

REGULAR MEETING - PLANNING COMMISSION

CITY OF NOVI

July 26, 2017

Proceedings taken in the matter of the PLANNING COMMISSION, at City of Novi, 45175 West Ten Mile Road, Novi, Michigan, on Wednesday, July 26, 2017.

BOARD MEMBERS

Mark Pehrson, Chairperson

David Greco

Robert Giacometti

Tony Anthony

Ted Zuchlewski

John Avdoulos

Michael Lynch

ALSO PRESENT:

Barbara, McBeth, City Planner

Thomas Schultz, City Attorney

Kirsten Mellem, Planner

Sri Komaragiri, Landscape Architect

Theresa Bridges, Construction 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, July 26, 2017

7:00 p.m.

\*\* \*\* \*

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Call to order  
the July 26th, 2017 regular meeting of the Planning  
Commission.

Sri or Kirsten, can you call the  
roll, please.

MS. MELLEEM: Good evening.

Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Here.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Here.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Here.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Here.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Here.

MS. MELLEEM: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Here.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Here.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: With that, if

1 we could rise for the Pledge of Allegiance. Member  
2 Zuchlewski, if you can lead us, please.

3 (Pledge recited.)

4 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

5 I'll look for a motion to approve  
6 the agenda.

7 MR. AVDOULOS: Motion to approve.

8 MR. ANTHONY: Second.

9 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: There's a  
10 motion and a second. Any other comments?

11 All those in favor?

12 THE BOARD: Aye.

13 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Anyone  
14 opposed? We have an agenda.

15 We come to our first audience  
16 participation. If there's anyone in the audience that  
17 wishes to address the planning commission, please step  
18 forward at this time. There will be other times to  
19 participate.

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

22 I don't believe we have any  
23 correspondence.

24 Any committee reports?

25 City Planner report, Ms. McBeth.

1 MS. MCBETH: Thank you. Good  
2 evening. I have a couple of things to report from the  
3 July 10th City Council meeting, a couple of items the  
4 Planning Commission had also recently considered.

5 The City Council did approve the  
6 Special Land Use Permit and Preliminary City Plan for  
7 the drive-thru at the Novi Town Center. City Council  
8 also approved the two text amendments, one related to  
9 above-ground storage tanks in the OSD and I-1  
10 districts and in the outdoor display areas in  
11 connection with the general hospital use.

12 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

13 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.  
14 Appreciate it.

15 The first agenda item is the public  
16 hearing for the Master Plan for Land Use update, a  
17 public hearing for Planning Commission's adoption of  
18 the 2016 Master Plan for Land Use in order to fulfill  
19 the requirements of the Michigan Planning Enabling Act  
20 and provide a plan for the future development in the  
21 City of Novi.

22 MS. MCBETH: Thank you. Mr. Chair,  
23 I've got a few things to say. It's been a little  
24 while since we last talked about the plan, so I'll go  
25 over a little bit of that, the history of it.

1                   So the Master Plan review process  
2                   for the 2016 update began with the required written  
3                   notice to the neighboring jurisdictions and other  
4                   agencies. Following an initial meeting of the Master  
5                   Plan and Zoning Committee, the City's staff and  
6                   consultants provided opportunities for the public to  
7                   comment on the draft plans and documents through an  
8                   Open House that we held here at the City Hall, and  
9                   through a dedicated spot on the City's Webpage which  
10                  provided an easy link for everyone to access the  
11                  documents as they were drafted and reviewed by the  
12                  Master Plan and Zoning Committee.

13                  Additionally, a survey for  
14                  residents was provided on the City's Webpage which  
15                  sought the public's thoughts on the market and retail  
16                  availability in Novi. Following that was a business  
17                  survey on the City's Webpage to seek responses from  
18                  business owners regarding hiring trends, business  
19                  needs, and where the business markets are going from  
20                  our local business person's perspective. Results of  
21                  these opportunities for public comment were included  
22                  in the recommendations provided in the plan.

23                  One key element of the plan update  
24                  is the Grand River Corridor Study. The Corridor Plan  
25                  is intended to identify and incorporate community

1 character aspects, seeks to promote economic vitality,  
2 and helps to recognize opportunities for development  
3 and redevelopment throughout the study area. A key  
4 concept is to identify opportunities for mixed use  
5 development consistent with the areas planned for the  
6 Town Center and the Gateway East District.

7 Pedestrian-oriented and transit-oriented elements were  
8 reviewed taking into consideration the recommendations  
9 of the Town Center area plan. Over the last few  
10 months the City has undertaken initial steps to begin  
11 the creation of a Corridor Improvement Authority along  
12 Grand River with the expectations that the vision of  
13 that plan will be consistent with the recommendations  
14 of this Master Plan Update.

15 Another key element of the plan update are  
16 the redevelopment strategies. For this plan update,  
17 the City had focused on identifying and prioritizing  
18 sites, neighborhoods, and/or districts that may be  
19 positioned for redevelopment, infill development or  
20 adaptive reuse. Redevelopment properties that were  
21 selected for special consideration include the Anglin  
22 property at the northeast corner of Grand River and  
23 Town Center Drive, properties near Old Novi Road and  
24 Thirteen Mile Road, as well as the City West property.  
25 Over the last few months, staff has seen interest from

1 the development community in portions of all three of  
2 these areas for possible redevelopment, and we  
3 actually received one letter from Robertson Brothers  
4 indicating support of the concepts provided. That was  
5 included in your packet.

6           Once the Master Plan is adopted,  
7 the vision identified in each of the redevelopment  
8 areas will be fine-tuned and assessed in detail  
9 through the development of zoning ordinance text  
10 amendments. The Planning Commission will play an  
11 important part in developing these ordinance standards  
12 and will be asked to make recommendations to the City  
13 Council following the public hearings as each of these  
14 master plan recommendations are implemented through  
15 ordinance amendments.

16           I also wanted to mention that the Oakland  
17 County Coordinating Zoning Committee reviewed the  
18 draft copy of Novi's Master Plan Update. Oakland  
19 County Planner, Kristen Kapelanski, complimented the  
20 work that went into researching and writing the plan,  
21 and the numerous maps, photographs and charts that  
22 contribute to the readability of the plan. She  
23 highlighted the chapter that focused on the Grand  
24 River Corridor, noting that the plan presents a  
25 realistic vision of how a cohesive corridor can come

1 together to work for families, young adults and the  
2 active adult community. She further noted the  
3 introduction of the City West District concept that  
4 helps to address the needs for a vibrant and varied  
5 housing types in close proximity to and within walking  
6 distance of the commercial establishments.

7 Following the review, the Committee  
8 voted unanimously to endorse the County Planner's  
9 review of the Master Plan.

10 A public hearing was held by the  
11 Planning Commission to consider the Master Plan at the  
12 September 28, 2016 Planning Commission meeting for  
13 further discussion and possible adoption at that time.  
14 Following the public hearing, the Planning Commission  
15 made a motion to approve the Resolution to adopt the  
16 Master Plan for Land Use. Although approved by a  
17 motion of 4 to 1, the vote for approval did not meet  
18 the 2/3 threshold that is needed to adopt the plan.

