CITY OF NOVI CITY COUNCIL JULY 22, 2024



SUBJECT:

Approval of the request of DTN Management/Tricap Holdings for JSP18-10 The Bond development for a Third Amendment of the Development Agreement, and revised Preliminary Site Plan, Storm Water Management Plan and Woodland Permit, to allow 69 additional units. The Subject Property is zoned Town Center One and is approximately 7.99 acres of vacant land in Section 22.

SUBMITTING DEPARTMENT: Community Development Department - Planning

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

The subject property is approximately 7.99 acres and is located on the southwest side of Bond Street. Bond Street is located near the southwest quadrant of Grand River Avenue and Novi Road (Section 22). The applicant previously received approval to redevelop the former Fendt Transit Mix Concrete Plant into a mixed-use development with two four-story multi-family residential buildings with a total of 260 apartments and a single-story commercial building (5,578 SF). The site improvements included a two-level parking structure, surface parking, site amenities such as a swimming pool, landscaped courtyards and related improvements.

REVISIONS TO THE PLAN

The current revised Preliminary Site Plan primarily includes adding a fifth floor to both residential buildings to accommodate an additional 69 residential units (329 total) and add a third level to the parking structure. The applicant states that delays caused by FEMA floodplain delineation nearby, followed by the COVID-19 pandemic prevented construction from getting started, and now increased building costs and interest rates has made the previous project economically unfeasible.

The building footprint and site layout remains largely as previously approved, with only minor adjustments to façade materials, open space, landscaping, and surface parking. The additional units increase the room count to 812. The number of rooms previously approved was 641. For a parcel of this size in the TC-1 District, a room count exceeding 435 may be allowed, up to 870 rooms, if the City Council determines the following:

- a. That an increase in total number of rooms will not cause any detrimental impact on the capabilities of public services and facilities, including water service, sanitary sewer service, storm water disposal, and police and fire protection to serve existing and planned uses in the area;
- b. That an increase in total number of rooms is compatible with adjacent uses of land in terms of location, size, character, and impact on adjacent property or the surrounding neighborhood.

DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT

The site plan qualifies for a mixed-use development and the higher densities the Town Center-1 District offers since the applicant is proposing 10 percent of the total development as a non-residential use. Because the applicant is proposing to build the qualifying non-residential use in phase 3, the timing of which is undetermined, the developer agreed to enter into a Development Agreement with the City. The Development Agreement was approved by City Council at their April 15, 2019 meeting (recorded with Oakland County Records on May 24, 2019, at Liber 52859, Page 785). The agreement in general consists of the following:

- 1. It sets forth conditions required in connection with the approval relating to certain deviations and variances.
- 2. The subject property shall be developed and used solely for a mixed-use development in accordance with the approved Site Plan.
- 3. It governs the type of use and timing of construction of the commercial portion of the project.

On November 25, 2019, the Developer and City Council entered into a First Amendment to the Development agreement, which increased the allowable number of rooms to 260 with a corresponding increase in the room count.

On January 25, 2021, City Council approved the 2nd Amendment to the Development Agreement, incorporating the revised Preliminary Site Plan, which included modifications of the Section 9 façade waiver and landscaping waivers. Final Stamping Set approval was granted administratively on April 18, 2022. That approval received approval for a one-year extension on March 18, 2024.

The current proposed changes impact the building height and density, but do not significantly alter the other conditions of the agreement. If the City Council is inclined to approve the modified plan, the recommendation is for the City Council to direct the City Attorney to prepare the 3rd Amendment to the Development Agreement, incorporating the modifications that are presented at this time that will be brought back to Council for final consideration and possible approval.

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

On June 26, 2024, the Planning Commission held a public hearing and made a recommendation to City Council to approve the revised Preliminary Site Plan, Woodland Permit, and Storm Water Management Plan based on the motion listed in the action summary attached. The draft minutes from the meeting are included in this packet.


According to Sec. 3.27, where the site proposed for development is five (5) acres or more in area in TC and TC-1 districts, preliminary site plan approval shall be by the City Council after review and recommendation by the Planning Commission. Following City Council approval, final site plan approval will be reviewed administratively.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Tentative approval of the request of DTN Management/Tricap Holdings for JSP 18-10 The Bond Development for the revised Preliminary Site Plan, Woodland Permit, and Storm Water Management Plan and to direct the City Attorney to prepare the Third Amendment to the Development Agreement that will be brought back to Council for consideration and approval. The agreement shall be based on and subject to the following:

- 1. All deviations and waivers that have been previously granted in the Development Agreement, except as modified below.
- 2. City Council for allowing an increase in the number of rooms allowed (812 proposed) with the following findings per Section 4.82.2.b.:
 - a. That an increase in total number of rooms will not cause any detrimental impact on the capabilities of public services and facilities, including water service, sanitary sewer service, storm water disposal, and police and fire protection to serve existing and planned uses in the area;
 - b. That an increase in total number of rooms is compatible with adjacent uses of land in terms of location, size, character, and impact on adjacent property or the surrounding neighborhood.
- 3. City Council finding the usable open spaces as shown on the site plan acceptable as the proposed spaces meet the intent of the Ordinance to provide active and passive recreational opportunities for future residents.
- 4. Section 9 waivers for:
 - a. Not providing the minimum required brick (30% minimum required) on the east (17% proposed), north (21-24% proposed), west (23% proposed), and south (21-24% proposed) facades for Building 1 and 2;
 - b. Exceeding the maximum allowed percentage of EIFS (25% maximum allowed) on all facades (proposed: East-52%, North-51%, South-51% and West-77%) for Building 1 and 2;
 - c. Not providing the minimum required brick and stone (50% minimum required) for TC-1 district on all facades (23-34% proposed) for Building 1 and 2;
 - d. Not providing the minimum required brick (30% minimum required) on all facades (proposed: North -23%, -West 8%, South- 8% and East- 17%) for Commercial Building;


- e. Exceeding the maximum allowed for Cast Stone (50% maximum allowed) on all facades (proposed: North-55%, West-76%, South-76% and East-64%) for Commercial Building;
- f. Exceeding the maximum allowed percentage for Ribbed Metal (0% allowed) on all facades providing the ribbed metal (proposed: North-12%, West-6%, South-6% and East-9%) for Commercial Building;
- g. Exceeding the maximum allowed concrete for west facade for parking structure (0% allowed, 100% proposed) in lieu of providing the minimum required brick (30% minimum required, 0% provided);
- h. Exceeding the maximum allowed cast stone for north and south facades for parking structure (0% allowed, 100% proposed) in lieu of providing the minimum required brick (30% minimum required, 0% provided).
- 5. Zoning Board of Appeals variances previously granted will need to be reapproved as they have expired.
- 6. The findings of compliance with Ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters and the conditions and the items listed in those letters being addressed on the Final Site Plan.

This motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Article 3, Article 4, and Article 5 of the Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 11 and Chapter 37 of the Code of Ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance.




THE BOND **LOCATION**





LEGEND





City of Novi

Dept. of Community Development City Hall / Civic Center 45175 W Ten Mile Rd Novi, MI 48375 cityofnovi.org


Map Author: Lindsay Bell Date: 6/14/24



1 inch = 292 feet

MAP INTERPRETATION NOTICE

THE BOND ZONING





- R-4: One-Family Residential District
- RM-2: High-Density Multiple Family
 - I-1: Light Industrial District
- I-2: General Industrial District
 - OS-1: Office Service District
 - OSC: Office Service Commercial
 - TC: Town Center District
- TC-1: Town Center -1 District
- Subject Property



City of Novi

Dept. of Community Development City Hall / Civic Center 45175 W Ten Mile Rd Novi, MI 48375 cityofnovi.org

Map Author: Lindsay Bell Date: 6/14/24 Project: THE BOND Version #: 1


0 65 130 260 39



1 inch = 292 feet

MAP INTERPRETATION NOTICE

THE BOND FUTURE LAND USE







City of Novi

Dept. of Community Development City Hall / Civic Center 45175 W Ten Mile Rd Novi, MI 48375 cityofnovi.org

Map Author: Lindsay Bell Date: 6/14/24 Project: THE BOND Version #: 1

0 65 130 260 390




1 inch = 292 feet

MAP INTERPRETATION NOTICE

THE BOND NATURAL FEATURES





LEGEND

WETLANDS

WOODLANDS

Subject Property



City of Novi

Dept. of Community Development City Hall / Civic Center 45175 W Ten Mile Rd Novi, MI 48375 cityofnovi.org


Map Author: Lindsay Bell Date: 6/14/24 Project: THE BOND Version #: 1


65 130 260 39





1 inch = 292 feet

MAP INTERPRETATION NOTICE













| | | | | | | UNIT | % UNIT |
|-----------|-----------|----------|------------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|
| UNIT NAME | UNIT TYPE | AREA(SF) | UNIT COUNT | BED COUNT | TOTAL AREA | PERCENTAGE | BREAKDOWN |
| E1 | 1br/1ba | 607 | 18 | 18 | 10,926 | 5.5% | |
| E1-ALT 1 | 1br/1ba | 607 | 18 | 18 | 10,926 | 5.5% | |
| E1-ALT 2 | 1br/1ba | 607 | 2 | 2 | 1,214 | 0.6% | |
| E1-ALT 3 | 1br/1ba | 607 | 2 | 2 | 1,214 | 0.6% | |
| A0 | 1br/1ba | 637 | 14 | 14 | 8,918 | 4.3% | |
| A0-ALT 1 | 1br/1ba | 637 | 6 | 6 | 3,822 | 1.8% | |
| A0-ALT 2 | 1br/1ba | 637 | 10 | 10 | 6,370 | 3.0% | |
| A0-ALT 3 | 1br/1ba | 637 | 4 | 4 | 2,548 | 1.2% | 59% |
| A1 | 1br/1ba | 759 | 40 | 40 | 30,360 | 12.2% | |
| A1-ALT-1 | 1br/1ba | 759 | 40 | 40 | 30,360 | 12.2% | |
| A2 | 1br/1ba | 778 | 7 | 7 | 5,446 | 2.1% | |
| A3 | 1br/1ba | 853 | 13 | 13 | 11,089 | 4.0% | |
| A3-ANSI | 1br/1ba | 853 | 3 | 3 | 2,559 | 0.9% | |
| A3-ALT 1 | 1br/1ba | 853 | 16 | 16 | 13,648 | 4.9% | |
| A4 | 1br/1ba | 825 | 1 | 1 | 825 | 0.3% | |
| В0 | 2br/1ba | 871 | 4 | 8 | 3,484 | 1.2% | |
| B1 | 2br/2ba | 951 | 32 | 64 | 30,432 | 9.7% | |
| B1-ALT 1 | 2br/2ba | 951 | 8 | 16 | 7,608 | 2.4% | |
| B2 | 2br/2ba | 1,090 | 36 | 72 | 39,240 | 10.9% | 35% |
| B3 | 2br/2ba | 1,161 | 32 | 64 | 37,152 | 9.7% | |
| B3-ANSI | 2br/2ba | 1,161 | 2 | 4 | 2,322 | 0.6% | |
| B3-ALT 2 | 2br/2ba | 1,161 | 2 | 4 | 2,322 | 0.6% | |
| C1 | 3br/2ba | 1,395 | 16 | 48 | 22,320 | 4.9% | |
| C1-ANSI | 3br/2ba | 1,395 | 1 | 3 | 1,395 | 0.3% | 6% |
| C1-ALT 1 | 3br/2ba | 1,395 | 1 | 3 | 1,395 | 0.3% | |
| C1-ALT 2 | 3br/2ba | 1,395 | 1 | 3 | 1,395 | 0.3% | |
| TOTALS | | | 329 | 480 | 287,895 | 100.0% | 100% |

























FRONT ELEVATION (East)








SIDE ELEVATION (North/pool courtyard)





BUILDING TYPE-I-ELEVATIONS

THE BOND Novi, MI. HPA# 17659

HUMPHREYS & PARTNERS ARCHITECTS, L.P. 5339 Alpha Rd., Suite 300, Dallas, TX 75240 | 972.701.9636 | www.humphreys.com





SIDE ELEVATION (South)












REAR ELEVATION (West) Esc: 1: 32"= 1' 0"






REAR ELEVATION (West-part I)

REAR ELEVATION (North)






REAR ELEVATION (West-part II)

REAR ELEVATION (Souht)

BUILDING GARAGE ELEVATIONS




GARAGE ELEVATIONS


THE BOND


Novi, MI.


HPA# 17659





POOL FRONT ELEVATION





















FRONT ELEVATION (East)








SIDE ELEVATION (South/pool courtyard)










SIDE ELEVATION (North)







| BL | JILDING I - EAST ELEV | |
|----------------|-----------------------|-----|
| | SQFT. | % |
| STUCCO (EIFS) | 5390.5 SQ. FT. | 56 |
| BRICK VENNER | 2040.1 SQ. FT. | 21 |
| SPLIT FACE CMU | 761.7 SQ. FT. | 8 |
| ALUMINUM PANEL | 1464.3 SQ. FT. | 15 |
| TOT, AREA | 9656.72 SQ. FT. | 100 |



OVERALL EAST ELEVATION



EAST ELEVATIONS-POOL COURTYARD







BUILDING 1-OLD FRONT ELEVATION (East)




BUILDING 1- FRONT ELEVATION (East) **BUILDING TYPE I ELEVATIONS**



A414-ELEVATION COMPARATION

BUILDING TYPE I ELEVATIONS

THE BOND Novi, MI. HPA# 17659



BOND OF NOVI, LLC RECEIVED APR 15 2014 OF NOVI DEMENT

April 12, 2024

Ms. Lindsay Bell City of Novi Community Development Department 45175 Ten Mile Road Novi, Michigan 48375

RE: The Bond at Novi

Dear Lindsay;


Attached to this letter is our application for site plan revision for the Bond at Novi. As we discussed when we met with you and Barb, in these challenging times we are still working hard to get the project off the ground. As you know, if FEMA did not demand that the city revise the floodplain map, which unfortunately took over a year, this project would have been completed by now. During that year plus period, we experienced a once in a century pandemic, a quadrupling of inflation, and a doubling of interest rates.

We remain committed to the project, and therefore have provided this revision seeking approval, as this provides a more viable per unit cost and feasibility. The revision includes adding a fifth floor to both of the residential buildings, and a second floor to the parking deck to support the additional 69 units being requested. The project will now contain 329 units. The additional floor on the parking deck allows the parking ratio to remain the same as previously approved. We believe that this plan will be in compliance with all codes, and no additional variances will be necessary, as the building materials, ratios, and the site plan remain unchanged.

We look forward to meeting with the Planning Commission and / or the City Council to obtain their approval.

Very Truly Yours
The Bond at Novi

Albert J. Ludwig Member





PLAN REVIEW CENTER REPORT

June 3, 2024

Planning Review The Bond fkg The District

JSP 18-10

PETITIONER

The Bond, fka The District

REVIEW TYPE

Revised Preliminary Site Plan

PROPERTY CHARACTERISTICS

| | I | | | | |
|----------------|---|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Section | 22 | | | | |
| Site Location | West side of Bond Street in the south west corner of Grand River Avenue and Novi Road; 50-22-22-226-008 and 50-22-22-226-009; | | | | |
| Site School | Novi Community School District | | | | |
| Site Zoning | TC-1: Town Center One | | | | |
| Adjoining | North | TC-1: Town Center One | | | |
| | East | TC-1: Town Center One | | | |
| | West | I-1 Light Industrial across railroad | | | |
| | South | TC-1: Town Center One | | | |
| Current Site | Vacant | | | | |
| | North | Commercial | | | |
| Adjoining Uses | East | Commercial: City Center Plaza | | | |
| Adjoining uses | West | Gen Mar and CVS warehouse | | | |
| | South | Novi Cemetery | | | |
| Site Size | After ROW dedication 7.99 acres | | | | |
| Plan Date | May 3, 2024 (Original: May 10, 2018) | | | | |

PROJECT SUMMARY

The subject property is approximately 7.99 acres and is located on the southwest side of the renamed Bond Street (formerly Flint Street). Bond Street is located near the southwest quadrant of Grand River Avenue and Novi Road (Section 22). The applicant had received approval to redevelop the former Fendt Transit Mix Concrete Plant into a mixed-use development with two four-story multi-family residential buildings with 260 units and a single-story commercial building (Phase 2). The site improvements include a two-level parking structure, surface parking, site amenities such as a swimming pool, landscaped courtyards and related landscape improvements. Phase 2 is not being reviewed at this time.

Since approval, the applicant states that delays caused by FEMA floodplain delineation followed by the COVID-19 pandemic prevented construction from getting started, and now increased building costs and interest rates has made the previous project economically unfeasible. The applicant now proposes to increase the height of both residential buildings to 5 stories in order to accommodate an additional 69 residential units and add a third level to the parking structure. The footprint and general layout of the rest of the project remains unchanged, with only minor adjustments to open space, landscaping, utilities, surface parking, and stormwater management facilities.

APPROVAL SUMMARY

The site plan has received the following approvals:

- 1. On June 27, 2018, the Planning Commission held a public hearing and recommended City Council to approve the Preliminary Site Plan, Phasing Plan, Woodlands Permit, and Storm Water Management Plan.
- 2. On July 23, 2018, the City Council approved the Preliminary Site Plan, Phasing Plan, Woodlands Permit, and Storm Water Management Plan.
- 3. On August 14, 2018, the Zoning Board of Appeals approved a list of variances as noted in City Council action summary attached.
- 4. On November 25, 2019, City Council approved the First Amendment of the Development Agreement to permit up to 260 units, with 641 rooms.
- 5. On November 19, 2019, the Zoning Board of Appeals approved a variance to allow an increase up to 59% of the maximum number of 1-bedroom units, where the ordinance allows up to 50%.
- 6. On December 9, 2020, the Planning Commission recommended approval to City Council of the revised Preliminary Site Plan and Storm Water Management Plan, which included modifications of the Section 9 façade waiver and landscape waivers.
- 7. On January 25, 2021, the City Council approved the 2nd Amendment to the Development Agreement, incorporating the revised Preliminary Site Plan and modifications to the landscaping and façade waivers.
- 8. Final Stamping Set approval was granted administratively April 18, 2022.

RECOMMENDATION

Approval of the Phase 1 revised Preliminary Site Plan is **recommended** subject to the City Council action on the Revised Preliminary Site Plan, amendment of the Development Agreement to include the proposed increased room count, and the Zoning Board of Appeals approval of the now-expired variances. Reauthorization of the Woodland Permit should also be considered by the Planning Commission concurrently.

ORDINANCE REQUIREMENTS

This project was reviewed for conformance with the Zoning Ordinance with respect to Article 3 (Zoning Districts), Article 4 (Use Standards), Article 5 (Site Standards), and any other applicable provisions of the Zoning Ordinance. Items in **bold** below must be addressed and incorporated as part of the Final Site Plan submittal:

- 1. <u>Development Agreement</u>: This project is subject to the terms of the Development Agreement (DA) and 1st and 2nd Amendments to the DA. The site plan is subject to all previous approved conditions and deviations. A list of all waivers, variances and deviations granted shall be listed within the Plan Set. The Development Agreement will require a 3rd Amendment if Council agrees to allow the additional rooms requested.
- 2. <u>Current Revised Site Plan</u>: With the current revised plan, the applicant is proposing to add a 5th story to the building with 69 additional units. **The revised site plan does not indicate significant changes to the building footprint or the site layout**. The applicant noted that the minor changes to the site plan will comply with the ordinance requirements at the time of final site plan. The site plan is subject to all previous approved conditions and deviations that will need to be revisited as a part of this Revised Preliminary Site Plan review process, including the one approved condition that is proposed to be revised. The following items will be checked for compliance at the time of final site plan.
 - a. Lighting plan
 - b. Landscape plan

c. Complete site plan submittal

If any items do not comply with the requirements, the applicant shall seek necessary approvals at that time. The applicants are proposing a large number of amenities and services on site, such as the pool deck, bike repair, dog wash, gyms, studios and clubhouse. They further state that the proposed unit mix tends to provide a more urban apartment living style than the traditional suburban style living.

3. <u>Density and Total Number of Rooms</u>: The previously approved site plan included a total of 260 units, with 641 rooms. The approved development exceeded the maximum room count and received the following related variance from the City Council in the Development Agreement:

City Council finding per Section 4.82.2.b. for allowing an increase of the maximum number of rooms allowed (421 allowed, 641 proposed) based on justification provided by the applicant in their response letter dated June 22, 2018;

With the current revised site plan, the applicant is proposing to add 69 units to the mix, thus increasing the number of units to 329 and total room count to 812. This would require approval of the increased room count by the City Council.

In the Town Center district, the total number of rooms dictates the maximum density that can be granted for a specific site. This development proposes a mix of 1, 2 and 3 bedroom units. In the TC-1 district, the maximum allowable rooms is calculated by taking the area of the parcel in square feet, divided by a factor of 800 for a mixed use development. For the subject parcel, the maximum number of rooms allowed for this property is 435 rooms (7.99 acres = 348,044 sq. ft. / 800).

The ordinance permits the City Council to allow an increase in the number of rooms if strict adherence would serve no good purpose or if the intent of the district would be better served by allowing the increase. However, not more than double the number of rooms can be approved (cap of 870 rooms in this case). The applicant's room count of 812 is within the allowable range of permitted maximum density of the TC-1 District. To permit any increase in additional rooms beyond 435, the City Council must confirm the following:

- a. That an increase in total number of rooms will not cause any detrimental impact on the capabilities of public services and facilities, including water service, sanitary sewer service, storm water disposal, and police and fire protection to serve existing and planned uses in the area;
- b. That an increase in total number of rooms is compatible with adjacent uses of land in terms of location, size, character, and impact on adjacent property or the surrounding neighborhood.

City Council previously approved up to 641 rooms and the applicant is seeking approval for the additional 171 rooms (69 units) to allow a total of 812 rooms (329 units).

4. <u>Percentage of 1-Bedroom units</u>: The previously approved site plan proposed a total of 260 units, of which 59 percent were one-bedroom units. The applicant received a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals from Section 4.82.2 for increasing the maximum percentage of one-bedroom units allowed for this development (50% maximum allowed, 59% proposed).

With the current revised site plan, the applicant is proposing to maintain the same percentage of 1-bedroom units. However, since Zoning Board of Appeals approvals expire after one year, the applicant will require re-approval of each of the variances.

5. Open Space (Sec. 3.27.1.F): A minimum of 15% of the gross area of a development shall be devoted to permanently landscaped open spaces and pedestrian plaza areas accessible to the public. For this type of open space, areas interior to the building cannot be counted, however other landscaped areas less than 50-feet wide, including the stormwater basin and parking lot islands can

count toward this requirement. It appears that the requirement can be met if the calculations are revised to include those areas and subtracting the clubhouse and fitness room. The applicant should confirm the calculations in their response letter with a graphic to show which areas are included.

- 6. <u>Usable Open Space (Sec. 3.1.26.D)</u>: The ordinance requires a minimum of 200 square feet of <u>usable open space per residential unit</u>, so the revised plan will require 65,800 square feet. Usable Open Space is defined as balconies, courts and yards that are specifically designed for active or passive recreational use by residents of the development. The plan shows 68,401 square feet of usable space will be provided, exceeding the 65,800 square feet required. However, some of the spaces proposed do not meet the strict Ordinance interpretation because they are interior spaces (i.e., the club house and fitness room). In the previous approval, these spaces were permitted to be counted toward the requirement as they were indicated on the site plan that was approved by City Council. In this current request, staff asks that City Council make a formal finding to accept these spaces in the terms of the amendment to the Development Agreement. Given the unusual shape of the lot and more urban design, the applicant has done what they can to meet the intent of the Ordinance to provide active and passive amenity spaces for future residents.
- 7. Total Parking required and Proposed: After reviewing all information provided, staff recommended adding a 20% contingency to minimum required count per TC-1 requirements. The contingency would address the unknown factors such as renters demographic and occupancy rate, etc. With the additional 69 units, a total of 557 spaces are required. The current site plan indicates a total of 562 spaces. The proposed number meets the Ordinance minimum, as well as the recommended additional 20% contingency. Note to meet landscaping standards two parking spaces will need to be removed to provide the appropriate planting area at the two ends of the parking garage.
- 8. <u>Woodland Conservation Easement</u>: A Woodland Conservation Easement will be required for preservation of the existing trees being retained to count toward woodland credits. The conservation easement boundary is shown on the site plan.

