



PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

CITY OF NOVI

Regular Meeting

August 28, 2019 7:00 PM

Council Chambers | Novi Civic Center
45175 W. Ten Mile (248) 347-0475

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:03 PM.

ROLL CALL

Present: Member Avdoulos, Member Gronachan, Member Lynch, Member Maday

Absent: Member Anthony, Member Ferrell, Chair Pehrson

Also Present: Barbara McBeth, City Planner; Sri Komaragiri, Planner; Lindsay Bell, Planner; Victor Boron, Staff Engineer; Kate Richardson, Staff Engineer; Thomas Schultz, City Attorney

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Moved by Member Lynch and seconded by Member Gronachan.

VOICE VOTE TO APPROVE THE AUGUST 28, 2019 AGENDA MOTION MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER GRONCHAN.

Motion to approve the August 28, 2019 Planning Commission Agenda. Motion carried 4-0.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

Dorothy Duchesneau, 125 Henning, said given where we are today, August of 2019, and with Robertson Brothers PRO approved for Lakeview, and it's not August of 2018 anymore when citizen input was given at the Pavilion Shore Park workshop, I don't understand why the entire six acres mentioned today as the proposed rezoning of Pavilion Shore Village needs to be rezoned.

Robertson Brothers was approved this past spring as a PRO development with an overlay. The new development does not even need to be part of the Pavilion Shore footprint. It seems like an overlay on top of an overlay on top of an already existing subdivision overlay, which is getting redundant. This portion of the neighborhood, as per the 2016 Master Plan, is now being developed and it's being fixed. The properties that were sold to Robertson Brothers were part of two subdivisions that were platted and date back ninety years. They

should stay under the aspects of the subdivisions they are part of and the PRO they are building it under. The new homeowners will be part of Lakeview and under their own home owners association.

By eliminating the lots on 13 Mile Road that face the park currently from the Pavilion Shore Park equation these would then be left as viable buildable home lots as part of their existing subdivision. They would fit in with the other homes built to the east on 13 Mile Road and they would also fit in with the homes behind them, which does not need to be business. The two existing homes on the north end of Austin Drive and on the west side of Old Novi Road are fine being left in their respective subdivision, they do not need to be a part of the Pavilion Shore District either.

Dorothy Duchesneau continued to say now that leaves the remaining properties at the intersection of Old Novi Road, South Lake Drive, and 13 Mile Road. These are very challenging, they are 1.66 acres that face the park and straddle Old Novi Road on two sides and that should be defined as Pavilion Shore Village. With the Park across from it, this is an area that screams Walkable Novi. Everything in it is either non-conforming to current standards, grandfathered, or too small to do anything with in today's rules. This is where the rezoning help is needed.

It currently has three existing long-time successful neighborhood businesses, they consist of 1.18 acres, and there is the Lakeview Bar, Vet Select, and the party store. What remains is only 0.4 acres. Those 0.4 acres consist of four lots under one owner. They are unique properties. In addition to the three existing businesses, that should be Pavilion Shore Village. This should be an area that makes sense for redevelopment that does need help. Thank you.

Michel Duchesneau, 1191 South Lake Drive, said I recognize that there is not a public hearing on Pavilion Shore Village, but would like to offer some comments. I followed the proposals for this area and have spoken before the Planning Commission, the City Council, and the Zoning Board of Appeals on multiple occasions regarding citizen preferences and the 2016 vision as a respondent in the Master Plan.

In short, the 2016 Master Plan goal of redeveloping this area while supporting the existing businesses has been substantially accomplished. The ten additional parking spaces being added along Old Novi Road have been needed by the three existing businesses in the area and achieve the Master Plan goals. I am on record for supporting the Robertson Brothers Lakeview PRO as approved; several affected residents still fully oppose that development. In my opinion, the zoning ordinance change as presented in your packet is not ready for a public hearing and should be tabled or revised. If the proposal is sent to the Implementation Committee, I would like to attend the meetings. This map here shows the area we are discussing. The zoning proposal in your packet creates two sub-districts; a residential and a commercial. I have highlighted the undeveloped parcels on the map. The undeveloped business area, currently zoned B-3, consist of less than one-half an acre of land and it's only with one owner. The remaining parcels, zoned R-4, are on three undeveloped lots; a lot with a house on it, a small city owned lot, and has a total of 0.68 acres of unbuild land in the residential district. Without going into great detail, these lots can and should be built as single family residential detached homes under R-4. The map makes it easy to visualize where the three missing houses will be. I agree with MKSK that B-3 is a more intensive zoning then is merited for the half-acre of undeveloped land left. Live-

