



**PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES**  
CITY OF NOVI  
Regular Meeting  
**September 14, 2022 7:00 PM**  
Council Chambers | Novi Civic Center  
45175 W. Ten Mile (248) 347-0475

**CALL TO ORDER**

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

**ROLL CALL**

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

Absent – Excused: Member Verma

Staff: Barbara McBeth, City Planner; Beth Saarela, City Attorney; Lindsay Bell, Senior Planner; Rick Meader, Landscape Architect; Humna Anjum, Plan Review Engineer; James Hill, Planner

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

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

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Motion made by Member Lynch and seconded by Member Avdoulos.

**VOICE VOTE TO APPROVE THE SEPTEMBER 14, 2022 PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA MOVED BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER AVDOULOS.**

**Motion to approve the September 14, 2022 Planning Commission Agenda. Motion carried 6-0.**

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION**

Chair Pehrson invited members of the audience who wished to address the Planning Commission during the first audience participation to come forward. Seeing that nobody wished to participate, Chair Pehrson closed the first public participation.

**CORRESPONDENCE**

There was not any correspondence.

**COMMITTEE REPORTS**

City Planner McBeth said there was a Master Plan Steering Committee on September 7; Mr. Roney was able to attend as Mr. Verma could not attend that meeting. We discussed the summary of interviews held with developers and real estate professionals, we reviewed the real estate market analysis and land use associated with that, and finally we reviewed the Master

Plan survey results. Next month, we will be discussing the Thoroughfare Plan.

Member Avdoulos said I thought the information provided fell in line with how the city is growing and what opportunities are available. I believe our consultants are going to provide a summary, and we could pass that on to the rest of the Planning Commission. It is great to see how well the city is growing and its future potential.

## **CITY PLANNER REPORT**

City Planner McBeth had nothing to report.

## **CONSENT AGENDA - REMOVALS AND APPROVALS**

There were not any consent agenda items.

## **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

### **1. TERRA JSP 21-12 TERRA PRO SECOND AMENDMENT**

Public hearing at the request of Cambridge of Novi, LLC for Planning Commission's recommendation to the City Council for the Second Amendment to the previously approved Terra Planned Rezoning Overlay (PRO) Plan, JSP17-52 and JSP 21-12, and associated with Zoning Map Amendment 18.718. The subject property is approximately 30.14-acres and is located east of Napier Road and on the north side of Nine Mile Road (Section 29, 30). The applicant proposed a 41-unit single-family ranch housing development. The current amendment is requested as the applicant is seeking to eliminate previously proposed sidewalk connections in two locations and to pay into the Tree Fund for 51 woodland tree credits rather than planting them on site to the north of units 27-36 as previously proposed.

Senior Planner Bell said this is a familiar plan to some of you. It came before the Planning Commission as a PRO Concept plan a few times in 2017 and 2018 and was recommended for approval to City Council. Council approved the rezoning request to R-1 subject to the conditions of the PRO agreement in September of 2018. The site plan returned to the Planning Commission and received approval in late 2018. The approved development consists of 41 single-family units, to be built in 2 Phases. Both phases are currently under construction.

Ms. Bell went on to say the current revised plan being considered is a request to amend the PRO Agreement and Concept Plan in three ways:

1. The first change proposes the removal of woodland replacement trees to the north of units 27 through 36. The applicant had previously shown 51 woodland replacement trees would be planted along the north property line. They now propose to pay into the Tree Fund for those trees. Staff has encouraged the applicant to plant as many of them as possible on-site or consider alternative ways to lessen the impact on the homes as described in the landscape review.
2. The second change would be the removal of a sidewalk segment along the south side of Villa Court. During construction of the culvert for the Garfield Drain, the decision was made by on-site engineers to shift it to the north a few feet to avoid eroding soils over time. This change created a narrower space between the road and the culvert, which limits the space to place the sidewalk as shown on the original plan. The current plan shows the sidewalk ending on the south side of Villa Court about 110 feet east of the intersection with Villa Drive, with ramps provided to enable pedestrians to cross the street to connect to the north side sidewalk. However, based on the plan provided and on-site inspection, it still appears feasible to redesign the sidewalk to fit it between the road and the culvert. Staff recommends the applicant adhere to the Code to provide the required sidewalk.
3. The third change is to eliminate the sidewalk connection from the east side of the site to