19 Since there is a desire to have as  
20 many Planning Commission members participate as  
21 possible for the consideration of the plan, a poll was  
22 taken earlier this year to determine when a full  
23 quorum of members would be present. It was found that  
24 a full quorum of members would be present tonight, so  
25 thank you for coming out. The public hearing has been



1 scheduled for this evening.

2 Two minor additions are  
3 incorporated into the plan at this time: A map has  
4 been added that shows the Thoroughfare  
5 Classifications; and a map has been added that shows  
6 the Sidewalk and Pathway Plan.

7 There were also updates to the  
8 acknowledgement page, and those have been  
9 incorporated.

10 Staff and our consultants are here  
11 to answer any questions if you have any, and the  
12 suggested motion is included in your packet.

13 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

14 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you,  
15 Barb.

16 This is a public hearing. Is there  
17 anyone in the audience that wishes to address the  
18 Planning Commission on this matter?

19 There's no one.

20 I don't believe -- do we have any  
21 correspondence?

22 MR. GRECO: No correspondence.

23 MS. MCBETH: There was one that was  
24 included in the packet.

25 MR. GRECO: Oh, in the packet from

1           Robertson Homes.

2                                   CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON:   That's noted  
3           and in the record.

4                                   With that, we'll close the audience  
5           participation and at this point turn it over to the  
6           Planning Commission for their consideration.

7                                   Member Anthony?

8                                   MR. ANTHONY:   First of all, I  
9           wanted to thank you for the work that you've put in  
10          and all the effort that you've made to solicit public  
11          opinion and incorporate that.

12                                  I'm glad to see the interest in  
13          developing the Grand River Corridor and the formation  
14          of the Corridor Improvement Authority.  So I'm very  
15          pleased on both of those.

16                                  So, one, I wanted to voice my  
17          support, and I think it's timely that at the same time  
18          we're looking at approving the Master Plan, later on  
19          today we're also going to be looking at a request from  
20          Farmington Hills in approving their Corridor  
21          Improvement Authority, and I would like to at that  
22          point talk about making sure we don't miss an  
23          opportunity that since they're our neighboring  
24          community and we're both looking at renewing our  
25          master plans, that we don't lose an opportunity at

1 working together on the Grand River portion in  
2 Farmington Hills that affects flow of traffic on Ten  
3 Mile and Grand River in Novi. So but I do like the  
4 work that you've done.

5 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you,  
6 Member Anthony.

7 Anyone else?

8 MR. GIACOPETTI: I have some.

9 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Member  
10 Giacopetti.

11 MR. GIACOPETTI: Thank you. I'm  
12 going to follow up on Member Anthony's comment  
13 concerning the efforts of our neighbors in Farmington  
14 Hills. Has anyone explored or considered the  
15 opportunity to create one very, very large corridor  
16 authority as opposed to simply two that end at  
17 Haggerty Road? Because it just seems to be -- some of  
18 the challenge areas honestly are between where they're  
19 ending and we're kind of starting. I think that that  
20 area there should be considered for a target for  
21 redevelopment. So I can ask that if there is any  
22 consideration or if that's just crazy talk.

23 MS. MCBETH: No. Through the Chair  
24 again. So you may recall that Farmington and  
25 Farmington Hills got started a little bit earlier than

1 we did on their corridor plan. As part of our plan we  
2 thought we would just tackle a portion of the corridor  
3 at first, and then on further discussion with a lot of  
4 the stakeholders on the west part of the community and  
5 the Grand River Corridor, we decided to expand the  
6 study for the entire length. So I think at this point  
7 we're doing what we can and are kind of following  
8 behind what Farmington and Farmington Hills have done  
9 in their setting up, and I think they're currently in  
10 the process of that. And as I think we indicated in  
11 the memo, the City of Novi is currently working on  
12 setting up a Corridor Improvement Authority as well.

13 MR. GIACOPETTI: So I guess, and I  
14 do appreciate all the work that has been done and  
15 efforts to solicit community feedback on the Master  
16 Plan, but otherwise this plan hasn't changed much  
17 since we last reviewed it.

18 MS. MCBETH: It has not. The  
19 updates that I mentioned were the couple of maps that  
20 have been highlighted and some acknowledgements.

21 MR. GIACOPETTI: And I'm going  
22 to -- I think I'm leaning towards not recommending  
23 this plan only because I don't feel like it does  
24 enough to promote redevelopment, particularly along  
25 Grand River where you have the redevelopment, the City

1 West District is limited, and you have just so much  
2 industrial property, some of which is very blighted,  
3 and I don't feel that -- I don't feel that this map  
4 for future use goes far enough to encourage developers  
5 to redevelop this property, because you're -- we need  
6 to make the zoning so enticing that it's worth their  
7 while financially to replace an industrial site with  
8 high-rise condominiums or, you know, something that we  
9 would consider an improvement. That would be one  
10 direction.

11 The other direction would be to  
12 just abandon the Town Center concept, because it  
13 hasn't really panned out. There isn't enough  
14 population density near that core to really promote a  
15 downtown, and that would be the other direction that I  
16 can support, which would be to abandon that. To  
17 either do it all, or abandon it and focus our efforts  
18 otherwise. Like the Walled Lake, I really -- in the  
19 redevelopment plan, that district in Walled Lake that  
20 is identified for redevelopment I thought was a great  
21 idea. But this plan sort of is a little bit of both,  
22 and I don't particularly -- for my taste I don't  
23 particularly care for that, because I don't think that  
24 will work. I don't think that corridor will be  
25 redeveloped in a way that is appealing if there are so

1 much industrial property along that corridor. That's  
2 just traditionally what it had been, that's the legacy  
3 of Novi and Grand River. It was an attractive place  
4 for industrial sites.

5 So I would like to see the plan  
6 personally to go further and expand that City West to  
7 sort of a Grand River corridor zone that went all the  
8 way the entire stretch of the city, or I would like to  
9 abandon -- or if not, I would like to see the Town  
10 Center district just abandoned and kind of start over,  
11 because I don't think -- I don't think our strategies  
12 are working, and I think it may be because our zoning  
13 is not enticing enough for developers to want to  
14 redevelop, rather their removing open space. And, you  
15 know, we saw recently commercial properties being  
16 developed north of Twelve Mile, and I think really  
17 that's a factor of developers are trying to create a  
18 sense of place for their offices and for their  
19 corporate homes where they look out and they see green  
20 open space and, you know, well-manicured landscapes.  
21 And so they're not choosing sites along Grand River  
22 that are in need of redevelopment, and this plan in my  
23 opinion encourages that.

24 So I can't support it. It's not because  
25 it's not a fine product, and it provides -- it was

1 well done, it's just that I would like to see it go  
2 one way or the other, but not try and straddle both  
3 because I think that is not successful.

4 MS. MCBETH: Mr. Chair, I've got a  
5 couple of comments if you don't mind.

6 So there are a number of land use  
7 recommendations that are included in the plan that  
8 would transform some of the light industrial pieces,  
9 some of the vacant ones and some of the under-utilized  
10 ones, to either OST or another zoning district, and I  
11 think at some point those would be available and ready  
12 to go with an OST type of development or some other  
13 development that matches the plan.