IDENTIFIED LIST OF DEVIATIONS:

Following are list of the items identified as deviating from the Ordinance, which were granted approval in the original Development Agreement and as modified by the subsequent amendments. **Current modifications are noted in Bold Underline.** Staff supports the items listed below due to limitations posed by unusual shallow shape of the lot. The applicant previously provided a narrative which expands on reasons for requesting the deviations.

City Council Waivers/DCS variances:

For developments in Town Center District, City Council may make findings and allow certain deviations from ordinance standards. The following require a City Council determination based on certain conditions listed in Ordinance:

- 1. City Council finding per Section 4.82.2.b. for allowing an increase of maximum number of rooms allowed (435 allowed, 812 proposed);
- 2. City Council waiver for exceeding the maximum allowable front yard building setback per Section 3.1.26.D (10 ft. maximum allowed, approximately 15 ft. proposed);
- 3. City Council approval according to Sec. 3.6.2.Q. for allowing an increase in the minimum required parking setback as listed in Sec. 3.1.26.D for seven parking spaces designated for public use (10 ft. maximum allowed, approximately 7 ft. proposed).
- 4. <u>City Council finding acceptable the usable open spaces as shown on the site plan as they meet the intent of the Ordinance to provide active and passive recreational opportunities for future residents.</u>

The applicant agreed to dedicate six parking spaces in the Commercial parking lot as a benefit to the Novi Public Cemetery visitors to provide convenient access the cemetery through their property. The applicant proposes to build a permanent parking lot as part of Phase 2 improvements. The timeline for Phase 2 is not yet determined. In the interim, the applicant proposes to build the six spaces as a

temporary gravel lot. A gravel parking area required the following City Council variances, which are part of the Development Agreement. These variances would be considered temporary until Phase 2 is built.

- 5. City Council variance from Sec. 11-239(b)(1),(2)of Novi City Code for absence of hard surface for parking lot and driveway for proposed temporary parking lot of six spaces in Phase 1;
- 6. City Council variance from Sec. 11-239(b)(1),(2) of Novi City Code for absence of curb and gutter for parking lot and driveway for proposed temporary parking lot of six spaces in Phase 1;
- 7. City Council variance from Sec. 11-239(b)(3) of Novi City Code for absence of pavement markings and layout including end islands for proposed temporary parking lot of six spaces in Phase 1;

Façade review indicates that the current revised elevations are consistent with the deviations previously granted from the Façade ordinance and recommends a section 9 waiver for all of the items listed below as it enhances the overall design and is consistent with the intent and purpose of the Ordinance. <u>Current minor modifications are noted in Bold Underline.</u>

- 8. A Section 9 waiver for:
 - a. not providing the minimum required brick (30% minimum required) on the east (17% proposed), north (<u>21-24</u>% proposed), <u>west (23% proposed)</u>, and south (<u>21-24</u>% proposed) facades for Building 1 and 2;
 - b. exceeding the maximum allowed percentage of EIFS (25% maximum allowed) on all facades (proposed: East-<u>52</u>%, North-<u>51</u>%, South-<u>51</u>% and West-<u>77</u>%) for Building 1 and 2;
 - c. not providing the minimum required brick and stone (50% minimum required) for TC-1 district on all facades (23-34% proposed) for Building 1 and 2;
 - d. not providing the minimum required brick (30% minimum required) on all facades (proposed: North -23%, -West 8%, South- 8% and East- 17%) for Commercial Building;
 - e. exceeding the maximum allowed for Cast Stone (50% maximum allowed) on all facades (proposed: North-55%, West-76%, South-76% and East-64%) for Commercial Building;
 - f. exceeding the maximum allowed percentage for Ribbed Metal (0% allowed) on all facades providing the ribbed metal (proposed: North-12%, West-6%, South- 6% and East- 9%) for Commercial Building;
 - g. exceeding the maximum allowed concrete for west facade for parking structure (0% allowed, 100% proposed) in lieu of providing the minimum required brick (30% minimum required, 0% provided);
 - h. exceeding the maximum allowed cast stone for north and south facades for parking structure (0% allowed, 100% proposed) in lieu of providing the minimum required brick (30% minimum required, 0% provided).

The following waivers were previously granted in the Development Agreement:

- 1. Landscape waiver from Sec. 5.5.3.B.ii for the lack of a berm and screening as the applicant proposed a line of arborvitaes along the property line to soften the view toward the railroad tracks and industrial site beyond in lieu of required landscape screening;
- 2. Landscape waiver from Sec. 5.5.3.B.ii for a reduction in the required greenbelt width between the right-of-way and parking areas along Flint/Bond Street (20 ft. width required, a range of 10 ft. to 20 ft. provided). A 2.5-foot brick wall screening the parking and additional landscaping in the narrower areas help to compensate for the lack of space in the areas with just a 10-foot greenbelt;
- 3. Landscape waiver from Sec. 5.5.3.F.ii.b(1) for a reduction in the total number multifamily unit trees provided (171 trees required, 129 provided) as the site is otherwise well-landscaped and there is not additional room for trees;
- 4. Landscape waiver from Sec. 5.5.3.F.ii.B(2) for the reduction in the number of interior roadway perimeter trees provided (1 tree short) due to conflict with fire access lane (grass pavers);

- 5. Landscape waiver from Sec. 5.5.3.D. for the deficiency in the foundation landscaping coverage around the parking deck due to limited space available along the southwest side, along the railroad. Large arborvitaes are proposed in that area to help screen the view of the railroad and the industrial site;
- 6. Landscape waiver from Sec. 5.5.3.C.(3) Chart footnote for not proposing the required parking lot perimeter trees for the temporary gravel parking proposed to be constructed for use by visitors to Novi Cemetery in Phase 1 (11 trees required, 0 proposed) as the landscape requirements will be met at the time of Phase 3 construction within a certain time mutually agreed between the applicant and the City.

Zoning Board of Appeals Variances:

If approval is recommended by the City Council, the applicant should seek to renew the following variances with the Zoning Board of Appeals. The subject parcel has an atypical shallow shape that limits conformance to certain code requirements. The applicant has dedicated approximately an acre of the property for the Bond Street realignment which further decreased the depth of the property and made it even shallower. The applicant is seeking the following variances to setbacks and loading space location due to limitations posed by the shape of the lot in order to maximize the developable area. <u>All these are staff supported</u>.

1. A Zoning Board of Appeals variance from section 4.82.2 for <u>increasing the maximum percentage of one-bedroom units allowed</u> for this development (50% maximum allowed, 59% proposed).

Parking Setbacks

- 2. A Zoning Board of Appeals variance from section 3.27.1.D for <u>allowing parking in the side yard for commercial building (approximately 49 spaces)</u>;
- 3. A Zoning Board of Appeals variance from section 3.27.1.D for <u>allowing parking in the front yard for residential section</u> (39 spaces, 7% of total 562 spaces);
- 4. A Zoning Board of Appeals variance from section 3.27.1.D for <u>allowing parking in the side yard for residential section</u> (50 spaces, 9% of total spaces in east and 35 spaces 6% of total spaces in west);

Building Setbacks

- 5. A Zoning Board of Appeals variance from section 4.82.2.e for <u>reduction of minimum building</u> <u>setback for Building 1 on east side</u> (15 ft. required, a minimum of 12 ft. proposed for an approximate length of 12 ft., total building length is 283 ft.);
- 6. A Zoning Board of Appeals variance from section 4.82.2.e for <u>reduction of minimum building</u> <u>setback for Building 2 on east side</u> (15 ft. required, a minimum of 8 ft. proposed for an approximate length of 16 ft. Total building length is 283 ft.);
- 7. A Zoning Board of Appeals variance from section 4.82.2.e for <u>reduction of minimum building</u> <u>setback for parking garage on west side</u>(15ft. required, 5 ft. proposed for entire structure, total building length is 283 ft.);

Lighting and Photometric Plan

- 8. A Zoning Board of Appeals variance from section 5.7.3.E. for <u>allowing an increase of average to minimum light level ratio</u> for the site (4:1 maximum allowed, 4.81 provided); **This is <u>supported</u> as the applicant has clearly demonstrated all alternates have been explored to minimize the overage of the ratio**;
- 9. A Zoning Board of Appeals variance from section 5.7.3.K for <u>exceeding maximum allowed foot candle along south property line</u> abutting railroad tracks (1 fc maximum allowed, up to 1.7 is proposed for a small area); This is <u>supported</u> as the overage for an insignificant area along south property line;

Loading Areas

- 10. A Zoning Board of Appeals variance from section 3.27.1.H. and Sec. 5.4.2 for <u>allowing two loading areas in the side yard for residential section</u>;
- 11. A Zoning Board of Appeals variance from section Sec. 5.4.2 for <u>reduction in minimum required</u> <u>loading area</u> for each of the two loading spaces in residential section (2,830 square feet

required, 644 square feet provided); This is <u>supported</u> as the development is residential in nature and large commercial trucks are not anticipated;

Other

- 12. A Zoning Board of Appeals variance from section 3.27.1.I. for <u>reduction in width of the sidewalk</u> <u>along a non-residential collector</u> (12.5 feet required on both sides, 8 feet proposed on west side and 10 feet asphalt path proposed on east); **This is <u>supported</u>** as it aligns with the City's design for Bond Street realignment;
- 13. A Zoning Board of Appeals variance from section 5.3.2. for <u>reduction of minimum parking bay depth</u> for spaces proposed in parking garage (19 ft. minimum required, 18 ft. proposed); <u>Staff supported as the reduction is requested due to manufacturers specification for pre-fabricated structures and additional green space provided.</u>

OTHER REVIEWS

- a. <u>Engineering Review:</u> Approval of the Preliminary Site Plan and Storm Water Management Plan is recommended. Additional comments to be addressed with Final Site Plan submittal.
- b. <u>Landscape Review:</u> No revised landscape plans have been provided, so **landscaping** requirements will need to be confirmed with Final Site Plan submittal.
- c. <u>Wetland Review:</u> The changes proposed do not impact the previous wetland approval. No new review was completed at this time.
- d. <u>Woodland Review</u>: The changes proposed do not impact the previous woodland approval. No new review was completed at this time.
- e. <u>Traffic Review</u>: The changes proposed do not impact the previous traffic approval. No new review was completed at this time. The applicant has submitted an updated Trip Generation Statement which shows a decrease in estimated trips compared to the previous submittal, which is being reviewed separately.
- f. <u>Façade Review</u>: Approval is recommended. The proposed revisions do not result in a significant change to the previously granted façade waivers.
- g. Fire Review: The Preliminary Site Plan is **recommended** for approval.

NEXT STEP: PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

All reviews are recommending approval. The site plan will be scheduled for public hearing at the **June 26**th meeting. Planning Commission will be asked to make a recommendation to City Council for approval or denial of the revised request. Please provide the following no later than **10 am on June 20**, **2024**.

- Current Site Plan submittal in PDF format. Staff has already received this item. Please provide the
 previously approved landscaping plan with areas circled that will be modified in the Final Site
 Plan submittal.
- 2. A response letter addressing ALL the comments from ALL the review letters and a request for waivers/deviations as you see fit.
- 3. A color rendering of the Site Plan or building elevations the applicant would like to be included in the Planning Commission packet (Optional).

CITY COUNCIL MEETING

The site plan will be placed on City Council's agenda once Planning Commission makes a recommendation. No additional information is required prior to City Council meeting, unless Planning Commission provides comments that would require a resubmittal.

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING

If City Council approves the site plan, the applicant should then seek approval for Dimensional Variances as stated previously. The application can be found at this <u>link</u>. Please contact Sarah Fletcher at 248-347-0459 for meeting and deadline schedule. **The application deadline to be on the agenda for August 13th meeting is July 1st**.

FINAL SITE PLAN SUBMITTAL

If all approvals are granted Preliminary Site Plan by City Council and ZBA, the applicant should submit the following for Final site plan review:

- 1. Seven copies of the complete Final Site Plan set addressing all comments from Preliminary review
- 2. Response letter addressing all comments and refer to sheet numbers where the change is reflected
- 3. <u>Final Site Plan Application</u>
- 4. Final Site Plan Checklist
- 5. Engineering Cost Estimate
- 6. Landscape Cost Estimate
- 7. Other Agency Checklist
- 8. Hazardous Materials Packet (Non-residential developments)
- 9. Non-Domestic User Survey (Non-residential developments)
- 10. No Revision Façade Affidavit (if no changes are proposed for Façade)
- 11. Legal Documents as required (Note that off-site easements need to be executed and any onsite easements need to be submitted in draft form before stamping sets will be stamped)

ELECTRONIC STAMPING SET SUBMITTAL AND RESPONSE LETTER

If all reviewers recommend Final Site Plan approval, please submit the following for Electronic stamping set approval:

- 1. Plans addressing the comments in all of the staff and consultant review letters in PDF format.
- 2. Response letter addressing all comments in ALL letters and ALL charts and refer to sheet numbers where the change is reflected.
- 3. Legal Documents as required (note that off-site easements need to be executed and any on-site easements need to be submitted in draft form before stamping sets will be stamped)
- 4. A Design and Construction Standard **variance** from Section 11-68 (a)(9) in the Code of Ordinances shall be requested for proposing only a single domestic water service lead and single fire protection lead for the property.

STAMPING SET APPROVAL

Stamping sets are still required for this project. After having received all of the review letters from City staff the applicant should make the appropriate changes on the plans and submit 10 size 24" x 36" copies with original signature and original seals, to the Community Development Department for final Stamping Set approval.

SITE ADDRESSING

A new address is required for this project. The applicant should contact the Building Division for an address prior to applying for a building permit. Building permit applications cannot be processed without a correct address. The address application can be found by clicking on this <u>link.</u>

Please contact the Ordinance Division 248.735.5678 in the Community Development Department with any specific questions regarding addressing of sites.

STREET AND PROJECT NAME

The project and the street name are approved. Please contact Diana Shanahan (248-347-0483) in the Community Development Department if any changes are proposed. The application can be found by clicking on this <u>link</u>.

PRE-CONSTRUCTION MEETING

A Pre-Construction meeting is required for this project. Prior to the start of any work on the site, Pre-Construction (Pre-Con) meetings must be held with the applicant's contractor and the City's consulting engineer. Pre-Con meetings are generally held after Stamping Sets have been issued and prior to the start of any work on the site. There are a variety of requirements, fees and permits that must be issued before a Pre-Con can be scheduled, so it is suggested you contact Sarah Marchioni [248.347.0430 or smarchioni@cityofnovi.org] once the Final Site Plan has been approved to begin the Pre-Con checklist. If you have questions regarding the checklist or the Pre-Con itself, please contact Sarah.

CHAPTER 26.5

Chapter 26.5 of the City of Novi Code of Ordinances generally requires all projects be completed within two years of the issuance of any starting permit. Please contact Sarah Marchioni at 248-347-0430 for additional information on starting permits. The applicant should review and be aware of the requirements of Chapter 26.5 before starting construction.

If the applicant has any questions concerning the above review or the process in general, do not hesitate to contact me at 248.347.0484 or lbell@cityofnovi.org.

Lindsay Bell, AICP – Senior Planner

Kindsmy Bell



PLANNING REVIEW CHART: TC-1 - Town Center-1 District

Review Date: May 21, 2024

Review Type: Revised Preliminary Site Plan

Project Name: 18-10 THE BOND (FKA THE DISTRICT)

Plan Date: May 3, 2024

Prepared by: Lindsay Bell, Senior Planner

E-mail: |bell@cityofnovi.org | Phone: 248.347.0484

Items in **Bold** in the comments column need to be addressed by the applicant and/or the Planning Commission/City Council before approval of the Preliminary Site Plan. <u>Underlined</u> items need to be addressed on the Final Site Plan. Items in <u>bold and underline</u> are not conforming to the code.

| Item | Required Code | Proposed | Meets Code | Comments |
|--|---|---|---------------|---|
| Zoning and Use Requir | ements | | | |
| Master Plan (adopted July 26, 2017) | TC Commercial | Mixed Use: Retail, Residential, and Parking | Yes | |
| Area Study | Town Center Study 2014 | Preferred Uses: Office, restaurants, retail, outdoor cafes abutting Middle Rouge Creek Other uses to be considered: Upper story residential or live/work units | Yes | |
| Bond Street Realignment | Town Center Area Study provided recommendations for Bond Street realignment | Bond Street has been completed | Yes | |
| Zoning (Effective Jan. 8, 2015) | TC-1: Town Center-1 | No Change | Yes | |
| Uses Permitted (Sec 3.1.26.B & C) | Sec. 3.1.25.B Principal Uses Permitted. Sec. 3.1.25.C. – Special Land Uses Permitted. Retail (4.78.3) and Residential Dwellings 4.82) | 5,578 SF if retail 329 Apartments 194 1-BR, 116 2-BR and 19 3-BR units Area for Commercial site: 1.07 acres Area for residential site: 6.87 acre | Yes | This development is considered mixed use. |
| Density Future Land Use Map (adopted July 26, | Maximum 20.0 DUA | Total site area: 7.99 acres 41 dwelling Units per | No | Revised Deviation will need to be granted in room count to allow additional density |

| Item | Required Code | Proposed | Meets Code | Comments |
|---|---|--|---------------|---|
| 2017) | | Acre | | |
| Phasing | Show proposed phasing lines on site plan. | Two phases are being proposed Phase 1 Building 1 - 163 units Building 2 - 166 units 2-level garage: 269 spaces Pool and amenities Surface Parking: 150 spaces Parallel on-street parking: 20 spaces Temporary gravel cemetery parking area in commercial area: approximately 6 spaces Phase 2 Commercial building 5,587 sf Commercial building and associated parking | Yes | A pedestrian access to cemetery should be provided with phase 1 City Council variance granted for gravel parking |
| Height, bulk, density a | nd area limitations | | | |
| Frontage on a Public Street (Sec. 5.12) Access To Major Thoroughfare (Sec. 5.13) | Frontage upon a public street. Access to major thoroughfare. | The site has frontage and access to Bond Street (public) | Yes | Bond Street is not a major thoroughfare; however this site qualifies to have an access to other than a major thoroughfare based on section 5.13 |
| Usable Open Space for Multiple Dwelling Units (Sec. 3.1.26.D) | Usable Open Space is defined as balconies, courts and yards that are private recreational uses, and no dimension is less than 50 ft. 200 sq. ft. per dwelling unit 200 x 329 = 65,800 sq. ft. | Outdoor Amenity courtyards, Pool and Hot tub – 24,692 sf Balconies: 19,916 sf Courtyards: 13,504 sf Fitness Room: 3,162 sf Clubhouse: 7,127 sf Total: 68,401 sf | No | The spaces in bold do not meet the Ordinance definition of Usable Open Space – City Council may allow for the inclusion of spaces that do not meet the strict interpretation of the Ordinance |
| Maximum % of Lot Area Covered (By All Buildings) (Sec. 3.6.2 D) | No Maximum | Building 1: 38,791 sf Building 2: 39,473 sf Garage: 47,351 sf Commercial: 5,578 sf Total 131,193 sf (37.7%) | Yes | |

| Item | Required Code | Proposed | Meets Code | Comments |
|--|--|--|---------------|---|
| Building Height (Sec.3.1.26.D) (Sec. 3.27.1.A) | 5 stories or 65 ft, whichever is less** ** See Section 3.27.2.A for exceptions and additional requirements to exceed 65 stories | 5 stories proposed; Approximately 60 feet | Yes | Specify the maximum height under site data on sheet 2 |

Residential portion of this development is subject to conditions and requirements of Section 4.82: Residential Dwellings in TC and TC-1 districts (Ordinance Amendment 18.279)

Commercial Portion is subject to TC and TC-1 requirements

Commercial Building Setbacks (Sec 3.1.26 D) and (Sec. 3.27.1.C)

Non-residential collectors and Local Streets

Additional setbacks may also be required by Planning Commission or City Council if deemed necessary for better design or functionality

| Front (Flint Street) | 0 ft. minimum 10 ft. maximum *Setback may be | | Phase 2 not evaluated at this time – Will require its own PSP/FSP review |
|--|--|----|--|
| Exterior Side Yard (Novi Road) See 3.27.1.C for waiver conditions for City Council | increased where necessary to obtain clear vision area for vehicular traffic. | | |
| | Commercial building is fronting on Novi Road | | |
| Side Yard | 0 ft. minimum None | | |
| Rear Yard (Railroad tracks) | 0 ft. minimum None | | |
| Commercial Parking S | etback (Sec 3.1.26.D) | | |
| Front Flint Street | 20 ft. from ROW | | Phase 2 not evaluated at this time – Will require its |
| Exterior Side Yard (Novi Road) | 20 ft. from ROW | | own PSP/FSP review ** Note: DA states Commercial Project must |
| Side Yard, west | 10 ft. | | commence within 3 years of |
| Rear Yard (Railroad tracks) | 10 ft. | | commencement of construction of Residential project |
| Note To District Standa | r ds (Sec 3.6.2) | | |
| Exterior Side Yard Abutting a Street (Sec 3.6.2.C) | All exterior side yards abutting a street shall be provided with a setback | NA | NA to Phase 1 |

| Item | Required Code | Proposed | Meets Code | Comments |
|---|--|---|---------------|----------|
| | equal to front yard. | | | |
| Minimum lot area and width (Sec 3.6.2.D) | Except where otherwise provided in this ordinance, the minimum lot area and width, maximum percentage of lot coverage shall be determined by the requirements set forth. | Proposed | Yes | |
| Distance between buildings (Sec 3.6.2.H&L) | If site abuts a residential zone, buildings must be set back at least 3' for each 1' of building height, but in no case can be less than 20' setback | Does not abut residential zoning | NA | |
| Wetland/Watercourse Setback (Sec 3.6.2.M) | A setback of 25 ft. from wetlands and from high watermark course shall be maintained | Middle Rouge creek runs through the site- 25 ft watercourse buffer shown | Yes | |
| Parking setback screening (Sec 3.6.2.P) | Required parking setback area shall be landscaped per sec 5.5.3. | | | |
| Modification of parking setback requirements (Sec 3.6.2.Q) | The Planning Commission may modify parking setback requirements based on its determination according to Sec 3.6.2.Q. | | | |

The Planning Commission may modify parking setback requirements in those instances where it determines that such modification may result in improved use of the site and/ or in improved landscaping; provided, however, that such modification of the setback requirements does not reduce the total area of setback on a site below the minimum setback area requirements of this Section.