the ITC Pathway. The applicant states the residents of the development would like to eliminate the sidewalk in favor of continuing the berm to provide additional screening of the ITC transmission towers, as well as to limit pedestrian & bicycle traffic through the community. While the connection to the ITC Trail is not a requirement of the Zoning Ordinance, its inclusion in the original PRO Agreement and Plan was listed as a site amenity in the Concept Plan submittals and was a specific development condition in City Council's motion to approve the PRO Agreement. Staff recommends the segment be provided in the interest of preserving the amenities promised to the City in the PRO Agreement and enhancing non-motorized connectivity throughout the community.

For these reasons, Staff does not recommend approval of the request at this time.

Ms. Bell concluded by saying the applicant has provided a response letter in addition to letters of support from Terra residents, all of which are in the meeting packet. The Planning Commission is asked tonight to hold the public hearing to consider making a recommendation to City Council for the requested amendment to the PRO Agreement and Plan. The applicant Mark Guidobono is here tonight if you have any questions for him, and staff is happy to answer questions as well.

Chair Pehrson invited the applicant to address the Planning Commission.

Mark Guidobono, owner of Cambridge Homes, the developer of Terra, said I'll start with the outlet request. There is a detention basin that we installed during Phase 1. We did this so the City could run their dewatering operation into it. We installed an outlet, per our plan, into the drain that runs parallel to our entrance. During Phase 2, we went to install the culvert underneath the road to connect the drain getting the water from south to north. However, a City consultant realized that a volume of 2 million gallons per day reaching this culvert would erode the culvert over time. The City asked the contractor doing the work to shift the culvert over 3 to 4 feet; as the developer, we were not consulted about this until after it was done. I understand their rationale for doing it, but when it came time to put in the sidewalk, we realized we would have to install a retaining wall in order to construct the sidewalk per the plan that was approved by the City. By installing this retaining wall, which would likely include a rail, we will likely have to spend an additional \$25,000 that we were not expecting. There are a couple different options, which I believe the City has included in their letter. One was the retaining wall, which we are not very excited about. Another option would be to shift the sidewalk against the curb; we might be able to eliminate the retaining wall with that move, but we would have to get rid of the street trees that are in that location. Also, having a sidewalk against a curb is not the best look for a development. One thing our team noticed was that if the sidewalk continued to Villa Drive, we would still have to cross the street going north, similar to the crossing to the east. We will have to do that anyway at the intersection because there isn't a sidewalk on the east side of Villa Drive. The pedestrian would have to get to the west side either way. We would be willing to stripe that area to mark it as a crossing, and there are only four houses on that side of street. For us, the cost does not seem worth the benefit to us. We don't have a sidewalk on the east side of Villa Drive. The pedestrian will have to cross Villa Court to the north and then cross Villa Drive, either at the intersection or 100 feet back – it's just a matter of where they choose to do it. However, as the developer, I feel it is unfair to cost us \$25,000 for this particular issue.

Mr. Guidobono continued by saying the next request is for the tree fund. In Phase 1, we have some residents that are wanting to do small projects in their yards, like a patio or a pool. We've kept the woodlands tight to these houses. In several instances, we had to come back to the City with plans to cut down trees in order to fit a patio or pool. We made it tight on purpose because we wanted the development to have a natural atmosphere. Now, in Phase 2, we don't have any space to plant these 50 trees, and we've already planted around 800 trees on the site. Our landscape architect showed us planting around the backs of the properties, and I realized that the plantings weren't going to work because people would want to install a patio

or pool. Therefore, we have taken a position to pay into the tree fund rather than plant the trees. I know that the City staff believes there is room for the trees elsewhere, but we are right up against the woods, and I feel that we have every square inch covered. We also want to avoid having to come back to the Planning Commission for tree removals during the second phase.

