 Kentucky. Don't hold that against me.

9 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Secondly, the  
10 original plan that we saw on this, weren't the  
11 original or the curb cuts on that plan, weren't they  
12 closer to the intersection?

13 MR. SWEET: They are the exact same  
14 place as the original.

15 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: This is the same  
16 place?

17 MR. SWEET: This is the same one.  
18 So we actually had two along 14 Mile. We're proposing  
19 to close the one closest to the intersection. The one  
20 furthest away from the intersection we'll move it to  
21 align with the shopping center across 14 Mile. The  
22 one on Haggerty, if you look down, and I can't really  
23 see it, but there -- yes, if you move the cursor, keep  
24 moving it the other way, north. Yes, there you go.  
25 There is a little -- there is a B9 call out right

1           there. That is where the driveway currently sits  
2           today, and we're shifting that away from the  
3           intersection as well.

4                         MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: So this is moving  
5           them back then?

6                         MR. SWEET: Yes, sir.

7                         MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: That was my first  
8           question. And then the second question having to do  
9           with stormwater.

10                        MR. SWEET: Yes.

11                        MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Is it your  
12           proposal just to store underground in tanks, detention  
13           tanks of some kind?

14                        MR. SWEET: No. The big pond back  
15           there, that's where the stormwater is going to go.  
16           I'm not an engineer, I don't claim to be one on TV,  
17           but my understanding is that it will be piped out, it  
18           will be piped someplace as it runs off site and into  
19           that basin. Again, that's about what I know on that  
20           portion. But again, we're not going to go underground  
21           with the stormwater, we're going to keep it in the dry  
22           detention basin.

23                        MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Okay. Those are  
24           my only questions.

25                        CHAIR PEHRSON: Member Anthony.

1 MR. ANTHONY: Yes. You know, I  
2 think this is a good improvement on the property.  
3 When you look at the area with how heavy it is with  
4 commercial, with retail, rezoning this portion of the  
5 property and upgrading the gas station is a good thing  
6 to do.

7 In with that improvement of the gas  
8 station, in installing underground storage tanks, even  
9 though that is not necessarily a concern here, it does  
10 create a great improvement of protecting the  
11 environment for the community, so we're always happy  
12 to see that type of improvement.

13 And because we have a lot of head  
14 of us, and it looks like both the developer and the  
15 city are in agreement, I'm ready to make a motion at  
16 this point.

17 CHAIR PEHRSON: Sure.

18 MR. ANTHONY: So in the matter of  
19 Speedway JSP17-63 with Rezoning 18.720, motion to  
20 postpone making a recommendation on the proposed PRO  
21 and concept plan to rezone the subject property from  
22 OST, Office Service Technology, and B-3, General  
23 Business, to B-3, General Business. This  
24 recommendation is made to allow the applicant time to  
25 work with the staff proposed driveway along proposed

1 deceleration lane as discussed in the review letter.

2 MR. LYNCH: Second.

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

5 Any other comments?

6 Sri, can you call the roll, please.

7 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Sure.

8 Member Zuchlewski?

9 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

10 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Anthony?

11 MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

12 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?

13 MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

14 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

15 MR. GRECO: Yes.

16 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

17 MR. LYNCH: Yes.

18 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

19 CHAIR PEHRSON: Yes.

20 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes 6 to  
21 0.

22 CHAIR PEHRSON: All set. Thank  
23 you, sir.

24 MR. SWEET: Thank you all.

25 CHAIR PEHRSON: Next on the agenda

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

12 Sri, good evening.

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

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

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

25 The rezoning category requested by

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

12 Since then, the applicant has  
13 acquired a fifth parcel, the development area is now  
14 measuring 51 acres. The number of units have been  
15 increased from 53 to 56. The pool and other amenities  
16 proposed earlier have been eliminated as they were  
17 recommended -- based on the recommendations from their  
18 market study. The applicant indicated that the  
19 residents will have an option to add a loft space or  
20 an attic, or an indoor pool in lieu of these site  
21 amenities. The site entrance is moved further west to  
22 align with Garfield Road. The applicant took a  
23 suggestion from the last public hearing and held two  
24 open houses to communicate with the neighbors. A  
25 comparable plan developed at R1 density is overlaid on

1 the proposed concept plan to identify additional  
2 woodland impacts. However, it did not compare  
3 additional impacts to site and deviations from  
4 development standards. The applicant mentioned they  
5 he'll expand on these issues at the presentation  
6 tonight.

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

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

22 Impacts to the surrounding  
23 properties as a result of the proposal would be  
24 expected as part of the development of any residential  
25 development.

1                   The woodland study plan notes that  
2                   35.38 acres of the 51 acre development site is  
3                   existing tree canopy based on the City's Regulated  
4                   Woodlands Map. As such, the current plan notes that  
5                   10.51 acres, about 30 percent of the regulated  
6                   woodlands located on-site will be impacted. Proposed  
7                   impacts to individual trees have not been described or  
8                   quantified. The applicant is requesting multiple  
9                   deviations for woodland replacement plantings such as  
10                  off-site replacement, additional credits for upsizing,  
11                  and to waive the diversity requirement. A tree survey  
12                  is not included as the applicant is requesting to  
13                  defer the survey to the time of preliminary site plan  
14                  approval. Staff does not support the deviation at  
15                  this time without a tree survey and it's recommended  
16                  that the applicant provide one so that staff can make  
17                  an informed recommendation or the applicant can  
18                  conform to the requirements at the time of preliminary  
19                  site plan.

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

23                                 Proposed concept plan proposes to  
24                                 connect to the City's sewer. City does not have a set  
25                                 time line for the construction of this public sewer

1 line. In the event that the project, the City's sewer  
2 project is not available prior to approval of final  
3 site plan, the applicant is recommended to submit an  
4 alternative plan for the full review process.

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

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

23 The applicant is proposing a layout  
24 that does not meet the minimum dimensional standards  
25 for a single-family development. Staff identified

1 that deviations will be required for lot size, lot  
2 frontage, setbacks, lot coverage, but is currently  
3 unable to identify the extent of deviations sought.  
4 The Planning Commission may choose to approve the  
5 concept plan as shown subject to conditions listed in  
6 the letter.

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

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

21 All reviews except woodlands are  
22 currently recommending approval. While the applicant  
23 has addressed some of the concerns highlighted in the  
24 staff and consultant letters, there are a number of  
25 ongoing concerns by staff, primarily the density

1 proposed with the housing pattern so closely spaced,  
2 the provision of a comparable plan as requested by the  
3 Planning Commission, details of likely woodland  
4 impacts, which the applicant wishes to address at the  
5 time of preliminary site plan review, and the  
6 deviations requested with regard to the woodland  
7 ordinance.

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

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

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

19 Good evening everyone. My name is  
20 Mark Guidobono, owner of Cambridge Homes. I've been a  
21 Novi resident for 14 years, lived in this area for  
22 about 30. I've been a builder developer for 37 years.  
23 Some of the communities that you're probably familiar  
24 with in the area that we've developed are Woods of  
25 Edenderry in Northville Township. Bellagio and

1 Tuscan Reserve in Novi. We've also built custom  
2 homes in Hilton Head, South Carolina. We've also done  
3 about 30 commercial projects as a general contractor.

4 In 1998 I was president of the Home  
5 Builders Association of Southeastern Michigan, and in  
6 1999 Woods of Edenderry won Development of the Year in  
7 southeastern Michigan, and in 2005 Bellagio won  
8 Development of the Year in southeastern Michigan as  
9 well.

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

25 And here is a view from Nine Mile

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

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

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

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

20 This is moving farther east. This  
21 is the Lamp property off of Nine Mile Road more in the  
22 center of the site. This is part of Phase 2. All of  
23 Phase 2 is out in the open impacting very little  
24 woodlands. Here is Mr. Lamp's home right here, and  
25 some outbuildings that Mr. Lamp has behind a garage.

1 We'll be removing all this, all these things.

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

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

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

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

25 Here is a view from the Lamp

1 property looking towards Nine Mile and Garfield. The  
2 intersection, that's an intersection we would like to  
3 improve. We would like to pave it. We would like to  
4 add landscaping in that area and upgrade the light  
5 that was just placed there recently. So we would like  
6 to upgrade that intersection.

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

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

20 Villa D'Este is our plan. It's an  
21 empty-nester, a gated empty-nester community. It is  
22 -- I feel it could be a very special place. It's a  
23 place where you could go and you would feel like  
24 you're up north. You're surrounded by a woodland  
25 area. And it's -- I'll admit it's a very sensitive

1 woodland and wetland area on this property. It's --  
2 the 51 acres is really the last developable piece on  
3 Nine Mile Road, and so it needs to be developed in a  
4 way that we keep the environment in mind. And by  
5 putting these homes closer together, you'll see that  
6 it's saves a lot more trees than if we went with  
7 single-family zoning. 57 percent on this site is  
8 going to be preserved as open spaces. So that's all  
9 those green areas, that's 57 percent of the site  
10 that's going to be preserved.

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

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

1 that at that location.

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

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

18 It is an environmentally sensitive  
19 site, so I kind of highlighted here the woodland study  
20 plan. You can see the areas in white are pretty much  
21 open field. To the east you can see, that's Phase 2,  
22 that's pretty much all out in the open. There is a  
23 little bit of woodland removal at that location. To  
24 the west almost half of Phase 1 is out in the field  
25 area. And the main woodland area that we have to

1 disturb is in the center. There is really no way to  
2 develop this site because we have to get from the  
3 right side to the left side, we have to put a road  
4 through there. To do that we're going to have to  
5 remove trees.

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

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

21 Our plan would be in the area of  
22 the white. The Mercato plan would be removing  
23 woodlands in the red areas. Those woodlands would all  
24 be coming down. That has 40 half-acre sites. And if  
25 we did go to one-acre sites, then we would --

1 obviously we wouldn't have 40 units, but as a  
2 developer we'll try to use all the upland area, the  
3 wooded upland area that we can, and that represents  
4 all the candy-cane area that is marked on the plan.  
5 Now, because of the shape and the wetlands, we  
6 wouldn't be able to use all of that area in our design  
7 for larger lots if that's the way the city decides  
8 they want to go.