14 The other thing that I think we're  
15 hopeful about, at least as staff people, is that the  
16 Corridor Improvement Authority will kind of bring the  
17 corridor together as a unified place within the city,  
18 and as it transitions from one side of the community  
19 to the other that the changes will come about and  
20 there will be consistency brought about by that as  
21 well.

22 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you,  
23 Barb.

24 Anyone else?

25 Member Greco.

1 MR. GRECO: Yes. I just have a few  
2 comments. I do -- I think that Member Giacometti's  
3 concern are valid, and I think they are valid concerns  
4 with respect to what we're trying to achieve generally  
5 and what we're seeing come in. That being said, with  
6 respect to this document being at the end stages, I  
7 think that, you know, some of the things that maybe  
8 Member Giacometti brings up, you know, and we do it  
9 again need to be looked at, you know, through the  
10 Corridor Authority that Ms. McBeth brought up, maybe  
11 it would be the time to again try and coalesce and get  
12 all of those things together.

13 So while I definitely respect  
14 Mr. Giacometti's points that he's making, and I think  
15 they are valid, with respect to this particular  
16 document and the work that was put in with this, with  
17 the items and the issues and the zoning that are  
18 there, I think, you know, it was a picture of what we  
19 wanted and what we were looking for at the time, and  
20 I, you know, I'm satisfied with the document as it  
21 exists right now as we kind of already approved.

22 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Member  
23 Avdoulos.

24 MR. AVDOULOS: Thank you. I hadn't  
25 seen the document in many years. I was on the



1 commission in the early 2000's and was fortunate  
2 enough to be on the Master Plan and Zoning Committee.  
3 So it's done quite a bit of work, and it looks like a  
4 great amount of information has gone into it a little  
5 bit differently than what or how it was presented  
6 before? I definitely -- I do agree with some of the  
7 comments that, you know, things could be looked at a  
8 little differently. This Master Plan with the  
9 Corridor Authority will help advance some of that  
10 discussion.

11 I've been a resident for 25 years,  
12 so I've seen a lot of what the Master Plan has done  
13 for the City in a positive way, in a surprising way.  
14 There are some areas that are very frustrating, and,  
15 you know, you just have to diligently keep working at  
16 it, but also provide opportunities for developers, you  
17 know, to come in. And so if in the course of a  
18 developer's review of where to land in the city, I'm  
19 sure that when it comes to the Planning Department and  
20 they begin looking at it and there is indeed a unique,  
21 you know, opportunity, maybe that can be brought  
22 forward and we can look at it. Sometimes it takes one  
23 or two developments to really spur something and catch  
24 on.

25 Grand River is, you know, a really

1 interesting road and a corridor in its history and how  
2 it's developed, and I had honestly my reservations  
3 when we were looking at having the expansion of the  
4 library and the park on the corner, and that's turned  
5 out to be a really nice area, almost like that's the  
6 central part of Novi. I'm not convinced that you can  
7 create a downtown like the Town Center. I think  
8 downtowns have to evolve and become organic. But I  
9 think, you know, that's another thing to study, you  
10 know, what can we do to help that out.

11 So I think as we progress, with  
12 each and every iteration of this, it does get better.  
13 And I do like the fact, too, that we're including  
14 things on sustainability and the environment. And  
15 then I would like to really hone in on that with the  
16 developments that come up. Because we had an instance  
17 a couple of months ago where the developer just paved  
18 the entire surface of their property, and that was in  
19 a way in my opinion a bit irresponsible. You know,  
20 30 percent of what we see of the built environment is  
21 basically parking. So this begins to address some of  
22 that, and that's helpful, too.

23 So I understand the concerns, but I  
24 think as we progress, we can maybe dial in and  
25 concentrate on those. And I think if we look at some

1 of these major areas where there are intersections  
2 interfacing between the two communities, that we'll  
3 then address an area that can spur both ways. So I  
4 think what has been presented, at least from my fresh  
5 eyes again, has been a nice improvement over time, so  
6 I'm for the package that's been presented to us.

7 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you,  
8 sir.

9 Member Greco.

10 MR. GRECO: At this time I'd like  
11 to make a motion, and I'd like to make the motion for  
12 the Planning Commission to adopt and approve the  
13 resolution adopting the City of Novi's 2016 Master  
14 Plan for Land Use as presented on Pages 9 and 10 of  
15 our packet as is.

16 MR. ANTHONY: Second.

17 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a  
18 motion by Member Greco, a second by Member Anthony.  
19 Any other discussion?

20 Kirsten, call roll, please.

21 MS. MELLEEM: Member Anthony?

22 MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

23 MS. MELLEEM: Member Avdoulos?

24 MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

25 MS. MELLEEM: Member Giacopetti?

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

MR. GIACOPETTI: No.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Motion passes 6 to 1.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

Next on the agenda is Matters for Consideration. Item Number 1, Bolingbroke Woodland Permit. Correspondence from Singh Development to request reconsideration of the conditions of the approval of the Woodland Permit for the Bolingbroke site plan.

Kirsten, good evening.

MS. MELLEEM: Good evening. A letter was received by planning staff from Singh Development regarding the Bolingbroke Woodland Permit that was approved subject to a number of conditions at the June 28th, 2017 Planning Commission meeting. The applicant would like the Planning Commission to reconsider the conditions that were a part of the

1 woodland permit approval. The conditions are as  
2 follows:

3 That the applicant should pay the  
4 537 proposed off-site replacements to the City of Novi  
5 tree fund should either of the following conditions  
6 occur:

7 1. No building permits are applied  
8 for and issued for the Ballantyne site by December  
9 2017, or

10 2. If the current owner of the  
11 Ballantyne site, Singh Development, sells the  
12 property.

13 The applicant's letter states that  
14 the slow down in the very high-end homes market has  
15 delayed construction of the Ballantyne site and would  
16 like the Planning Commission to consider an extension  
17 of the deadline to December 2022.

18 The City's woodland consultant does  
19 not support the extension based on the intent and  
20 stipulations of the Woodland Ordinance that states  
21 replacements:

22 - Should be on-site within the same  
23 woodland area

24 - Elsewhere on the subject  
25 property, or

1 - Credits paid into the Tree Fund.

2 Staff recommends that the  
3 additional five years the applicant is requesting is  
4 too long of a time frame to wait for the necessary  
5 replacement of the 745 regulated trees that were  
6 removed in 2005 from the Bolingbroke site, and that  
7 the time frame is not consistent with the intent of  
8 the ordinance. Staff advises a defined time frame for  
9 planting the replacements in order to uphold the  
10 intent of the Woodland Ordinance.

11 It is up to the Planning Commission  
12 if you wish to reconsider the motion that was made at  
13 the last Planning Commission meeting and if you wish  
14 to entertain an alternate time frame for the woodland  
15 replacement trees to be planted. If the Planning  
16 Commission wishes to reconsider, then staff recommends  
17 the deadline be November 1, 2018. We believe this is  
18 a reasonable time in order to give the applicant time  
19 to obtain building permits and to update the site  
20 plan.