Mr. Guidobono went on to say the last request is pertaining to the ITC Trail. We have gotten push back from current and future residents; that is 21 people out of 40. They would prefer not to have a connection to this trail, and they would also like the berm to be raised up where the trail crosses. The berm is very low there, and they would like to block the high-tension wires. They'd also like us to plant the trees on top of the berm to block out as much as possible. Several residents submitted letters, and one of our residents is here on behalf of the other residents. Also, the trail is about 10 feet away from the house at site 37. That customer is likely not going to be happy about having the trail being that close to the house. This was not a part of the public benefit portion of the PRO; it was more a connectivity item we agreed upon with the staff. We moved the ITC Trail to our side of the street, so there is access to the trail directly at the entrance to the development. The trail crosses our boulevard at 9 Mile Road, so our residents can access the ITC Trail very easily.

Chair Pehrson invited members of the audience who wished to participate in the public hearing to approach the podium.

Carleen Lunsford, Novi resident, said I've been a Novi resident for 20 years, and I am here today representing the residents of Terra. We unanimously support removing the connector leading into our subdivision from the ITC Trail on 9 Mile Road. If you are walking, jogging, or biking on the ITC Trail neighboring Terra, you can access the subdivision through the main entrance. Therefore, the connector serves no real purpose. Removing the connector would provide Terra residents additional privacy and security. A berm with plantings in lieu of the connector would provide additional screening from the power lines, and it is consistent with the overall vision of this project.

Sarah Tedesco, 22830 Evergreen Court, said the east line of my property directly abuts the Phase 1 of Terra. I am here to advocate for myself and my neighbors Dan and Erin Shaheen. Our houses are the most affected by the trees that have been taken down. Today, I measured the setback from a large tree trunk that was likely a woodland tree. It was taken down in order to build one of the aforementioned patios, even though they had been informed they only had 20 to 30 feet of setback from the regulated woodland. That tree has left a very large hole in the canopy that I can see directly outside my bedroom and bathroom windows. It provided screening and privacy, as you could assume I would want for my master suite. If we planted evergreens, it would take about 20 years on our end of the property for them to grow tall enough to provide backfill for screening and canopy loss incurred from removing the one tree. Dan and Erin Shaheen have four houses along their property line, and I have three houses along mine. I don't think anyone would be okay with pools and patios for their neighbors at the expense of the natural features and privacy they paid a lot of money for. I understand people want what they want in their backyards, but what about the people like me and my neighbors? Are some of the funds going into the City's Tree Fund going to be used to somehow compensate us for the loss of privacy and seclusion? Would those trees be large mature evergreens on the edges of our properties to compensate for the old and large trees that have been removed by the developer?

Karl Migrin, 49450 West 9 Mile Road, said my home is the first house west of the entrance to the Terra subdivision. I pretty much lost any privacy I had in my backyard when they began building Terra. I have gotten to know the sounds of the cement trucks and gravel haulers, but this project was not mine to approve or disapprove. As of today, I can only find sales data for 21 of the 40 lots in both Phases 1 and 2 of the Terra subdivision. Only 10 lot owners have expressed their

support for this second amendment to the Terra PRO Amendment. Are the remaining lot owners for or against the proposed changes? Sales data could only be located for one lot in Phase 2. This lot owner, at 49362 Villa Court, is the only one of the 10 lot owners expressing support for this amendment who has a clear view of the transmission towers and power lines from their lot. The transmission towers and power lines are obscured from view from all the Phase 1 lots by trees that were not removed by the developer during site clearing. The Terra website lists exposed aggregate sidewalks as a community feature, and the Terra site plan clearly shows a connection between Phase 2 and the ITC Trail. The site plan also shows an abundance of trees throughout Phase 2 and a babbling brook that flows from the Garfield Drain. Is this false advertising? I also ran across a letter from Mr. Guidobono dated March 6, 2018, where he states we agree to connect to the proposed location of the ITC Trail. I am truly saddened that the 10 lot owners who support this amendment are fearful that the sidewalks will encourage walkers and bike riders to tour their community on a constant basis. These sidewalks and the connection to the ITC Trail were clearly shown on the Terra site plan at the time they purchased their lots. The residents of Terra should be grateful that they have safe sidewalks to walk on and for their grandchildren to learn how to ride a bike on. I support the staff's position to deny this second amendment.