TC-1 District Required Conditions (Sec 3.27)

| To a pismer required containors (acc 0.27) | | | | |
|--|--|-----------------------|-----|--|
| | Site area under 5 acres: Requires Planning Commission approval; Site area over 5 acres: Requires City Council approval upon Planning Commission recommendation | Site is over 5 acres | Yes | Revised Site Plan and Development Agreement will required City Council approval upon Planning Commission recommendation. |
| Parking Setbacks | 20 ft. from ROW | 10 feet in some areas | Yes | Waiver for 10 ft granted |

| Item | Required Code | Proposed | Meets Code | Comments |
|--|--|---|---------------|--|
| (3.27.1 D) | Surface parking areas must be screened by either a 2.5 ft. brick wall or a semi-transparent screening or a landscaped berm from all public ROW | A 2.5 foot screening wall is proposed in leu of berm due to lack of space | Yes | |
| | No front yard or side yard parking on any non-residential collector. | Residential: Of 562 spaces proposed, 39 spaces (7%) are proposed in front yard and 50 (9%) spaces in eastern side yard and 35 spaces (6%) in western side yard. | No | A Zoning Board of Appeals variance was granted for proposing parking in front yard and side yard, due to smaller depth of the parcel - Approval has expired, will need to reapply for variance |
| Architecture/Pedestri an Orientation (3.27.1.E) | No building in the TC-1 district shall be in excess of one-hundred twenty-five (125) feet in width, unless pedestrian entranceways are provided at least every one-hundred twenty-five (125) feet of frontage. | This only applies to Commercial building. | | |
| Open Space (3.27.1.F) | 15% (permanently landscaped open areas and pedestrian plazas) Required: 44,888 sq. ft. | Open space plan provided - Pool and Hot tub and Park areas – 24,692 sf Courtyards: 13,504 sf 38,196 sf Total | No | Balconies and indoor areas cannot count toward this type of Open Space – see definition in Ordinance. Can include additional landscaped lawn areas less than 50-feet wide |
| Façade materials (Sec. 3.27.1.G) | All sides of the building and accessory buildings must have the same materials. Façade materials may deviate from brick or stone with PC approval. | Section 9 waivers required which are supported by our Façade consultant | Yes | City Council has-previously granted Section 9 waivers required. |
| Parking, Loading, Signs, Landscaping, Lighting, Etc (Sec. 3.27.1.H) | All loading in TC-1 shall be in rear yards. | Residential: Side yard Commercial: Rear Yard Bond Street is | Yes | A Zoning Board of Appeals variance was granted for loading area in side yard – Approval has expired, will need to reapply for |

| Item | Required Code | Proposed | Meets Code | Comments |
|---|--|--|---------------|--|
| | | considered a front yard | | <u>variance</u> |
| | Off-street parking counts can be reduced by the number of on-street parking adjacent to a use | 20, on-street parking on Bond Street proposed | Yes | |
| | PC may allow parking requirement reduction when parking areas serve dual functions. | The development proposes mixed uses. However, they are served by separate entrances and are not connected. | Yes | |
| | Special assessment district for structured park | Not proposed | NA | |
| Sidewalks required (Sec. 3.27.1.1) | Sidewalks required along non-residential collector to be 12.5 ft. wide | 8 ft sidewalk on Bond Street frontage | Yes | A Zoning Board of Appeals variance granted to allow 8 ft sidewalk on Bond Street Approval has expired, will need to reapply for variance |
| | Direct pedestrian access between all buildings and adjacent areas | Provided. | Yes | |
| Bicycle Paths (Sec. 3.27.1.J) | Bike paths required to connect to adjacent residential & non-residential areas. | 10 ft. wide asphalt bike path constructed along north side of Bond Street | NA | 10 ft. wide asphalt bike path constructed along north side of Bond Street by City |
| Development amenities (Sec. 3.27.1.L) | All sites must incorporate amenities such as exterior lighting, outdoor furniture, and safety paths in accordance with Town Center Study Area. | The development appears to be proposing sufficient and significant amenities such as pool and interior courtyards; Landscape park east of | Yes | |
| | | proposed detention pond | | |
| Combination of use groups within a single structure (Sec. 3.27.1.M) (Sec. 3.27.2.B) | 7,500 sq. ft. GLA max may exceed when: - All floors above 1st floor permitted in TC-1 - No retail above 2nd floor - 2nd floor retail is less | 5,578 square feet of commercial space if provided in a separate building within the same site | NA | Commercial space to be completed in phase 2 |

| Item | Required Code | Proposed | Meets Code | Comments |
|---|---|---|---------------|---|
| | than 12,000 sq. ft. or 25% of the floor area - Single user max. is 15,000 sq. ft 50% of retail commercial space on 1st floor is devoted to users of 5,000 sq. ft. or less | | | |
| Street and Roadway Rights-Of-Way (Sec. 3.27.1 N) | Nonresidential collector and local stress shall provide ROWs consistent with DCS standards | ROW has been dedicated | Yes | Bond Street now constructed |
| Mixed-Use Developme To qualify as a mixed-u | | t must meet the following | require | ments. |
| Each use shall comprise of at least 10% in the TC-1 district of either a. The net site area or b. The total gross floor area of all buildings | | Gross site area: 8.73 acres Gross site area after ROW taking: 7.99 acres Residential Site Area: 6.87 acres Commercial site area: 1.07 acre (11.5% of total site area) | Yes | Property splits have been completed; new parcel numbers shown |
| A development with both conventional multi- family and senior, age-qualified, independent multi-family uses shall not be considered mixed use unless a non-residential use is also included | | Not applicable | NA | |
| A performing arts facility unconditionally dedicated to the public use, under separate agreement with the City, shall be considered a second use, provided that it is a fully enclosed structure with a minimum of 500 seats. | | Not applicable | NA | |
| Residential Dwellings / | Mixed-Use in TC/TC-1 (Sec | c. 4.82) | r | |
| Multiple-Housing Dwell | lings Units (Sec. 4.82.2) | Must meet RM-1 district requirements. | Not Ap | pplicable |
| Mixed Use Guidelines | (Sec. 4.82.2) | | | |
| Number of Rooms and Area of Parcel (Sec. 4.82.2.a) TC/TC-1, Multiple Family, and Mixed- Use | Total number of rooms shall not have more than the area of the parcel in square feet, divided by a factor of 1200. For mixed use, it is divided by factor of 800. | For 7.99 acres 348,044 sq. ft. / 800 = 435 rooms Applicant has provided floor plans Total: 812 rooms proposed | No | City Council will need to approve revised increase in number of rooms |

| Item | Required Code | Proposed | Meets Code | Comments |
|--|---|--|---------------|---|
| Allowing increase in number of rooms (Sec. 4.82.2.b) | Planning Commission (for sites <5 acres) or City Council (for sites >5 acres) can approve increase in number of rooms subject to conditions listed in Sec. 4.82.2.b. The increase cannot exceed more than two times the rooms otherwise allowed | Allowed: 435 rooms Proposed: 812 rooms Increase in rooms in less than two times otherwise allowed | | City Council would need to approve increase in number of rooms |
| Floor plans for Mixed Use developments (Sec. 4.82.2.c) | Conceptual floor plans layouts for each dwelling unit is required to establish maximum number of rooms permitted, subject to minor modifications | Floor plans included in this submittal | Yes | |
| Minimum Distance between Buildings (Sec. 4.82.2.d) | 10 ft. | 129.33 ft. | Yes | |
| Building Setbacks (Sec. 4.82.2.e) | 15 ft. minimum, unless conflicts with corner clearance 75 ft, if adjacent to single family | Building 1: Total length: 273 ft. Minimum setback provided: 12.2 ft. Length of building not meeting the minimum setbacks: 12 ft. (4%) Building 2: Total length: 273 ft. Minimum setback provided: 8.1 ft. Length of building not meeting the minimum setbacks: 16 ft. (6%) Parking Structure: Minimum setback provided: 5 ft. Length of building not meeting the minimum setbacks: entire parking structure (approximately 700 ft. long) | Nos | A Zoning Board of Appeals variance has been granted for not meeting the minimum required building setback requirements for the parking garage and the residential units. Approval has expired, will need to reapply for variance |

| Item | Required Code | Proposed | Meets Code | Comments |
|--|--|---|---------------|----------|
| Parking Setbacks Off-street Parking (Sec. 4.82.2.f) Residential dwelling are subject to this section, not Sec. | 10 ft. minimum from any wall of any dwelling structure, which contains openings involving living areas; | A minimum of 10 feet is maintained except for parking in front of Building 2. However, floor plans indicate that façade does not include any openings | Yes | |
| 3.1.26. | 5 ft. from any wall with no openings | Meets the minimum | Yes | |
| | 10 ft. from any ROW)includes drives and loading) | Meets the minimum from ROW | Yes | |
| | 5 ft. from all other property lines | Meets the minimum for other property lines | Yes | |
| | 30 ft. from property lines adjacent to Single family homes | Not applicable | NA | |
| Business and Office Uses (Sec. 4.82.3) | Not occupy same floor as residential No office use above a residential use Separate entrance, private pedestrian entrance to residential shall be provided | Not applicable | NA | |
| Parking Location (Sec. 4.82.4) | Off-street parking shall be provided within a building, parking structure physically attached, or designed off-street parking within 300 ft. of building. | Off-street proposed surface parking and parking structure | Yes | |

Sec. 4.82.2. Residential Guidelines for Development

Note: Staff has made a determination for mixed use guidelines that is consistent with non-mixed use guidelines. For purpose of determining compliance, the minimum square footages are associated with number of bedroom as follows: 1 BR- 500 SF min; 2 BR- 750 SF min; 3 BR – 750 SF min; 4+ BR- 1,000 SF min; 3

The applicant has proposed a mix of 1, 2, and 3 bedroom units. One bedroom units range from 603 sf to 864 sf. Two bedroom units range from 944 sf to 1259 sf; 3 br are at 1277 sf. The applicant has provided floor plans.

| Maximum Room Count: Mixed Use Guidelines(Sec. 4.82.2) | | | | |
|---|---|--------------|---|--|
| Efficiency-400 | 1 | Not proposed | Unit tabulation on Sheet | |
| 1 BR: 500 sq. ft. | 2 | 2 | A410 shows "Bed Count" rather than "Room Count" | |
| 2 BR: 750sq. ft. | 3 | 3 | as specified by ordinance | |

| Item | Required Code | Proposed | Meets Code | Comments |
|---|---|---|---------------|--|
| 3 BR: 900 sq. ft. | 4 | 4 | | |
| 4 BR: 1000 sq. ft. | 5 | Not proposed | | |
| Maximum Density: Mix | xed Use Guidelines(Sec. 4.8 | 82.2) | | |
| Efficiency-400 | | Proposed density: 41 | No | City Council would need to |
| 1 BR: 500 sq. ft. | 27.3 DUA (a) | DUA | | approve the increase of maximum number of rooms and thus the increase in |
| 2 BR: 750sq. ft. | 18.15 DUA | Allowable Density: 23 | | |
| 3 BR: 900 sq. ft. | 13.61 DUA | DUA; Allowable density is calculated based on | | density. |
| 4 BR: 1000 sq. ft. | 10.89 DUA | maximum number of rooms allowed for this property (435 rooms) | | |
| Maximum Percentage | of Units: Mixed Use Guide | elines(Sec. 4.82.2) | | |
| Efficiency-400 | 5% | Not proposed | | A ZBA variance has been |
| 1 BR: 500 sq. ft. | 50% | 1 BR @ 146 units : 59 % | No | granted for exceeding the maximum allowable |
| 2 BR: 750sq. ft. | 100% | 2 BR @ 93 units : 35 % | Yes | percentage for 1-bedroom |
| 3 BR: 900 sq. ft. | 100% | 3 BR @ 14 units : 6 % | Yes | <u>units</u> Approval has expired, will |
| 4 BR: 1000 sq. ft. | 100% | Not proposed | | need to reapply for variance |
| Minimum Off-street po | arking per unit: Mixed Use | Guidelines(Sec. 4.82.2) | | |
| Efficiency-400 | 1 per unit | 194 spaces @ 1 BR | | |
| 1 BR: 500 sq. ft. | 1 per unit | 232 spaces @ 2 BR 38 spaces @ 3 BR | Yes | |
| 2 BR: 750sq. ft. | 2 per unit | | Yes | |
| 3 BR: 900 sq. ft. | 2 per unit | Total 464 spaces required plus 20% | Yes | |
| 4 BR: 1000 sq. ft. | 2 per unit | contingency parking (557 spaces) | | |
| | | Total 562 spaces proposed | | |
| Parking, Loading, and | Dumpster Requirements (| 5.3 site specific review requ | uired) | |
| Required Parking Calculation (Sec. 5.2.12) (Sec. 4.82.2) | Commercial 1 per 250 sq. ft. of gfa 5,578 / 250 = 23 spaces Residential Development 464 spaces minimum 93 spaces 20% contingency Total of 557 spaces | Commercial 49 spaces Of which, four are dedicated for public parking for cemetery Residential Development 562 spaces 20 On street 378 garage 164 surface parking | Yes | |

| Item | Required Code | Proposed | Meets Code | Comments |
|--|---|---|---------------|--|
| Parking Space Dimensions and Maneuvering Lanes (Sec. 5.3.2) | 90° Parking: 9 ft. x 19 ft. 24 ft. two way drives 9 ft. x 17 ft. parking spaces allowed as long as detail indicates a 4" curb at these locations 60° 9 ft. x 18 ft. | 9 ft. x 17 ft. parking spaces allowed as long as detail indicates a 4" curb at these locations 60° 9 ft. x 18 ft. 9 ft. x 18 ft. (garage) | No | A ZBA variance has been granted for not meeting the minimum depth requirement for the parking spaces in the garage. Approval has expired, will need to reapply for variance |
| Parking lot entrance offset (Sec. 5.3.6) | Parking lot entrances must be set back 25' from any single-family residential district. | Not applicable | NA | |
| End Islands (Sec. 5.3.12) | End Islands with landscaping and raised curbs are required at the end of all parking bays that abut traffic circulation aisles. The end islands shall generally be at least 8 ft. wide, have an outside radius of 15 ft., and be constructed 3 ft. shorter than the adjacent parking stall | Some end islands are not shown to be 3' shorter than adjacent parking space | Yes | |
| Parking stall located adjacent to a parking lot entrance (public or private) (Sec. 5.3.13) | - Shall not be located closer than twenty-five (25) feet from the street right-of-way (ROW) line, street easement or sidewalk, whichever is closer | All entrances appear meet the requirements | Yes | |
| Barrier Free Spaces Barrier Free Code *No deviations since this is a Michigan Building Code requirement | Residential Portion: A total of 2% of 464 required parking = 9 barrier free | Phase 1 6 barrier free 4 regular and 2 van accessible on surface parking lot 8 barrier free all van accessible in garage Total of 14 barrier free | Yes | |
| Barrier Free Space Dimensions Barrier Free Code | 8' wide with an 8' wide access aisle for van accessible spaces 8' wide with a 5' wide access aisle for regular accessible spaces | Spaces are distributed into five locations with two spaces each | Yes | |

| Item | Required Code | Proposed | Meets Code | Comments |
|--|--|--|---------------|--|
| Barrier Free Signs Barrier Free Code | One sign for each accessible parking space. | Signs indicated | Yes | Sign quantity details needed at time of FSP |
| Minimum number of Bicycle Parking (Sec. 5.16.1) | Multiple-Family: 1 for each 5 dwellings 329/5 = 50 bike spaces Commercial: Five (5) percent of required automobile spaces, min. of 2 24 spaces = 2 bike spaces Total = 66 bike spaces | Multiple-Family: Building 1: 20 indoor spaces; 6 outdoor spaces Building 2: 20 indoor spaces; 6 outdoor spaces; 6 outdoor spaces Garage: 30 spaces Total 82 spaces | Yes | |
| Bicycle Parking General requirements (Sec. 5.16) | No farther than 120 ft. from the entrance being served When 4 or more spaces are required for a building with multiple entrances, the spaces shall be provided in multiple locations Spaces to be paved and the bike rack shall be inverted "U" design Shall be accessible via 6 ft. paved sidewalk | Appears to be within 120 ft. | Yes | |
| Bicycle Parking Lot layout (Sec 5.16.6) | Parking space width: 7 ft. One tier width: 11 ft. Two tier width: 18 ft. Maneuvering lane width: 4 ft. Parking space depth: 32 in. | Detail provided | Yes | |
| Loading Space Area (Sec. 5.4.2) | Within TC zoning, loading space shall be provided in the rear yard (or in the interior side yard beyond the side yard setback for double frontage lots) in the ratio of 10 sq. ft. per front foot of building. | Residential: Two spaces measuring approximately 630-690 square feet is proposed for residential buildings. Loading area is located in the interior side yard for residential portion. | No | Loading area location and size granted ZBA Variance Approval has expired, will need to reapply for variance |

| Item | Required Code | Proposed | Meets Code | Comments | |
|--|---|--|---------------|----------|--|
| | 2830 square feet of loading area is required for residential building For 55 feet long | | | | |
| | commercial building, 550 square feet of loading area is required | | | | |
| Loading Space Screening (Sec. 5.4.2 B) | Loading area must be screened from view from adjoining properties and from the street. | Residential loading areas are screened adequately. | Yes | | |
| Dumpster Sec 4.19.2.F | Located in rear yard Attached to the building or no closer than 10 ft. from building if not attached Not located in parking setback (20 ft.) Rear lot abuts ROW, 50 ft. setback required. Away from Barrier free Spaces | Residential: Dumpsters are located inside the building | Yes | | |
| Dumpster Enclosure Sec. 21-145. (c) Chapter 21 of City Code of Ordinances | Screened from public view A wall or fence 1 ft. higher than height of refuse bin And no less than 5 ft. on three sides Posts or bumpers to protect the screening Hard surface pad. Screening Materials: Masonry, wood or evergreen shrubbery | Located internally within the building | NA | | |
| Lighting and Photometric Plan (Sec. 5.7) | | | | | |
| Intent (Sec. 5.7.1) | Establish appropriate minimum levels, prevent unnecessary glare, reduce spill-over onto adjacent properties & reduce unnecessary transmission of light into the night sky | Proposed | Yes | | |

| Item | Required Code | Proposed | Meets Code | Comments |
|---|--|-----------------------------------|---------------|--|
| Lighting Plan (Sec. 5.7.2 A.i) | Site plan showing location of all existing & proposed buildings, landscaping, streets, drives, parking areas & exterior lighting fixtures | Lighting plan previously provided | | |
| Building Lighting (Sec. 5.7.2.A.iii) | Relevant building elevation drawings showing all fixtures, the portions of the walls to be illuminated, illuminance levels of walls and the aiming points of any remote fixtures. | | | Please provide photometric for building lighting |
| Lighting Plan (Sec.5.7.2 A.ii) | Specifications for all proposed & existing lighting fixtures | | | |
| | Photometric data | | | |
| | Fixture height | | | |
| | Mounting & design | | | |
| | Glare control devices | | | |
| | Type & color rendition of lamps | | | |
| | Hours of operation | | | |
| Maximum height when abutting residential districts (Sec. 5.7.3.A) | Height not to exceed maximum height of zoning district (or 25 ft. where adjacent to residential districts or uses) | | | |
| Standard Notes (Sec. 5.7.3.B) | Electrical service to light fixtures shall be placed underground Flashing light shall not be permitted Only necessary lighting for security purposes & limited operations shall be permitted after a site's hours of operation | | | |
| Indoor Lighting | - Indoor lighting shall not | | | |

| Item | Required Code | Proposed | Meets Code | Comments |
|--|---|----------|---------------|----------|
| (Sec. 5.7.3.H) | be the source of exterior glare or spillover | | | |
| Security Lighting (Sec. 5.7.3.1) Lighting for security purposes shall be directed only onto the area to be secured. | All fixtures shall be located, shielded and aimed at the areas to be secured. Fixtures mounted on the building and designed to illuminate the facade are preferred | | | |
| Color Spectrum Management (Sec. 5.7.3.F) | Non-Res and Multifamily: For all permanent lighting installations - minimum Color Rendering Index of 70 and Correlated Color Temperature of no greater than 3000 Kelvin | | | |
| Parking Lot Lighting (Sec. 5.7.3.J) | - Provide the minimum illumination necessary to ensure adequate vision and comfort. Full cut-off fixtures shall be used to prevent glare and spillover. | | | |
| Min. Illumination (Sec. 5.7.3.L) | Parking areas: 0.2 min | | | |
| [J.7.J.L] | Loading & unloading areas: 0.4 min | | | |
| | Walkways: 0.2 min | | | |
| | Building entrances, frequent use: 1.0 min | | | |
| | Building entrances, infrequent use: 0.2 min | | | |
| Average Light Level (Sec.5.7.3.L) | Average light level of the surface being lit to the lowest light of the surface being lit shall not exceed 4:1 | | | |
| Residential Exceptions (Sec.5.7.3.0) | Residential developments may deviate from the minimum illumination levels and uniformity | | | |

| Item | Required Code | Proposed | Meets Code | Comments |
|---|---|---|---------------|--|
| | requirements in Section 5.7.3.L so long as site lighting requirements for parking lots, property lines, and security lighting is provided | | | |
| Max. Illumination adjacent to Non- Residential (Sec. 5.7.3.K) | When site abuts a non- residential district, maximum illumination at the property line shall not exceed 1 foot candle | | | A ZBA variance granted to exceed max. fc to south abutting the railroad tracks up to 1.7 fc Approval has expired, may need to reapply for variance |
| Cut off Angles (Sec. 5.7.3.L) | When adjacent to residential districts: - All cut off angles of fixtures must be 90° - maximum illumination at the property line shall not exceed 0.5 foot candle | | | |
| Building Code and Oth | ner Requirements | | | |
| Accessory Structures (Sec. 4.19) | -Each accessory building shall meet all setback requirements for the zoning district in which the property is situated -Shall meet the façade ordinance standards | No accessory structures i.e. carports are proposed | NA | |
| Exterior Building Wall Façade Materials (Sec. 5.15) (Sec. 3.27.1.G) | Façade Region: 1 Primarily brick with materials that complement | Elevation drawings submitted previously; requires section 9 waivers supported by Doug | Yes? | Section 9 waivers have been granted for deviations from material requirements |
| Roof top equipment and wall mounted utility equipment Sec. 4.19.2.E.ii | All roof top equipment must be screened and all wall mounted utility equipment must be enclosed and integrated into the design and color of the building | Rooftop equipment is proposed to be hidden behind the parapet. | Yes | Add a note on the plan |
| Building Code | Building exits must be connected to sidewalk system or parking lot. | Sidewalks illustrated | Yes | |


| Item | Required Code | Proposed | Meets Code | Comments |
|--|--|---|---------------|--|
| Design and Construction Standards Manual | Land description, Sidwell number (metes and bounds for acreage parcel, lot number(s), Liber, and page for subdivisions). | Mostly provided | Yes | Refer to all reviews for missing information |
| General layout and dimension of proposed physical improvements | Location of all existing and proposed buildings, proposed building heights, building layouts, (floor area in square feet), location of proposed parking and parking layout, streets and drives, and indicate square footage of pavement area (indicate public or private). | Mostly provided; | Yes | Refer to review letters for missing information |
| Economic Impact | Total cost of the proposed building & site improvements Number of anticipated jobs created (during construction & after building is occupied, if known) | | | |
| Signage | Signage if proposed requires a permit. Signage is not regulated by the Planning Commission or Planning Division. | A monument sign is indicate between the two residential buildings | NA | Please contact ordinance department for sign permit requirements and process |
| Property Address | The applicant should contact the Building Division for an address prior to applying for a building permit. | | | Submit address application after Final Site Plan approval. |
| Project and Street Naming Committee | Some projects may need approval from the Street and Project Naming Committee. | The Bond has been approved by the committee | Yes | |
| Property Split/Combination | The proposed property split must be submitted to the Assessing Department for approval. | | | Lot split/combination has been completed |

Planning Review Summary Chart

| Item | Required Code | Proposed | Meets Code | Comments |
|---|--|--|---------------|--|
| Traffic Study (Site Plan and Development Manual) | Traffic Impact Statement Required for more than 105 units | A traffic study was provided and reviewed under separate packet in March 15 | Yes | Previously reviewed and accepted |
| Community Impact Statement (Site Plan and Development Manual) | Community Impact Statement Required for more than 150 units | Dated May 10, 2018 | Yes | Previously reviewed and accepted |
| Easements | All draft easements are required to be submitted along with electronic stamping sets | Indicate the easement boundaries on final site plan submittal | Yes? | Conservation easement required for saved trees counted toward woodland credits |

NOTES:

- 1. This table is a working summary chart and not intended to substitute for any Ordinance or City of Novi requirements or standards.
- 2. The section of the applicable ordinance or standard is indicated in parenthesis. Please refer to those sections in Article 3, 4, and 5 of the zoning ordinance for further details.
- 3. Please include a written response to any points requiring clarification or for any corresponding site plan modifications to the City of Novi Planning Department with future submittals.