9 The tree canopy as mentioned was  
10 35 acres. We're showing 24 acres of upland woodland  
11 on the site right now. That previous Mercato plan was  
12 almost removing 16 acres. Our plan is 10 acres. We  
13 know we wouldn't remove all the upland area if we were  
14 going to go in with one-acre sites, but -- and that's  
15 8 acres of candy-cane we're talking about, but let's  
16 say conservatively that we could use half of that area  
17 for lots over and above what that -- if we went to  
18 one-acre sites. That would be 20 acres of disturbed  
19 woodland for large lot zoning compared to Villa D'Este  
20 would be a half of what would be disturbed. And when  
21 we do -- when we put in lots that are wooded, this is  
22 an example of some lots in Tuscany that we developed,  
23 and homeowners, single-family homeowners don't want  
24 woods up to the back of their home, they want a clear  
25 woods in these areas to make play areas for their

1 kids, for grass, they want to add pools, they want to  
2 add a lanai or hot tub and things of this nature. Of  
3 the 12 sites that were wooded in Tuscany, we cleared a  
4 significant amount of trees for the consumer, they  
5 paid the -- obviously the replacement tree costs. But  
6 the single-family home really is best used in large  
7 lots in cornfield areas on sites that are less  
8 sensitive. Empty-nesters actually by putting these  
9 homes closer together is a better way to save the  
10 natural features of the site.

11 Here is -- we're going to move to  
12 traffic now. We're showing average daily trips based  
13 on the traffic study that was created. And you can  
14 see the Mercato plan at 40 units had 378 trips per  
15 day, 32 single-family units, which is near what the  
16 current zoning would allow is 302 trips per day. And  
17 then I showed a comparison of 56 empty-nester units  
18 are 239 trips per day, and that's very comparable to  
19 26 single-family homes just to look at it from a  
20 traffic standpoint, because you know the empty-nester,  
21 they don't have kids to run around, they don't have  
22 to -- you know, a lot of them don't go to work, they  
23 have homes in other locations, and all of these  
24 reasons are why these traffic numbers are less for the  
25 empty-nester. Also you can see here at peak hour that

1 for 40 units, at peak hour there's 30 trips going on  
2 per hour, at 32 units it's 24, and we go all the way  
3 down to the empty-nester at 56 units, there's 13 trips  
4 per hour. The empty-nester avoids the high traffic  
5 times to drive. They don't want to get caught in that  
6 scenario.

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

24 Here is the drawing of the  
25 entrance. We are moving it as far to the east as we

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

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

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

1 that rural feel.

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

17 Here is Kirkway Place. I put  
18 this in there for a couple of reasons. One, it was a  
19 site that was environmentally sensitive. There was  
20 significant woodlands, wetlands on this site. This  
21 proposal was brought to the city maybe 20 years ago  
22 plus or minus, I don't know, staff would know, and it  
23 was an empty-nester community, homes were put  
24 together. We drive by it all the time on Ten Mile --  
25 I mean on Beck between Ten and Eleven, and we never

1 notice it because it's just so quiet there because  
2 it's empty-nesters, and we just don't have enough of  
3 these communities in Novi. It's something the city  
4 definitely needs.

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

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

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

3 MR. GUIDOBONO: Are units as you  
4 can see, very dramatic. Starting price 595. Very  
5 open concepts here. You've got your porch. Here is  
6 the master plan. We meet the master plan in so many  
7 areas. Diverse housing site. You can see the check  
8 marks, more open space, and in accordance with land  
9 and in accordance with their character. Conserve  
10 natural resources, all these things. Less traffic.  
11 We don't meet density. What is density? We're at  
12 1.1. Quail Hollow at Links of Novi was approved at  
13 1.35 gross. We're comparing gross. Most people would  
14 say this is the way to control the intensity of the  
15 use at a location to reduce traffic, minimize noise,  
16 preserve woodlands, wetlands, create open space,  
17 prevent overcrowding. Our proposal addresses all  
18 these.

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

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

24 The Silver Tsunami report, we need  
25 empty-nester housing for the City of Novi. That's in

1 the goals of the master plan. We just need to give  
2 the city a mechanism to get this done.

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

14 I'd be happy to answer any  
15 questions.

16 CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you, sir.

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

24 MR. REGGISH: Good evening, ladies  
25 and gentlemen. My name is Gary Reggish. I'm the

1 owner of Remerica United Realty in Novi. We're a real  
2 estate office that has existed in Novi for over 30  
3 years. I'm an immediate past president of the  
4 Michigan Association of Realtors and a liaison to the  
5 president of the National Association of Realtors.

6 When I was first presented with  
7 this project, I was asked if it made sense, if I liked  
8 the project. My initial reaction was I thought it was  
9 a great project. Now, but with that I'm very  
10 analytical by nature, so what I did was I went back to  
11 the chief economist of the National Association of  
12 Realtors, and I met with him in Chicago last week, and  
13 here's what we came up with, because I asked him, what  
14 are the buying habits of the empty-nester. And, you  
15 know, some things that I found was the empty-nester of  
16 today is uniquely different than the empty-nester of  
17 20 years ago or even ten years ago. I mean, largely  
18 the empty-nesters of today are comprised of  
19 baby-boomers, and here is what I found out. 84  
20 percent of the baby-boomers and the empty-nesters are  
21 looking for detached single-family residential homes.  
22 Only 4 percent are looking for condominiums. They're  
23 looking for first floor bedrooms and bathrooms, so  
24 they're looking for ranches. More specifically, two  
25 bedrooms with flex space, so a library, a study, or a

1 hobby room. Easy to maintain landscaping. They're  
2 trading larger lawns for living patios such as lanais.  
3 Subdivision setting and quality of neighborhood is  
4 important. Empty-nesters, largely the boomers, are  
5 interested in up and coming neighborhoods and are  
6 interested in a more sophisticated style and luxury.  
7 They're interested in more efficiency, better  
8 lighting, bigger windows, top of the line amenities  
9 and wireless home networks. They do not want to  
10 renovate. 67 percent are looking for ranches between  
11 2,000 and 3,000 square feet, and they like their green  
12 space.

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

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

23 CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you, sir.

24 MS. OHLGREN: My name is Theresa  
25 Ohlgren. I've lived at 21666 Garfield Road for the

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

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

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

1 months. The north end of Garfield was rechipped a  
2 year or two ago.

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

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

14 I'm not opposed to development, I'm  
15 opposed to the high-density development requested by  
16 Cambridge Homes. One, current rezoning in RA includes  
17 one-acre minimum lot size, 150 minimum width, and  
18 setbacks of 45 foot front, 20 foot side, 50 foot  
19 combined, and it's a 50 foot rear from the lot line.  
20 Requested zoning change to R1 includes a half acre  
21 minimum lot size, 120 feet minimum width, and setbacks  
22 of 30 foot front, 15 foot side, 40 feet combined, and  
23 35 feet rear from the lot line.

24 Cambridge Homes has requested a  
25 deviation for every setback to maximize density beyond

1 that of R4 zoning. Cambridge is requesting to rebuild  
2 100 by 45 foot on a 60 foot wide space. This is a 20  
3 feet narrower than the current city of Novi R4 zoning,  
4 detached condo units on common land. There is no  
5 reason to have density greater than a '70 era trailer  
6 park. Come to think of it, the layout does remind me  
7 of a double-wide trailer park.

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

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

24 CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you.

25 MS. TEDESCO: Before I give my

1           comments, I just want to establish the relationship of  
2           my parcel.

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

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

13                          So Mark shares a story about  
14          providing senior homes for our area.  I would like to  
15          share with you another story, one that the current  
16          residents are likely to experience during the  
17          development of this property.  Currently there is low  
18          traffic volume on our rural unpaved road with our  
19          neighbors walking dogs along side joggers and bikers  
20          all enjoying the natural beauty and relative safety.  
21          With this plan there will now be the intrusion of  
22          bulldozers, cement trucks and tractor trailers hauling  
23          supplies in and debris out.  Day in and day out for  
24          several years the heavy traffic will continue to beat  
25          upon are already rutted and relatively flooded dirt



1 turn can raise our own children in piece and solitude,  
2 and so that they can also enjoy the experience of  
3 nature that we had growing up.

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

23 As of right now the gravity sewer  
24 is planned for Nine Mile, but it's neither projected  
25 in its time lines nor is it funded by the city. To me

1 with all my knowledge of how infrastructure projects  
2 work, this looks like five to ten years until  
3 fruition. If I were Cambridge Homes, I would not be  
4 holding out for the city to place the sewer along Nine  
5 Mile before I made accommodations for my customer's  
6 waste water. If I were Cambridge, I would do exactly  
7 as Mark has proposed, wisely connect to the Evergreen  
8 Court grinding station off the western end upwind  
9 portion of my property.

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

23 CHAIR PEHRSON: If you can  
24 summarize, please.

25 MS. TEDESCO: Yes, I'm coming to my

1 conclusion. Thank you.

2 Will the Cambridge company be  
3 paying for the additional upgrades to the grinding  
4 station until the sewer project is installed along  
5 Nine Mile. Will they also be paying for the projected  
6 10 percent degradation in property value that my  
7 family will personally experience on our hard-earned  
8 investment, my increased asthma and noise on our front  
9 lawn. Will Cambridge also be paying for the  
10 remediation work necessary for a driveway and  
11 landscape that will be associated with this upgrade?

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

14 CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you.

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

22 I don't know that we fully  
23 understand that the densely populated 23 acres of  
24 complete undrainable other than the advent of storm  
25 sewers to alleviate ground water from that area, that

1 will have to be a permanent dewatering taking place  
2 there on that concentrated 23 acres to my estimation,  
3 which is going to basically make that a 23 acre dry  
4 pond that will I believe dewater our pond on Garfield  
5 Road in the long term.

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

10 The last thing I would like to talk  
11 about is the increased traffic on Garfield Road. It  
12 is a 25 mile per hour limit without sidewalks. There  
13 is a lot of residents and nonresident visiting areas  
14 walking dogs, and when we had the construction on Beck  
15 Road recently, it was really pathetic what the speed  
16 limits did. Even with the City of Novi there on an  
17 hourly basis probably five, six hours a day, they  
18 could no sooner write a ticket then turn around and  
19 write another ticket, turn around and write another  
20 ticket. And with the 56 units, it's going to see the  
21 majority of the traffic. The would-be residents of  
22 this subdivision are going to go to Northville in most  
23 cases. They're entrance is going to be right at  
24 Garfield Road. They're going to take the paved road  
25 to Eight Mile. Our traffic is going to increase more

1 so than the traffic study alludes to in my opinion.

2 And I guess I would just like to  
3 second every that Kurt and Terri Ohlgren said. I  
4 agree and I'd like to go on record saying I agree with  
5 everything they said so as not to burden this panel  
6 with more testimony.