Seeing that nobody else wished to speak, Chair Pehrson turned it over to Member Lynch to note the correspondence received for this public hearing.

Member Lynch said Thomas and Diane Busard, 49506 Villa Drive, are in support due to concerns about privacy and the ITC Trail; Annette Mullett, 49438 Villa Drive, is in support; Jean and Howard Bleiwas, 49599 Villa Drive, are in support to maintain privacy; Marion Harris, 49542 Villa Drive, is in support; Daryl Adams, 49554 Villa Drive, is in support; finally, Karl Migrin, who just spoke, objects.

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

Member Lynch said concerning Mr. Guidobono's first point about the sidewalk and culvert, it sounds valid. It appears we, the City, made the mistake. Who was a part of the discussion to move the culvert over? I understand that there is room to do it, but the additional charges to the applicant seem unnecessary. I don't think we should burden the developer with installing that segment of sidewalk since we did not fully understand the culvert situation. We did ask for a sidewalk at that location, but it doesn't make sense to push a sidewalk directly against a curb.

Member Lynch went on to say the other two requests are a bit different. I remember Mr. Meader and I discussed the tree planting situation for this development at length when it was originally brought before us for approval. The reason that I, and many of my fellow Commissioners from my understanding, approved this project because it was Mr. Guidobono presented it as a rustic and natural environment, like you were driving up north. There were agreements on planting trees on site to replace the ones that would be removed for construction. I do recall Mr. Guidobono mentioning that people would want pools and patios in certain areas of the neighborhood, but I specifically remember having a conversation where the developer said they would include those amenities as possible based upon the footprint they had. I understand that the residents of the neighborhood have their wants and needs, but I think it should be remembered the difficulty this Commission went through to get this project approved. The first order of business was maintaining the natural environment. I am reluctant to approve removing the trees along the boundary since they are woodland replacement trees. Mr. Meader, could you provide some insight? I know that Novi has a history of trying to fit too many trees where they won't fit, but my understanding is that the developer's landscape architect said they would have plenty of space to plant the trees and the trees would survive planted according to the plan. The only reason the developer wants the trees removed now is to accommodate a patio or a pool. Am I getting this right?

Landscape Architect Meader said that is my understanding as well. I was also told that another reason was to prevent blocking the view of the woods, but this was not included in their application before you today. We've had quite a few applications from Terra residents who want to add decks, pools, and other things behind their lots. My position is that the trees don't have to be planted exactly where they are located on the drawing, but I believe they do need to be planted in the development. For the developer to say they aren't going to plant 51 replacement trees, it seems like they aren't trying hard enough to find space for them.

Member Lynch asked do you think there is enough room for those trees elsewhere in the development?

Mr. Meader replied maybe not for all 51 trees, but for a good portion of them I do believe that.

Member Lynch said the last item requested was for not including a sidewalk connection to the ITC Trail. I was not a very big fan of connecting the trails to this site because the developers of Island Lake did something similar, and it has caused controversy among the residents. However, the site plan was approved with the trails, and people bought the properties the way the developer had originally laid out. I am a little nervous about this similar request for Terra, so I will listen to my colleagues for their comments on this.

Member Becker asked what is the minimum lot size for the RA Residential Acreage zoning designation?

Senior Planner Bell replied it is one acre in the RA district.

Member Becker asked what is the minimum lot size for R-1?

Ms. Bell replied it's half an acre.

Member Becker asked what is the minimum distance required between houses in the R-1 district?

Ms. Bell said based on setbacks, it would be essentially 30 feet.

Member Becker asked does the City allow any residential development to prohibit non-motorized traffic by non-residents?

Ms. Bell said in the case of a private street, we wouldn't necessarily get involved if it is posted – that is my understanding. That is more of a legal question regarding trespassing.