21 A suggested motion is provided in  
22 the cover memo dated July 20th, 2017. If the Planning  
23 Commission has any questions regarding the applicant's  
24 letter or the staff memo, City staff and the  
25 applicant's engineer are here to answer any questions.

1 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you,  
2 Kirsten.

3 I'll turn it over to the Planning  
4 Commission for your consideration. Who would like to  
5 start?

6 Member Anthony.

7 MR. ANTHONY: Thank you. So  
8 with -- I guess I'll direct this to staff. So as we  
9 stated here, the original agreement in order to  
10 relocate the trees to another off-site location wasn't  
11 placed for 12 years.

12 MS. MELLEM: The original site plan  
13 was started in 2005 is when it was stamped, and 2007  
14 is when they actually took the trees down and started  
15 site work.

16 MR. ANTHONY: Okay. So 2005 is  
17 when they initially set out to begin the development.  
18 And then the developer allowed the or let the site  
19 plans expire, did I understand that correctly, which  
20 then made the agreement -- kind of ended the agreement  
21 on relocating the trees, which is why we're here  
22 asking to extend that agreement, do I understand that  
23 correctly?

24 MS. MELLEM: So the original site  
25 plan from 2005 we didn't have completion agreements or

1 the two-year time frame at the time when they started  
2 the agreement. So a completion agreement was put  
3 together after the recession to complete it, and that  
4 was not completed. The applicant came back when the  
5 site plan expired to reintroduce it in 2014, and then  
6 let it expire again.

7 MR. ANTHONY: Okay.

8 MR. SCHULTZ: Through the Chair,  
9 and Kirsten will correct me if I'm wrong, just to make  
10 sure, because there a couple different agreements that  
11 are relevant here. So the original concept of  
12 relocating trees from one Singh Development to another  
13 was from the Oberland Development to Ballantyne. So  
14 there was an agreement to that effect. That never  
15 happened because Oberland was essentially given over  
16 to Pulte which instead of planting the trees on  
17 Ballantyne paid into the Tree Fund.

18 MR. ANTHONY: Okay.

19 MR. SCHULTZ: So Bolingbroke is now  
20 coming back to you after a long hiatus, and they're  
21 just trying to essentially put the same concept into  
22 play with a different Singh Development to the same  
23 Ballantyne Singh Development. So the question for you  
24 was has this one been hanging out there long enough  
25 that you don't want to wait for Ballantyne to develop,



1 and I think the staff is saying it's been a long time  
2 that these trees were cleared, maybe we need to end  
3 it, but they have the recommendation that we would do  
4 a new agreement, essentially there would be a new  
5 approval to transfer if you agree to do that for  
6 Bolingbroke. They still have to come in and deal with  
7 the fact that Ballantyne now is not going to get, you  
8 know, the trees from Oberland. So they're probably  
9 going to have to come back on Ballantyne and go  
10 through that to amend the process, right? I mean --

11 MR. ANTHONY: So Ballantyne needs  
12 the trees for its development?

13 MS. McBETH: So, yes, Ballantyne is  
14 basically a farm field, and part of the nice aspects  
15 of that RUD was that Singh Development was proposing  
16 to do some off-site plantings there to kind of  
17 re-forest that part of town.

18 MR. ANTHONY: Okay. So now I see  
19 how the agreement was structured. Five years is a  
20 long time considering the amount of time that we've  
21 already gone through that, and we're -- I think we're  
22 well past the 2008/2009 drop. But from my view, and  
23 I'll let the rest of my fellow commissioners discuss  
24 this, I can support a short extension in order to get  
25 all of these development site plans back on track so

1 that these could be completed, but not -- I really  
2 couldn't support after all this time of going back and  
3 forth the full length your request asked for.

4 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you,  
5 Member Anthony.

6 Member Zuchlewski.

7 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: I agree with what  
8 you're saying. I mean, '22 is a long way out there,  
9 and if we can shorten that up and sweeten this or put  
10 some pressure on the developers so that something  
11 happens. It seems like nobody is willing to make a  
12 move here and they're waiting for the best times of  
13 history to build something. I think it's been long  
14 enough. That's my opinion.

15 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Anyone else?

16 Member Giacometti.

17 MR. GIACOPETTI: Some questions.  
18 What is the city's recourse when someone doesn't  
19 fulfill its commitment? I mean, is it a judgment, or  
20 do we have to go to court? Is there a fine?

21 MR. SCHULTZ: I guess no one is at  
22 the point of not fulfilling a commitment yet. I mean,  
23 theoretically Ballantyne if they ever start to develop  
24 that, they're going to have to get the trees from  
25 somewhere and plant 800 trees or whatever it is.

1 Bolingbroke, if you decide to let  
2 them -- you know, for a while you had a chance to  
3 plant them somewhere else, but if you don't, you're  
4 going to have to pay into the Tree Fund. That becomes  
5 an obligation of the property essentially. So if they  
6 ever want to develop it, they're going to have to do  
7 what they're obligated to do. So it's not a question  
8 of suing them or anything like that. It all falls  
9 into place eventually. Obviously we've been waiting  
10 on Bolingbroke since '07 when things went south, but  
11 eventually if they're going to do something on that  
12 property, they'll step up and do this.

13 MR. GIACOPETTI: I guess my concern  
14 or frustration as a resident comes from a different  
15 direction, which is this project is put off because of  
16 the demand for high-end housing. I mean, there is no  
17 shortage for demand for sort of medium level, you  
18 know, medium income housing options. So I guess my  
19 frustration or reluctance to agree to any extension is  
20 that, you know, they're sitting on property waiting  
21 for the market to come around for million dollar  
22 houses rather than, you know, it would be in the  
23 city's interest to have something attractive placed  
24 there sooner rather than later. So it's hard for me  
25 to approve an extension honestly. Just my thoughts.

1 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Member Lynch.

2 MR. LYNCH: Yes, you know, I share  
3 the frustration, but at the same time I think it's in  
4 the best interest of the city to develop the property.  
5 I don't agree with five years, I agree. I don't mind  
6 a slight extension if they're serious about  
7 development. I think it's in the best interest of the  
8 city to develop the property. And, you know, you're  
9 never going to have conditions perfect for whatever  
10 market, but I don't want to give up, but at the same  
11 time I agree with Member Anthony that we need to -- I  
12 guess we need to be I guess conscious of a win-win for  
13 both the city and the developer.

14 Like I said, I don't agree with the  
15 five year. A year or two extension, you know, I don't  
16 think is unreasonable. And then after two years I  
17 think, you know, if I plan on still being here, I  
18 would be willing to say, no, that's just enough. But  
19 I just think it's in the best interest of the city to  
20 develop the property, and I would like to do as much  
21 as we possibly can to get the process moving and act  
22 in a manner of good faith with the developer. But I  
23 do agree with Member Anthony, five years is way, way  
24 too long. So I'm willing to entertain proposals from  
25 my fellow commissioners of an extension of any period

1 less than five years.

2 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you,  
3 Member Lynch.