PLAN REVIEW CENTER REPORT

5/31/2024

Engineering Review

The Bond JSP18-0010

APPLICANT

Tri-Cap Holdings

REVIEW TYPE

Revised Preliminary Site Plan

PROPERTY CHARACTERISTICS

Site Location: South side of Bond Street west of Novi Road

Site Size: 6.87 acresPlan Date: 5-3-2024

Design Engineer: Seiber Keast Engineering

PROJECT SUMMARY

- Residential development including two multi-family apartment buildings with an attached parking deck. Site access would be provided via Bond Street.
- Water service will be provided via a connection to the existing 8-inch stub in Bond Street, just west of Novi Road.
- Residential sanitary sewer service will be provided via a connection to the existing 15-inch sewer along the south side of Bond Street and commercial sanitary sewer service will be provided via a connection to the existing 8-inch sanitary sewer on the west side of Novi Road.
- Storm water will be collected by a storm sewer collection system and bank full detention will be provided in an on-site detention basin and underground detention basin. Storm water will be discharged to the Walled Lake Branch of the Middle Rouge River that eventually flows to the C&O District regional detention basin.

RECOMMENDATION

Approval of the Revised Preliminary Site Plan is recommended, with items to be addressed at Final Site Plan submittal.

Comments:

The Revised Preliminary Site Plan meets the general requirements of the design and construction standards as set forth in Chapter 11 of the City of Novi Code of Ordinances,

the Storm Water Management Ordinance and the <u>Engineering Design Manual</u> with the following items to be addressed at the time of Final Site Plan submittal:

General

- 1. Provide Phasing details in next submittal, last review letter indicated that this site plan will be split into 2 phases.
- 2. A Right-of-Way Permit will be required from the City of Novi.
- 3. Provide a traffic control sign table listing the quantities of each **permanent** sign type proposed for the development. Provide a note along with the table stating all traffic signage will comply with the current MMUTCD standards.
- 4. Provide a note that compacted sand backfill (MDOT sand Class II) shall be provided for all utilities within the influence of paved areas; illustrate and label on the profiles.
- 5. Provide a construction materials table on the utility plan listing the quantity and material type for each utility (water, sanitary and storm) being proposed.
- 6. Provide a utility crossing table indicating that at least 18-inch vertical clearance will be provided, or that additional bedding measures will be utilized at points of conflict where adequate clearance cannot be maintained.
- 7. Where the minimum 18-inch clearance at utility crossings cannot be achieved, provide a prominent note stating the substandard clearance and that proper bedding/encasement will be determined by the inspecting engineer.
- 8. Provide a note stating if dewatering is anticipated or encountered during construction, then a dewatering plan must be submitted to the Engineering Division for review.
- 9. Generally, all proposed trees shall remain outside utility easements. Where proposed trees are required within a utility easement, the trees shall maintain a minimum 5-foot horizontal separation distance from any existing or proposed utility. All utilities shall be shown on the landscape plan, or other appropriate sheet, to confirm the separation distance.
- 10. Relocate light poles outside of utility easements where possible. Light poles in a utility easement will require a License Agreement.

Water Main

- 11. Provide profiles for all water main. Provide water main basis of design.
- 12. A tapping sleeve, valve and well is required at the connection to the existing water main.
- 13. Provide additional valves to limit pipe runs to a maximum of 800 feet between valves.
- 14. Per current EGLE requirement, provide a profile for all proposed water main 8-inch and larger.
- 15. All gate valves 6" or larger shall be placed in a well with the exception of a hydrant shut off valve. A valve shall be placed in a box for water main smaller than 6".

- 16. Valves shall be arranged so that no single line failure will require more than eight hundred (800) feet of main to be out of service.
- 17. In the general notes and on the profile, add the following note: "Per the Ten States Standards Article 8.8.3, one full 20-foot pipe length of water main shall be used whenever storm sewer or sanitary sewer is crossed, and the pipe shall be centered on the crossing, in order to ensure 10-foot separation between water main and sewers." Additionally, show the 20-foot pipe lengths on the profile at each crossing.
- 18. The existing EGLE permit has expired, and a new permit will be needed for new REUs. A sealed set of utility plans along with the Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes & Energy (EGLE) permit application for water main construction, the Streamlined Water Main Permit Checklist, Contaminated Site Evaluation Checklist, and an electronic version of the utility plan should be submitted to the Engineering Division for review, assuming no further design changes are anticipated. Utility plan sets shall include only the cover sheet, any applicable utility sheets, and the standard detail sheets.

Irrigation Comments

19. If irrigation is proposed submit a copy of the irrigation plan with the next submittal, irrigation plans must be approved by the cross-connection specialist before plans can be stamped.

Sanitary Sewer

- 20. Provide sanitary sewer profiles. Illustrate all pipes intersecting with manholes on the sanitary profiles. Label sanitary sewer lead length.
- 21. Note on the construction materials table that 6-inch sanitary leads shall be a minimum SDR 23.5, and mains shall be SDR 26.
- 22. Provide a note on the Utility Plan and sanitary profile stating the sanitary leads will be buried at least 5 feet deep where under the influence of pavement.
- 23. Existing EGLE permit has expired, and a new permit will be needed for new REUs. Three (3) sealed sets of revised utility plans along with the Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes & Energy (EGLE) permit application, electronic utility plan for sanitary sewer construction, and the Streamlined Sanitary Sewer Permit Certification Checklist should be submitted to the Engineering Division for review, assuming no further design changes are anticipated. Utility plan sets shall include only the cover sheet, any applicable utility sheets, and the standard detail sheets. It should be indicated with the application if an expedited EGLE review is requested. EGLE will charge a fee that can be paid directly to the State.

Storm Sewer

24. A minimum cover depth of 3 feet shall be maintained over all proposed storm sewer. Currently, a few pipe sections do not meet this standard. Grades shall be elevated, and minimum pipe slopes shall be used to maximize the cover depth. In situations where the minimum cover <u>cannot</u> be achieved, Class V pipe must be used with an absolute minimum cover depth of 2 feet. An explanation shall be provided where the cover depth cannot be provided.

JSP18-0010

- 25. Provide a 0.1-foot drop in the downstream invert of all storm structures where a change in direction of 30 degrees or greater occurs.
- 26. Match the 0.80 diameter depth above invert for pipe size increases.
- 27. Storm manholes with differences in invert elevations exceeding two feet shall contain a 2-foot-deep plunge pool.
- 28. Provide a four-foot-deep sump and an oil/gas separator in the last storm structure prior to discharge underground detention system.
- 29. The minimum pipe size for storm sewers receiving surface runoff shall be 12-inch diameter.
- 30. Provide profiles for all storm sewers 12-inch and larger. All storm pipes accepting surface drainage shall be 12-inch or larger.
- 31. Label all inlet storm structures on the profiles. Inlets are only permitted in paved areas and when followed by a catch basin within 50-feet.
- 32. Label the 10-year HGL on the storm sewer profiles and ensure the HGL remains at least 1-foot below the rim of each structure.
- 33. Illustrate all pipes intersecting storm structures on the storm profiles.
- 34. An easement is required over the storm sewer accepting and conveying offsite drainage.
- 35. Provide a schedule listing the casting type, rim elevation, diameter, and invert sizes/elevations for each proposed, adjusted, or modified storm structure on the utility plan. Round castings shall be provided on all catch basins except curb inlet structures.
- 36. Show and label all roof conductors and show where they tie into the storm sewer.

Storm Water Management Plan

- 37. The Storm Water Management Plan (SWMP) for this development shall be designed in accordance with the Storm Water Ordinance and Chapter 5 of the **Engineering Design Manual.**
- 38. Provide calculations verifying the post-development runoff rate directed to the proposed receiving drainage course does not exceed the pre-development runoff rate for the site.
- 39. The SWMP must address the discharge of storm water off-site, and evidence of its adequacy must be provided. This should be done by comparing pre- and post-development discharge rates. The area being used for this off-site discharge should be delineated and the ultimate location of discharge shown.
- 40. Rather than a sediment forebay, a permanent water surface and storage volume are preferred. Refer to section 5.6.1 A. of the Engineering Design Manual for depth and volume requirements for wet detention basins.
- 41. An adequate maintenance access route to the basin outlet structure and any other pretreatment structures shall be provided (15 feet wide, maximum running slope of 1V:5H, maximum cross slope of 3%, and able to withstand the passage of heavy equipment). Verify the access route does not conflict with proposed landscaping.

- 42. Provide manufacturer's details and sizing calculations for the pretreatment structure(s) on the plans. Provide drainage area and runoff coefficient calculations specific to the area tributary to each treatment structure. The treated flow rate should be based on the 1-year storm event intensity (~1.6 In/Hr). Higher flows shall be bypassed.
- 43. Provide release rate calculations for the three design storm events (first flush, bank full, 100-year).
- 44. Due to maintenance concerns, each restricting orifice in the control structure shall be a minimum of 1 inch in diameter, even though this may result in a flow rate above that calculated.
- 45. The flow restriction shall be accomplished by methods other than a pipe restriction in an oversized pipe due to the potential for clogging and restrictor removal. A perforated standpipe, weir design, baffle wall, etc. should be utilized instead.
- 46. The primary outlet standpipe shall be designed with a secondary outer pipe with numerous holes. The stone filter would rest against this outer pipe and would help protect the outlet standpipe from clogging.
- 47. Provide a soil boring in the vicinity of the storm water basin to determine soil conditions and to establish the high-water elevation of the groundwater table. Note the bottom of the detention facility must be a minimum of three (3) feet above the groundwater elevation.
- 48. Provide supporting calculations for the runoff coefficient determination.
- 49. A runoff coefficient of 0.35 shall be used for all turf grass lawns (mowed lawns) and 0.95 shall be used for all impervious surfaces.
- 50. A 4-foot-wide safety shelf is required one foot below the permanent water surface elevation within the basin.
- 51. [Residential Projects] A 25-foot vegetated buffer shall be provided around the perimeter of each/the storm water basin. This buffer cannot encroach onto adjacent lots or property.

Underground Storage:

- 52. Provide the overland routing that would occur in the event the underground system cannot accept flow. This route shall be directed to a recognized drainage course or drainage system.
- 53. Provide an underdrain along the downstream side of the underground detention system which is tied into a manhole as a means of secondary storm water conveyance to the outlet.
- 54. Provide a soil boring in the vicinity of the proposed underground detention system to determine bearing capacity and the high-water elevation of the aroundwater table.


JSP18-0010

- 55. Provide a table or note addressing the required bedding depth vs. bearing capacity of the underlying soils in the vicinity of the underground detention system per the manufacturer's specifications.
- 56. Provide a note on the plans stating the City's inspecting engineers shall verify the bearing capacity of the native soils to verify an adequate bedding depth is provided.
- 57. Indicate the assumed porosity of the aggregate. The volume calculations shall consider only 85-percent of that volume as available for storage to account for sediment accumulation in the aggregate. [This means that the usual 40% porosity assumed by many manufacturers must be reduced to 0.85 of that = 34%]
- 58. Provide a note on the underground detention detail that aggregate porosity will be tested, and results provided to the City's inspecting engineers.
- 59. Provide an isolator row in the underground detention system in addition to the swirl concentrator chamber. Contact the Engineering Division for further information.
- 60. Provide inspection ports throughout the underground detention system at the midpoint of all storage rows. Additional inspection ports may be required for systems larger than 200 feet. One inspection port every 50 feet for isolator row.
- 61. Inspection ports shall be a minimum of 8-inches.
- 62. For piped/chamber systems the underground storage system shall include 4-foot diameter manholes at one end of each row for maintenance access purposes.
- 63. Provide critical elevations (low water, first flush, bank full, 100-year, and pavement elevation) for the detention system. Also, provide a cross-section for the underground detention system. Ensure that there is at least 1 foot of freeboard between the 100-year elevation and the subgrade elevation beneath the pavement.

Paving & Grading

- 64. Provide a construction materials table on the Paving Plan listing the quantity and material type for each pavement cross-section being proposed.
- 65. Provide a minimum of 6 spot elevations where the pathway crosses each driveway (one at each corner and two in the center of the driveway on each side of the pathway). Spot elevations shall be provided to demonstrate a level landing adjacent to each side of the pathway crossing.
- 66. Provide a dumpster pad detail.
- 67. Provide spot elevations at the intersection of the proposed pathway with the existing pathway.
- 68. Detectable warning plates and ADA ramps should align with the receiving ramp on the opposite side.

The Bond JSP18-0010



- 69. Verify the slopes along the ingress/egress routing to the building from the barrier-free stalls. All barrier-free stalls shall comply with Michigan Barrier-Free regulations.
- 70. Provide existing and proposed contours on the Grading Plan at the time of the Final Site Plan submittal.
- 71. Provide a note on the Grading Plan stating that the proposed pathway within the road right-of-way shall match existing grades at both ends.
- 72. Provide at least 3-foot of buffer distance between the sidewalk and any fixed objects, including hydrants and irrigation backflow devices. Include a note on the plan where the 3-foot separation cannot be provided.
- 73. Show proposed grades for all adjusted sanitary, water, and storm structures.
- 74. Site grading shall be limited to 1V:4H (25-percent), excluding landscaping berms. Numerous areas appear to exceed this standard.
- 75. The grade of the drive approach shall not exceed 2-percent within the first 25 feet of the intersection. Provide spot grades as necessary to establish this grade.
- 76. The sidewalk within the right-of-way shall continue through the drive approach. If like materials are used for each, the sidewalk shall be striped through the approach. The sidewalk shall be increased to 6-inches thick along the crossing or match the proposed cross-section if the approach is concrete. The thickness of the sidewalk shall be increased to 6 inches across the drive approach. Provide additional spot grades as necessary to verify the maximum 2-percent cross-slope is being maintained along the walk.
- 77. Per MDOT Special Provision for Crushed Concrete; the use of crushed concrete is prohibited on the project within 100 feet of any water course (stream, river, county drain, etc.) and lake, regardless of the application of location of the water course or lake relative to the project limits. Add note to use 21AA crushed limestone base for any pavement within 100 feet of a water course.
- 78. Provide additional spot grades as necessary to demonstrate that a minimum 5-percent slope away from the building is provided for a minimum distance of ten feet around the perimeter of the building.

- 79. The end islands shall conform to the City standard island design, or variations of the standard design, while still conforming to the standards as outlined in Section 2506 of Appendix A of the Zoning ordinance (i.e. 2' minor radius, 15' major radius, minimum 10' wide, 3' shorter than adjacent 19' stall).
- 80. The City standard straight-faced curb (MDOT F-4 curb detail) shall be provided. Remove detail and attach City standard paving details.
- 81. Provide top of curb/walk and pavement/gutter grades to indicate height of curb adjacent to parking stalls or drive areas.
- 82. Parking stalls should be 19-feet in length, parking stalls on site plan are shown as 18-feet in length. Indicate if a variance was granted for this in pervious reviews.
- 83. Curbing and walks adjacent to the end of 17-foot stalls shall be reduced to 4-inches high (rather than the standard 6-inch height to be provided adjacent to 19-foot stalls). Additionally, 2-foot overhang should be provided adjacent to 17-foot parking stalls (show 2-foot overhang on paving sheets). 4-inches curb is only needed where the 2-foot overhang is proposed, all other curbs should be 6-inches. There are some spots with 17' stalls where curb is not shown as 4" and some areas where 4" curb is proposed, and it is not needed.
- 84. Label the actual usable length of the proposed angled parking stalls. This is done by measuring between parallel lines representing the position at the front and rear of the car, without the rear of the car conflicting with the maneuvering aisle.
- 85. Retaining wall sheets shall be signed and sealed by the design engineer responsible for the proposed retaining wall design and all associated calculations. Provide detail for proposed retaining wall. This should include the materials being used, length of wall, and height of wall.
- 86. A License Agreement will be required for the proposed retaining wall within any utility easements. A plan view and cross-section shall be included with the agreement showing the relationship between the wall foundation and the existing/proposed utility.
- 87. Retaining walls that are 48-inches or larger shall need a permit from the Building Department. A retaining wall that has a grade change of 30" or more within a 3' horizontal distance will require a guardrail.

Flood Plain

88. Show the limits of the 100-year flood plain and floodway per the current FIRM maps (2006). Indicate if any impacts are proposed.

Soil Erosion and Sediment Control

89. A SESC permit is required. A full review has not been completed at this time. A review will be done when a completed packet is submitted to Sarah Marchioni at Community Development.

Off-Site Easements

90. Off-Site easement for grading has already been obtained.

Agreements

- 91. A license Agreement will be required for the retaining wall proposed within the proposed sanitary sewer and water main easements. The agreement shall state that the wall and all site facilities within the influence of the wall that may be removed or damaged in the event the utility requires maintenance will be the responsibility of the property owner to repair or replace. Additionally, a cross-section shall be included with the agreement showing the distance between the wall foundation and the utility. A template agreement is available from the Engineering Division.
- 92. License agreements shall be needed for the light poles located within the proposed water main easement.

The following must be submitted with the Final Site Plan:

- 93. A letter from either the applicant or the applicant's engineer must be submitted with the Stamping Set highlighting the changes made to the plans addressing each of the comments listed above and indicating the revised sheets involved.

 Additionally, a statement must be provided stating that all changes to the plan have been discussed in the applicant's response letter.
- 94. An itemized construction cost estimate must be submitted to the Community Development Department for the determination of plan review and construction inspection fees. This estimate should only include the civil site work and not any costs associated with construction of the building or any demolition work. *The estimate must be itemized* for each utility (water, sanitary, storm sewer), on-site paving (square yardage, should include number do detectable warning plates), right-of-way paving (including proposed right-of-way), grading, and the storm water basin (basin construction, control structure, pretreatment structure and restoration).
- 95. Due to the above comments, the itemized construction cost estimate should be revised and resubmitted to the Community Development Department for the determination of plan review and construction inspection fees.


To the extent this review letter addresses items and requirements that require the approval of or a permit from an agency or entity other than the City, this review shall not be considered an indication or statement that such approvals or permits will be issued.

Please contact Humna Anjum at (248)735-5632 or email at hanjum@cityofnovi.org with any questions.

Humna Anjum, Project Engineer

cc: Lindsay Bell, Community Development

Ben Nelson, Engineering Ben Croy, City Engineer





PLAN REVIEW CENTER REPORT

June 3, 2024

<u>Revised Preliminary Site Plan – Landscaping</u>

The Bond

Review TypeJob NumberRevised Preliminary Site Plan Landscape ReviewJSP18-0010

Property Characteristics

• Site Location: West side of Flint Street

Site Acreage: 8.2 acresSite Zoning: TC-1

Adjacent Zoning: North, East: TC-1; South, West: I-1

• Plan Date: 5/3/2024

Ordinance Considerations

This project was reviewed for conformance with Zoning Article 5.5 Landscape Standards, the Landscape Design Manual and any other applicable provisions of the Zoning Ordinance. Items in **bold** below must be addressed and incorporated as part of the revised Preliminary Site Plan submittal. <u>Underlined</u> items must be addressed on Final Site Plans. Please follow guidelines of the Zoning Ordinance and Landscape Design Manual. This review and the accompanying Landscape Chart are summaries and are not intended to substitute for any Ordinance.

Recommendation:

No revised landscape plans were included in the set. The changes in layout along the west side of the site include the addition of two surface parking bays and the elimination of a landscape island at the north end of the parking deck. It appears that there will be sufficient room for the required plantings, but that cannot be determined without landscaping plans for the proposed layout. The applicant states no additional landscape waivers are requested, so all remaining requirements will be confirmed with Final Site Plan submittal.

LANDSCAPE WAIVERS GRANTED BY PLANNING COMMISSION 6/27/2018:

- 1. Landscape waiver from Sec. 5.5.3.B.ii for the lack of a berm and screening as the applicant proposed a line of arborvitaes along the property line to soften the view toward the railroad tracks and industrial site beyond in lieu of required landscape screening;
- 2. Landscape waiver from Sec. 5.5.3.B.ii for a reduction in the required greenbelt width between the right-of-way and parking areas along Flint/Bond Street (20 ft. width required, a range of 10 ft. to 20 ft. provided). A 2.5 foot brick wall screening the parking and additional landscaping in the narrower areas help to compensate for the lack of space in the areas with just a 10 foot greenbelt;
- 3. Landscape waiver from Sec. 5.5.3.F.ii.b(1) for a reduction in the total number multifamily unit trees provided (147 trees required, 127 provided) as the reduction is only 14% from the total requirements and the site is otherwise well-landscaped;
- 4. Landscape waiver from Sec. 5.5.3.F.ii.B(2) for the reduction in the number of interior roadway perimeter trees provided (1 tree short) due to conflict with fire access lane (grass pavers);
- 5. Landscape waiver from Sec. 5.5.3.D. for the deficiency in the foundation landscaping coverage around the parking deck due to limited space available along the southwest side, along the railroad. Large arborvitaes are proposed in that area to help screen the view of the railroad and the industrial site:

6. Landscape waiver from Sec. 5.5.3.C.(3) Chart footnote for not proposing the required parking lot perimeter trees for the temporary gravel parking proposed to be constructed for use by visitors to Novi Cemetery in Phase 1 (11 trees required, 0 proposed) as the landscape requirements will be met at the time of Phase 3 construction within a certain time mutually agreed between the applicant and the City.


Please add landscape plans to the set that include the current layout and provide revised calculations for the interior parking areas and all required landscaping, except those where waivers were granted.

Please include the above italicized text on the landscape plans.

Please add the city project number, JSP18-0010, to the bottom right corner of the cover sheet.

If the applicant has any questions concerning the above review or the process in general, do not hesitate to contact me at 248.735.5621 or rmeader@cityofnovi.org.