City Attorney Saarela said this is a condominium development, so the street, as a general common element, are owned as a proportionate share by all the unit owners. Therefore, there is no right for anyone other than those unit owners to use those private streets.

Member Becker said, regarding the trees between lots 27 and 36, how close would those trees be planted to the property line? Are there any restrictions as to how close trees can be planted to the property line?

Landscape Architect Meader said generally, and especially between units, we want them to be at least 4 feet away to allow drainage between the units. Along the back, some of the trees are almost directly on the property line, but we approved that because there's only woods behind those lines – no residents are back there. Also, the property behind those lots belongs to the City.

Member Becker asked what is the minimum DBH we require for a replacement tree?

Mr. Meader replied they are generally two-and-a-half-inch caliper for canopy trees, and we usually do 2 to 1.75 inches for subcanopy trees – there are a few subcanopy trees on the list.

Member Becker said there are a lot of items here that remind me of issues we've had to face with other developments. Hypothetically, if the applicant agrees to planting 51 replacement trees behind the lots on the north side of the development, what is the limitation for future property owners regarding removing these trees to build a deck, pool, or other property enhancement?

Mr. Meader said they would have to plant them somewhere else or contribute to the tree fund. In this case, since the developer is doing the building, they would be replaced by the developer.

Senior Planner Bell said there is also a conservation easement over the areas where they'd proposed to plant those trees.

Member Becker said regarding the ITC Trail, one of the rationales for eliminating the connector to the trail was to allow the berm to come all the way through to screen the view of the ITC towers. How high is the berm as it exists in the plan.

Mr. Meader said probably 8 to 10 feet.

Member Becker said I can somewhat see how that would screen those towers. We have done a lot of work over the years with much thoughtful consideration to amend and deviate from some standards that were in place. This started with the 2016 Master Plan Update when the property that is now Terra was completely Residential Acreage. By approving the PRO under R-1 standards, we potentially doubled the amount of lots for them to sell and houses to build. I also looked at the October 2019 City Council meeting documents, and there appeared to be about 19 deviations, alterations, or other modifications that were approved for the developer that we could have denied. I think I would probably be in favor of not requiring the sidewalk segment over the culvert, but the other two items are legitimate. They were agreed to by the developer three years ago, and they should be adhered to.

Member Dismondy said the rerouting of the sidewalk to the north around the culvert seems to be reasonable, especially since there isn't a sidewalk on the east side of the entrance street. This original agreement predates my membership on this commission, so I don't have the full history of it. However, the concern with eliminating the connection to the trail is that it was presented originally as a public benefit. I personally don't consider a trail going through a private neighborhood as a public benefit, especially when that trail is accessible from the entrance to the neighborhood. I would be okay with eliminating that requirement; that way, they could build up the berm and perhaps plant some of those 51 trees on top. I also imagine there is a compromise on the trees that can be reached between Mr. Meader and the applicant. Perhaps it isn't possible to fit all 51 replacements on site, but it certainly should be more than zero.

Member Roney said I spent a good deal of time thinking about this over the weekend. It is sort of difficult to address three different items at once, so I'll take each one at a time. The request regarding the sidewalk over the culvert makes sense to me. The next issue is the trees; it seems to me that we really should plant as many trees as we possibly can. That is the entire idea of the Woodland Ordinance. Maybe not all 51 can be planted, but as many as possible should be planted. For me, it comes down to the ITC Trail. I agree with Member Dismondy that the ITC Trail connection doesn't seem like a public benefit to me. Was the trail connection a stated public benefit in the PRO or was it just implied?

City Attorney Saarela said it was stated as a condition.

Member Roney said given that, it seems difficult to recommend to City Council to change the PRO unless we have a solid reason. I'm wondering if there was ever an alternative offered; since the developer believes the trail won't work, has there been any discussion with the developer about other options to keep the same amount of public benefit stated in the original PRO?

Senior Planner Bell said no, that has not been discussed.

Member Roney asked is it possible to ask to replace the trail connector with an alternate public benefit?