4 For my purpose I go along with  
5 staff's recommendation for 2018. I think that's far  
6 away enough. Five years is way too far out for me to  
7 approve or recommend anything like that.

8 MR. GIACOPETTI: If I may through  
9 the Chair. What was the justification for five years?  
10 I'm not sure I fully understand. That to me is  
11 tipping your hand that you're not planning on  
12 developing the site for five years.

13 MS. McBETH: That was included in  
14 the applicant's letter. I'm not sure if Mr. Norberg  
15 (ph) wants to address that any further, but that was  
16 the request that was inputted in the letter.

17 MR. NORBERG: I'm George Norberg  
18 with the engineer. Unfortunately Mike couldn't make  
19 it today. But the five years was I think as he stated  
20 in the letter is the market right now for that type of  
21 development, it's just not there. So the hope was --  
22 I mean this is -- the transplanting or putting the  
23 trees on this property and creating smaller woodlands,  
24 and they'll be placed in preservation, it's of course  
25 an enhancement to the Ballantyne development. So

1 holding off isn't -- I mean, it has to do with the  
2 Ballantyne property itself, but that is why, the  
3 market is just not there for this type of development.  
4 And a one-year time frame just doesn't seem enough to  
5 get from where we're at today to building permits.  
6 And maybe there is some other number, two years, three  
7 years, that might make more sense.

8 I do believe, though, that when  
9 Bolingbroke was done, I wish I had these numbers, I  
10 believe that the funds for the trees that were removed  
11 that had to be replaced, that those are in escrow at  
12 the City, and maybe there is a way to confirm that.  
13 Because most developments when they take trees down,  
14 at the precon, we have to have those monies set aside,  
15 and I believe they've been at the City for probably  
16 10, 12 years now. So it's not something that -- the  
17 obligation is there of course, but so is the money.  
18 So I just thought I bring that up.

19 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

20 Member Lynch.

21 MR. LYNCH: Just one question. You  
22 mentioned the guy named Mike.

23 MR. ANTHONY: Mike Kahm.

24 MR. LYNCH: Oh, from Singh?

25 MR. NORBERG: Yes, from Singh

1 Development.

2 MR. LYNCH: Because that was -- I  
3 do remember -- well, I do remember a meeting where  
4 this gentleman came in and stood in front of the  
5 Planning Commission, it was in the 2007/2008 time  
6 frame saying that the market is never, ever going to  
7 recover, and this had to do with the golf course  
8 property where they wanted commercial and stuff like  
9 that north of Ten Mile. And since that time we've had  
10 Maybury Estates, which is a high-end project, we've  
11 had the project over on Beck Road and Eight Mile,  
12 right, it's a high-end project, and I think there was  
13 one other one.

14 MR. AVDOULOS: Tuscany Estates.

15 MR. LYNCH: Tuscany Estates. So  
16 I'm -- I guess I'm a little more skeptical now that --  
17 I'll wait for the rest of my planning commissioners to  
18 voice their concern, but I'm little more skeptical now  
19 than I initially was before I understood who the  
20 gentleman was he was talking about.

21 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

22 Member Greco.

23 MR. GRECO: Just briefly. You  
24 know, I too, you know, am not interested in giving an  
25 extensive extension, but I will just, you know,

1 comment that we do have some plans and things that we  
2 did approve. There was an economic slow down and  
3 there are issues with regard to market. I'm not an  
4 expert in the real estate market for high-end homes or  
5 medium-end homes, but it is -- there are issues that  
6 are there. Why there are other high-end ones  
7 developing while this one isn't, the answer is I don't  
8 know. What I do know, though, is that when we have  
9 something in place or we have a site plan or we have  
10 plans that are there, it is a big mess to undo or deal  
11 with once it gets abandoned. It is a problem. It is  
12 a problem that is an issue not only for the residents  
13 around but for the City, the City staff, City Council  
14 dealing with agreements that are abandoned, properties  
15 that are abandoned, you know, obligations that are  
16 abandoned and people walk away. So I was glad to hear  
17 that at least money, we believe, or the funds are in  
18 escrow. So that at least helps me a little bit that  
19 we can hold someone's feet to the fire or deal with  
20 the issue that was promised to us.

21 So all of that being said, while  
22 I'm not in favor of an extensive extension, it has  
23 been long enough, I do not object to the staff's  
24 recommendation. I was thinking actually even a  
25 shorter time like a year from today or something that



1 provides maybe another six months, but I'm not opposed  
2 if it is the consensus of the commission to go with  
3 the staff's recommendation.

4 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Do we have a  
5 motion there?

6 MR. GRECO: Sure.

7 MR. SCHULTZ: And just a reminder.  
8 Two motions, one to reconsider, and then a vote on  
9 that, and then a separate motion to take whatever  
10 action you want.

11 MR. GRECO: First I would like to  
12 make a motion to reconsider. In the matter of  
13 Bolingbroke JSP17-34, motion to reconsider the motion  
14 that approved the woodland permit approved by the  
15 Planning Commission on June 28th, 2017 as requested by  
16 the applicant in the letter dated June 30th, 2017.

17 MR. ANTHONY: Second.

18 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a  
19 motion by Member Greco, second by Member Anthony.  
20 Any discussions?

21 Kirsten, please.

22 MS. MELLEEM: Member Avdoulos?

23 MR. AVDOULOS: No.

24 MS. MELLEEM: Member Giacopetti?

25 MR. GIACOPETTI: No.

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. MELLEEM: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Motion passes 5 to 2.

MR. GRECO: Next I would like to make another motion in the matter of Bolingbroke JSP17-34, motion to approve the Woodland Permit subject to the applicant being required to pay the 537 proposed off-site replacements to the City of Novi Tree Fund should either of the following conditions occur:

That no building permits are applied for and issued for the Ballantyne site by November 1, 2018, a one-year extension.

Or, if the current owner of the Ballantyne site, Singh Development, sells the property.

This motion is made to allow the

1 applicant sufficient time to obtain the required  
2 permits, update the Ballantyne site plans with respect  
3 to the Bolingbroke replacement trees, and request the  
4 site plan extension on the project due to expire in  
5 December 2017. This motion is subject to the findings  
6 of compliance with the ordinance standards and the  
7 staffing consultant review letters and all of the  
8 other conditions and items listed in those letters  
9 being addressed on the electronic stamping set.

10 This motion is made because the  
11 plan is otherwise in compliance with Chapter 37 of the  
12 Code of Ordinances and all other applicable provisions  
13 of the ordinance.

14 MR. ANTHONY: Second.

15 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a  
16 motion by Member Greco, second by Member Anthony.  
17 Any other discussions?

18 Kirsten, please.

19 MS. MELLEEM: Member Giacobetti?

20 MR. GIACOPETTI: No.

21 MS. MELLEEM: Member Lynch?

22 MR. LYNCH: Yes.

23 MS. MELLEEM: Chair Pehrson?

24 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

25 MS. MELLEEM: Member Zuchlewski?

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. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.  
MS. MELLEEM: Member Avdoulos?  
MR. AVDOULOS: No.  
MS. MELLEEM: Member Anthony?  
MR. ANTHONY: Yes.  
MS. MELLEEM: Member Greco?  
MR. GRECO: Yes.  
MS. MELLEEM: Motion passes 5 to 2.  
CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you

very much.