When Meader - Landscape Architect







May 21, 2024

City of Novi Planning Department 45175 W. 10 Mile Rd. Novi, MI 48375-3024

Attn: Ms. Barb McBeth – Director of Community Development

Re: FACADE ORDINANCE Revised Final Site Plan (3rd Review)

The Bond (FKA Flint St.), JSP18-0010 Façade Region: 1, Zoning District: TC-1

Dear Ms. McBeth:

This Facade Review is based on the revised drawings dated 5/3/24. The revision consists of adding a 5th floor to both buildings. The percentages of materials proposed for each façade are as shown below. The percentage from the previously approved drawings is shown in parenthesis, for comparison. The percentages required by the Ordinance(s) are indicated in the right-hand column. Materials in non-compliance are highlighted in bold.

| Building Type I | East (Front) | North | South | West | Façade Ordinance Section 5.15 Maximum (Minimum) |
|--------------------------------|--------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|---|
| Brick | 18% (17%) | 24% (24%) | 21% (24%) | 23% (23%) | 100% (30%) |
| Cast Stone | 9% (9%) | 10% (8%) | 12% (8%) | 0% | 50% |
| EIFS | 52% (54%) | 51% (56%) | 51% (56%) | 77% (77%) | 25% |
| Flat Metal Panels, Woodgrained | 15% (13%) | 11% (12%) | 10% (12%) | 0% | 50% |
| Spanderal Glass | 2% (3%) | 2% (3%) | 2% (3%) | 0% | 50% |
| Fabric Awning | 2% (3%) | 1% (3%) | 3% (3%) | 0% | 10% |
| Metal Canopies | 1% (1%) | 1% (1%) | 1% (1%) | 0% | 50% |
| Combined Brick & Stone | 28% (26%) | 34% (26%) | 33% (26%) | 23% (23%) | TC-1 Ordinance 3.26.1.G, 51% Min. |

| Building Type II | East (Front) | North | South | West | Façade Ordinance Section 5.15 Maximum (Minimum) |
|--------------------------------|--------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|---|
| Brick | 18% (17%) | 21% (28%) | 24% (18%) | 23% (23%) | 100% (30%) |
| Cast Stone | 9% (9%) | 12% (20%) | 10% (12%) | 0% | 50% |
| EIFS | 52% (54%) | 51% (38%) | 51% (61%) | 77% (77%) | 25% |
| Flat Metal Panels, Woodgrained | 15% (13%) | 10% (7%) | 11% (9%) | 0% | 50% |
| Spanderal Glass | 2% (3%) | 2% (3%) | 2% (3%) | 0% | 50% |
| Fabric Awning | 2% (3%) | 3% (3%) | 1% (3%) | 0% | 10% |
| Metal Canopies | 1% (1%) | 1% (1%) | 1% (1%) | 0% | 50% |
| Combined Brick & Stone | 28% (26%) | 33% (32%) | 34% (30%) | 23% (23%) | TC-1 Ordinance 3.26.1.G, 51% Min. |


Building Types I and II – A Section 9 Waiver was previously granted for the underage of Brick and Stone and the overage of EIFS. As shown above the proposed revision does not result in any significant change in the previously approved façade percentages. For this reason, we believe that extending the previous Section 9 Waivers to the revised design is justified.

If you have any questions regarding this review, please do not hesitate to call.

Sincerely,

DRN & Architects PC

Douglas R. Necci, AIA





CITY COUNCIL

Mayor

Justin Fischer

Mayor Pro Tem Laura Marie Casey

Dave Staudt

Brian Smith

Ericka Thomas

Matt Heintz

Priya Gurumurthy

City Manager Victor Cardenas

Director of Public Safety Chief of Police

Erick W. Zinser

Fire Chief

Todd Seog

John B. Martin

Assistant Chief of Police

Scott R. Baetens

Assistant Fire Chief

Novi Public Safety Administration 45125 Ten Mile Road Novi, Michigan 48375 248.348.7100 248.347.0590 fax

cityofnovi.org

June 3, 2024

TO: Barbara McBeth - City Planner Lindsay Bell - Plan Review Center James Hill – Plan Review Center Heather Zeigler – Plan Review Center Dan Commer – Plan Review Center Diana Shanahan – Planning Assistant

RE: The Bond (FKA Flint Street Development)

PSP# 24-0002

PSP# 21-0027

PSP# 21-0001

PSP# 21-0001

PSP# 19-0152

PSP# 18-0089

Project Description:

Build 2 multi-story/multi family structures off Flint St., and 1 commercial building property off Novi Rd x Flint St.

Comments:

- All fire hydrants MUST be installed and operational prior to any combustible material is brought on site. IFC 2015 3312.1
- For new buildings and existing buildings, you MUST comply with the International Fire Code Section 510 for Emergency Radio Coverage. This shall be completed by the time the final inspection of the fire alarm and fire suppression permits.
- Fire hydrant MUST be installed and operational prior to above ground construction starts.
- **CORRECTED 10/16/19-**MUST provide water-mains and sizes on a site plan for review.
- CORRECTED 3/22/18 MUST provide drawings to scale for turning radius review.
- CORRECTED 10/16/19-Turning radius in the middle and south parking lots do not city standards for 50' outside and 30' inside.
- **CORRECTED 6-14-18-** Building >55' MUST be built to High Rise specifications.
- CORRECTED 6-3-24-Hydrant spacing is 300' from hydrant to hydrant (Not as the crow flies). Novi City Ordinance 11-68(F)(1)C.
- Building #1's FDC locations MUST be within 100' from a fire hydrant. (Novi City Ordinance Sec15-17 912.3). However, FDC locations are NOT included for the residential buildings on this submittal. They must also be located within 100" of hydrants and not obstructed by landscaping.
- CORRECTED 1-20-2021 KSP. Fire apparatus access roads

- shall be designed and maintained to support the imposed loads of fire apparatus and shall be surfaced so as to provide all-weather driving capabilities supporting thirty-five (35) tons (Novi City Ordinance 503.2.3 Surface).
- **CORRECTED-** Dry standpipes/FDC's on each end of parking structure KSP 6-14-18. For the parking structures: The parking structures lengths are (710') longer than the fire departments pre connect hose lays. Need to figure out a solution for this issue. Possible dry standpipe connections from both ends towards the middle.
- **CORRECTED 5/11/21 KSP-MUST** show water-mains to building #2 on plans for review.
- CORRECTED 5/11/21 KSP-MUST decrease the distance between the Dry Standpipe connections on both floors for the parking deck. The distance between the standpipe connections is 404'. MUST be decreased by 50' per verbal agreement in pre-app meeting.
- **DISREGARD- MUST** separate the fire lead for the property into two separate leads, one for each building. **City of Novi Ordinance 11-68(a)(9).**
- See Memo Dated 5/11/21 from Ben Croy to Kevin Pierce Fire Marshal. CORRECTED 5/11/21- Generally, distribution system in all developments requiring more than eight hundred (800) feet of water main shall have a minimum of two (2) connections to a source of supply and shall be a looped system. Exceptions will be made in those instances when a second connection is not available, or it is not otherwise possible to provide a looped system, provided the system is designed to accommodate a second connection when made available. The ability to serve at least two thousand (2,000) gallons per minute in single-family detached residential; three thousand (3,000) gallons per minute in apartment, cluster residential and similar complexes, institutional and school areas; and at least four thousand (4,000) gallons per minute in office, industrial and shopping centers is essential. Water mains are required to be extended along all road frontages abutting the proposed development at the direction of the city in accordance with the City of Novi Master Plan current edition for water main construction. (D.C.S. Sec.11-68(a)1).


Recommendation:

Approved

Sincerely,

Kevin S. Pierce-Fire Marshal City of Novi – Fire Dept.

cc: file





June 19, 2024

Mrs. Lindsay Bell, Planner City of Novi 45175 W. Ten Mile Road Novi, Michigan 48375

Re: The Bond Phase 1 – Revised Preliminary Site Plan (JSP 18-10)

Dear Mrs. Bell:

In response to the Revised Preliminary Site Plan review comments dated June 3, 2024

In accordance with your staff review dated June 3, 2024 – for the Revised Preliminary Site Plan, we offer the following comments in response. The comment numbers shown below correspond to the comments contained in your staff review letter where applicable.

Please note, the Revised Preliminary Site Plan is for Phase 1 only and includes the residential portion of the development. The commercial phase of the development will be Phase 2 and will be submitted separately.

As noted in the Planning Review letter, The Bond Phase 1 was previously approved by the Planning Commission, City Council and ZBA in 2018. Final Stamping Set approval was also granted on April 18, 2022. The Revised Preliminary Site Plan proposes to increase the height of both residential buildings to 5 stories (69 additional residential units) and add a third level to the parking structure.

PLANNING REVIEW (dated June 3, 2024):

- 1. <u>Development Agreement:</u> It is noted that the Development Agreement will require a 3rd amendment if City Council agrees to allow the additional rooms requested.
- 2. <u>Current Revised Site Plan:</u> It is noted that the Site Plan will be subject to all previously approved conditions and deviations and that they will be revisited as a part of the Revised Preliminary Site Plan process.
- 3. <u>Density and Toal Number of Rooms:</u> The Revised Preliminary Site Plan requests an increase in the total number of rooms from 641 rooms, previously approved, to 812 rooms (329 units).
- 4. <u>Percentage of 1-Bedroom Units:</u> It is noted that the applicant will need Zoning Board of Appeal reapproval of the percentage of 1-Bedroom units. The percentage of 1-Bedrooms remains unchanged for the previously approved plan.
- 5. <u>Open Space:</u> Please see the attached revised Open Space Plan and calculations. The revised Open Space Provided is 1.94 Ac. (1.03 Ac. Required). Areas interior to the building (Fitness Room, Clubhouse, Balconies) have been excluded from the Open Space calculations as required.
- 6. <u>Usable Open Space</u>: Please see the attached revised Open Space Plan and Usable Open Space Calculations. The revised Usable Open Space Provided is 1.58 Ac. (1.51 Ac. Required). Areas interior to the building (Fitness Room, Clubhouse, Balconies) have been included in the Usable Open Space Calculations as was shown in the previously Approved Final Site Plan.

- 7. <u>Total Parking Required and Proposed:</u> The Revised Site Plan proposes 562 parking spaces (557 required). As noted in the review comment, the total number of parking spaces will be reduced by 2 spaces to accommodate additional landscaping area.
- 8. <u>Woodland Conservation Easement:</u> It is noted that a Woodland Conservation Easement will be required. The Conservation Easement boundary is shown on the Site Plan.

Identified List of Deviations: The identified list of deviations is acknowledged including the Current Modifications shown in the review letter. A list of waivers, variances and deviations will be included in the Site Plan set future submittal packages as requested.

Planning Review Chart:

<u>Density:</u> It is noted a revised deviation will be required in room count to allow the additional density.

<u>Phasing:</u> A 5' wide temporary gravel path is provided for pedestrian access to the cemetery. This path will be constructed as a part of Phase 1 as shown in the Revised Preliminary Site Plan.

<u>Usable Open Space</u>: As noted in the Planning Review letter, The Fitness Room and Clubhouse areas were previously permitted to be included in the Usable Open Space calculations. It is noted that City Council will need to determine if these spaces can be included in the Usable Open Space Calculation. The revised Usable Open Space Provided is 1.58 Ac. (1.51 Ac. Required) inclusive of the Clubhouse and Fitness Room. Please see the attached revised Open Space Plan and Usable Open Space Calculations.

<u>Building Height:</u> Building height is indicated on the Architectural Elevations Sheets A414 and A424, which is lower than the maximum allowed in the ordinance. Max building height is 61'-2", 5 Story Building. Maximum building height will be added to Site Date on the Overall Site Plan as requested.

<u>Parking Setbacks:</u> It is noted a ZBA variance will be required for proposed parking in the front and side yards. This variance was previously approved.

<u>Open Space</u>: Please see the attached revised Open Space Plan and calculations. The revised Open Space Provided is 1.94 Ac. (1.03 Ac. Required). Areas interior to the building (Fitness Room, Clubhouse, Balconies) have been excluded from the Open Space calculations as required.

<u>Loading</u>: It is noted a ZBA variance will be required for loading areas in the side yard. This variance was previously approved.

<u>Sidewalks required:</u> It is noted a ZBA variance will be required to allow 8-ft wide sidewalk on Bond Street. This variance was previously approved.

<u>Number of Rooms and Area of Parcel:</u> It is noted that City Council will need to approve the revised increase in the number of rooms.

<u>Building Setbacks</u>: It is noted a ZBA variance will be required for not meeting the required building setbacks for the parking garage and the residential units. This variance was previously approved.

<u>Maximum Room Count</u>: The unit tabulation will be revised to read "Room Count" as specified in the ordinance.

<u>Maximum Density:</u> It is noted that City Council will need to approve the revised increase in the number of rooms and the corresponding increase in density.

<u>Maximum Percentage of Units:</u> It is noted a ZBA variance will be required for exceeding the maximum allowable percentage of 1-bedroom units. This variance was previously approved. The percentage of 1-Bedrooms remains unchanged for the previously approved plan.

<u>Parking Space Dimensions:</u> It is noted a ZBA variance will be required for not meeting the minimum depth requirements for the parking spaces within the garage. This variance was previously approved.

<u>Loading Space Area:</u> It is noted a ZBA variance will be required for the loading area locations and size. This variance was previously approved.

<u>Building Lighting:</u> A photometrics plan for the project was previously approved. The Revised Preliminary Site Plan will be reevaluated to determine if any revisions to the Photometric Plan will be needed. If required, a revised Photometric Plan will be provided at Final Site Plan for approval.

Max. Illumination adjacent to Non-Residential: It is noted a ZBA variance will be required for exceeding the max fc to the south abutting the railroad. This variance was previously approved.

Exterior Building Wall Façade Materials: Section 9 waivers were previously approved.

<u>Roof Top Equipment:</u> A note will be added to the Site Plan to screen rooftop equipment as requested.

ENGINEERING REVIEW (DATED May 31, 2024):

As noted in the Planning Review letter, Stamping Set Approval was granted for The Bond project on April 18, 2022. Other than the change in the building height, a slight change in the parking lot footprint and adding a 3rd level to the parking deck, the general layout and design of the remainder of the site is unchanged. To accommodate the new parking deck footprint, some local revisions to the grading plan and storm sewer will be required at Final Site Plan. However, the remainder of the design will remain largely unchanged from the Approved Stamping Sets. SKL will coordinate with the City Engineers to address all the Engineering Review comments in the review letter at Final Site Plan.

The comment numbers shown below correspond to the comments contained in the Engineering Review letter where applicable.

General:

- 1. The project will be constructed in 2 phases as noted in the last response letter. Previously, the project was to be constructed in 3 phases. The Revised Preliminary Site Plan will be revised to show 2-Phase construction.
- 2. It is noted a Right-of-Way permit from the City of Novi will be required.
- 3. A revised Traffic Control Sign Table will be provided at Final Site Plan.
- 4. A note for Compacted Sand Backfill (Cl II Sand) will be provided at Final Site Plan.
- 5. A revised Construction Materials table will be provided at Final Site Plan.
- 6. A revised Utility Crossing Table will be provided at Final Site Plan.
- 7. A note for 18" utility clearance will be provided at Final Site Plan.
- 8. A dewatering note will be provided at Final Site Plan.
- 9. All utilities and easements will be shown on the Landscape Plan, as required, at Final Site Plan.
- 10. It is noted that any light poles within a utility easement will require a License Agreement with the City.

Water Main:

- 11. Water main profiles for all pipe exceeding 8" diameter will be profiled as required by EGLE and the City of Novi at Final Site Plan.
- 12. The proposed water main connections at the southern entrance to Building 1 are connecting to existing water main stubs. A TSV&W is not required at these locations.
- 13. Water main valve locations have not been changed from the previously approved Stamping Sets. SKL will coordinate with the City Engineer to review the valve locations at Final Site Plan.

- 14. Water main profiles for all pipe exceeding 8" diameter will be profiled as required by EGLE and the City of Novi at Final Site Plan
- 15. Water main valve sizes have not been changed from the previously approved Stamping Sets. SKL will coordinate with the City Engineer to review the valve sizes at Final Site Plan.
- 16. Water main valve locations have not been changed from the previously approved Stamping Sets. SKL will coordinate with the City Engineer to review the valve locations at Final Site Plan.
- 17. The water main crossing note will be added to the Plan set at Final Site Plan as required.
- 18. It is noted that a new EGLE Act 399 permit will be required to replace the previously issued permit that has expired.

Irrigation Comments:

19. The irrigation plan was previously approved and will be resubmitted (with minor revisions) at Final Site Plan.

Sanitary Sewer:

- 20. Sanitary sewer will remain unchanged from the previously approved Stamping Sets. Profiles will be included at Final Site Plan.
- 21. The previously approved Stamping Sets have a single 8" sanitary lead to each building as required by the Architect. A 6" sanitary lead is not adequate for the flows.
- 22. As noted in item 21 above, the proposed 8" sanitary sewer shown in the Approved Stamping sets are considered "leads" rather than permitted sanitary sewers. Previously, an EGLE Pt 41 permit was not required for this project. SKL will review this permit requirement with the City Engineer at Final Site Plan.
- 23. A note for the sanitary sewer depth will be provided at Final Site Plan.

Storm Sewer:

- 24. The 3' minimum cover requirement is noted. SKL will review with the City Engineer at Final Site
- 25. The 0.1-ft drop at storm sewer structures is noted. SKL will review with the City Engineer at Final Site Plan.
- 26. The 0.80 diameter requirements for pipe size changes are noted. SKL will review with the City Engineer at Final Site Plan.
- 27. Manhole sump requirements are noted. SKL will review with the City Engineer at Final Site Plan.
- 28. An Oil/Gas separator is provided.
- 29. All storm sewers are minimum 12" in diameter.
- 30. All storm sewer will be profiled at Final Site Plan.
- 31. Inlet structure requirements are noted. SKL will review with the City Engineer at Final Site Plan.
- 32. The 10-yr HGL will be profiled on the storm sewer at Final Site Plan.
- 33. Utility crossings will be shown in profile at Final Site Plan.
- 34. There are no offsite areas tributary to the proposed storm sewer system. SKL will review with the City Engineer at Final Site Plan.
- 35. A storm structure table will be provided at Final Site Plan.
- 36. All roof conductors will be shown at Final Site Plan.

Storm Water Management Plan:

37. The storm water management plan remains unchanged from the previously Approved Stamping Sets. It should be noted that the Approved Stamping Sets make use of the adjacent Regional Detention Basin to store the 100-yr flood for this site. The previously Approved SWMP required that the Bankfull Flood be detained onsite and the 100-yr volume would be stored in the

- adjacent Regional Detention Basin. SKL will review the existing SWMP with the City Engineer at Final Site Plan.
- 38. Pre/Post-Development runoff will be provided at Final Site Plan.
- 39. The SWMP remains largely unchanged from the previously Approved Stamping sets. SKL will review with the City Engineer at Final Site Plan.
- 40. The SWMP remains largely unchanged from the previously Approved Stamping sets. SKL will review with the City Engineer at Final Site Plan.
- 41. The proposed maintenance Access Route will be verified so it does not interfere with any landscaping.
- 42. Details and calculations for the pretreatment structure will be provided at Final Site Plan.
- 43. As noted in item 37 above, the adjacent Regional Detention Basin provides the 100-yr storage for this development.
- 44. Minimum 1" dia holes will be provided in the standpipe as required. SKL will review with the City Engineer at Final Site Plan.
- 45. The current flow restriction was previously approved in the Stamping Sets. SKL will review with the City Engineer at Final Site Plan to determine if the current restriction system is adequate.
- 46. SKL will review with the City Engineer at Final Site Plan. The standpipe shown is the City of Novi Standard detail and the Oakland Couty approved SO-2 detail.
- 47. Soil borings have already been provided and will be included in the Final Site Plan for reference.
- 48. Runoff Coefficient calculations will be provided at Final Site Plan.
- 49. Runoff coefficient requirements are noted.
- 50. A 4' wide safety shelf is provided.

Underground Storage:

- 51. The 25' vegetated buffer is shown on the Site Plan. Site restrictions did not allow for the buffer around the full basin and was previously approved. SKL will review with the City Engineer at Final Site Plan.
- 52. The overland routing, if the UG Basin cannot accept flow, is over the detention basin overflow spillway that outlets directly to the Middle Rouge River. Notes will be provided at Final Site Plan for clarification.
- 53. The UG basin is solid pipe. The backfill material for the basin will not require an underdrain system.
- 54. Soil borings have already been provided and will be included in the Final Site Plan for reference.
- 55. A note will be added addressing bearing capacity of the soil below the UG basis at Final Site Plan.
- 56. A note will be added stating the City inspectors shall verify the bearing capacity of the soil below the UG basis at Final Site Plan.
- 57. The UG basin is solid pipe. The backfill material will not provide any storage volume. SKL will review with the City Engineer at Final Site Plan.
- 58. See response item 57 above.
- 59. An isolator row will not be required for the UG Basin system. The open detention basin serves as a sediment basin. The open detention will back up into the storge volume provided by the UG Basin system. SKL will review with the City Engineer at Final Site Plan.
- 60. Inspection ports are provided as required.
- 61. Inspection ports are currently 6" diameter as previously approved by the City of Novi. SKL will review the port diameter with the City Engineer at Final Site Plan.
- 62. 4 access manholes are currently provided as previously approved by the City of Novi. SKL will review with the City Engineer at Final Site Plan.
- 63. Basin storage elevations will be provided in plan and profile at Final Site Plan.

Paving and Grading:

- 64. A Construction Quantities Table will be provided at Final Site Plan.
- 65. SKL will review the site grading with the City of Novi Engineer at Final Site Plan.
- 66. Dumpster pads are not provided on the Site Plan because they are internal to the building.
- 67. SKL will review the site grading with the City of Novi Engineer at Final Site Plan.
- 68. Locations of the detectable warning plates will be reviewed with the City of Novi Engineer at Final Site Plan.
- 69. SKL will review the site grading with the City of Novi Engineer at Final Site Plan.
- 70. Existing and proposed grading contours will be provided at Final Site Plan.
- 71. Note will be provided as requested.
- 72. A note will be added to provide 3-ft distance as required. Hydrants should be located correctly as previously approved.
- 73. Minor revisions to storm sewer and water leads are expected due to the revised footprint of the parking structure. Revisions will be provided at Final Site Plan.
- 74. SKL will review the site grading with the City of Novi Engineer at Final Site Plan.
- 75. SKL will review the site grading with the City of Novi Engineer at Final Site Plan. Additional grades will be provided if required.
- 76. SKL will review the previously approved crosswalks with the City Engineer at Final Site Plan.
- 77. A note will be added to the Final Site Plan addressing the MDOT Special Provision for Crushed Concrete.
- 78. SKL will review the site grading with the City of Novi Engineer at Final Site Plan.
- 79. End islands remain unchanged from the previously approved Stamping Sets. SKL will review with the City of Novi Engineer at Final Site Plan.
- 80. The typical detail will be removed as requested.
- 81. Curb and gutter grades will be provided at Final Site Plan.
- 82. A variance was previously granted for the 18' parking spaces within the parking garage structure.
- 83. SKL will review the site grading with the City of Novi Engineer at Final Site Plan.
- 84. Parking stalls will be labeled as requested at Final Site Plan. All stalls meet City standards and are unchanged from the previously approved Stamping Sets.
- 85. There are not any retaining walls currently proposed on the site. If one is required, calculations will be provided as requested.
- 86. There are not any retaining walls currently proposed on the site. It is understood a License Agreement will be required for permanent structures within utility easements.
- 87. There are not any retaining walls currently proposed on the site.

Floodplain:

88. The revised limits of the 100-yr floodplain will be verified and added to the Final Site Plan.

Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control:

89. It is understood a City of Novi SESC Permit will be required for the project.

Off-Site Easement:

90. Noted.

Agreements:

- 91. The walls within the sanitary sewer and water easements are "Screen Walls". It is understood a License Agreement will be required for permanent structures within utility easements.
- 92. It is understood a License Agreement will be required for permanent structures within utility easements.

Required at Final Site Plan:

- 93. A letter will be provided as required.
- 94. A cost estimate will be provided as required.
- 95. Noted.

LANSCAPING REVIEW (dated June 3, 2024)

Please see the attached Landscaping Plans previously approved as a part of the Stamping Sets on April 18, 2022. In general, the Landscaping Plans remain unchanged from the original Stamping Sets. There will be some minor revisions to the Landscape Plans, due to the revised footprint of the Parking Structure, which will be submitted with the Final Site Plan package.

As noted in the Landscape Review Letter, no additional Landscape waivers are being requested.