Mark Guidobono said I'm not sure what else we could include as a public benefit. One thing we talked to the City about was to do a commemorative plaque at the comfort station in honor of Wayne Wrobel. I'm not sure if the City would still be interested in doing that; I think this is one of the last projects he worked on at the City Council level. We had early discussions with the City about that, but we've been so busy that we're finally just now completing that comfort station. However, my recollection was that the trail connector wasn't a public benefit, but rather it was just connectivity for the City. We can also think of some other ideas to amount to a public benefit for the City.

Member Roney said it seems to me that would be an appropriate way to approach this. When an applicant get a PRO approved, the zoning change is allowed due to the public benefits presented. When those benefits begin to be eliminated, it somewhat defeats the purpose of the PRO.

Member Avdoulos said just to verify, this development is a gated community, and we have other gated communities in the City. Does this mean that the public is prohibited from walking through a private community.

City Attorney Saarela said typically, when there is a private street that is not dedicated to the public, the public would have no right otherwise to go there. In this case, the Master Deed does indicate the ITC connection, and that does imply a right for whoever is on the ITC Trail to travel through the development. That sets this development apart from a standard private and gated community where the public is not allowed. This project was built with the condition that it would be connected to the public trail with outlets on several streets. That easement is identified in their Master Deed, so everyone who purchased property in the development was on notice that this connection was going to be part of the condition of the use of their streets.

Member Avdoulos said when this project was presented to the Planning Commission, we looked at what all the benefits could be for the developer and the City to create something unique. This isn't like a typical subdivision, so we worked together with Mr. Guidobono to create a nice development. I think the developer has been doing a nice job so far, but one major aspect of the agreement was to become a part of the community by having that connectivity to the trail amenity. Therefore, I am in support of keeping the connection to the trail. I understand the concern with the visualization of the ITC power lines, but they are large and tall. An addition to the berm will not stop those from being visible. I would also like to keep the trees on site; I think that can be worked out, and we can find places for them to be planted. I do agree with the condition of the sidewalk near the culvert. I live close to this subdivision, so I walk along Nine Mile Road and Garfield Road, and I also walk through the subdivision with my dog. That has been a great amenity for me as a neighbor, and I appreciate it. I'm familiar with that entrance and layout of that sidewalk – even if it came to the road, the pedestrian would have to cross a larger mouth. I would prefer to cross the road when it is further back. Therefore, I can agree with the applicant on that particular issue, but I agree with the staff on the other two requests.



Chair Pehrson asked does the Commission have the purview to modify the motions presented to accept one request and deny the others?

City Planner McBeth said yes, you can modify the motion as you see fit.

Chair Pehrson said I agree with the other Commissioners on the sidewalk issue near the culvert. I won't waver on the trees – that requirement was part of what this entire plan was intended to be. The same goes for the ITC Trail connection point; everyone involved was aware of this requirement and the PRO agreement states it as a condition. I would recommend that we keep that amenity in place, as well.

Motion made by Member Avdoulos and seconded by Member Lynch.

**In the matter of the request of Cambridge of Novi, LLC, for Terra JSP21-12, motion to recommend denial to the City Council for an amendment to previously approved Planned Rezoning Overlay (PRO) plan and agreement for two of the requested changes, based on the following:**

- 1. The asphalt sidewalk connection to the ITC Trail helps to further the goals of non-motorized connectivity in the City and was presented as a public amenity at the time the PRO Agreement was approved.**
- 2. The applicant should attempt to find alternate on-site locations for the 51 woodland credits. Any remaining tree credits that cannot feasibly be planted on site may be paid into the Tree Fund.**

**ROLL CALL VOTE TO RECOMMEND PARTIAL DENIAL OF THE PRO PLAN AND AGREEMENT AMENDMENT FOR JSP21-12 TERRA TO CITY COUNCIL MADE BY MEMBER AVDOULOS AND SECONDED BY MEMBER LYNCH.**

**Motion to recommend partial denial of the PRO Plan and Agreement Amendment for JSP21-12 Terra to City Council. *Motion carried 5-1.***

Motion made by Member Avdoulos and seconded by Member Lynch.