7 So in summary I disapprove of the  
8 development.

9 CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you, sir.

10 MR. MITTS: Good evening. My name  
11 is Tim Mitts, 22125 Garfield. I was here at the first  
12 meeting that you gentlemen held for this proposal.  
13 After that Mark offered an informational meeting at  
14 the library which I did attend. I was very pleased  
15 when I left the meeting to hear so many of you talk  
16 about the density count that realistically should be  
17 26 homes on one acre, not 56. So I was relatively  
18 pleased, okay, there is going to be something  
19 corralled here and brought into real life, but I was  
20 very, very disamazed to see the secondary plan with 56  
21 homes instead of 53. As the meeting went on I found  
22 Mark to become a little less informatory and a little  
23 bit more insistent upon if I don't do this, I'm going  
24 to rip out more trees. If I don't do this, this is  
25 going to happen. I found it a little strange to use

1 the bullying tactic. Even though he was very polite  
2 about it, he -- you know, it wasn't like it was a  
3 knock-down, drag-out fight or anything like that, but  
4 I looked at it is I really expected to come back and  
5 instead of seeing 53 homes, something with maybe 38  
6 homes or just something to knock it down, to bring it  
7 down to within reason. Empty-nesters, whether it's an  
8 empty-nester or single-family, something is going to  
9 go in back there, but there should only be so much  
10 allowed in there. RA is what I had to conform to and  
11 all my neighbors had to conform to. I don't think  
12 there should be much of an adjustment made up and  
13 beyond that.

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

18 Also, as far as his road coming  
19 directly out onto Garfield, it's not so much as  
20 connecting to Garfield, it's just that it does give a  
21 straight shot, it's going to give a straight shot for  
22 construction trucks, and it's going to give a straight  
23 shot for the construction. So I really think the  
24 entrance where he used to have it makes more sense as  
25 far as divvying up traffic and giving an alteration.

1 But I think something much more has to be done with  
2 Nine Mile and Garfield as far as before we increase  
3 that traffic any more. Thank you.

4 CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you, sir.

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

14 CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you.

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

23 CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you.

24 MR. SHAGINE: Good evening. My  
25 name is Dan Shagine. I live at 4900 West Nine Mile

1 Road. I've just moved here about a year ago. And the  
2 first thing I'd like to say is that I'm really  
3 empathize with everything I've heard people say to  
4 today. I have the same concerns as everybody else  
5 does that are in this room, and I'm addressing my  
6 neighbors more than -- just as much as I'm addressing  
7 the board where I say if it's up to me and nobody  
8 wants to buy this property and not let it ever be  
9 developed, I would choose that right now, and I would  
10 never support Mr. Guidobono moving forward if you can  
11 say that.

12 The reason that I'm, and I'll say  
13 it up front, I do support this is for a couple of  
14 reasons. It's the lesser of the two evils from what  
15 I've seen. What we're looking is we're looking at  
16 traffic on Garfield and traffic on Nine Mile, which  
17 none of us like. What we're looking at is people  
18 throwing stuff out the windows and going 40 miles an  
19 hour in a 25, which we all hate. You know, we want  
20 this to stay exactly how it is, but unfortunately  
21 unless the City of Novi can come up with some money,  
22 it's not going to happen. So what I'm looking at for  
23 my neighbors and for the Board is to assess a few  
24 things. Is this actually something that is going to  
25 better for the people in five and ten years from now

1 than somebody else coming in, following the zoning,  
2 and then having astronomical sized homes on large lots  
3 and cutting down the woodlands and destroying the  
4 wetlands.

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

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

1 16, 17 and 18 year olds.

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

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

19 CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you.

20 MR. SCOTT: Good evening. My name  
21 is Richard Scott. I live at 49590 Deer Run right off  
22 Garfield. I was at the first meeting when this was  
23 presented, and just some comments I wanted to make  
24 tonight. One thing I do like about the new  
25 presentation is the rural entrance concept. I like

1 that quite well over what I saw last week. I don't  
2 think this in general, though, addresses the  
3 additional traffic on Garfield. Again, with no  
4 sidewalks on that road, it's a little shaky road  
5 already. I run and bike on that road all the time.  
6 It's not too dangerous. Nine Mile is a disaster to do  
7 any of that on. You can hardly get two lanes of  
8 traffic going. I think it's a horrible area for this  
9 kind of development just with the traffic in both  
10 those roads. If you all have driven down it, you know  
11 exactly what I'm saying.

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

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

24 CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you, sir.

25 MS. HUDSON: Good evening. My name

1 is Suzanne Hudson. This is my husband, Michael  
2 Hudson. This is a joint statement by us. We live at  
3 22111 Garfield Road just down south of what this  
4 proposed development is.

5 As with all developments, there are  
6 pros and cons to each. There is lot of good things  
7 that Mr. Guidobono is proposing. I don't have any  
8 doubt that he would do a quality development.

9 However, after review of this proposal, we have  
10 several concerns that have not been fully addressed.

11 Number one, the target population.  
12 You're calling it empty-nesters. What exactly does  
13 that mean? He's talked about the over 55 community.  
14 However, the majority of people who are 55 are still  
15 working until the normal retirement age of 66. So the  
16 idea that they're all retired and they're not going  
17 anywhere to work is a false statement. That's an  
18 assumption. So what are the provisions in buying into  
19 this community of empty-nesters. In the proposal it  
20 says that 80 percent will be empty-nesters. So who is  
21 going to be the other 20 percent that are going to  
22 buying into this? Are there going to be any laws that  
23 says, oh, my adult son or sons, a lot of us who are  
24 empty-nesters have known about the returning of the  
25 adult child to the home for a while. What is that

1 going to do that to community, and is there going to  
2 be something, a police force to prevent them from  
3 coming back. What happens if my daughter gets  
4 divorced and comes back with her three kids if she's  
5 got no place else to go. As her mother, I'm not going  
6 to turn her out in the street. What is that going to  
7 do to the traffic patterns? So how is this  
8 empty-nester concept going to be enforced, controlled,  
9 regulated.

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

1 road, up and down into this community. So I think  
2 that traffic study is partially based on assumptions  
3 that are invalid.

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

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

18 CHAIR PEHRSON: If you could  
19 summarize, please.

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

23 CHAIR PEHRSON: Excuse me, sir.  
24 If you could summarize, please.

25 MS. HUDSON: I won't address the

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

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

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

19 There are unanswered questions  
20 here. The main thing with this is the area is  
21 currently designated RA by the master plan. By your  
22 Council it's RA. And I don't know what the  
23 overwhelming reason is. He has a great concept here.  
24 I don't disagree that we need that in Novi, just not  
25 here. We're trying to put a square peg into a round

1 hole and with all these deviations. I really think  
2 that needs to be relooked at. I would love  
3 empty-nester housing as he defines it in the City of  
4 Novi, I just don't think this is the best site for it.  
5 Thank you.

6 MR. HUDSON: Thank you.

7 CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you.

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

15 This is zoned RA, and I'm not going  
16 to talk about the marketing, I'm not going to talk  
17 about the polls. That's not my area of expertise.  
18 I'm sure that Mr. Guidobono has done his research  
19 well. He knows this is going to be a viable prospect  
20 for him as well as for his target of customers. What  
21 I would like to talk about, though, is about what RA  
22 means. In the options that we saw, RA is a minimum  
23 one acre. I didn't see any options for anything  
24 greater than one acre. You can still build beautiful  
25 fall homes as demonstrated by Mr. Guidobono himself on

1 one acre and greater lots preserving the natural  
2 beauty of the area. So I'd be welcome to see that as  
3 part of the suggestion here.

4 Also I would like to see just an  
5 explanation of the rural. I heard the selling pitch  
6 about rural, the tranquility, the things you want to  
7 keep. There's beautiful views when you look down Nine  
8 Mile and across Nine Mile. I'd like to take you on a  
9 journey down Garfield Road as you come from Eight  
10 Mile. As you travel going south on Garfield Road you  
11 see some beautiful houses to the left and the right.  
12 You see smaller, quaint houses historic reminiscent of  
13 the history of the area. You see beautiful homes that  
14 are over 4,000 square feet. You see ponds, you see  
15 wildlife, you see open spaces, you see horses. If you  
16 continue down that road, you see more open spaces,  
17 offset houses, houses close to the road, all with real  
18 nice distances, some not, some that are closer  
19 together, but it's a true community. You walk down or  
20 you drive down or walk or ride at the very end of  
21 Garfield Road, and you see this beautiful proposal for  
22 a park to the left. You see beautiful woodlands. You  
23 see the house on the right. It's a beautiful area,  
24 it's tranquil, it's nature, it's community reminiscent  
25 of days gone by when you were truly a rural community

1 working with each other, combining with each other,  
2 collaborating, making sure everybody moved together in  
3 the community in a healthy way.

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

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

20 CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you.

21 MR. ASHGARD (ph): My name is Bill  
22 Ashgard. I live in 48923 Benito Drive. Currently I  
23 live in one of Cambridge development community, and I  
24 support the plan because Cambridge always put  
25 community first and build a quality lifestyle and

1 makes our city more beautiful, organize the Nine Mile  
2 stretch between Garfield and Beck Road. Cambridge is  
3 all about preserving environment and keeping the eco  
4 system in place. Thank you.

5 CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you.

6 MS. MARCOTTE: Hi there. My name  
7 is Robyn Marcotte, and I'm at 49425 Deer Run. I'm  
8 right on the corner of Garfield and Deer Run, and I'm  
9 just going to overall object or reject the proposal  
10 for all the reasons all my neighbors have said, but I  
11 just -- I suggest that you check into one data point,  
12 and that is from a traffic standpoint it was an  
13 absolute fact that while Beck Road was closed, our  
14 street was a runway, and I don't think it was  
15 17-year-old kids. I know for a fact, because my house  
16 was the place where all the police pulled them over.  
17 There was probably six to ten cars pulled over per  
18 hour, and I think you can get that data from the  
19 records associated with all the tickets given during  
20 that time period. I just really think you should  
21 check into the accuracy of the traffic pattern.  
22 That's it.

23 CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you.

24 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: They were  
25 clocked at 65 miles an hour.

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

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

23 CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you, sir.

24 MR. IORGA: Good evening everyone.  
25 My name is Silviu Iorga. I live at 49450 Deer Run.

1 This is in the northwest corner of Garfield Road and  
2 Deer Run. I am fortunate enough to have some  
3 fantastic neighbors, and I know they very deeply care  
4 about our community. So I take this opportunity to  
5 express my opinion on this, and I too object to it,  
6 and this is why I think we should not approve this.