As requested in the Planning Review letter, the Landscape areas that will be revised have been marked up in red as follows:


<u>Sheet L1.00:</u> Removed 2 landscape islands at ends of parking structure. Added new parking spaces and landscaping areas at ends of parking structure. Please see Revised Site Plan for revised layouts in these areas.

<u>Sheet L2.00:</u> Close up view of the landscape island to be removed and new parking areas at the north end of the parking structure.


<u>Sheet L2.02:</u> Close up view of the landscape island to be removed and new parking areas at the south end of the parking structure.

The overall landscape calculations will be revised at Final Site Plan. Removing the two landscape islands at the ends of the parking structure results in a loss of Landscape Area of **367 sq. ft**. Adding the new parking and landscape areas results in an increase in Landscape area of **503 sq. ft**. The net result is a gain in landscape area of + 136 sq. ft. with the revised parking structure.

New Parking and Landscape Areas North of the Parking Structure:



New Parking and Landscaping Areas South of the Parking Structure:



It was noted by the Planning and Landscaping reviewers that the new landscape areas adjacent to the parking decks may be inadequately sized. These landscape areas can be increased in size by removing the adjacent parking space. This revision will be included in the Final Site Plan submittal, if required.


FAÇADE ORIDINACE REVIEW (dated May 21, 2024)

Façade review recommends extending the previously approved Section 9 waivers for the revised Architectural façade percentages. No additional comments were provided in the review.

FIRE REVIEW (dated June 3, 2024):

The comment numbers shown below correspond to the comments contained in the Fire Review letter where applicable.

- 1. Comment is noted.
- 2. Comment is noted.
- 3. Comment is noted.
- 9. Building #1's FDC is located approximately 47 ft from a fire hydrant located along the Bond Street ROW. Please see sketch below:



14. The previously approved Stamping Sets proposed one 8" Fire Line and one 6" Water Service Lead to service both buildings located at the southeast corner of Building #1. A 6" Fire Line and a 4" Water Service Lead extends from Building #1 to Building #2 to provide water and fire service to Building #2. The Developer will coordinate with the City Fire Marshal to determine how water service will be provided to Building #2 at Final Site Plan.

The Bond – Revised Site Plan June 19, 2024


If you have any questions regarding the Revised Preliminary Site Plan or the response comments above, please feel free to contact me at 248.639.9442 or by email at bobe@skl-eng.com.


Very truly yours,

SEIBER KEAST LEHNER, INC.

Robert J. Emerine, P.E.

Enclosures





LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURAL SITE PLAN

PLANT PALETTE - OVERALL

Liriodendron tulipifera

Buxus x 'Green Velvet'

Taxus x media 'Hicksii

HICKS YEW (TH)

Juniperus communis

COMMON JUNIPER (JC)

KARL FORESTER GRASS (KF)

Rudbeckia fulgida 'Goldstrum'

BLACK-EYED SUSAN (RF)

Hemerocallis 'Violet Light'

Thuja 'Green Giant'

VIOLET LIGHT DAYLILY (DLG)

SHASTA DAISY ALASKA (CS)

GREEN GIANT ARBORVITAE (TGG)

Leucanthemum x superbum 'Alaska' 121 #2 CONT.

CONTINUOUS HEDGE AT LEAST 3'-0" TALL

NOTE: SCREENING SHRUBS TO BE MAINTAINED AS A

HAMELN FOUNTAIN GRASS (PA)

JÁPANESE TREE LILAC (SR)

GREEN VELVET BOXWOOD (BX)

Calamagrostis x acutiflora 'Karl Foerster' 06 #2 CONT.

Pennisetum alopecuroides 'Hameln' 436 #2 CONT.

121 #2 CONT.

TULIP TREE (LTP)

Syringa reticulata

GENERAL LANDSCAPING

| ANTI ALLITE OVENALL | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------|------|----------------|-------------------------|---|---------|-------------|------|-------------------------|
| REENBELT | | | | | UNIT LANDSCAPING | | _ | | |
| NAME | QTY. | ROOT | CALIPER | UNIT PRICE/ TOTAL | NAME | QTY. | HEIGHT | ROOT | UNIT PRICE/ TOTAL |
| Malus 'Adirondack' ADIRONDACK CRABAPPLE (MAG | 13) | B&B | 2.5" CAL. MIN. | \$375.00/ \$4,875.00 | Picea glauca WHITE SPRUCE (AG) | 09 | 8' | B&B | \$400.00/ \$3,600.00 |
| Ulmus x ' <i>Pioneer</i> ' PIONEER ELM (UPG) | 15 | B&B | 3" CAL. MIN. | \$400.00/ \$6,000.00 | Abies concolor WHITE FIR (AC) | 13 | 8' | B&B | \$400.00/ \$5,200.00 |
| Quercus rubra RED OAK (QR) | 10 | B&B | 3" CAL. MIN. | \$400.00/ \$4,000.00 | DETENTION PLANTING | | | | φ3,200.00 |
| Cornus florida FLOWERING DOGWOOD (CF) | 11 | B&B | 3" CAL. MIN. | \$375.00/ \$4,125.00 | NAME | QTY. | HEIGHT | ROOT | UNIT PRICE/ TOTAL |
| Quercus bicolor SWAMP WHITE OAK (SWO) | 06 | B&B | 3" CAL. MIN. | \$400.00/ \$2,400.00 | Cornus amomum SILKY DOGWOOD (CA) | 17 | 36" | | \$50.00/ \$850.00 |
| Cornus alternifolia PAGODA DOGWOOD (CA) | 04 | B&B | 3" CAL. MIN. | \$375.00/ \$1,500.00 | Cornus rugosa ROUND-LEAVED DOGWOOD (CR) | 17 | 36" | | \$50.00/ \$850.00 |
| RKING LOT AND PERIMETER TREI | | DOOT | CALIDED | LINIT DDIOE | Viburnum dentatum ARROW-WOOD (VD) | 17 | 36" | | \$50.00/ \$850.00 |
| NAME | QTY. | ROOT | CALIPER | UNIT PRICE/ TOTAL | EMERGENT WETLAND SEED MIX (| (BY CAR | RDNO JFNEW) | | 2,135 SF |

TOTAL

\$50.00/

\$7,400.00

\$50.00/

\$350.00

\$50.00/

\$1,850.00

\$15.00/

\$90.00

\$15.00/

\$6,540.00

\$15.00/

\$1,815.00

\$15.00/

\$2,790.00

\$50.00/

\$2,550.00

\$15.00/

\$1,815.00

| X Vibramo do oto tamo | | |
|--|-------------------------|----------|
| PARKING LOT AND PERIMETER TREES Viburnum dentatum ARROW-WOOD (VD) | 17 | 36" |
| NAME QTY. ROOT CALIPER UNIT PRICE/ TOTAL EMERGENT WETLAND SE | ED MIX (BY CARD | NO JFNEV |
| Acer rubrum 05 B&B 3" CAL. MIN. \$400.00/ 39.8 LBS PER ACRE APPL \$2,000.00 2.2 LBS OF EMERGENT SE | ICATION RATE EED MIX | |
| Acer rubrum 'October Glory' 11 B&B 3" CAL. MIN. \$400.00/ OCTOBER GLORY RED MAPLE (ARP) 3"-6" OF TOPSOIL OR WET PLACED IN THIS AREA. US \$4,400.00 | SE SEED MAT. | |
| Betula nigra 04 B&B N/A - 15' HEIGHT \$400.00/ RIVER BIRCH - MULTI STEM (BNP) \$1,600.00 \$1,600.00 2.3 LBS OF STORMWATER | ICATION RATE | IEW) |
| Gleditsia triacanthos 'Shademaster' 12 B&B 3" CAL. MIN. \$400.00/ 3"-6" OF TOPSOIL SHALL E SHADEMASTER HONEY LOCUST (GTP) \$4,800.00 | | IS AREA |

| 11 | B&B | 3" CAL. MIN. | \$400.00/ | GRASS | | |
|------|--------|----------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------|------------------|
| | | o o <u>_</u> | \$4,400.00 | NAME | QUANTITY | UNIT PRICE/ |
| 01 | B&B | 2.5" CAL. MIN. | \$375.00/ | ¥ | | TOTAL |
| O I | ΒαΒ | B&B | \$375.00/ \$375.00 | KENTUCKY BLUE GRASS | 22,378 SF | \$8.00(per sf)/ |
| | | DQD | φ3/3.00 | * * * * * * | | \$179,024.00 |
| | | | | * | тот | AL: \$256,049.00 |
| QTY. | HEIGHT | ROOT | UNIT PRICE/ | | | |

FROM THE PROPERTY LINE.

NOTE: NO TREE SHALL BE PLANTED CLOSER THAN 10 FEET FROM A HYDRANT OR

OTHER UTILITY STRUCTURE, AND 5 FEET FROM AN UNDERGROUND UTILITY LINE.

ALL TREES SHALL BE PLANTED AT LEAST 3 FEET BEHIND A CURB AND FEET AWAY



3,220 SF

Call MISS DIG before digging 1-800-482-7171

LANDSCAPE SUMMARY - MULTI-FAMILY

| TC-1 | FOUNDATION LA |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| | Building Perimeter Landscape Required |
| 230' | Landscape Provided |
| 10 Trees (230 / 25) 17 Trees | MULTI-FAMILY R |
| 16 Trees (230' / 15') | Units Proposed |
| 16 Trees | Trees Required |
| 850' | Trees Provided |
| 159' | WOODLAND REI |
| 691' | Trees Required |
| 23 Trees (691' / 30') | Trees Provided |
| 24 Trees | Trees to be Paid Into I |
| 35 Trees (691' / 20') 09 Trees | DETENTION PON High Water Length |
| | 230' 10 Trees (230' / 25') 17 Trees 16 Trees (230' / 15') 16 Trees 850' 159' 691' 23 Trees (691' / 30') 24 Trees 35 Trees (691' / 20') |

PARKING LOT LANDSCAPING ("P")

| Vehicular Use Area (Exclusive of Deck) | 68,138 SF |
|---|-------------------------|
| VUA up to 50,000 SF | 3,750 SF (50,000 x 7.5% |
| VUA Over 50,000 SF | 181 SF (18,138 x 1%) |
| Landscape Area Required | 3,931 SF |
| Landscape Area Provided | 4,376 SF |
| Trees Required | 20 Trees (734' / 35') |
| Trees Provided | 21 Trees |
| Trees Required | 20 Trees (734' / 35') |

PARKING LOT PERIMETER LENGTH ("Per") Parking Lot Perimeter Length Trees Required 29 Trees (1,010' / 35')

Trees Provided 30 Trees **MULTI-FAMILY UNIT TREES TOTAL ("*"** Trees Required 171 Trees

171 Trees Trees Provided

approximate locations.

- A. Transformer to be screened per detail on sheet L-3 of preliminary landscape submittal by Allen Design. B. Plantings shall be located to closer than 4' to property
- C. Plantings shall be no closer than 10' to hydrants and
- utility structures D. No Japanese Knotweed is present on the site. Phragmites australis is found on site, refer to L4.06 for removal instructions and refer to LWP1.00 for
- . No replacement trees are proposed to be planted on site and a payment of \$77,200 (193 tree credits x \$400) will be paid into the City of Novi Tree Fund.

FOUNDATION LANDSCAPING - INCLUDING DECK Building Perimeter 2,072 LF

16,576 SF (2,072' x 8')

andscape Provided 16,645 SF MULTI-FAMILY REQUIREMENTS 57 Units (Ground Floor) Jnits Proposed

171 Trees (57 x 3) Trees Required Trees Provided 171 Trees

WOODLAND REPLACEMENT 193 Trees Trees Required Trees Provided 0 Trees Trees to be Paid Into Fund 193 Trees

DETENTION POND

411 LF High Water Length 288 LF (411' x 70%) Plantings Required Plantings Provided 300 LF (73%)

WAIVERS GRANTED BY PLANNING COMMISSION ON 6/27/18:

1. Landscape waiver from Sec. 5.5.3.B.ii for the lack of a berm and screening as the applicant proposed a line of arborvitaes along the property line to soften the view toward the railroad tracks and industrial site beyond in lieu of required landscape screening 2. Landscape waiver from Sec. 5.5.3.B.ii for a reduction in the

required greenbelt width between the right-of-way and parking areas along Flint/Bond Street (20 ft. width required, a range of 10 ft. to 20 ft. provided). A 2.5 foot brick wall screening the parking and additional landscaping in the narrower areas help to compensate for the lack of space in the areas with just a 10 foot 3. Landscape waiver from Sec. 5.5.3.F.ii.b(1) for a reduction in the total number multifamily unit trees provided (147 trees required,

127 provided) as the reduction is only 14% from the total requirements and the site is otherwise well-landscaped 4. Landscape waiver from Sec. 5.5.3.F.ii.B(2) for the reduction in the number of interior roadway perimeter trees provided (1 tree short) due to conflict with fire access lane (grass pavers) 5. Landscape waiver from Sec. 5.5.3.D. for the deficiency in the foundation landscaping coverage around the parking deck due

to limited space available along the southwest side, along the railroad. Large arborvitaes are proposed in that area to help screen the view of the railroad and the industrial site 6. Landscape waiver from Sec. 5.5.3.C.(3) Chart footnote for not proposing the required parking lot perimeter trees for the temporary gravel parking proposed to be constructed for use by visitors to Novi Cemetery in Phase 1 (11 trees required, 0 proposed) as the landscape requirements will be met at the time

of Phase 3 construction within a certain time mutually agreed

ADDITIONAL LANDSCAPE WAIVERS APPROVED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION ON 12/9/2020: Revision of the landscape waiver from Sec 5.5.3.F.ii.b(1) for a deficiency in the number of total number multifamily unit trees provided (171 required, 129 provided) as the number of ground floor

units has increased but the building footprint has not changed and

between the applicant and the Cit;

the site is otherwise well-landscaped

OPEN SPACE CALCULATIONS

SHEET L1.00 - COVER

SHEET L2.01

SHEET L3.00

SHEET L4.00

SHEET L4.02

SHEET L5.02

SHEET L2.00 - HARDSCAPE

- HARDSCAPE

HARDSCAPE

HARDSCAPE

HARDSCAPE

DIMENSION

DIMENSION

DIMENSION

DIMENSION

DIMENSION

LANDSCAPE

LANDSCAPE

LANDSCAPE

LANDSCAPE

LANDSCAPE

LANDSCAPE

IRRIGATION

IRRIGATION

IRRIGATION

IRRIGATION

IRRIGATION

GRADING

GRADING

SITE DETAILS

SITE DETAILS

SITE DETAILS

SITE DETAILS

SHEET L9.04 - SITE DETAILS

GENERAL LANDSCAPE DETAILS

LANDSCAPE

OPEN SPACE REQUIREMENTS: TOTAL PARCEL X 15% = 6.87 AC X .15 = 1.03 AC

OPEN SPACE PROVIDED: EAST PARK AREA (AS SHOWN) 7,671 SF SOUTH PARK AREA (AS SHOWN) 9,583 SF

8,956 SF POOL AREA (AS SHOWN) ADDITIONAL OPEN SPACE:

BUILDING 1 BALCONIES 7,690 SF CLUB HOUSE (AS SHOWN) 7,127 SF COURTYARDS (AS SHOWN) 6,752 SF BUILDING 2

7,297 SF **BALCONIES** FITNESS ROOM (AS SHOWN) 3,162 SF COURTYARDS (AS SHOWN) 6752 SF 64,990 SF = 1.49 AC |

DESIGNED BY: DRAWN BY

PLOT DATE:

07/02/2019

LAOR:

SPENCER J. OKESON S.J.O. & I.K. DANIEL R. ERLANDSON 06/25/2021

ISSUE FOR PRICING/BIDDING:

ISSUE FOR PERMIT APPLICATION

ISSUE FOR CONSTRUCTION: ISSUE DATE

| | REVISION SCHEDULE | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|-------------------|--------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| NO: | DATE: | DESCRIPTION: | | | | | | | | | |
| B | 08/14/2020 | ADDENDUM B | | | | | | | | | |
| \bigcirc | 09/25/2020 | ADDENDUM C | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |

COPYRIGHT 2019 - Humphreys & Partners Landscape Architecture, L.L.C. All Rights Reserved

are the sole property of Humphreys & Partners Landscape Architecture, L.L.C. and may not b constructed or used without its express written

Landscape Architecture, L.L.C. and, in the absence

of any written agreement to the contrary, is limited to a one-time use on the site indicated on these plans



HUMPHREYS & PARTNERS LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE, L.L.C. 5339 ALPHA ROAD SUITE 300 DALLAS, TX 75240 T: (972) 701-9636 F: (972) 701-9639

W: www.hplastudio.com CLIENT DTN MANAGEMENT 2502 LAKE LANSING RD


LANSING, MI 48912

SHEET TITLE COVER SHEET

SHEET NUMBER

SCALE: AS INDICATED CITY JOB #: JSP18-0010

10 MILE ROAD LOCATION MAP NOT TO SCALE







VIA EMAIL albert@tricapre.com

To: TriCap Holdings LLC

Julie Kroll, PE, PTOE

From: Jacob Loebig, EIT

Fleis & VandenBrink

Date: May 29, 2024

"The Bond" Development

Re: Novi, Michigan

Trip Generation Analysis

1 INTRODUCTION

This memorandum presents the results of the Trip Generation Analysis (TGA) for the proposed mixed-use development in Novi, Michigan. The project site is located adjacent to the south side of Bond Street, west of Grand River Ave. in Novi, Michigan, as shown in **Figure 1**. The proposed project includes a mixed-use development, with both multi-family residential and commercial uses. Fleis & VandenBrink (F&V) previously completed a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) for the proposed development plan in 2018. The site plan has subsequently been updated and is currently in the review process with the City of Novi.

The purpose of this study is to provide a Trip Generation Analysis (TGA) for this project as part of the site plan approval process with the City of Novi. This TGA provides a trip generation comparison of the previously approved project as evaluated in the 2018 traffic study and the current development plan for this site.



FIGURE 1: SITE LOCATION MAP

2 TRIP GENERATION ANALYSIS

The 2018 TIS performed for this project included an evaluation of the trip generation associated with the proposed development plan that included 250 apartment units and 6,000 SF shopping center. The number of weekday peak hour (AM and PM) and daily vehicle trips that would be generated by the previously approved development was forecast based on data published by ITE in the *Trip Generation Manual*, 9th Edition. The trip generation evaluated in the 2018 TIS is summarized in **Table 1**.

TABLE 1: 2018 TRAFFIC STUDY TRIP GENERATION

| Land Use | ITE Size | | Unit | Weekday Average Daily | AM Pe | ak Hou | ır (vph) | PM Peak Hour (vph) | | |
|-----------------|----------|-------------|------------|--------------------------|-------|--------|----------|--------------------|-----|-------|
| Luna 300 | Code | | O.I.I. | Traffic (vpd) | ln | Out | Total | In | Out | Total |
| Apartments | 220 | 250 | DU | 1,931 | 38 | 96 | 134 | 98 | 68 | 166 |
| Shopping Center | 820 | 6,000 SF | | 887 | 51 | 43 | 94 | 37 | 37 | 74 |
| | Pa | ss-by Trips | (34% PM) | 302 | 17 | 15 | 32 | 13 | 12 | 25 |
| | | | New Trips | 585 | 34 | 28 | 62 | 24 | 25 | 49 |
| | | T | otal Trips | 2,818 | 89 | 139 | 228 | 135 | 105 | 240 |
| | 302 | 17 | 15 | 32 | 13 | 12 | 25 | | | |
| | 2,516 | 72 | 124 | 196 | 122 | 93 | 215 | | | |

The proposed development plan has been updated to include 329 multi-family units and 5,578 SF retail center. The projected trip generation for the proposed development plan was calculated based on the data published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) in *Trip Generation Manual*, 11th Edition. The number of weekday peak hour (AM and PM) and daily vehicle trips that would be generated by the current proposed development plan is summarized in **Table 2**.

TABLE 2: PROPOSED SITE PLAN TRIP GENERATION

| | | | | Weekday | AM F | Peak Hou | ır (vph) | PM Peak Hour (vph) | | |
|---------------------------------|-------------|-------------|------------|--------------------------------|------|----------|----------|--------------------|-----|-------|
| Land Use | ITE Size | | Unit | Average Daily Traffic (vpd) | ln | Out | Total | ln | Out | Total |
| Multi-Family Housing (Mid Rise) | 221 | 329 | DU | 1,523 | 31 | 102 | 133 | 79 | 50 | 129 |
| Strip Retail Plaza (<40kSF) | 822 | 5,578 | SF | 465 | 8 | 5 | 13 | 26 | 25 | 51 |
| | Pa | ss-by Trips | (40% PM) | 186 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| | | | New Trips | 279 | 8 | 5 | 13 | 16 | 15 | 31 |
| | | T | otal Trips | 1,988 | 39 | 107 | 146 | 105 | 75 | 180 |
| | ss-by Trips | 186 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 20 | | |
| | | Total | New Trips | 1,802 | 39 | 107 | 146 | 95 | 65 | 160 |

The total trip generation associated with the current development plan and the previously evaluated development in the 2018 TIS is summarized in **Table 3**. The results of the analysis show that the proposed development plan generates *less* trips than the previously evaluated site plan. Therefore, the change in trip generation for this site is below the City of Novi Thresholds for either a Traffic Impact Assessment or a Traffic Impact Study.

TABLE 3: TRIP GENERATION COMPARISON SUMMARY

| TABLE 6. THE SERENATION SOME ACCOUNTACT | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|------|--------|----------|--------------------|-----|-------|--|--|--|
| | Weekday | AM P | eak Ho | ur (vph) | PM Peak Hour (vph) | | | | | |
| Scenario | Average Daily Traffic (vpd) | ln | Out | Total | ln | Out | Total | | | |
| 2018 TIS | 2,818 | 89 | 139 | 228 | 135 | 105 | 240 | | | |
| Revised Site Plan | 1,988 | 39 | 107 | 146 | 105 | 75 | 180 | | | |
| Difference | -830 | -50 | -32 | -82 | -30 | -30 | -60 | | | |
| City of Novi TIA Threshold | 500 | | 75 | | 75 | | | | | |
| City of Novi TIS Threshold | 750 | | 100 | | 100 | | | | | |



3 **CONCLUSIONS**

- The results of the trip generation comparison show that the proposed development plan is expected to generate less trips than was previously evaluated for this site in the 2018 TIS.
- The adjacent roadway (Bond Street) was designed and constructed to accommodate the previously approved development plan for this site. Since the previous development plan had anticipated more trips, the existing roadway network is expected to adequately accommodate the projected trips generation associated with the proposed development plan.

Any questions related to this memorandum should be addressed to Fleis & VandenBrink Engineering.



I hereby certify that this engineering document was prepared by me or under my direct personal supervision and that I am a duly licensed Professional Engineer under the laws of the State of Michigan.