Next on the agenda is the Farmington Corridor Improvement Authority comments. It's a comment on the Farmington/Farmington Hills Grand River Corridor Improvement Authority (CIA) Grand River Corridor Vision Plan as a sub plan to the City's master plan as required by the State of Michigan Municipal Planning Enabling Act (Act 33 of 2008, as amended).

MR. ANTHONY: Chairman Pehrson, I'll have to recuse myself from the vote because I'm on the Corridor Improvement Authority for Farmington, but after staff does its presentations, I'd just like to make a couple comments if that's permitted before the vote.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Do we have a

1 motion to recuse?

2 MR. GRECO: Motion to accept Member  
3 Anthony's, or do I --

4 MR. SCHULTZ: We were discussing  
5 whether or not there's going to be an actual vote, and  
6 I think in your packet it says --

7 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Motion to  
8 approve.

9 MR. GRECO: So I can make a motion  
10 to accept the recusal, the request for recusal by  
11 Member Anthony.

12 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Second.

13 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Second by  
14 Member Zuchlewski.

15 All those in favor?

16 THE BOARD: Aye.

17 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Anyone  
18 opposed?

19 Thank you, sir. Appreciate it.  
20 Sri?

21 MS. KOMARAGIRI: Thank you. The  
22 City of Farmington has originally adopted the Grand  
23 River Vision Plan in 2013. Now they intend to adopt  
24 it as a sub plan to their Master Plan. They have  
25 asked us to comment on their plan as required by the

1 State of Michigan Municipal Planning Enabling Act.

2 As you're aware, as part of our  
3 2016 Master Plan update which we discussed earlier  
4 tonight, Novi planning staff and consultants studied  
5 Grand River Corridor from Haggerty Road to Wixom Road.  
6 Haggerty Road acts as a line of separation between  
7 Farmington Hills and Novi. The project study area for  
8 the Farmington Hills Grand River Corridor stops at the  
9 intersection of Mayfield Street and Grand River Avenue  
10 in Farmington. There is an approximate 3.5 mile  
11 stretch along Grand River Avenue in Farmington Hills  
12 which is not included in their project study area.

13 Farmington Hills is preceding us  
14 in our efforts to improve Grand River Corridor. Novi  
15 planning staff believes that the proposed vision plan  
16 will complement Novi's own vision plan in the future  
17 and will likely to have a positive impact on the City  
18 of Novi. It does not conflict with our recommended  
19 goals or negatively impact the City of Novi's  
20 infrastructure. The joint CIA performed an extensive  
21 outreach to gather public input at the Farmington  
22 Hills. Novi staff supports their efforts. Some of  
23 the notable recommendations from their vision plan are  
24 included in the memo.

25 It is the planning staff's

1 recommendation that the Planning Commission authorize  
2 the Planning Commission Chair to send a letter to the  
3 City of Farmington Hills Planning Commission  
4 complimenting them on their proposed adoption of the  
5 Grand River Corridor Vision Plan and state that their  
6 proposed plan supports the City of Novi's Master Plan  
7 for Land Use.

8 Thank you.

9 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you,  
10 Sri.

11 With that, turn it over to the  
12 Planning Commission for their consideration. Who  
13 would like to start?

14 MR. ANTHONY: Am I allowed to make  
15 comments?

16 MR. SCHULTZ: If the Chair allows.

17 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Well, all  
18 right.

19 MR. ANTHONY: So that both the  
20 Farmington Hills and Farmington Corridor Improvement  
21 Authority have done a really, really nice job.  
22 They've looked at things along really improving Grand  
23 River. And you can tell that was very blighted if you  
24 drive through there, and their plans incorporate the  
25 same concepts as our staff's does, making it walkable.

1                   They also are looking at issues  
2                   such as traffic calming, and they've done a successful  
3                   job of negotiating with MDOT who happens to have  
4                   control of Grand River in that area. So that's  
5                   another government entity that is very cooperative in  
6                   achieving their goals for their municipality.

7                   The zone from the bridge that  
8                   crosses M5 to Haggerty Road is not included in  
9                   Farmington Hills Corridor Improvement Authority, so  
10                  there is a gap. Now, what both Farmington Hills and  
11                  Farmington have done is met with MDOT over the bridge  
12                  that goes over M5 to discuss that congestion that  
13                  occurs there. MDOT has provided them four or five  
14                  different renderings of concept to improve that.

15                  Now here in Novi the reason why  
16                  that is important is because we have Ten Mile Road  
17                  which is a corridor that gets a lot of traffic that  
18                  cuts right through a cluster of residential  
19                  neighborhoods that the Ten Mile Meadowbrook  
20                  intersection is their gathering spot, and that where  
21                  the Ten Mile Road and Grand River Road split, at some  
22                  point it was modified to where it makes the natural  
23                  flow go to Ten Mile as opposed to Grand River.

24                  Because this is in Farmington  
25                  Hills, I would recommend our staff reach out to



1 Farmington Hills or Farmington staff to talk about the  
2 MDOT proposals for the bridge and try to include that  
3 junction so that we can do -- modify the  
4 infrastructure in such a way that we encourage traffic  
5 to Grand River, hopefully work with whatever  
6 government agency controls it to widen it, and then to  
7 discourage or calm traffic that moves through our  
8 neighborhoods on Ten Mile.

9 So that's my one comment. And when  
10 I work on the other side, because my office is  
11 building is on the other side, I do keep an eye out  
12 over that because I also have an interest, and I  
13 wanted you to be aware of the progress they've made.

14 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you,  
15 Member Anthony. We appreciate that.

16 Anyone else?

17 MR. GIACOPETTI: I have a question.  
18 I don't know if anyone felt -- through the Chair, if  
19 anyone felt that this letter could be even more  
20 enthusiastic in terms of reaching out to form or --  
21 reaching out to form some sort of partnership because  
22 of this gap, if there are ways to partner or to create  
23 some more formal synergy between our efforts and their  
24 efforts. So I not only support this letter, but am  
25 wondering if anyone else feels that it could even say

1 some more.

2 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Okay. Anyone  
3 else?

4 Member Avdoulos.

5 MR. AVDOULOS: I was thinking along  
6 the same lines, having both cities work together and  
7 maybe the committees from the planning commissions of  
8 each city maybe getting together for, you know, a  
9 little work shop just to -- instead of having one  
10 group have ideas and then pass it back and forth, and  
11 sometimes, you know, even at work when you get e-mails  
12 and you're starting to play ping pong, you just pick  
13 up the phone and call so you hear it right away. So I  
14 think that would be good.

15 The nice thing is is that  
16 Farmington's interest in the Grand River Corridor is  
17 actually, you know, it's very natural, because that's  
18 where their downtown nucleus is, and so they want to  
19 extend it. And, again, it's one of those things where  
20 you're driving down Grand River and it's great through  
21 Farmington, it's not bad as you come out, and then you  
22 get to that, you know, dreaded Halsted area, and then  
23 you go past that and it's a mess until it splits. And  
24 so, yes, there has to be some concentration. And I  
25 think because this road is not only important to our

1 communities, but important regionally, and it's a big  
2 animal, I think it would be opportunistic if we can do  
3 something like that. But I'm in support of this. So  
4 thank you.