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

17 This proposed rezoning change will  
18 kind of demolish the city master plan for this area  
19 and pretty much make it obsolete for this specific  
20 area, and we'll have to, you know, put it back forward  
21 and carefully redo it. It's basically an attempt  
22 to -- I mean, the development itself is an attempt to  
23 increase the city population density in this area, and  
24 of course is going to increase the tax paying revenue  
25 of the city, which is good in itself, but the density

1 in itself for this area is not quite suitable.

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

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

25 To summarize it, I'm not that much

1 against the development itself, it's just too high  
2 dense. And the rezoning, I don't think it's the right  
3 way to do it here.

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

10 CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you, sir.

11 MR. SARKAR: Good evening everyone.  
12 My name is Shyamal Sarkar. I live at the property at  
13 49500 Nine Mile Road in the City of Novi. I support  
14 this development due to following. The first thing is  
15 I'm sure like we are upgrading a plan to upgrade the  
16 sewer system along the Nine Mile Road, and I'm sure  
17 there must be a plan to pave Nine Mile. So for that  
18 we need revenue. So revenue, this project will help  
19 with a lot of those revenue.

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

25 Now, the project is very

1 interesting, it's for the home nester, for the home  
2 empty-nester. Now the home empty-nester, a lot people  
3 asked what does home empty-nester mean. I'm a typical  
4 home empty-nester. I haven't been working maybe four  
5 or five years. My daughters both graduated from Novi  
6 school, and went to University of Michigan. Now they  
7 are all gone away, they are working, and they visit me  
8 maybe four or five days or six days in a year. So I  
9 don't have a lot of traffic and I don't create a lot  
10 of traffic. And so -- and since I'm in Novi for 26  
11 years, a project like this with home-nesters is great  
12 for not only me, people like me like who goes into  
13 retirement or about to go into retirement, time to go,  
14 I'm going to go and find a place like this, not with a  
15 lot of land and backyard and others. And another  
16 advantage, this one is not creating any pressure for  
17 the school. With so many homes, there's no pressure  
18 with the school, to increase the school. Just imagine  
19 40 homes, 50 homes, there will be 100 kids or so many  
20 more, you have to think about school, we have to  
21 upgrade the schools.

22 And as empty-nesters like me, when  
23 I'm not going to work, I don't travel. When I was  
24 young of course I still go out four times, five time  
25 with the kids, so many kids, so many cars.

1                   And this type of project brings  
2                   prestige to Novi. Like Bellagio, the other great  
3                   projects, it brings prestige, and it helps other  
4                   people, affluent people or well-to-do people to come  
5                   to Novi, and they contribute because they got spending  
6                   power, they contribute to the business and the  
7                   business thrives. And just for example, some area  
8                   like the business is not thriving, going down because  
9                   the affluency or whatever you call it, at the end of  
10                  the day we need money to come and spend on the  
11                  business.

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

14                                   MR. SARKAR: Yes. And there's one  
15                                   more thing. You know, like any particular area, I  
16                                   mean you think this particular square mile will  
17                                   generate so much in revenue to support the  
18                                   infrastructure and all the costs. Now when we look at  
19                                   the Nine Mile, I'm not sure when you look at per  
20                                   square mile how much or revenue we generate to support  
21                                   that area. It's possible that some other area is kind  
22                                   of helping them to maintain the support. So bottom  
23                                   line is everybody has to do their fair share, you have  
24                                   to see the model, okay, where the revenue comes from  
25                                   to support this particular area.

1                   Finally, I'm very thankful to all  
2                   the Council. I've been here 26 years. Both daughters  
3                   went to Novi School, University of Michigan, and it's  
4                   a great place, you've done an awesome job in  
5                   controlled development and everywhere I hear everyone  
6                   says Novi is premier and a great place to live. Thank  
7                   you again for the great work.

8                   CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you, sir.

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

24                  CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you, sir.

25                  MR. SMITH: Good evening. My name

1 is Dan Smith. I live at 968 McDonald Drive in  
2 Northville, and I'm also a business owner in the City  
3 of Novi. I'm 57 years old and I'm thinking about  
4 retiring soon, in the next five years. And I'm also  
5 in the mortgage banking business, and I know what the  
6 elderly people are looking for, and Cambridge Homes,  
7 the product that they're putting forth, and I think  
8 what Gary Reggish said is absolutely true. This is  
9 the kind of project that people are looking for.

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

23 The point being is we moved to  
24 Northville because we liked the ambiance of  
25 Northville, and I don't want to go anywhere else. And

1 I think one of the reasons that Mark and his projects  
2 have been so successful is people want to live in nice  
3 communities, and that is what Northville and Novi both  
4 represent. And I'd also be willing to tell you that a  
5 lot of people don't want to leave Novi or Northville,  
6 they want to stay in the communities. So I think  
7 Mark's project hits it out of the park from that  
8 standpoint.

9 25 years ago my parents bought in  
10 an empty-nester gated community in Plymouth called  
11 Plymouth Homestead Estates, and they're the classic  
12 people we're talking about today. Two people 25 years  
13 ago wanted to plan ahead, get a first floor master.  
14 They bought in there, all five of the kids never lived  
15 there, none of us went back to it. For 25 years they  
16 lived in this gated community. They had a home in  
17 northern Michigan and a home in Florida, and I think  
18 on average they spent two months a year in this  
19 condominium, which I think kind of gives you an idea  
20 of how much infrastructure they're using, how much of  
21 police services they use, they fire services. And, by  
22 the way, they're pretty expensive, so the taxes went  
23 to the community, and, you know, they weren't getting  
24 the benefit of that, because -- well, they already got  
25 the benefit, and I'm a result of it.

1                   But the point being is what I will  
2                   say to the people on Garfield, I know there's concern  
3                   out, and I think the other gentleman on Nine Mile said  
4                   it best, be careful what you wish for, because you  
5                   might get something other than a Mark Guidobono. And  
6                   you guys all know his projects. I own one of his  
7                   homes. I'm a personal friend of his, I think the  
8                   world of him and everything he does. Nick said it  
9                   best, he's a man of his word. I think you can work  
10                  through all the issues here, but I'm all in support of  
11                  the project. I'll probably be a homeowner in there  
12                  somewhere down the road. And next we need to work on  
13                  getting those taxes down on this place.

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

21                   CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you, sir.

22                   MR. BODRIE: Nick Bodrie,  
23                   21940 Garfield Road. I've been a resident on Garfield  
24                   Road for 25 years. I know Mark. He's a very good  
25                   builder, no doubt about it. He's builds one of the

1 best products out there. The biggest problem with  
2 this project is the infrastructure does not support  
3 it. If his product went out on Beck, went out on  
4 Eight Mile, went out on a road that would support the  
5 traffic, I wouldn't be here. Mark would get it done.  
6 But when we have a situation where it's zoned RA, and  
7 Mark has done a tremendous job with his traffic report  
8 and stating that you can get 25, 26, 40 homes on this  
9 property. Myself as a developer, you would never get  
10 that many homes on there because of all the  
11 regulations and all the frontages if you lived there.  
12 You'd lose all kinds of acreage with the roads, you'd  
13 lose all kinds of acreage with the wetlands and the  
14 woodlands. And then he requests, well, let's just not  
15 count them or at least not for this consideration.  
16 Why should Mark even though he's such a wonderful  
17 person, and I'm a builder and developer, why should he  
18 be afforded that advantage to just say just trust me.

19 Myself, my home is going to be on  
20 his entry to his condominium project, bottom line. I  
21 want it to be a nice community, I want it to be a  
22 community that I can take my dog and walk it through  
23 his property. Just like Deer Run, they became our  
24 neighbors, they became our friends. We have hayrides  
25 on Halloween so the kids can travel all the distance

1 of the rural road. That's what we have as a  
2 community, and when you take a gated community with  
3 people that are not invested, they just want a  
4 beautiful setting. Well, we can find a beautiful  
5 setting somewhere else. We're trying to cram way too  
6 much density into a piece of property with  
7 insufficient infrastructure to support the traffic.

8 One thing Mark hasn't considered.  
9 He says most of the traffic is going to be not at rush  
10 hour. Guess what, I don't walk my dog at 8:30, 7:30,  
11 5:00, because there's too much darn traffic. I don't  
12 want to get run over. Now his customers as he stated  
13 are going to be driving when I want to walk. If I  
14 want to utilize the ITC walkway, I have to walk down  
15 Garfield Road. I can't do that, we don't have  
16 sidewalks, which is fine, that's what I bought. I  
17 bought RA. We're expecting you, the Planning  
18 Commission, to protect the people that reside on the  
19 master plan of an RA zoning.

20 Out of Mark's words, one thing he  
21 said is there is no way to develop the site without  
22 all these variances and without this. If you go down  
23 Nine Nile, you go down Garfield, you have 120, 150  
24 foot lots, large acreage lots. That's what you have  
25 now. These homes that are on there can be torn down,

1 but beautiful estate size homes, they can be split  
2 within the RA zoning. It would be much better for  
3 conformity of the neighborhood.

4 Now, Mr. Guidobono has asked for  
5 23 variances to maximize his density. Basically  
6 maximize density, people make this economically  
7 feasible.

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

25 In summary, we have a wonderful

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

13 CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you, sir.

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

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

25 There is what it looks like from

1 the air. The entrance is just moved over here now.

2 There is my house right there. I  
3 built it myself. I'm an empty-nester. I still owe  
4 190,000, so I'll be there a while.

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

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

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

25 This is looking south towards my

1 house. These trees are on my property, so I will at  
2 least be able to keep up three or four trees that they  
3 can't touch.

4 Like I say, this is the old  
5 Garfield Drain here, the original one there.

6 That's wetlands and flood plain.

7 This is looking up through the tree  
8 canopy. This is what the Cooper's hawks and the other  
9 wildlife need when they fly low for their prey, they  
10 fly underneath the canopy. That is going to be wiped  
11 out.

12 The park land we're getting, the  
13 18 acres, it's passive, it's useless, it's wetland.  
14 It's not going to go anywhere. If it was important,  
15 someone would have bought it already.

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

1 to nest.

2 Thank you.

3 CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you, sir.

4 Anyone else?

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

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

22 CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you.

23 Anyone else?

24 Seeing no on else, I think we have  
25 correspondence, Mr. Lynch?

1 MR. LYNCH: Yes, we do. Okay. Let  
2 me begin here, there is quite a few. I guess we'll  
3 put it in the public record. Did you ever figure out  
4 how people can view these things? How do they do it  
5 right now, because I'm not going to read through all  
6 these. We'll be here to midnight. I can summarize  
7 them if you like.