Julie M. Kroll Julie M. Jucell 2024.05.29 16:05:49-04'00'

Attachments: 2018 TIS Trip Generation Summary



Table 5: Background Intersection Operations with Improvements

| | | | | | AM | Peak | | PM Peak | | | |
|---|------------------|------------|----------|------------------|--------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|-----|
| ı | ntersection | Control | Approach | | Background Conditions | | Background w/ Improvements | | round itions | Background w/ Improvements | |
| | | | | Delay (s/veh) | LOS | Delay (s/veh) | LOS | Delay (s/veh) | LOS | Delay (s/veh) | LOS |
| | | Signalized | EB | 60.9 | Е | 14.7 | В | 73.8 | Е | 56.9 | Е |
| | Novi Road | | WB | 48.9 | D | 32.0 | С | 70.0 | Е | 57.3 | Е |
| 1 | & Grand River | | NB | 83.5 | F | 51.9 | D | 95.9 | F | 63.1 | Е |
| | Avenue | | SB | 58.6 | Е | 52.8 | D | 111.5 | F | 78.2 | Е |
| | | | Overall | 63.6 | E | 37.1 | D | 87.0 | F | 63.7 | Е |
| | | | EB | 65.3 | Е | 30.4 | С | 55.2 | E | 24.2 | С |
| | Novi Road | | WB | 59.6 | Е | 30.8 | С | 59.2 | Е | 29.0 | С |
| 2 | & Flint | | NB | 20.6 | С | 21.2 | С | 25.3 | С | 23.4 | С |
| | Street | | SB | 19.7 | В | 8.6 | Α | 28.4 | С | 22.5 | С |
| | | | Overall | 25.7 | С | 17.7 | В | 30.9 | С | 23.5 | С |

The results of the background conditions analysis show that vehicle delays and LOS are expected to be similar to existing conditions with proposed improvements except the eastbound left turn movement and southbound through/right turn movement will operate at LOS F during the PM peak period and the northbound through/right turn movement will operate at LOS E during the PM peak period.

A review of network simulations indicated improved conditions at the signalized intersection of Novi Road & Grand River Avenue, however, long vehicle queues for the westbound, eastbound and northbound left-turn movements as well as the northbound and southbound through movements are present during the PM peak period. At all other study intersections, acceptable traffic operations were observed during both the AM and PM peak hours.

Site Trip Generation Analysis

The number of AM and PM peak hour vehicle trips that would be generated by the proposed development was forecast based on data published by ITE in the *Trip Generation Manual*, *9*th *Edition*. The site trip generation forecast for the proposed development is summarized in Table 6.

Table 6: Site Trip Generation

| | ITE | | Average Daily Traffic | PM Peak Hour (vph) | | | SAT Peak Hour (vph) | | |
|-----------------|------|-----------|--------------------------|--------------------|-----|-------|------------------------|-----|-------|
| Land Use | Code | Amount | (vpd) | ln | Out | Total | In | Out | Total |
| Shopping Center | 820 | 6,000 SF | 887 | 51 | 43 | 94 | 37 | 37 | 74 |
| Pass-By | | 34% | 302 | 17 | 15 | 32 | 13 | 13 | 25 |
| | | New Trips | 585 | 34 | 28 | 62 | 24 | 24 | 49 |
| Apartments | 220 | 250 D.U. | 1,931 | 38 | 96 | 134 | 98 | 68 | 166 |
| | | Total | 2,818 | 89 | 139 | 228 | 135 | 105 | 240 |
| | | Pass-By | 302 | 17 | 15 | 32 | 13 | 13 | 25 |
| | | New Trips | 2,516 | 72 | 124 | 196 | 122 | 92 | 215 |

The vehicle trips that would be generated by the proposed development were assigned to the study road network based on existing peak hour traffic patterns and the methodologies published by ITE. This methodology indicates that new trips will return to their direction of origin, while pass-by trips enter and exit the



| PLANNING COMMISSION DRAFT MINUTES – | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | EXCERPT JUNE 26, 2024 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |



PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

CITY OF NOVI Regular Meeting June 26, 2024 7:00 PM

Council Chambers | Novi Civic Center 45175 Ten Mile Road, Novi, MI 48375 (248) 347-0475

CALL TO ORDER

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

ROLL CALL

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

Roney, Member Verma

Absent Excused: Member Dismondy

Staff: Barb McBeth, City Planner; Beth Saarela, City Attorney; Lindsay Bell, Senior

Planner: James Hill, Planner; Heather Ziegler, Planner; Humna Anjum, Plan Review

Engineer; Rick Meader, Landscape Architect

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Member Becker 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 to approve the June 26, 2024 Planning Commission Agenda.

VOICE VOTE ON MOTION TO APPROVE THE JUNE 26, 2024 PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA MOVED BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER AVDOULOS. 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 no one, Chair Pehrson closed the first public audience participation.

CORRESPONDENCE

There was not any correspondence.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

There were no Committee reports.

CITY PLANNER REPORT

There was not a City Planner report.

CONSENT AGENDA - REMOVALS AND APPROVALS

There were no Consent Agenda Removals and Approvals items.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. PICKLEBALL NOVI JSP23-15

Planner James Hill relayed a Special Land Use application was submitted to the City for consideration of a certified nurse assistant school in an existing building at 22960 Venture Drive. Unfortunately, due to personal reasons the applicant was unable to attend the meeting tonight and is requesting to postpone the public hearing until they are available at a later date. Since a public hearing was advertised and scheduled, Planner Hill provided a brief presentation.

The name of the proposed school is the Reliable Training Institute and is proposed to operate out of a portion of industrial office building at 22960 Venture Drive.

The current zoning of the site is I-1 Light Industrial. Trade schools are a Special Land Use in the I-1 Light Industrial zoning district when the site abuts residential. In this case, the site abuts R-4 One Family Residential to the east and I-1 Light Industrial to the north, south, and west.

The Future Land Use shows Industrial, Research, Development, and Technology for the site in addition to the property to the north, south, and west, and Single Family Residential to the east.

There are no proposed site changes, and any interior changes will go through the building department when and if Special Land Use approval is granted.

The Planning Commission is asked to hold the public hearing tonight for PSLU24-04 Reliable Training Institute, postpone the Special Land Use Permit, and leave the public hearing open until the applicant is prepared to move forward. Staff is available for any questions.

Chair Pehrson confirmed that the applicant was not present to address the Planning Commission and then opened the public hearing by inviting anyone who wished to speak to come forward. Seeing no one, and confirming there was no correspondence, Chair Pehrson held the public hearing open.

Motion to postpone the PSLU24-04 Reliable Training Institute Special Land Use permit and leave the public hearing open made by Member Avdoulos and seconded by Member Lynch.

In the matter of Reliable Training Institute, PSLU24-04, motion to postpone the Special Land Use Permit and leave the public hearing open until the applicant is prepared since the applicant had a conflict and was unable to prepare a response or attend the meeting.

ROLL CALL VOTE ON MOTION TO POSTPONE PSLU24-04 RELIABLE TRAINING INSTITUTE SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT AND LEAVE THE PUBLIC HEARING OPEN MOVED BY MEMBER AVDOULOS AND SECONDED BY MEMBER LYNCH. Motion carried 6-0.

3. THE BOND JSP18-10

Public Hearing at the request of Bond at Novi LLC for JSP18-10 for recommendation to the City Council for approval or denial of the revised Preliminary Site Plan, Woodland Permit and Storm Water Management Plan. The revised plans propose to add a fifth floor to accommodate additional units.

Planner Bell stated the subject property is approximately 7.99 acres and is located in Section 22, southwest of the intersection of Grand River and Novi Road. The subject property is behind City Center Plaza between the recently reconstructed Bond Street and the railroad, west of Novi Road.

The property is zoned Town Center - 1 surrounded by the same on all sides except across the railroad tracks which is zoned Light Industrial.

The Future Land Use map indicates similar uses for the subject property and surrounding parcels.

The applicant had received approval to redevelop the former Fendt Transit Mix Concrete site into a mixed-use development with two four-story multi-family residential buildings with 260 units and a single-story commercial building as a Phase 2. The project included a two-level parking structure, surface

parking, site amenities such as a swimming pool, landscaped courtyards, fitness room, and related landscape improvements. No changes to Phase 2 are proposed.

Since approval of the project in 2021, the applicant states that delays caused by nearby FEMA floodplain delineation followed by the COVID-19 pandemic prevented construction from getting started, and now increased building costs and interest rates has made the previous project economically unfeasible. The applicant now proposes to increase the height of both residential buildings to 5 stories to accommodate an additional 69 residential units (329 total) and add a third level to the parking structure. The footprint and general layout of the rest of the project remains unchanged, with only minor adjustments to landscaping, utilities, surface parking, and stormwater management facilities.

In the Town Center district, the total number of rooms dictates the maximum density that can be granted for a specific site. This development proposes a mix of 1, 2 and 3 bedroom units. In the TC-1 district, the maximum allowable rooms is calculated by taking the area of the parcel in square feet, divided by a factor of 800 for a mixed-use development. For the subject parcel, the maximum number of rooms allowed for this property is 435 rooms (7.99 acres = 348,044 sq. ft. / 800).

However, the Ordinance permits Planning Commission or City Council, if the project is over 5 acres, to allow an increase in the number of rooms if strict adherence would serve no good purpose or if the intent of the district would be better served by allowing the increase. However, not more than double the number of rooms can be approved (cap of 870 rooms in this case). The applicant's new room count of 812 is within the allowable range of permitted maximum density of the TC-1 District. To allow any increase in additional rooms beyond 435, the City Council must confirm the following:

- a. That an increase in total number of rooms will not cause any detrimental impact on the capabilities of public services and facilities, including water service, sanitary sewer service, storm water disposal, and police and fire protection to serve existing and planned uses in the area.
- b. That an increase in total number of rooms is compatible with adjacent uses of land in terms of location, size, character, and impact on adjacent property or the surrounding neighborhood.

Staff is also asking for a finding that the Usable Open Spaces shown on the site plan, including the clubhouse and fitness room, are acceptable and meet the intent of the Ordinance to provide active and passive recreation, although they do not meet the strict Ordinance definition because they include indoor spaces. Given the unique shape and configuration of the site, the applicant has provided the outdoor space to the extent possible, and the indoor amenities can be used year-round.

With the addition of a fifth story, the Façade review notes that the proposed revisions do not result in any significant change to the previously approved Section 9 waivers for an underage of brick/stone and overage of EIFS, and making the slight adjustments to the previous waivers is recommended.

No new landscape waivers are required, and landscape comments will be addressed in the Final Site Plan submittal if the revised plan receives approval.

An updated Trip Generation Analysis was provided, which shows a decrease in the estimated trips compared to the previous submittal. As explained by our traffic consultant, the reason behind this is the use of two different versions of the ITE trip generation manual, the former 9th edition versus the 11th edition which is now available. Generally, the number of trips has been going down per unit every time a newer version is published. This is the reason a lower impact is shown even when total units are increasing.

The site plan is subject to all previously approved conditions and deviations. Although there are no changes to the Woodland Permit previously approved, reauthorization is being requested along with the revised Site Plan.

The project required several variances from the Zoning Board of Appeals, mostly due to the irregularly shaped lot and urban design of the project. Since those approvals have now expired, the applicant will need to reapply for those variances.

All reviews are recommending approval. The development is over 5 acres and is located in the TC-1

district. This would require City Council approval based on your recommendation, and amendment of the associated Development Agreement.

The Planning Commission is asked to hold the public hearing to consider the proposed changes to the plan described and to make a recommendation to City Council to either approve or deny the revised Preliminary Site Plan and Woodland Permit. Applicants Albert Ludwig, Glenn Cantor, and their design team are present for any questions. Staff is available for questions as well.

Chair Pehrson invited the applicant to address the Planning Commission.

Albert Ludwig introduced himself along with Glenn Cantor and John Woods. They are all members of The Bond at Novi, which is a partnership formed between Mr. Ludwig, Mr. Cantor, Mr. Woods along with DTN management out of Lansing. DTN owns thousands of apartments and student housing units and was brought in for their expertise.

The property was purchased back in 2017. While working on final plans, HUD financing was lined up. It was all approved with one exception. One of their consultants is from FEMA and FEMA demanded that the floodplain map for the entire city of Novi be revised by the City because they put in the loop road which is now called Bond Street. FEMA took over a year to approve the new floodplain map. By that time, COVID had come, interest rates went crazy, and construction costs went crazy. People were out of the office and couldn't work for a while. Since then, you can't get insurance on wood stick buildings anymore. The building had to be redesigned to steel in order to be able to obtain insurance, since there have been too many casualty claims on wood frame buildings.

This proposal has no change to the site plan whatsoever, the ramps got a little bit longer on the parking deck, to add the additional floor, but it's a very minor change on the landscape plan. No parking spaces are lost because of it. There are the same percentage of one-bedroom units as before. There is the same parking ratio as before. There are the same materials on the exterior elevations as before with the same percentages.

The development team is trying to make this work from an economic standpoint and get it off the ground. The whole financing world has changed since 2017. Mr. Ludwig and his team have been in it for the long run and want to get it done. They have worked with Beth over and over on development agreements, and with Barb and Lindsay. Staff has been incredible to work with.

Downtowns need people to survive and to thrive. This is a TC-1 district that needs people. From what Mr. Ludwig is reading in the paper, some of the other TC-1 parcels are downsizing their number of units or type of units, so he thinks this proposal is a good thing for the City to add more people coming into the downtown.

Chair Pehrson opened the Public Hearing and invited members of the audience who wished to participate to approach the podium.

Mike Duchesneau, 1191 South Lake Road, congratulated the three Planning Commission members who got reappointed. He loves the consistency of this board. He was here when The Bond was first proposed. It's a very nice development. Looking closer at the Ordinances, a five-story building is allowed next to a railway or a freeway. That's not an issue for this particular location. Mr. Duchesneau doesn't have an issue with the density if the City Council approves it. He is usually here complaining about traffic, but not with this particular location. The ring road is complete now, it wasn't when it was first proposed.

Mr. Duchesneau recommended to keep the flavor of the Town Center district, that the commercial aspect not be a separate phase, but be included either before units start to get rented or at some other appropriate time frame.

Seeing no one else, and confirming there was no correspondence, Chair Pehrson closed the Public Hearing and turned the matter over to the Planning Commission.

Member Lynch did not have any issues.

Member Becker stated this is the most complex, complicated project he's seen. The subject property is one of the most godforsaken pieces of property in all of Novi. It's a very strange setting. It's a limiting lot shape. Railroad tracks are down the entire west side, warehouses on the back of that, and there is backside of the City Center Plaza to look at. There is a small access road. Member Becker is not sure what other kind of development would even want to go into this TC-1 parcel or would fit.

Member Becker is 74 years old and loves this concept here, the modern part of it and everything else. Maybe this project could go in City West, but then what would we put on this terrible piece of property? Many residents are going to look at this five-story building and say it's so modern, it's a monstrosity, it's aesthetically offensive. But where it is going it's really a remarkable job of tucking it out of the way, of mitigating its size and look for those who don't like it. The parking garage is going to be virtually invisible to anyone but the residents. To check that out, Member Becker went down Clark Street and then into the residential area on the north side of it. He has lived in Novi for 48 years and has never been down Clark Street or knew there was a Creek Crossing subdivision development down there. It's amazing. This will be tucked away; it won't be seen.

It will provide a new close-up group of customers for existing commercial businesses that are accessible right across the street, but also mobility to perhaps even go over into the rest of Town Center. Member Becker is concerned about the traffic volume on Bond Street, which is going to be condensed into the normal morning and evening rush hours, so he is hoping the new traffic assessment process with its updated metrics is correct.

Member Becker believes this concept should be supported in every legal way possible. He loves the urban design, where it is, and hopes this can proceed.

Member Verma had no comment.

Member Roney stated there is not really a significant change in adding one floor when he looks at the elevation, somehow it even looks better. He cannot think of a better place to put something like this than over in that corner of Novi. Now with the ring road going through it seems like it would make it an even greater success. He is in support.

Member Avdoulos did not have any further comments other than he agrees with Member Roney on the accessibility. He thinks it is going to work out great.

Motion to recommend approval to City Council the revised Preliminary Site Plan for JSP18-10 The Bond moved by Member Avdoulos and seconded by Member Lynch.

In the matter of The Bond JSP18-10, motion to recommend approval to City Council the Revised Preliminary Site Plan based on and subject to the following:

- 1. The previously approved waivers and Development Agreement granted by City Council.
- 2. City Council finding per Section 4.82.2.b. for allowing an increase of maximum number of rooms allowed (435 allowed, 812 proposed), as the number of rooms falls within the allowable range and the increase is not anticipated to cause negative impacts to the site or the surrounding area.
- City Council finding acceptable the usable open spaces as shown on the site plan as they
 meet the intent of the Ordinance to provide active and passive recreational opportunities
 for future residents and as the unique shape and urban-style design of the project limits
 the ability to comply with the strict ordinance definition.
- 4. A revised section 9 waiver for the following deviations as the overall appearance of the building would not be significantly improved by strict application of the percentage listed in the Ordinance:
 - a. Not providing the minimum required brick (30% minimum required) on the east (17% proposed), north (21-24% proposed), west (23% proposed), and south (21-24% proposed) facades for Building 1 and 2.

- b. Exceeding the maximum allowed percentage of EIFS (proposed: East-52%, North-51%, South-51% and West-77%) for Building 1 and 2.
- c. Not providing the minimum required brick and stone (50% minimum required) for TC-1 district on all facades (23-34% proposed) for Building 1 and 2.
- d. The previously approved Section 9 waivers for the commercial building and parking garage remain unchanged as the interesting massing and creative use of materials is not compromised by the proposed revisions as recommended by the City's façade consultant.
- 5. The following variances require re-approval from the Zoning Board of Appeals since the original approvals have expired:
 - a. Variance from Section 4.82.2 for increasing the maximum percentage of one-bedroom units allowed for this development (50% maximum allowed, 59% proposed) based on applicant's response that a 60% unit mix is recommended based on their internal marketing survey and assessment.
 - b. Variance from Section 3.27.1.D for allowing parking in the side yard for a commercial building (around 49 spaces) due to the unusual shallow shape of the subject property and the inability to park in the rear yard.
 - c. Variance from Section 3.27.1.D for allowing parking in front yard for residential section (around 38 spaces, 9% of total 432 spaces) due to the unusual shallow shape of the subject property and the inability to park in the rear yard.
 - d. Variance from Section 3.27.1.D for allowing parking in side yard for residential section (around 50 spaces,12% of total spaces in east and 35 spaces 12% of total spaces in west) due to the unusual shallow shape of the subject property and the inability to park in the rear yard.
 - e. Variance from Section 4.82.2.e for a reduction of the minimum building setback for Building 1 on the east side (15 ft. required, a minimum of 12 ft. with overhang of 8.8 ft. proposed for an approximate length of 12 ft., total building length is 283 ft.) due to the unusual shallow shape of the subject property.
 - f. Variance from Section 4.82.2.e for a reduction of the minimum building setback for Building 2 on the east side (15 ft. required, a minimum of 8 ft. with overhang of 3.8 ft. proposed for an approximate length of 16 ft., total building length is 283 ft.) due to the unusual shallow shape of the subject property.
 - g. Variance from Section 4.82.2.e for a reduction of the minimum building setback for the parking garage on the west side (15 ft. required, 5 ft. proposed for entire structure, total building length is 283 ft.) due to the unusual shallow shape of the subject property.
 - h. Variance from Section 5.7.3.E. for allowing an increase of the average to minimum light level ratio for the site (4:1 maximum allowed, 4.81 provided) due to site layout and the site's shallow depth.
 - i. Variance from Section 5.7.3.K for exceeding the maximum allowed foot candle measurements along the south property line abutting the railroad tracks (1 foot candle is maximum allowed, up to 1.7 foot candles is proposed for a small area).
 - j. Variance from Section 3.27.1.H. and Sec. 5.4.2 for allowing two loading areas in the side yard for the residential section due to the unusual shallow shape of the subject property.
 - k. Variance from Section Sec. 5.4.2 for a reduction in the minimum required loading area for each of the two loading spaces in the residential section (2,830 square feet required, 644 square feet provided) due to residential nature of the development that does not require larger loading areas.
 - Variance from Section 3.27.1.I. for a reduction in width of the sidewalk along a non-residential collector (12.5 feet required on both sides, 8 feet proposed on west side and 10 feet asphalt path proposed on east) as it aligns with City's current plans for Flint Street realignment.
 - m. Variance from Section 5.3.2. for a reduction of the minimum parking bay depth for spaces proposed in the parking garage (19 ft. minimum required, 18 ft. proposed) as the depth is limited by the pre-fabricated manufacturers' specifications.
- 6. The findings of compliance with Ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review

letters and the conditions and the items listed in those letters being addressed on the revised Final Site Plan.

This motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Article 3, Article 4, and Article 5 of the Zoning Ordinance and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance.

ROLL CALL VOTE ON MOTION TO RECOMMEND TO CITY COUNCIL THE PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN FOR JSP18-10 THE BOND MADE BY MEMBER AVDOULOS AND SECONDED BY MEMBER LYNCH. Motion carried 6-0.

Motion to recommend approval to City Council the revised Stormwater Management Plan for JSP18-10 The Bond moved by Member Avdoulos and seconded by Member Lynch.


In the matter of The Bond JSP18-10, motion to recommend approval to the City Council of the revised Stormwater Management Plan based on and subject to the findings of compliance with Ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters, and the conditions and items listed in those letters being addressed on the Final Site Plan. This motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Chapter 11 of the Code of Ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance.

ROLL CALL VOTE ON MOTION TO RECOMMEND TO CITY COUNCIL THE REVISED STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR JSP18-10 THE BOND MADE BY MEMBER AVDOULOS AND SECONDED BY MEMBER LYNCH. Motion carried 6-0.

Motion to recommend approval to City Council the Woodland Permit for JSP18-10 The Bond moved by Member Avdoulos and seconded by Member Lynch.

In the matter of The Bond JSP18-10, motion to recommend approval to City Council of the Woodland Permit based on and subject to the following findings of compliance with Ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters, and the conditions and items listed in those letters being addressed on the Final Site Plan. This motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Chapter 37 of the Code of Ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance.

ROLL CALL VOTE ON MOTION TO RECOMMEND TO CITY COUNCIL THE WOODLAND PERMIT FOR JSP18-10 THE BOND MADE BY MEMBER AVDOULOS AND SECONDED BY MEMBER LYNCH. Motion carried 6-0.



2821 MAR 15 AM 8: 40

NOVI CITY CLERK

APR 1 9 2021

RECEIVED

T9668
LIBER 55966 PAGE 759
\$26.00 MISC RECORDING
\$4.00 RENONUMENTATION
03/30/2021 10:44:21 A.M. RECEIPT\$ 66560
PAID RECORDED - OAKLAND COUNTY
LISA BROWN, CLERK/REGISTER OF DEEDS



CITY OF NOVI COUNTY OF OAKLAND STATE OF MICHIGAN

DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT REGARDING COMMERCIAL PROPERTY THE BOND (MIXED-USE)

THIS SECOND AMENDMENT TO DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT REGARDING COMMERCIAL PROPERTY, by and between Bond at Novi, LLC, a Michigan limited liability company, whose address is 2502 Lake Lansing Road, Suite C, Lansing, MI 48912 ("Developer"), and the City of Novi, 45175 Ten Mile Road, Novi, MI 48375-3024 ("City").

RECITATIONS:

- I. Developer owns the "Land" described on the attached and incorporated Property Description Exhibit "A".
- II. On or about April 25, 2019, Developer and the City entered into a certain Development Agreement Regarding Commercial Property The Bond (Mixed-Use), recorded with Oakland County Records on May 24, 2019, at Liber 52859, Page 785, Oakland County Records (the "Development Agreement"), which Development Agreement authorizes the Developer to develop the Land for a mixed-use development (the "Development") consisting of two four-story multi-family residential buildings with a total of 255 apartments with a 2 story parking structure (the foregoing portion of the Development is sometimes referred to as the "Multi-Family Project"), and up to a 5,578 square foot single-story commercial building (the foregoing portion of the Development is sometimes referred to as the "Commercial Project").
- III. On or about November 25, 2019, Developer and the City entered into a First Amendment of Development Agreement Regarding Commercial Property The Bond (Mixed-Use), recorded with the Oakland County Register of Deeds on January 23, 2020, at Liber 53751, Page 385, Oakland County Records (the "First Amendment"). The First Amendment increases the number of apartments in the Development from 255 to 260 resulting in a net increase in room count of 14 rooms (627 rooms to 641 rooms).
- IV. On November 19, 2019, the Zoning Board of Appeals approved an additional variance for the purpose of allowing 59 percent of the units to be one-bedroom units, where the Ordinance allows up to 50 percent.