5 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Member  
6 Zuchlewski.

7 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: My only thought is  
8 that with the two cities combining their efforts, and  
9 I know there is dichotomy of scale, there is a lot of  
10 good things that can come out of this, dichotomy of  
11 engineering, what have you, but do we lose something  
12 in the tradeoff. I mean, do we lose the voice? Are  
13 we now 50 percent of what we would have been having  
14 authority to go ahead on our way? You know, when you  
15 form a partnership like that, is there any loss?  
16 That's my only comment. And if it's -- maybe it's not  
17 even a real worry.

18 MR. ANTHONY: I can share the  
19 experience.

20 So Farmington -- each city's  
21 Corridor Improvement Authority meets separately and  
22 they develop their own plans, and then they have joint  
23 meetings so that they can create contiguous flow so  
24 it's not abrupt between the communities.

25 One of the benefits is that they

1 have the same engineer, who we happen to be using for  
2 our Corridor Improvement Authority, and they have the  
3 same legal counsel that we happen to also have. So it  
4 would -- since the outside services are consistent,  
5 and that each city spends their own time developing  
6 their plan and then come together to make sure the  
7 transitions are together, like perhaps at some point  
8 there may be a rapid bus transit line that goes down  
9 Grand River, so they can work jointly on that, they  
10 make sure that they have connections. They can do  
11 that between the nonmotorized work plans. But the  
12 cities do retain their independence, and they cost  
13 share on when the same consultant is working on  
14 perhaps similar visions or doing survey studies.

15 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: So you  
16 mentioned the cost sharing. So here is what maybe a  
17 recommendation might be. I think we move forward with  
18 the letter as is with the notes that we have, because  
19 I think we have to now suggest that the City has to go  
20 back and formulate a strategy as to, A, how to do it,  
21 and how they're going to get Sri to pay for it.

22 So maybe with those notes we can  
23 ask the planning staff to kind of move the ball  
24 forward, because those are all great ideas, and I  
25 think it makes perfect sense so long as there is a

1 financial ability for us to pursue that going forward.

2 Member Lynch.

3 MR. LYNCH: Just one comment from  
4 engineering experiences. I don't think the customer  
5 or taxpayers really care who is paying for what as  
6 long as it looks like it's supposed to be there. So  
7 Commissioner Avdoulos' I think comments are critical.  
8 If somehow we can get everybody working together,  
9 because people don't really care if they're in  
10 Farmington Hills or Novi driving down there, they  
11 just -- they don't want the mess that they see right  
12 now. You don't want to see two distinct, you want it  
13 to be contiguous. And anything that we can do on the  
14 Novi side to make sure that our customer, it's  
15 seamless to them, I think we should do it. If it  
16 means improving the letter or reaching out to them or  
17 whatever you need to do to make sure that everybody is  
18 on the phone talking to each other instead of sending  
19 e-mails and posturing themselves Farmington versus  
20 Novi or, you know, I think it would be in everybody's  
21 best interest.

22 MR. GIACOPETTI: I'm sorry, are you  
23 ready to make a motion?

24 MR. GRECO: No. I was going to  
25 comment.

1 MR. GIACOPETTI: Sure.

2 MR. GRECO: You know, if I think  
3 from Member Giacometti's original comments, it wasn't  
4 actually enter into a partnership, but just to enhance  
5 the letter to explore the possibility of potentially  
6 entering a partnership. We can take this letter and  
7 add something -- you know, just add a sentence that  
8 says, you know, the City of Novi has created it's own  
9 Grand River Corridor study group, you know, we extend  
10 an invitation or invite you to reach out to us or  
11 we'll reach out to you to explore potentially meeting  
12 to discuss whether or not there is a possibility of  
13 coordinating some of our efforts, something like that.  
14 You know, because that's -- without agreeing to  
15 anything, it's just adds another sentence or two that  
16 says, you know, we are interested in potentially  
17 meeting to explore the coordination of efforts if it  
18 makes sense.

19 MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes, that's  
20 exactly what I had in mind, something like that.  
21 You've crystalized my thoughts.

22 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Barb, is that  
23 something that you can amend?

24 MS. McBETH: We can definitely add  
25 something like that to the letter.

1 MR. GIACOPETTI: While we're on the  
2 topic, just a quick question for counsel I guess, or  
3 Member Anthony. These authorities, they're funded by  
4 the -- not by the taxpayers, but by the businesses  
5 along the corridor, correct?

6 MR. SCHULTZ: So most likely.

7 MR. ANTHONY: It's actually both.  
8 So the municipality does put in some funds, but the  
9 Corridor Improvement Authority does allow the  
10 authority the ability to collect some tax revenue,  
11 incremental increase in taxes that they can then use  
12 in the future. Those do not mingle from city to city.  
13 Farmington has their own pot, Farmington Hills has  
14 their own pot, Novi would have their own pot.

15 MR. GIACOPETTI: But a pot of  
16 the -- a pot of the TIF is it, that could be  
17 co-mingled?

18 MR. SCHULTZ: No. So I guess just  
19 to jump on those comments, that even though they have  
20 a joint plan, they have their own separate boards.  
21 There's a joint board, too, but they have separate  
22 boards. They have separate agreements with Oakland  
23 County as to what kind of tax monies they can capture,  
24 because that's where most of it comes from. So with  
25 the increase in value over time in tax revenues,

1 that's what is going to fund to some degree or another  
2 depending on your agreements with your local taxing  
3 communities and your own community, that's going to  
4 fund it. There was a little bit of seed money, more  
5 obviously from Farmington Hills to their group, and,  
6 you know, a smaller amount from Farmington because  
7 they have a smaller piece of the, you know, the  
8 overall area. So that kind of gets everything  
9 started, but the cities can contribute as much as they  
10 want to keep this thing going, but the idea is it's  
11 funded through taxes, through tax captured  
12 essentially.

13 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

14 MR. GRECO: So with that I'd like  
15 to make a motion to approve our Chairperson Pehrson to  
16 execute and sign the letter that's been presented to  
17 us approving or not objecting to the Farmington Hills  
18 Grand River Corridor Vision Plan, and also add a  
19 sentence or two indicating that the City of Novi has  
20 also, I'm not sure what exactly we've done so far, but  
21 created a group or a plan for our Grand River  
22 corridor, and to invite the Farmington Hills  
23 authorities to meet with our city's group to explore  
24 the possibility of coordinating efforts, language to  
25 that effect.



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. LYNCH: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: There's a motion by Member Greco, second by Member Lynch. Thank you.

Any other comments?

Call the roll, please.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Giacometti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Abstain.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: And Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes. Motion passes 6 to 0.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Excellent commentary, gentlemen. Thank you, appreciate it.

Next on the agenda is the election of the officers and appointments to committees.