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

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

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

15 Elizabeth Wylie, 21760 Garfield  
16 Road, Northville.

17 Larry Edson, 21880 Garfield.

18 Karl Migrin, 49450 West Nine Mile  
19 Road.

20 Brian Benton, 21820 Garfield Road.

21 Gregory and Nancy Cragel, no  
22 address.

23 Kyle Freitag, 50233 Nine Mile Road.

24 Richard Scott, 49590 Deer Run.

25 Michael Dazy, 21791 Garfield Road.

1 Janet Thurber, 21668 Garfield Road.  
2 Robyn Marcotte, 49425 Deer Run.  
3 Gordon Marcotte, 49425 Deer Run,  
4 Northville.  
5 Zachary Bonafiglio, 21940 Garfield  
6 Road. I apologize if I butcher people's names.  
7 Linda Bodrie, 21940 Garfield.  
8 Remie A. I'm not going to even try  
9 to pronounce it, 21975 Garfield Road.  
10 James Bodrie, 21940 Garfield Road.  
11 Timothy Wagner, 22155 Garfield,  
12 Northville.  
13 Deborah Wagner, 22155 Garfield,  
14 Northville.  
15 Scott Hoag, 21850 Garfield Road,  
16 Northville.  
17 Scott Bartley, 49050 Nine Mile  
18 Road, Novi.  
19 And Joseph DelCampo, 22140 Garfield  
20 Road, Northville.  
21 For the supports, Muin Rumman,  
22 49280 Nine Mile, Novi.  
23 Patti Mullen, don't see an address.  
24 Kevin Macaddino, don't see an  
25 address.

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

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

1 for it to happen. So there are issues that are  
2 addressed and taken into consideration. So it's  
3 not we're just zoning this from RA to R1. So that's  
4 not what the request is. So that's just a bit of  
5 information.

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

17 There is 51 acres that is part of  
18 this project, and at a density of 0.8, which is what  
19 RA is, that would give you 40, 41 units, and that is  
20 based on what we have right now in the master plan and  
21 in the zoning ordinance. So 51 acres is going to  
22 allow you to have 40 units on a piece of property. It  
23 may not be able to be developed to the 40 units  
24 depending on wetlands, woodlands and whatever other  
25 issues that has to be taken into consideration. So

1 that might drop down to 30 possible units. The  
2 Mercato plan I believe showed 40 units, and was  
3 that -- that was RA or was that R1?

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

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

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

24 The concerns with traffic, I'm  
25 personally not as concerned as a lot of you are.

1 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: You don't  
2 live there.

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

16 I have like I said no issue with  
17 the concept, I have no issue with the size of the  
18 units, I have no issue with how they're going to be  
19 laid out. I know that the city has concern with some  
20 of the setbacks, and that was with all these  
21 deviations that were coming into play. And it's just  
22 something that I feel is getting shoehorned. The  
23 property when it was at 53 and then it came at 56, you  
24 know, you're looking at the plan again, and you saw  
25 that the drive got shifted over and it's in line with

1 Garfield Road. For some people that doesn't make  
2 sense because it's a straight shot down Garfield. I  
3 take Eight Mile from work to Garfield down to Nine  
4 Mile and to get home, and I understand the concern  
5 with people driving 40, 50, 60 miles an hour. But if  
6 we have the drive to a particular development that is  
7 going to be offset, then you're going to be creating  
8 issues where cars are turning, and the wheels as  
9 you're turning in and out of things that are in an  
10 L-shape are going to even ruin the road even more.  
11 That has to be studied a little further.

12 I think that a development like  
13 this will enhance the community if it's done in an  
14 appropriate manner where we maintain the rural  
15 character of the community and look to be in line more  
16 with the density that's already there. I would look  
17 at if we had 51 acres and it was at the 0.8 and that  
18 gives you 40 to 41 units, then I would look at that  
19 instead of doing RA trying to get a subdivision in  
20 there, and, you know, getting 30 units. So I could  
21 take that into consideration. But going up instead of  
22 down based on the comments from the last Planning  
23 Commission is a bit disheartening, and I don't know if  
24 the message that Mr. Guidobono delivered as he was  
25 discussing things to the residents maybe didn't, you

1 know, sink in, or maybe at that point I don't know if  
2 the development grew in size from 53 to 56.

3 Those are right now the comments  
4 that I have, and I'm waiting to hear from the rest of  
5 my Planning Commission.

6 CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you Member  
7 Avdoulos.

8 Member Anthony.

9 MR. ANTHONY: Thank you.

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

23 With that, though, as we look at  
24 changing zoning and as we look at the -- whenever we  
25 do these moves, we also try to look at equivalency,

1 not wanting to move too far from where we were before.  
2 For instance, we looked at R1. I think we looked at  
3 it's maybe capable if you don't account for roads and  
4 for wetlands of being capable of handling in the high  
5 40's, maybe up to 50, but once you account for that,  
6 we can see in the other development that we were  
7 looking at 40 units.

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

21 There was what I think is a minor  
22 concern about dewatering of some of the smaller lakes  
23 that are in the area. When you look at the concept of  
24 dewatering that's caused from a development, one thing  
25 that you want to look at is you want to look at the

1 ground water recharge areas, which obviously are the  
2 wetland areas. And the actual development that is  
3 shown and proposed here preserves those. So you are  
4 more likely to preserve the lakes in the area with  
5 this development than you would with a development  
6 like RA that developed the whole site and incorporated  
7 41 lots. The reason why is because Novi's wetland  
8 ordinance encompasses a larger, broader definition of  
9 wetlands than the state. But when you get into the  
10 development, that portion that is the Novi wetlands  
11 ends up becoming a piece that is easily negotiated.  
12 So you would lose a good section of that wetland in an  
13 RA development, which then could potentially threaten  
14 or bring up the concern of dewatering some of the  
15 other ponds.

16 One area that I was really  
17 concerned with was the grinding station that was  
18 there. And perhaps I could direct the question to  
19 you, Darcy. So on the sanitary and that grinding  
20 station, just offhand hearing that it serves three  
21 homes now and already had an odor problem, and adding  
22 in even if the number of units is greatly reduced,  
23 that's still a substantial increase on that grinding  
24 station. What type of requirements would be there?  
25 Who would be responsible for it? You know, it

1 obviously needs it sounds like even under current  
2 operations needs some significant upgrade. What can  
3 you tell me about that?

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

9 MR. ANTHONY: Okay.

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

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

21 MS. RECHTIEN: Right. I think  
22 that's what we were looking at. In their current plan  
23 they want to tie into the gravity sewer project which  
24 is underway under permitting, and I think the design  
25 is essentially complete on that. And we did say that

1 if -- we need to see kind of a backup plan, you know,  
2 if the city's project doesn't for whatever go through  
3 as planned, we would have to basically start over with  
4 the site plans and look at what the alternative would  
5 be.

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

11 MS. RECHTIEN: Right.

12 MR. ANTHONY: Good. Thank you.

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

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

1 development do seem to be in order.

2 CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you, sir.

3 Member Zuchlewski.

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

16 I have a problem with the density,  
17 with the number of units that are proposed. And I  
18 think there was discussion about self-imposed issues  
19 in looking for variances. There is an awful lot of  
20 variances here from sidewalks to setbacks to whatever  
21 trying to jam more units in. We thought it was going  
22 the other way, and I really -- I came here all fired  
23 up today to say rah-rah, this is going to go and  
24 everything, but it seemed to go in the wrong way, and  
25 I'm sorry for that. And I think the developer, I hope

1 he is a little bit, too, that maybe he pushed the  
2 envelope a little farther than he should have.

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

20 CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you, sir.

21 Member Lynch.

22 MR. LYNCH: Thank you.

23 Yes, I looked at this project, too,  
24 from the last time when I got here. First of all, I  
25 mean, this is -- you've got a corner on the market

1 with this type of home that you're building. We'll  
2 talk about the density in a minute. But basically  
3 what you're doing is you're taking somebody from a  
4 6,000 square foot home and putting them into 3,000  
5 square foot detached condo and giving them the same  
6 opulence that they would get in the 6,000 home, and,  
7 you're right, there is nothing else out there.

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

11 Overall I like what you're doing, I  
12 just think the density -- and this is the reason I  
13 have such a problem with the density is we've been --  
14 since I've been on the commission for probably too  
15 long, you know, we've been trying to work, you know,  
16 with developers and allow for additional density where  
17 it kind of makes sense and it kind of fits, and this  
18 going from what I think should be in the low 40's to  
19 the 56, we'd be setting precedent, and that's my fear  
20 the most is I don't want to set precedent with future  
21 development. And then plus with what we've done on a  
22 number of projects starting with the corner of Beck  
23 and Ten Mile, allowing a little bit more there, but  
24 not over the top. I think the density in my opinion  
25 is over the top.

1 I think the product that you have,  
2 I can't imagine this thing -- you'd probably sell out  
3 in a year, just my impression, because there are  
4 people that are empty-nesters that are probably in  
5 their mid 50's and are not working that I think you  
6 know the market, and I think you'd be able to sell it  
7 out in no time. I don't see this project going on for  
8 more than a year, year and a half of development. I  
9 just think that -- I can't vote in favor of it right  
10 now because of the density, and it's not because -- I  
11 think it fits in, I mean, that type of concept fits  
12 into that area perfectly. You're isolated basically.  
13 You're basically isolated from everyone. You have  
14 park land all around.

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

21 Just the grinding issue, if I think  
22 the sewer goes in, that becomes a non-issue if the  
23 sewer goes in. With that grinding station, there's no  
24 way a grinding station should smell. Something must  
25 be wrong with the station that's out there right now.

1 That was a concern, but the density is something I  
2 can't -- you know, I think at the last meeting we kind  
3 of alluded to the fact that 53 seemed like kind of a  
4 lot in that area, and then to go to 56, I just -- not  
5 that I don't think 50 homes would work, I just don't  
6 think -- I don't want to set precedent, and I hope you  
7 understand that I just don't want to set precedent for  
8 the rest of Novi.

9 So at this point in time I like the  
10 project, I think you'd do great with what you've got.  
11 There is nothing else -- I know there's nothing else  
12 out there, not only in Novi, Northville and Plymouth,  
13 I don't think there's anything like this in Michigan  
14 to be quite honest with you. I just think if you  
15 can -- I know it becomes a finance issue, you may have  
16 to raise the price point, but I think if you can get  
17 the density down to an acceptable level, I think  
18 you've got a winner here. I really do think it fits  
19 into that area, and the way you have it designed  
20 isolates a lot of the -- and I understand the concerns  
21 of the homeowners, they have the one-acre lots and  
22 they like the rural stuff, but this is going to be in  
23 it's own little pocket and surrounded by woodlands.  
24 And I do like the idea of not ripping down all the  
25 trees, I do like that idea. But at this point in time

1 I can't support it mainly because I think the density,  
2 it put us into a very bad situation moving forward.

3 CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you.

4 Member Greco.

5 MR. GRECO: All right. Thank you.

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

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

24 Now, what Mr. Guidobono has done  
25 which is a benefit to the individuals that are there,

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

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

24 MR. GUIDOBONO: Can I approach?

25 CHAIR PEHRSON: Sure, you can have

1 a minute.