**In the matter of the request of Cambridge of Novi, LLC, for the Terra JSP 21-12 with Zoning Map Amendment 18.718, motion to recommend approval to the City Council for an amendment to the previously approved Planned Rezoning Overlay (PRO) plan to allow a deviation from Subdivision Ordinance Section 4.05 and Design and Construction Standards Section 11-256(b) for the absence of approximately 110 feet of sidewalk along the south side of Villa Court. *Motion carried 6-0.***

**ROLL CALL VOTE TO RECOMMEND PARTIAL APPROVAL OF THE PRO PLAN AND AGREEMENT AMENDMENT FOR JSP21-12 TERRA TO CITY COUNCIL MADE BY MEMBER AVDOULOS AND SECONDED BY MEMBER LYNCH.**

**Motion to recommend partial approval of the PRO Plan and Agreement Amendment for JSP21-12 Terra to City Council. *Motion carried 6-0.***

## **MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION**

### **1. APPROVAL OF THE 2023 PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING SCHEDULE**

City Planner McBeth said as you know, around this time each year our Community Relations Department requests boards and commissions submit meeting dates for the following year. We have put together a schedule for you, and we've tried to avoid all major holidays. Most of the

meetings will be on the second and fourth Wednesdays of each month. For November and December of next year, we are only proposing one meeting. If this suggested schedule is acceptable to you, we will forward it to the Community Relations Department to be included in the annual calendar.

Motion on the item made by Chair Pehrson and seconded by Member Avdoulos.

**VOICE VOTE TO APPROVE THE 2023 PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING SCHEDULE MADE BY CHAIR PEHRSON AND SECONDED BY MEMBER AVDOULOS.**

**Motion to approve the 2023 Planning Commission Regular Meeting Schedule. Motion carried 6-0.**

**2. APPROVAL OF THE AUGUST 10, 2022 PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**

Motion made by Member Avdoulos and seconded by Member Dismondy.

**VOICE VOTE TO APPROVE THE AUGUST 10, 2022 PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES MADE BY MEMBER AVDOULOS AND SECONDED BY MEMBER DISMONDY.**

**Motion to approve the August 10, 2022 Planning Commission minutes. Motion carried 6-0.**

**CONSENT AGENDA REMOVALS FOR COMMISSION ACTION**

There were not any consent agenda items.

**SUPPLEMENTAL ISSUES/TRAINING UPDATES**

There were not any supplemental issues or training updates.

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION**

Chair Pehrson invited members of the audience who wished to address the Planning Commission during the final audience participation to come forward.

Karl Migrin, 49450 West 9 Mile Road, said I want to give you an update on the property values in the section of the City near Terra and my house. I built my entire house on an acre and a quarter back in 1987 for \$107,000. We may need to look into attracting average income individuals to that area of the city to address the much higher costs today. The cost of the least expensive lot in Terra – just the lot alone – sold for a price of approximately \$220,000. The most expensive lot in Terra sold for around \$435,000. I don't know if the Planning Commission follows this data or if it factors into any of your decisions, but I just wanted to provide that information. Another thing to consider when approving subdivision like Terra is the amount of time allowed for the developer to complete construction. They've only sold half of the lots in Terra so far. I can hear the dump trucks and cement while I'm trying to sleep, and I watch all the traffic from my window. When the rest of the world was shut down due to Covid-19, I still watched the contractors still drive through and do work on homes. Concerning the Master Plan, we have the sewer and water infrastructure to handle the capacity for more homes, so the area really doesn't need to be zoned RA. The one-acre requirement is only in place in that area of the city because septic tanks were predominately used in the past, and they require a one-acre lot.

Seeing that nobody else wished to participate, Chair Pehrson closed the final public participation.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Motion to adjourn made by Member Lynch.

**VOICE VOTE ON THE MOTION TO ADJOURN MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH.**

**Motion to adjourn the September 14, 2022 Planning Commission Meeting. Motion carried 6-0.**

The meeting adjourned at 8:00 PM.