1 MS. MCBETH: Thank you. Good  
2 evening. It's that time of year again. After  
3 July 1st when the Mayor and City Council have  
4 appointed members to various boards and commissions,  
5 we've noted in an e-mail at least that Member Anthony  
6 has been reappointed for another three years and we'd  
7 like congratulate him on that.

8 But typically the first meeting  
9 following that reappointment, the planning commission  
10 decides on officers for the next year, as well as  
11 committee assignments for the next year. And we had  
12 sent out the annual chart that indicates who has been  
13 serving on the various committees, who has been the  
14 chairperson, vice chairperson and secretary from last  
15 year as well as who has served on each of the  
16 committees last year and request to know who would be  
17 serving on those committees in the next year.

18 I think Member Zuchlewski was  
19 the only person who has responded, so we've included  
20 those in the chart in front of us.

21 MR. GRECO: I'm glad you said that,  
22 because I was like, oh, man, I didn't respond.

23 MS. MCBETH: So typically I believe  
24 the chair, the vice chair and secretary are selected  
25 first, and then the committee members are selected.

1 MR. ANTHONY: I think we have a  
2 very good chairperson that we should keep, so I would  
3 nominate our Chairman Pehrson to remain our  
4 chairperson.

5 MR. GIACOPETTI: I'd like to make a  
6 second.

7 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: A motion and  
8 a second. Any other discussion?

9 Do we want to voice vote?

10 MS. MCBETH: I think a voice vote  
11 is fine.

12 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: All those in  
13 favor?

14 THE BOARD: Aye.

15 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: I guess I  
16 can't vote.

17 MR. GRECO: Do you accept?

18 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: I accept.

19 MR. ANTHONY: And I would make the  
20 same motion for our vice chair, that we keep  
21 Commissioner Greco as our vice chair.

22 MR. AVDOULOS: Second.

23 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a  
24 motion and a second.

25 All those in favor?

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 BOARD: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Anyone

opposed?

MR. ANTHONY: And the third motion to keep Commissioner Lynch as our secretary.

MR. AVDOULOS: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a motion and a second.

All those in favor?

THE BOARD: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you very much, appreciate that. Thank you, Member Anthony.

As to the commission committees, anyone have any --

MR. LYNCH: I wouldn't mind staying on the CIP. I hit a little bump in the road this January so I didn't make it.

MR. ANTHONY: Right now I'm only on one. So if there is one that is in need.

MR. GIACOPETTI: Which one would you like to be on?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: CIP, or do you need --

MR. ANTHONY: CIP is good. I like

1 that.

2 MS. MCBETH: I believe that Member  
3 Zuchlewski had responded first and requested a regular  
4 position on that and not an alternate.

5 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Okay. I  
6 didn't mean to take that away from you.

7 MS. MCBETH: Just to let you know.

8 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Do you want  
9 Master Plan and Zoning? I can give you that.

10 MR. ANTHONY: Okay. I'll take  
11 that.

12 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Cup of coffee  
13 and we'll make the switch.

14 MR. AVDOULOS: I don't mind staying  
15 on the ones that I've been targeted with.

16 MR. GRECO: I don't have any  
17 objection staying with the ones that I'm targeted with  
18 either. I mean, I suppose does anybody have any  
19 requests on any committees they want to be on?

20 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: That at least  
21 puts everybody on two, and some overachievers on  
22 three.

23 MR. GIACOPETTI: That's me. I  
24 can --

25 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: No, no.

1 MR. GIACOPETTI: I can give one of  
2 my seats to --

3 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Is everybody  
4 fine? Is everybody okay with what that is? Does  
5 anyone have any special requests?

6 MR. ANTHONY: I'm good staying on  
7 implementation.

8 MR. GIACOPETTI: I would like to be  
9 on the rules committee.

10 MR. ZUCHEWSKI: Rules are as good  
11 as mine.

12 MR. GIACOPETTI: I can -- Chair  
13 Pehrson, if you would like to remain on the CIP, I  
14 could go to two or -- you're on three now.

15 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: I just gave  
16 up Master Plan, so I'm only on two. I shared. Mom  
17 taught me that, so I shared.

18 MR. GIACOPETTI: We need three for  
19 the Walkable. Would you like to be Walkable Novi?

20 MR. ANTHONY: What would I give up?  
21 Implementation?

22 MR. GIACOPETTI: I thought you  
23 wanted to be an overachiever. I'm good with the  
24 current assignments.

25 MR. ANTHONY: Yeah, I'm fine.

1 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Good. We're  
2 done. Do we need a vote?

3 MS. MCBETH: No.

4 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: An oath in  
5 blood?

6 MS. MCBETH: I will put this in an  
7 e-mail. If I get anything incorrect, please let me  
8 know.

9 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Item Number 4  
10 is the approval of the May 10, 2017 Planning  
11 Commission Minutes. Any modifications, changes?

12 Motion to approve?

13 MR. AVDOULOS: Motion to approve.

14 MR. ANTHONY: And second.

15 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Motion by  
16 Member Avdoulos, second by Member Anthony. Any other  
17 comments?

18 All those in favor?

19 THE BOARD: Aye.

20 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Anyone  
21 opposed?

22 Approval of the May 24th, 2017  
23 Planning Commission minutes.

24 MR. AVDOULOS: Motion to approve.

25 MR. ANTHONY: And second.

1 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Motion by  
2 Member Avdoulos, second by Member Anthony. Any other  
3 comments?

4 All those in favor?

5 THE BOARD: Aye.

6 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Any opposed.

7 Thank you. Any other matter for  
8 discussions? Supplemental issues?

9 MS. MCBETH: Mr. Chair, I have  
10 supplemental issues. The technology in this room is  
11 going to be upgraded I have heard in the next month.

12 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Holographic?

13 MS. MCBETH: In the next month or  
14 so.

15 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Virtual  
16 reality?

17 MS. MCBETH: I think it's going to  
18 be a nice surprise for everybody, maybe a little bit  
19 more room to work on the table, so that will be nice.  
20 So I just wanted to alert you to that, this may be the  
21 last time you see the monitors in front of you.

22 Secondly, and maybe more  
23 importantly, our IT department is going to be updating  
24 everybody's access through the iPads. So they have  
25 asked for everybody to call to make an appointment to



1           come in and visit with the IT department to get that  
2           upgrade sometime between now and the next meeting,  
3           which is two weeks from now. If you can't make it  
4           during regular business hours, they have said just let  
5           them know some other time that would work for you and  
6           they will accommodate that.

7                           CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Okay.

8                           MS. MCBETH: Thank you.

9                           CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.  
10          Appreciate it.

11                           That brings us to our last audience  
12          participation. She's back. I don't believe our  
13          audience participant wants to participate, so we'll  
14          close the last audience participation and look for a  
15          motion to adjourn.

16                           MR. LYNCH: Motion to adjourn.

17                           MR. ANTHONY: Second.

18                           CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Motion to  
19          adjourn, there's a second. All those in favor?

20                           THE BOARD: Aye.

21                           CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Anyone  
22          opposed?

23                           Thank you gentlemen, ladies. We're  
24          adjourned.

25                           (The meeting was adjourned at 8:06 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 (58) 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

August 11, 2017.