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

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

22 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: If I could just  
23 add real quick to that. We really -- I personally  
24 would not want to see anything over 40 units, all  
25 right. So keep that in mind when you go through all

1 this and you come back again. Because I think the  
2 message is loud and clear from everyone here, and  
3 it's -- that's what we're looking for.

4 MR. GUIDOBONO: Yes, I understand.

5 CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you.

6 Member Greco.

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

16 MR. AVDOULOS: Second.

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

19 Any other comments?

20 Sri, can you call the roll.

21 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Zuchlewski?

22 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: No. I'm sorry,  
23 what was the motion?

24 CHAIR PEHRSON: Motion to deny.

25 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes. Sorry.

1 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Anthony?

2 MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

3 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?

4 MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

5 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

6 MR. GRECO: Yes.

7 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

8 MR. LYNCH: Yes.

9 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

10 CHAIR PEHRSON: Yes.

11 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes 6 to  
12 0.

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

17 Next is the Matters for  
18 Consideration. Introduction of Text Amendment 18.286,  
19 Restaurants in a B-1. And it's to set a public  
20 hearing for Text Amendment 18.286 to update Section  
21 3.1.10, B-1, Local Business District principal  
22 permitted use and for the purpose of allowing  
23 restaurants in the B-1, Local Business District,  
24 throughout the City of Novi.

25 MS. MCBETH: Mr. Chair, I have a

1 brief presentation on this, because we do hope to seek  
2 a little bit of input from the Planning Commission  
3 before this comes back. So I will just go through  
4 this.

5 Staff received an application for a  
6 proposed ordinance amendment for the purpose of  
7 allowing restaurants in the B-1, Local Business  
8 District, throughout the City of Novi. The applicant,  
9 Mr. Jonathan Brateman, who is here tonight with his  
10 daughter, is primarily interested in allowing sit-down  
11 restaurants in the Peachtree Plaza, which is located  
12 near the southwest corner of Ten Mile Road and  
13 Meadowbrook Road.

14 The B-1 District currently does not  
15 allow restaurants of any kind, but does allow various  
16 retail business and service uses that are intended to  
17 serve the day-to-day convenience shopping and service  
18 needs of the people residing in nearby residential  
19 areas.

20 As you can see on the map that was  
21 included in the packets, the B-1 Districts are located  
22 near the intersection of Ten Mile and Haggerty Road,  
23 Ten Mile and Meadowbrook Road, including the Peachtree  
24 Plaza, the Walgreens at Ten Mile Road and Novi Road,  
25 as well as some B-1 located on the west side of Wixom

1 Road south of Twelve Mile Road. These business  
2 districts are generally small in size, and are located  
3 very near, if not immediately abutting, residential  
4 areas.

5 In the memo attached to the packet,  
6 there is a short history of the Peachtree Plaza, which  
7 was approved and constructed in the mid 1980s. In  
8 1992 the Zoning Board of Appeals allowed a use  
9 variance for the Cottage Inn Pizza to locate in the  
10 plaza, but since the approval was specific to that  
11 use, once the restaurant moved out, that variance  
12 expired. In 1998 there was a request to rezone the  
13 plaza from B-1 to B-3, General Business, which was  
14 unsuccessful. In 1999 City Council considered an  
15 amendment to allow sit-down restaurants in the B-1  
16 District, which again was unsuccessful. In 2010 there  
17 was consideration to rezone the Peachtree Plaza to  
18 B-2, but that was not pursued. Additionally you may  
19 recall that the City had prepared a commercial  
20 rehabilitation plan for the four corners surrounding  
21 Ten Mile and Meadowbrook Road.

22 The applicant has presented an  
23 ordinance amendment to the B-1 District that includes  
24 restaurant businesses with sit-down and carry-out  
25 service to be allowed in the B-1 shopping center

1 provided the restaurants do not exceed 4800 square  
2 feet. Secondly, restaurant trash removal to be no  
3 closer than 100 feet from any residential area and not  
4 open longer than 12:00 a.m. in the evening. And,  
5 thirdly, the customers assembly area shall be  
6 sprinklered.

7 Staff's concerns regarding allowing  
8 restaurant uses in the B-1 District are noted in the  
9 review letter, including the comment that restaurant  
10 uses are already permitted in 16 zoning districts  
11 throughout the city.

12 In Novi, restaurants have not been  
13 permitted in the B-1 District since prior to 1990.  
14 Typical concerns have been increased traffic to the  
15 shopping center; odors from the foods cooking and from  
16 the waste in the dumpsters; and, noise, especially if  
17 there is outside dining or extended hours.

18 If the Planning Commission is  
19 inclined to support a text amendment as a means to  
20 accommodate restaurant uses in the Peachtree Plaza and  
21 other B-1 zoned properties throughout the city, staff  
22 and the City Attorney's Office will put together a  
23 text amendment that addresses this change prior to the  
24 public hearing. If this is the Commission's  
25 preference, staff would recommend the following:

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

The use would be considered a Special Land Use in the B-1 District, since most properties are immediately adjacent to residential districts and the required public hearing could inform the Planning Commission of nearby residents' concerns.

Secondly, limitation on the square footage allowed, and/or percentage of the tenant space occupied by the restaurants.

And, thirdly, limitation on the hours of operation.

At this point the Planning Commission is asked to provide any comments that you have so that we may prepare a text amendment for an upcoming public hearing.

Mr. Jonathan Brateman is here in the audience with his daughter this evening.

CHAIR PEHRSON: Very good.

Mr. Brateman, do you wish to address the Planning Commission, or your daughter?

MR. BRATEMAN: Yes. Thank you.

CHAIR PEHRSON: And what is your name, dear?

MR. BRATEMAN'S DAUGHTER: Raut (ph).

CHAIR PEHRSON: I'm sorry?

1 MR. BRATEMAN: Her name is Raut.

2 It means friendship.

3 CHAIR PEHRSON: How old?

4 MR. BRATEMAN: Raut is 9 1/2.

5 Sometimes she's 27, some days she's 4, but most times  
6 she's 9 1/2.

7 My name is Jonathan Brateman, and  
8 my address is 40015 Grand River Avenue, Suite 105 in  
9 Novi. I've been working as a commercial real estate  
10 broker since the fall of 1984, and specifically in  
11 Novi since 1985. I've brought hundreds of businesses  
12 to the area, and I'm very proud of my work. Our  
13 headquarters is here in Novi. I'm very proud of that.

14 I want to thank the Planning  
15 Department and Planning Commission for the opportunity  
16 to speak before you tonight. My purpose tonight is to  
17 amend the zoning ordinance regarding B-1 uses to  
18 include sit-down restaurants.

19 I want to present two visions to  
20 you. The first vision is one of hope and prosperity  
21 and light. By allowing sit-down restaurants in the  
22 B-1, you accomplish a number of goals. You bring  
23 economic sustenance to centers that need the energy  
24 these types of businesses provide. You give a chance,  
25 an opportunity to new business who can neither afford

1 or be sought out by power centers and position centers  
2 as a potential location. And you enhance the culture  
3 and hallmark of a local community who likes the  
4 national names, yet cherishes the unique,  
5 one-of-a-kind local spots.

6 Let me begin with the first. There  
7 is some shopping centers that are underperforming  
8 economically. The remedy is not just to do a lease  
9 with anyone with an idea, but the way to build up a  
10 center is through a combination of special rent  
11 incentives and by attracting quality individuals who  
12 have capital, aptitude, and creativity to make their  
13 dream happen. But the tenants that have capital,  
14 aptitude, and creativity also need traffic in the  
15 center and the appropriate zoning. At Peachtree, for  
16 example, we have 75 to 100 cars every day that visit  
17 Colby Learning Academy. I have three different  
18 Japanese restaurants, one from Los Angeles, one from  
19 Chicago, and one from here that see an opportunity to  
20 be successful with this Japanese speaking customer  
21 base, but I can't do that lease because of the  
22 restrictions in the B-1 ordinance. We need a zoning  
23 change to allow it.

24 Over time here in Novi when text  
25 amendment changes were made, businesses came in and

1 prospered and the whole community was enhanced. I did  
2 this successfully with the B-1 and the NCC on  
3 instructional centers. I'm asking for you to do this  
4 again with sit-down restaurants.

5 To my second point, some  
6 restaurants have a narrow market segment. Like the  
7 Japanese restaurant, they can compete, but not at the  
8 mass market level. They fill a need and should be  
9 allowed to fill that need. Restaurants in that  
10 category include vegetarian restaurants, ethnic  
11 restaurants, dietary restriction restaurants, high-end  
12 pastry and high-end coffee just to name a few.

13 Let me continue to the third point.  
14 The rent on places where Burgers 21 and Blaze Pizza,  
15 they are outside the realm for independent  
16 restauranteurs to be able to afford. By passing this  
17 ordinance, you give a chance to the local restaurant  
18 to make it. Each of you probably have five  
19 restaurants that you visit once a year at least. How  
20 many of them provide for a local person to showcase  
21 their skills. With shopping malls across America  
22 great accessibility to merchandise and restaurants  
23 came, but also a lack of local flavor. You close your  
24 eyes in a mall and open them, and you don't know if  
25 you're in Kansas City or Tallahassee or here in Novi.

1 We need our local places because these people who own  
2 these are usually the backbone of the Chamber of  
3 Commerce, sponsors of softball teams and youth  
4 organizations, in essence make a community unique and  
5 special.

6 Now, for the second vision. I just  
7 spoke about a vision of hope and prosperity and light.  
8 Now I'm going to speak about the opposite of those,  
9 underperforming and dark shopping centers, and people  
10 who have dreams but are priced out of the market to  
11 achieve those dreams. I'm afraid that if you don't  
12 pass this revision, the immediate situation will  
13 worsen, and this will lead to a situation that all of  
14 us want to avoid. For landlords that means vacancies.  
15 On the tenant side that means a dream backed by  
16 capital with no affordable place to go.

17 So I want you to choose hope and  
18 prosperity and light. Pass this text amendment and  
19 let us go forward in the light of a bright future.  
20 Thank you for your time.