- V. On January____,2021, the City of City Council approved a revised Preliminary Site Plan including a revised Storm Water Management Plan and Landscape Plan with respect to the Property which includes revisions to the façade materials, the western parking lot access and layout, and landscaping plan.
- VI. The Developer and the City wish to enter into this Second Amendment to the Development Agreement Regarding Commercial Property ("Second Amendment") for the purposes of incorporating the revised Preliminary Site Plan and Storm Water Management Plan, including related Deviations into the Development Agreement.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS AGREED AS FOLLOWS:

- 1. The Development Agreement is hereby amended to include the revised Preliminary Site Plan, including revised Storm Water Management Plan and Landscape Plan, dated 10-8-2020 (Civil), 12-3-2020 (Landscape Plot Date), and 7-29-2020 (Architectural) attached and incorporated herein as Exhibit B.
- 2. The Development Agreement is hereby amended to include an additional variance granted by the Zoning Board of Appeals on November 19, 2019, as attached and incorporated herein in the Minutes of the Zoning Board of Appeals as Exhibit C. Exhibit C supplements Exhibit C of the original Development Agreement, which variances remain in full force and effect.
- 3. The Development Agreement is hereby amended to include an amended list of Waivers and Deviations granted by the Planning Commission, as attached and incorporated herein as Exhibit D. Exhibit D restates and supersedes Exhibit D of the Development Agreement.
- 4. Except for the incorporation of the revised Preliminary Site Plan and other items as noted above, the Development Agreement shall remain in full force and effect.
 - 5. This Agreement may be signed in counterparts.

{Signatures Begin on the Following Page}

DEVELOPER

Bond at Novi, LLC, a Michigan

| | limited liability company |
|--|--|
| | By: Cent Cundway |
| A 1 | Albert Ludwig . |
| STATE OF Michigan | Albert Ludwig . Authorized Representation |
| COUNTY OF Oakland | AMONOTIZED REPROSOR |
| On this 11 day of Janua Albert Ludwig, authorized represent he/she has signed this document of his/her | ntative of Developer who states that own free will on behalf of Developer. |
| Bondat Novi, LLC | Linda Marie Checkley |
| | Notary Public Oakland County, |
| | My commission expires: 10/13/2024 Acting in Oakland County, |
| | |

LINDA MARIE CHECKLEY
NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE OF MI
COUNTY OF OAKLAND
MY COMMISSION EXPIRES ON 19, 2024
ACTING IN COUNTY OF CONTRACTOR

CITY OF NOVI

Robert J

Gatt, Mayor

y: Cortiley

Cortney Hanson, Clerk

STATE OF MICHIGAN

COUNTY OF OAKLAND)

On this 26th day of 3021, before me appeared Robert J. Gatt, Mayor and Cortney Hanson, Clerk of the City of Novi, authorized representatives of Developer, who state that they have signed this document of their own free will on behalf of Developer. The City of Novi

HALLEY HILTON
NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE OF MI
COUNTY OF WASHTENAW
MY COMMISSION EXPIRES Apr 7, 2026

HALLEY HILTON
NOTARY PUBLIC
OAkland County, MI
My commission expires: 4/7/26

Drafted by: Elizabeth Kudla Saarela 27555 Executive Drive, Suite 250 Farmington Hills, MI 48331

ACTING IN COUNTY OF Oakland

When recorded return to: Cortney Hanson, City Clerk City of Novi 45175 Ten Mile Road Novi, MI 48375

Acting in Oakland County, MI

EXHIBIT A

LEGAL DESCRIPTION

Land in the City of Novi, Oakland County, Michigan, described as:

PARCEL 1:

Lots 6, 7 and 8, RAILROAD SUBDIVISION, according to the plat thereof as recorded in Liber 92 of Plats, pages 16, 17 and 18, Oakland County Records.

PARCEL 2:

All that part of Lot 9, RAILROAD SUBDIVISION, according to the plat thereof as recorded in Liber 92 of Plats, pages 16, 17 and 18, Oakland County Records, described as: Beginning at the Southeast corner of Lot 7 of SUPERVISOR'S PLAT NO. 3, as recorded in Liber 54A of Plats, page 84, Oakland County Records, also being the Northerly corner of said Lot 9; thence South 58 degrees 39 minutes 32 seconds East, 91.79 feet; thence along the Southerly line of Flint Street, 90.00 feet wide, South 70 degrees 38 minutes 00 seconds East, 176.30 feet; thence along the Southwesterly line of Flint Street, 75.00 feet wide, South 29 degrees 51 minutes 45 seconds East, 219.68 feet; thence along the Easterly line of said Lot 9, South 27 degrees 03 minutes 36 seconds West, 375.00 feet; thence along the Southerly line of said Lot 9, North 36 degrees 26 minutes 24 seconds West, 633.32 feet; thence along the Westerly line of said Lot 9, North 13 degrees 04 minutes 21 seconds East, 171.48 feet; thence along the Southerly line of said Lot 7 and the Northerly line of said Lot 9, South 73 degrees 24 minutes 45 seconds East, 160.50 feet to the Point of Beginning.

PARCEL 2 ALSO DESCRIBED BY SURVEY AS FOLLOWS:

Part of Lot 9 of "RAILROAD SUBDIVISION" a Subdivision of part of Lot 17 of "SUPERVISORS PLAT NO. 3" Liber 54A, page 84, of part of the Southeast 1/4 of Section 15 and part of the Northeast 1/4 of Section 22, Town 1 North, Range 8 East, City of Novi, Oakland County, Michigan, as recorded in Liber 92, of Plats, page 16, 17, and 18, Oakland County Records, more particularly described as: Beginning at a point located South 03 degrees 10 minutes 57 seconds East along the East line of said Section 22, 138.97 feet and North 73 degrees 48 minutes 57 seconds West along the North line of said "SUPERVISORS PLAT NO. 3", 704.61 feet and South 09 degrees 00 minutes 28 seconds West, 168.50 feet and North 76 degrees 27 minutes 32 seconds West, 100.00 feet and South 07 degrees 56 minutes 01 second West, 99.43 feet from the Northeast corner of said Section 22, being the Point of Beginning and the Southeast corner of Lot 7 of said "SUPERVISIORS PLAT NO. 3"; thence South 61 degrees 37 minutes 16 seconds East, 92.05 feet; thence South 74 degrees 04 minutes 10 seconds East, 176.38 feet; thence South 32 degrees 39 minutes 31 seconds East, 218.62 feet; thence South 23 degrees 38 minutes 55 seconds West, 377.04 feet; thence North 39 degrees 42 minutes 28 seconds West, 633.32 feet; thence North 10 degrees 02 minutes 34 seconds East, 171.48 feet; thence South 77 degrees 38 minutes 25 seconds East, 161.11 feet to the Point of Beginning.

PRELIMINARY SITE PLANS FOR:

BOND

CITY OF NOVI, OAKLAND COUNTY, MICHIGAN SECTION 22, TOWN 1 NORTH, RANGE 8 EAST,

PREPARED FOR:



2502 LAKE LANSING ROAD, SUITE C LANSING, MICHIGAN 48912 PHONE: 517.371.5300 DTN MANAGEMENT COMPANY



30600 NORTWESTERN, SUITE 430 FARMINGTON, MICHIGAN 48334 PHONE: 248.538.1389 EXT. 236 TRICAP HOLDINGS LLC

SITE

MEADOWBROOK ROAD



A Ported of land located in a part of the Nothboart // of Scalab 22 Trans A Ported of land located in a part of the Nothboart Cover of each of the normal of the Nothboart Cover of each of the normal of the Nothboart Cover of each of Scalab 22 and centreline of Not Rocat Onesca North 7075/00 West, 70A.51 feet, along the statement part of the North Rocat Onesca North 7075/00 West, 70A.56 feet, along the scalabory line of the North Rocat Onesca North 7075/00 West, 70A.51 feet, along the scalabory line of rocat cells in the Scalabory line of rocat cells in the Scalabory line of the North Young Cover of the North Young

PHASE 1 - RESIDENTIAL LEGAL DESCRIPTION

I must be interested and the comments of the Northead Course of the section 22, the section 22, the section 24, the section 24

FUTURE PHASE 2 - COMMERCIAL



1. COVER SHEET
OVERALL SITE PLAN
ROW TAKING PLAN AND OPEN SPACE PLAN
STORM WATER MANAGEMENT PLAN
PHASING PLAN
PHASING PLAN
PHARCEL SPLIT - SUBJECT PROPERTY
PARCEL SPLIT - PROPOSED PARCELS

TO MILE ROAD

∑ }

RN SPIKL IN SOUTH FACT OF POWLY POLL LOCALI D ON THE WEST SIGH OF RUNT STREET ± 86" SOUTHEAST OF THE SOUTHEAST BUILDING CORNCR.

LLLVA I ION 908 44 (CI I Y OH NOVI DATUM) BIM OF SANITAKY MANHOLE AT NORTHERNMOST POINT OF PROPERT ELEVA I ION 908 51 (CI I Y OH NOVI DATUM)

ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN PREPARED BY: HUMPHREYS & PARTINERS ARCHITECTS, L.P. 5339 ALPHA ROAD SUITE 300. DALLAS, TX 57240 PHONE: 972.701.9636

BOUNDARY SURVEY PREPARED BY:
FAZAL KHAN & ASSOCIATES, INS
43279 SCHOENHERR
STERLING HEIGHTS , MICHIGAN 48313
FAX: 586.739.8007
FAX: 586.739.8094

7

SEIBER, KEAST ENGINEERING, L.L.C. CONSULTING ENGINEERS 100 MAINCENTRE • SUITE 10 • NORTHMILE, MICHIGAN • 48167 PHONE: 248,308,3331

LANDSCAPE PLANS PREPARED BY:


HPLA STUDIO
5339 ALPHA ROAD, SUITE 300
DALLAS, TEXAS 75240
PHONE: 972,701,9636


PROPERTY BOUNDARY & TOPO INFORMATION ALPINE ENGINEERING, INC. 46892 WEST RADS, SUITE 109 NOVI, MICHIGAN 48377 PHONE: 248,926,3765


A REV FOR PSP ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW


COVER SHEET


SEIBER, KEAST
ENGINEERING, L.L.C.
COMMUNICO DOMESTIC STATE OF NORTHWATE MANAGEMENT PROCESS MANAGEMENT MANAGEMENT PROCESS MANAGEMENT MANAGEMENT PROCESS MANAGEMENT MANAGEMENT PROCESS MAN

















ADDENDUM C - 2020-SEPTEMBER-25

SCALE AS INDICATED

THE LIBER

OF NOVI

COMMENTS SPECIAL NS SPECIAL NS

COMMENTS

J'HT,

STANDARD

J'HT,

STANDARD

J'HT,

STANDARD

20 - 2001. SZE 137 ACONT. SZE 12001. 121 ACONT. 121 ACO

COLIPER COMMENTS

TOLL MIN. 10-18 517.

TOLL MIN. 10-18 517.


TOLL MIN. 10-18 517.

TOLL MIN. 10-18 517.

TOLL MIN. 10-18 118.

TOLL

CALIPER 35" CAL MIN 3" CAL MIN.



EJ CONT

STANDARD STANDARD J'HT STANDARD J'HT STANDARD

978 878

SACONEN SACONE

ADDENDUM C - 2020-SEPTEMBER-25

1,01

SCALE AS MORCATED



\$35,400 \$7,050 \$3,250 \$46,450 \$11,565 \$90,820 \$6,000

THE BOND OF NOVI

27 EJ CONT.
28 AS CONT.
29 AS CONT.
20 AS CONT.
21 AS CONT.
22 CONT.
23 AS CONT.
24 CONT.
25 AS CONT.
26 AS CONT.
26 AS CONT.
27 BAS.
28 AS CONT.

To any


E E

J'CAL MIN HISA 12.15 HT.
STANDARD
12-15 HT.
STANDARD
13-15 HT.
STANDARD
12-15 HT.
12-15 HT.
13-17 HT.
14-17 HT.
14-17 HT.
14-17 HT.

AND SPECIAL SP

MILE FOR PERMIT AND COLUMN

B 8 1




SCALE AS NONCATED



THE BOND OF NOVE

AGE CONTINUED NO REVISION SCHEDULE

ISSUE FOR PERMIT APPLICATION



PLANT PALETTE - POOL COURTYARD ORNAMENTAL TREES Rudsertie fugide Goldstum
BLACK-EYED SUSAN TOTAL COST \$33,500 \$7,150 \$3,250 \$44,450 \$11,365 \$80,000 \$6,000 MN 30"HT, HEAVY SPECIMENS


ADDENDUM C - 2020-SEPTEMBER-25

SHEET NUMBER




THE BOND OF NOVI

SCALE AS INDICATED







WEET NUMBER


SCALE AS INDICATED

FILLIE

CLIENT DTN MANAGEMENT 2502 LAKE LANSING RD SUITE C SUITE C LANSING, MI 48912

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE, LLC S239 ALPHA ROAD SUITE 300 DALLAS TX 75240 F [972] 701-8536 F [972] 701-8539 W www.tphas.budo.com

studio




THEFT

CLIENT
DTN MANAGEMENT
2502 LAKE LANSING RD
SUITE C
LANSING MI 48912

HUMPHREYS A PARTNERS
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE, LLC
5339 ALPHA ROD SUITE 200
DALLAS TX 75240
T 1972) 701-6536
F (972) 701-6536
F (972) 701-6536
VV www.holestudio com

studio



SATE DETAILS

CLIENT
DTN MANAGEMENT
2502 LAKE LANSING RD
SUITE C


HUMPHREYS & PARTNERS
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE. L
5398 ALPHA ROAD SUITE 300
DALLAS TX 75240
T (972) 701-6536
F (972) 701-6536
W www.hplasludio.com

studio studio



SERVINE OF STREET REVISION SCHEDULE

NEW 2781 SWEAR STR. 2013 BEAT FOR FORMY AND LOS THE



SHEET TITLE DUTTE CHETTALLS


HLMPHREYS & PARTNERS
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE, L
539 A, IPHA RACAD SUITE 300
CALLAS TX 75240
T (972) 70 16639
F (972) 70 16639
W yww.hpbastado.com


hpla



ISSUE FOR CONSTRUCTION

WALKERSON (PREDCED) STATE





SHEET TITLE

CLEAT
DTN MANAGEMENT
2502 LAKE LANSING RD
SUITE C
LANSING MI 49912






REVISION SCHEDULE


REVISION SCHEDULE

ATTENDATE

ATTEND

Management and a state of the second





ADDENDUM C - 2020-SEPTEMBER-25

SOME AS NOCATED 9.04

CLIENT
DTN MANAGEMENT
2502 LAKE LANSING RD
SUITE C
LANSING MI 48912 STIE DETAILS


HUMPHREYS & PARTNERS
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE, L.
\$339 A.PHA ROAD SUITE DD
DALLAS TX 75240
T (972) 70 1-8636
F (972) 70 1-8639
W www.nplestudo.com





THE BOND OF NOVI

SOUTHLIBET NO PAGE




SAGET CAMBRAIS
BLDG 1 - FRST FLOOD
ONE FAULT PLAN
SAGET NO

HUMPHREYS & PARTNERS

ARCHITECTS, L.P.
21 W WALKERDRINE SUITE 2000 CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60601
(312) 599 - 4400 (572) 701 - 9439 FAX







HUMPHREYS & PARTNERS ARCHITECTS, L.P.




THE BOND OF NOVI SECTION 22, TOWN 1 NORTH, RANGE 8 EAST CITY OF NOVI, OAKLAND COUNTY, MICHIGAN




HUMPHREYS & PARTNERS ARCHITECTS, L.P.






ARCHITECTS, L.P. ER DRIVE SUITE 2000 CHICAGO, NEI (312) 680 - 4400 (372) 761 - 9639 FAX








HUMPHREYS & PARTNERS
ARCHITECTS, L.P.
121 W WACKER DRINE SUITE 200 CHICAGO, JULINOIS 66601
[12] 690 -4400 (972) 701 -9539 FAX







HUMPHREYS & PARTNERS

ARCHITECTS, L.P.

WACKER (INVE. BUILT 2000 - CHICAGO, BLHHOR 6000)
[312) 690 - 4400 [972) 701 - 9639 FAX









HUMPHREYS & PARTNERS ARCHITECTS, L.P.








HUMPHREYS & PARTNERS ARCHITECTS, L.P.






ARCHITECTS, L.P.,
RENORME SMITE 2000 CHICAGO, GLIM
CHIZI SING 4400 (8772) 701 MISS FAX




THE BOND OF NOVI SECTION 22, TOWN 1 NORTH, RANGE 8 EAST CITY OF NOVI, OAKLAND COUNTY, MICHIGAN



HUMPHREYS & PARTNERS


ARCHITECTS, L.P.








THE BOND OF NOVI SECTION 22, TOWN 1 NORTH, RANGE 8 EAST CITY OF NOVI, OAKLAND COUNTY, MICHIGAN



@ 9

1 m



ADDENDUM B

HUMPHREYS & PARTNERS

ARCHITECTS, L.P.,
SER DRIVE SUITE 7000 CHICAGO ILLINOIS
(312) 680 - 4400 (972) 701 - 8639 FAX

1) BLDG 182 - PARTIAL EAST ELEVATION - COURTYARD

THE BOND OF NOVI SECTION 22, TOWN 1 NORTH, RANGE 8 EAST CITY OF NOVI, OAKLAND COUNTY, MICHIGAN

REGULAR MEETING - ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS CITY OF NOVI

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 2019 7:00 P.M.

Council Chambers/Novi Civic Center

BOARD MEMBERS:

Joe Peddiboyina, Chairperson

Linda Krieger, Acting Secretary

Kevin Sanker

Michael Longo

Siddharth Mav Sanghvi

Clift Montague

Ramesh Verma, Member

ALSO PRESENT:

Elizabeth Saarela, City Attorney

Lawrence Butler, Community Development,

Deputy Director

Katherine Opperman, Recording Secretary

Reported by:

Cynthia Ann Chyla

Certified Shorthand Reporter

Page 65

Mr. Sanghvi, yeah, go ahead.

MEMBER SANGHVI: That we grant the variance in Case Number PZ-19-0047, The Bond at Novi, LLC, both the parcels here. As far as I can see the variance we granted earlier is not essentially changed, and only changes as they have described are more or less internal changes and no change in the footprint of the building, and they also assure us they have adequate parking for the whole units. And apart from them all the reasons why we granted the variance on August 14th, 2018, are still valid and I don't see any reason to change my opinion and I request the Board to grant him the variance. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Anybody wants to second?

MEMBER SANKER: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you.

The motion is passed. Please call the roll call, Katherine.

MS. OPPERMAN: Chairperson Peddiboyina?

CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Yes, please.

MS. OPPERMAN: Member Krieger?

MEMBER KRIEGER: Yes.

| | Page 66 |
|-----|--|
| 1 | MS. OPPERMAN: Member Longo? |
| 2 | MEMBER LONGO: Yes. |
| 3 | MS. OPPERMAN: Member Sanghvi? |
| 4 | MEMBER SANGHVI: Yes. |
| 5 | MS. OPPERMAN: Member Sanker? |
| 6 | MEMBER SANKER: Yes. |
| 7 | MS. OPPERMAN: Member Montague? |
| 8 | MEMBER MONTAGUE: Yes. |
| 9 | MS. OPPERMAN: Member Verma? |
| 10 | MEMBER VERMA: Yes. |
| 11 | MS. OPPERMAN: Motion passes. |
| 12 | CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: Thank you and |
| 13 | congratulations. |
| 14 | MR. LUDWIG: Thank you. |
| 15 | CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: I want to bring |
| 16 | back the first case number. Is there any the |
| 17 | applicant is here, Case Number 1, PZ19-0032. The |
| 18 | applicant is here, please? |
| 19 | MEMBER SANKER: North Hills Village |
| 20 | Apartments. |
| 21 | CHAIRPERSON PEDDIBOYINA: I'm sorry. |
| 22 | Go ahead, Attorney. |
| 23 | MS. SAARELA: You could just open the public |
| - 1 | |

EXHIBIT D FAÇADE AND LANDSCAPE WAIVERS

- 1. A Section 9 waiver for the following deviations as the overall appearance of the building would not be significantly improved by strict application of the percentage listed in the Ordinance:
 - a. not providing the minimum required brick (30% minimum required) on the east (17% proposed), north (24-28% proposed) and south (18% proposed) facades for Building 1 and 2;
 - b. exceeding the maximum allowed percentage of EIFS (25% maximum allowed) on all facades (proposed: East-54%, North-38-56%, South- 61% and West- 77%) for Building 1 and 2;
 - c. not providing the minimum required brick and stone (50% minimum required) for TC-1 district on all façades (proposed: East-26%, North-32%, South- 30% and West- 23%) for Building 1 and 2;
 - d. Not providing the minimum 30 percent required brick on all facades for the Commercial Building (proposed: North 23%, West 8%, South 8% and East 17%);
 - e. Exceeding the 50 percent maximum allowed for Cast Stone on all facades for the Commercial Building (proposed: North 55%, West 76%, South 76% and East 64%);
 - f. Exceeding the maximum allowed percentage for Ribbed Metal (0% allowed) on all facades providing the ribbed metal for the Commercial Building (proposed: North 12%, West 6%, South 6% and East 9%);
 - g. Exceeding the maximum allowed concrete for west facade of the parking structure (0% allowed, 100% proposed) in lieu of providing the minimum required brick (30% minimum required, 0% provided);
 - h. Exceeding the maximum allowed cast stone for north and south facades of the parking structure (0% allowed, 100% proposed) in lieu of providing the minimum required brick (30% minimum required, 0% provided);
- Landscape waiver from Sec. 5.5.3.B.ii for the lack of a berm and screening as the applicant proposed a line of arborvitaes along the property line to soften the view toward the railroad tracks and industrial site beyond in lieu of required landscape screening;
- 3. Landscape waiver from Sec. 5.5.3.B.ii for a reduction in the required greenbelt width between the right-of-way and parking areas along Flint/Bond Street (20 ft. width required, a range of 10 ft. to 20 ft. provided). A 2.5-foot brick wall screening the parking and additional landscaping in the narrower areas help to compensate for the lack of space in the areas with just a 10-foot greenbelt;
- 4. Landscape waiver from Sec. 5.5.3.F.ii.b(1) for a reduction in the total number multifamily unit trees provided (171 trees required, 129 provided) as the site is otherwise well-landscaped and there is not additional room for trees;

- 5. Landscape waiver from Sec. 5.5.3.F.ii.B(2) for the reduction in the number of interior roadway perimeter trees provided (1 tree short) due to conflict with fire access lane (grass pavers);
- 6. Landscape waiver from Sec. 5.5.3.D. for the deficiency in the foundation landscaping coverage around the parking deck due to limited space available along the southwest side, along the railroad. Large arborvitaes are proposed in that area to help screen the view of the railroad and the industrial site:
- 7. Landscape waiver from Sec. 5.5.3.C.(3) Chart footnote for not proposing the required parking lot perimeter trees for the temporary gravel parking proposed to be constructed for use by visitors to Novi Cemetery in Phase 1 (11 trees required, 0 proposed) as the landscape requirements will be met at the time of Phase 3 construction within a certain time mutually agreed between the applicant and the City.