21 CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you.

22 MR. BRATEMAN: I'm prepared to  
23 answer any questions you might have.

24 CHAIR PEHRSON: I'll turn it over  
25 to the Planning Commission for their consideration.

1 Ms. McBeth, if I might, when it was  
2 brought up by City Council and rejected, what was the  
3 primary rationale for not moving forward with it at  
4 that point in time?

5 MS. MCBETH: You meaning the  
6 rezoning request?

7 CHAIR PEHRSON: Yes.

8 MS. MCBETH: I would have to go  
9 back and research that a little bit more. I was just  
10 trying to do a quick review of the various activities  
11 that had happened at Peachtree Plaza to try to help it  
12 be successful through the years. I didn't check every  
13 reason why they may have decided not to pursue that.

14 CHAIR PEHRSON: So with everything  
15 that we -- whether it's a facade ordinance or whether  
16 it's off-street parking, or in this case B-3 or any  
17 kind of change, we're always trying to make the  
18 ordinances catch up to trends, what we didn't know was  
19 going to happen 20 years in the future, 10 years in  
20 the future, and when I looked at not only Peachtree  
21 but I looked at the Ten Mile and Beck where the CVS is  
22 there, there's always been a desire that I know of for  
23 people to have a small little coffee shop in that  
24 location. Then at that point in time when the  
25 dialysis center was there would have served well for

1 that community, for that group of people that need  
2 hope, that want hope to have that service offered to  
3 them but can't because of that particular B-3  
4 designation.

5 So my opinion is that I think this  
6 is one of those times where we're trying to have  
7 the -- in fact I would like to understand some of the  
8 history of why that was thought of in a negative light  
9 or why it didn't go forward just for edification, but  
10 I think this is one of those times where at least in  
11 my opinion this kind of amendment needs to catch up  
12 with the current trend. I never would have thought  
13 that we would have been talking about a Speedway gas  
14 station with a cafe as we talked about earlier. It  
15 seems incoherent to me that those two things can  
16 exist, but somebody has done some research, and I  
17 hope, knock on wood, that it will be successful. I  
18 didn't think I would be doing my grocery shopping at a  
19 CVS or a Walgreens either ten years ago, but I am.

20 So as we try to move forward, and I  
21 think it would make sense in my opinion to at least do  
22 the research, put together the amendment with again  
23 knowing that this body and City Council is going to  
24 have stipulations and have overarching conditions as  
25 to what can and what can't be done in these different

1 locations I think would make sense. My two cents.  
2 Anyone else?

3 Member Greco.

4 MR. GRECO: I have a comment. I  
5 think everything that Mark said makes sense, but also  
6 a question that I have is because this would be a  
7 rezoning of B-1, so it would affect throughout the  
8 city wherever B-1 is, not just this particular  
9 location which may need some help. With regard to our  
10 neighboring communities in B-1 districts, are sit-down  
11 restaurants allowed in B-1 districts?

12 MS. MCBETH: We can check that  
13 information as well.

14 MR. GRECO: Because we want to  
15 be -- first of all, we want to be Novi and do what we  
16 think is right, but we also want to see what everyone  
17 else is doing as well. Because I guess my concern is  
18 changing the B-1. I get it with this plaza, but then  
19 the effect is, well, what is the effect on everything  
20 else, because it affects the B-1, and is there a  
21 simpler problem for this which then ties into what's  
22 Mark statement of why wasn't this specifically fixed,  
23 you know, this area before.

24 MS. MCBETH: I would like to say as  
25 well, I think the Ten Mile and Beck is governed by a

1 consent judgment, and so it may not actually benefit  
2 from any changes to the ordinance that we would  
3 present today.

4 CHAIR PEHRSON: Good to know.  
5 Thank you.

6 Member Avdoulos.

7 MR. AVDOULOS: So a Jimmy John's, a  
8 Panera's, that's a sit-down restaurant that qualifies  
9 because you get food, it's prepared there, and you sit  
10 down and eat it?

11 MS. MCBETH: We have actually in  
12 the ordinance and included in the memo were the five  
13 different types of restaurants, sit-down restaurant,  
14 fast food sit-down restaurant, fast food carry out,  
15 fast food drive-thru, and then drive-in. So we have  
16 those five.

17 MR. AVDOULOS: I think some of the  
18 language that you've already started on like with your  
19 concern, you know, if it's a special land use type of  
20 thing in a B-1, at least there's a vehicle there to  
21 say, okay, it has to be presented and it has to be,  
22 you know, vetted similar to like we get with churches  
23 and other things in residential areas, it's allowed,  
24 and that might be the appropriate place for it, but we  
25 have a vehicle to do that.

1 I want to -- yes, we're changing  
2 how we're living nowadays, and I want to be able to  
3 help these businesses. The aspect of them being  
4 within a community and closer to a residential area I  
5 don't think is a big deal any more. I think nowadays  
6 with equipment and the way things are done with  
7 filters and things like that, it's not as bad. I, you  
8 know, I work in Northville, and, you know, the people  
9 that live around like the Garage Restaurant, it's --  
10 you have houses right behind there, and I think that's  
11 kind of cool, especially like in Europe where you have  
12 a lot of these neighborhood areas that you don't have  
13 to drive three miles to get to. You know, when my  
14 kids were younger, I'd wake up Saturday morning and  
15 they wanted bagels. Where I live, you know, by this  
16 Villa D'Este, I would have drive to Novi Road and  
17 Grand River, four miles to get bagels. And I could  
18 have had one if they had it at Ten Mile and Beck.

19 MR. GRECO: You must love your  
20 bagels.

21 MR. AVDOULOS: A little bit. But I  
22 think it's more of a convenience thing and the  
23 community. I know there's times when you look at  
24 projects, we look at how much traffic, you know, to  
25 get here and there, and you want to have commercial

1 and other developments in certain areas, but I think  
2 in certain spaces where we have buildings and we have  
3 businesses, if there is an opportunity to help and  
4 benefit not only the developer but also the city, that  
5 to me is a positive. So if we word it in such a way,  
6 I think that would be great.

7 MR. LYNCH: Don't your kids already  
8 drive?

9 MR. AVDOULOS: My kids aren't  
10 around any more.

11 CHAIR PEHRSON: Member Zuchlewski.

12 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Barb, when we're  
13 looking at this rezoning issue for this type of  
14 property, is it proper at the same time to look at the  
15 signage allowed or permitted. I mean, most of the  
16 times signage is allowed on a lineal foot basis or a  
17 square basis based on lineal frontage. So when you  
18 have these centers like this and they might have 100  
19 foot frontage and go back 6 or 800 feet and you've got  
20 10 to 12 tenants in there and you end up with a little  
21 monument sign, that really cramps and I think kills  
22 the businesses that are in there. You know, somebody  
23 owns half of it, and they get the top billing, and  
24 then the other tenants get some little tiny piece. So  
25 if there was some way to look at that. And I don't

1 know what we've done on our sign ordinance.

2 MS. McBETH: Actually just a couple  
3 of years ago, last year or a couple of years ago the  
4 City Council's ordinance review committee really took  
5 a really careful look at it and updated almost the  
6 entire ordinance.

7 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Was that included?  
8 Was that increased, though. Was there any help given?

9 MS. McBETH: I can't tell you in  
10 that specific situation. I can look at it when this  
11 comes back for public hearing if you would like some  
12 comments on it.

13 MR. GRECO: All right. I would  
14 like to make a motion to set for public hearing Text  
15 Amendment 18.286 to potentially add restaurants in the  
16 B-1 District.

17 MR. AVDOULOS: Second.

18 CHAIR PEHRSON: That was close.  
19 Motion by Member Greco, second by Member Avdoulos.

20 Any other comments?

21 Sri, please.

22 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Anthony?

23 MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

24 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?

25 MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

1 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

2 MR. GRECO: Yes.

3 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

4 MR. LYNCH: Yes.

5 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

6 CHAIR PEHRSON: Yes.

7 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Mr. Zuchlewski?

8 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

9 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes 6 to  
10 0.

11 CHAIR PEHRSON: There you go.

12 MR. BRATEMAN: Thank you so much.

13 I just wanted to recognize that Rabbi Suskin is here  
14 tonight, and if he can just have 45 seconds of your  
15 time, I would really appreciate it.

16 RABBI SUSKIN: I'm just here in  
17 support for this project. We've done some Jewish  
18 educational programs at the Peachtree Plaza. I live  
19 very close by on 42124 Loganberry Ridge right at  
20 Meadowbrook Glens subdivision. And it definitely  
21 would increase in terms of safety the fact that it  
22 would be occupied and wouldn't be as empty. And I  
23 know the people who go to the school nearby, they  
24 Japanese school are wonderful people, I've gotten to  
25 know them there. And If that's the crowd that they're

1 looking to attract, it's really reputable and good  
2 people, so I would like to support that. Thank you.

3 CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you.

4 Next Item Number 2 is the Hilton  
5 Tru Hotel, JSP17-54. It's a consideration at the  
6 request of Great Lakes Hospitality Group for Planning  
7 Commission's approval of Preliminary Site Plan and  
8 Storm Water Management Plan. The subject property is  
9 located on the south side of Thirteen Mile Road and  
10 East of M-5 in Section 12. The site measures  
11 approximately 3.58 acres. The applicant is proposing  
12 to construct a four-story 98 room hotel. The site  
13 layout proposes associated parking, loading and bike  
14 facilities. Site access is provided off of Thirteen  
15 Mile Road.

16 Sri.

17 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Thank you.

18 So tonight the applicant's  
19 representative, Candace Bacall, is here along with the  
20 Engineer Andy Wakeland, Architect Scott Bowers, and  
21 Project Manager Dennis Evans. I would like to thank  
22 them for sitting here patiently while we go through  
23 the whole agenda.

24 The property is located --

25 CHAIR PEHRSON: Somebody had to be

1 last. Sorry. But we saved the best, didn't we?

2 MS. KOMARAGIRI: If they were a  
3 public hearing, they would have gone first, but this  
4 is a matter for consideration. So I just wanted to  
5 thank them for their patience.

6 The property is located at the  
7 southeast corner of M-5 and Thirteen Mile Road in  
8 Section 12. It is currently zoned Office Service and  
9 Technology identified as the same on the Future Land  
10 Use Map. It is surrounded by same zoning on all sides  
11 east of M-5. It is zoned Residential Acreage and  
12 identified as single-family on the Future Land Use Map  
13 west of M-5.

14 The majority of the limits of  
15 disturbance area for the project consists of  
16 previously disturbed, filled land. An emergent and  
17 open water wetland area is located adjacent to the  
18 site on the eastern and southern sides. The site plan  
19 is not proposing any impacts to the wetland. A buffer  
20 authorization is required for minor impacts. There  
21 are no regulated woodlands on the property.

22 The overall project site area is  
23 noted as 3.58 acres with a developed area including  
24 right-of-way of 2.60 acres. The project includes the  
25 construction of a four-story hotel with 98 rooms,

1 access drive, and 104 parking spaces. Site stormwater  
2 will be managed within an on-site, underground  
3 stormwater detention system with an ultimate outfall  
4 to an upland area located on the southeast side of the  
5 proposed hotel.

6 The plans are in general  
7 conformance with the ordinance requirements with few  
8 deviations that are supported by staff. All reviews  
9 are recommending approval with additional comments to  
10 be addressed at the time of final site plan approval.  
11 Landscape has identified a couple of deviations for  
12 absence of required berm and street trees along M-5  
13 and Thirteen Mile right-of-way, reduction of parking  
14 lot perimeter trees, and the other one for proposing a  
15 retaining wall in lieu of a berm for a limited  
16 portion.

17 Traffic is recommending approval  
18 and noted that a Council variance may be required for  
19 absence of right-turn taper. The applicant agreed to  
20 propose the required right-turn taper at the site  
21 driveway at the time of final site plan and he's not  
22 seeking a variance at this time.

23 Facade was initially not  
24 recommending approval due to deviations sought,  
25 however, the applicant has provided revised elevations

1 to meet the intent of the facade ordinance. A Section  
2 9 Waiver is required for the overage of CMU and  
3 Laminated Plastic Panels.

4 As I mentioned, the applicant  
5 representative Candace Bacall is here with her team,  
6 and we're here as well if you have any questions. The  
7 Planning Commission is asked to approve the proposed  
8 preliminary site plan, Section 9 waiver, and  
9 stormwater management.

10 Thank you.

11 CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you, Sri.

12 Does the applicant wish to address  
13 the planning commission at this time?

14 MR. BOWERS: My name is Scott  
15 Bowers, Bowers & Associates Architects, 2400 South  
16 Huron Parkway, Ann Arbor, Michigan. We're excited  
17 about this hotel. It's a new Hilton brand, Tru. It's  
18 after a younger crowd. It has an expanded lobby  
19 space, smaller rooms, and the amenities are larger  
20 televisions and gaming areas and socialized areas. So  
21 it's really going after a younger crowd.

22 We've done a lot of work on the  
23 facade. Since it's a new brand, they've got a lot of  
24 things that typically in our area the cities don't  
25 care for, that was a large amount of EIFS, which we've

1 taken that down to mostly masonry with just a small  
2 amount of EIFS. And we've also -- we had an issue  
3 with their primary colors on their high density just  
4 accent panels you can see going up the windows in the  
5 larger portioned area. So we've muted those down to  
6 acceptable colors, but still in the same family that  
7 the brand would like.

8 If there is any other questions, I  
9 have Andy Wakeland, he's the civil engineer for the  
10 project.

11 MR. WAKELAND: If you have any  
12 questions on the site, I'm here.

13 CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you. We  
14 appreciate you spending the evening with us.

15 We'll turn it over to the planning  
16 commission for your consideration.

17 Member Zuchlewski.

18 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: I have a couple  
19 questions on the -- just on the whole hotel concept.  
20 I mean, younger crowds, small rooms, large gathering  
21 rooms. It sounds like a frat house. Do we have to up  
22 the police and fire department and let the liquor  
23 board what's going on here?

24 No. My questions really were there  
25 is two large berms, one along M-5 and one on Thirteen

1 Mile that are being eliminated. I just -- is that  
2 more of a marketing strategy so they can see hotel?  
3 This is four stories, right, it's high?

4 MR. WAKELAND: Correct.

5 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: It will have large  
6 signage on it. I was just wondering why the berms.

7 MR. WAKELAND: It is actually four  
8 stories, but we're actually cutting the site down by  
9 10 feet to balance the site.

10 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: So you have three  
11 stories still up.

12 MR. WAKELAND: Three stories that  
13 you'll ever see. But there is an existing berm along  
14 M-5. We're just kind of resculpting that. It will  
15 still be a berm along M-5. But along Thirteen Mile  
16 there is an existing swale that is in there, so we  
17 could fit the required berm, but we still required  
18 height and width that has to be there, but we're very  
19 close, within about a half a foot. So it will still  
20 have a berm, we just couldn't fit the full berm that  
21 was required.

22 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Thank you.

23 CHAIR PEHRSON: You hipster.

24 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Us old people, we  
25 want to keep it quiet.

1 MR. AVDOULOS: Thank you. I think  
2 the design is great. It's targeting, you know, the  
3 right audience. It's nice to be able to have this  
4 type of hotel in the city. It's really a great  
5 opportunity to also attract other type of businesses  
6 and stuff like that. And I travel all over the  
7 country for work, and I stay in these type of  
8 millennial type hotels that cater to people like  
9 Hannah Smith who need the game room and they watch  
10 Netflix instead of regular TV. But I think it's  
11 great. I like the location, and I think it's going to  
12 be something that is going to be something that's  
13 going to benefit and act as a bit of a genesis for  
14 some of these other newer type hotels. Everybody is  
15 rebranding themselves. So I stayed at a hotel last  
16 week in Chicago called the StayPineapple Hotel. I'm  
17 like I thought it was like, you know, just a fruit  
18 salad. But what they did is they sort of eliminate  
19 certain things, and then on each lobby they'll  
20 provide, you know, almost like a European-style little  
21 breakfast type of thing.

22 I also know in the Novi and  
23 Farmington area, with a lot of the work that we do,  
24 our consultants are looking for a lot of places to  
25 stay, and it's just shocking how booked things are

1 from let's say Ann Arbor Road and 275 all the way up  
2 into Novi and Farmington. It's just amazing. I think  
3 that's with the auto industry at a lot of those  
4 things. So I think this is great.

5 CHAIR PEHRSON: Member Greco.

6 MR. GRECO: All right. I'd like to  
7 make a motion. In the matter of Hilton Tru Hotel  
8 JSP17-54, motion to approve the preliminary site plan  
9 with a Section 9 waiver based on and subject to the  
10 following items listed in A through J on the motion  
11 sheet, and the findings of compliance with ordinance  
12 standards in the staff and consultant review letters,  
13 and the conditions and those items listed in those  
14 letters being addressed on the final site plan, and  
15 because the plan is otherwise in compliance with  
16 Article 3, Article 4, and Article 5 of the Zoning  
17 Ordinance and all other applicable provisions of the  
18 ordinance.

19 MR. LYNCH: Second.

20 CHAIR PEHRSON: Motion by Member  
21 Greco, second by Member Lynch.

22 Any other comments?

23 Sri, can you call the roll, please.

24 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Zuchlewski?

25 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

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

MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member 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.

MR. GRECO: I'd like to make  
another motion in the matter of Hilton Tru Hotel  
JSP17-54. Motion to approve the stormwater management  
plan based on and subject to the findings of  
compliance with ordinance standards in the staff and  
consultant review letters, and the conditions and  
items listed in those letters being addressed on the  
final site plan, and because the plan is otherwise in  
compliance with Chapter 11 of the Code of Ordinances  
and all applicable provisions of the ordinance.

MR. AVDOULOS: Second.

CHAIR PEHRSON: Motion by Member  
Greco, second by Member Lynch.

1 MR. AVDOULOS: I was quicker on  
2 that one.

3 CHAIR PEHRSON: You were. I was  
4 going to give it to Member Anthony just because.

5 Sri, can you call the roll, please.

6 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Chair Pehrson?

7 CHAIR PEHRSON: Yes.

8 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Zuchlewski?

9 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

10 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Anthony?

11 MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

12 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Avdoulos?

13 MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

14 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Greco?

15 MR. GRECO: Yes.

16 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Member Lynch?

17 MR. LYNCH: Yes.

18 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Motion passes 6 to  
19 0.

20 CHAIR PEHRSON: All set. Thank you  
21 gentlemen. I appreciate you staying around with us.

22 MR. WAKELAND: Thank you.

23 CHAIR PEHRSON: Any matters for  
24 discussion?

25 Supplemental issues?

1 Last chance for audience  
2 participation?

3 MR. MIGRIN: Karl Migrin,  
4 49450 West Nine Mile Road. I just want to say thank  
5 you to the Planning Commission and the staff for  
6 listening to the area residents and taking their  
7 concerns into consideration there.

8 I did -- on a general note I did  
9 notice some of the signage, like two of the parcels,  
10 the affected parcels were missing signs notifying the  
11 public of zoning, the upcoming zoning request there,  
12 but I think that's something maybe you can look at  
13 your signage part of your section, and maybe put  
14 wording in there if there's adjacent parcels that are  
15 affected, you only need to put one side for a bigger  
16 area rather than put one on each parcel there.

17 MS. KOMARAGIRI: The current  
18 ordinance requires one sign per street frontage.

19 MR. MIGRIN: That's on a corner  
20 lot, but I believe the way it's worded, it's one sign  
21 per each affected parcel. So there is five affected  
22 parcels. I only saw two signs. But like I say, if  
23 you could take a look at that.

24 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Thank you.

25 MR. MIGRIN: Thank you again. And

1 thank you for staff helping me with my Power Point.

2 CHAIR PEHRSON: Thank you, Karl.

3 Now if there would be a motion for  
4 adjournment.

5 MR. LYNCH: Wait. I've got one  
6 quick question. How does somebody go in and read the  
7 actual letters? How do they do that now? I know we  
8 read them, but how does somebody access them?

9 MS. MCBETH: You know, if somebody  
10 wanted to see what they included, we have them in our  
11 files, in our records. We're going to look into  
12 whether we should do something else to get them out  
13 there and put them more inclusively. If the matter  
14 was going to move on to Council, we'd somehow make  
15 sure that those comments were --

16 MR. LYNCH: Okay. Because I don't  
17 want to read all those things, and basically if nobody  
18 knows how to get them, you're going to force me to  
19 read them.

20 CHAIR PEHRSON: No, we don't want  
21 you to do that.

22 MR. LYNCH: Okay.

23 CHAIR PEHRSON: How about a motion  
24 to adjourn?

25 MR. LYNCH: Motion to adjourn.

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

MR. 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.)

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

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, Diane L. Szach, do hereby certify that I have recorded stenographically the proceedings had and testimony taken in the above-entitled matter at the time and place hereinbefore set forth, and I do further certify that the foregoing transcript, consisting of (143) pages, is a true and correct transcript of my said stenograph notes.

*Diane L. Szach*

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

December 14, 2017.