work businesses or the kinds of businesses listed in the proposal could make sense. If the creation of a Pavilion Shore Business District facilitates the three existing businesses staying in business, that's a good thing. Otherwise, we should wait until the B-3 owner offers a proposal, the approved PRO is completed, and the Master Plan is updated in a couple of years. In summary, the parcels not being developed in the Pavilion Shore Village consists of less than one and a quarter acres. The Master Plan objectives have been achieved, no further action needs to be taken at this time. The City has other larger and less controversial areas to focus on. Thank you.

CORRESPONDENCE

There was no correspondence.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

There were no Committee Reports.

CITY PLANNER REPORT

City Planner McBeth said thank you and good evening, I have one thing to announce tonight. We have a new Staff Engineer, Victor Boron, who is with us tonight. He along with Kate Richardson will be our plan review engineers. Victor has a bachelor's degree in civil engineering from Michigan Tech. He worked for a design engineer firm locally for about four years. So we welcome Victor.

CONSENT AGENDA- REMOVALS AND APPROVAL

1. FAIRFIELD INN & SUITES JSP 18-66: Approval of reduction of a parking space

Approval at the request of Novi Superior Hospitality, LLC for Planning Commission's approval of reduction of minimum required parking spaces from 119 to 118, as may be granted by the Planning Commission per the revised Planned Rezoning Overlay Agreement for the Adell Center. The applicant previously received Planning Commission approval of Preliminary Site Plan for a 5 -story hotel with 119 rooms on Unit 3 of Adell Center Development.

Member Avdoulos said do we have a motion?

ROLL CALL VOTE TO APPROVE REDUCTION OF MINIMUM REQUIRED PARKING SPACES FROM 119 TO 118 MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER MADAY.

Motion to approve the reduction of the minimum required parking spaces from 119 to 118, as may be granted by the Planning Commission per the revised Planned Rezoning Overlay Agreement for the Adell Center. Motion carried 4-0.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. TEXT AMENDMENT 18.289

Public hearing at the request of Frank Jonna for Planning Commission's recommendation to City Council for a Zoning Ordinance text amendment at Article 3, Section 3.10 "B-1, B-2 AND B-3 BUSINESS DISTRICTS REQUIRED CONDITIONS" in order to allow building height to be increased to 52 feet or 4 stories in the B-2 District under certain conditions.

Planner Bell said good evening. Staff received an application for a proposed ordinance amendment for the purpose of allowing building height to be increased from a maximum of forty-two feet or three stories to fifty-two feet or four stories in the B-2 Community Business District, throughout the City of Novi. The applicant, Mr. Frank Jonna, is primarily interested in developing a hotel on the remaining parcel in the Westmarket Square development, which is located near the northwest corner of Grand River Avenue and Beck Road.

The B-2 District currently has a standard building height limit of thirty feet, which may be increased on properties not adjacent to residential districts to forty-two feet or three stories. All developments on properties adjacent to residential districts would still be limited to thirty feet under the proposed amendment.

There are only two other areas of Novi that are currently zoned B-2 on the Zoning Map: The southwest corner of West Pontiac Trail and West Park Drive (Novi Square Shopping Center, Clearview Eyecare, and a vacant parcel) and the south side of Twelve Mile Road, west of Haggerty Road (One parcel – no residential adjacent and is developed as Holiday Inn Express & Suites)

Of the locations noted above, the three parcels on West Pontiac Trail are adjacent to residential districts, so the text amendment proposed would not apply to those properties. The parcel on Twelve Mile does not have freeway frontage, so the proposed amendment would currently be limited to application at Westmarket Square.

If the applicant chooses not to develop a hotel at this location, another use could be proposed, such as a four-story office. If the Planning Commission is inclined to support the text amendment as a means to accommodate additional height at Westmarket Square and other B-2 zoned properties in the City, staff would recommend additional height would only be permitted under the following conditions: when the parcel does not abut a residential district, when the proposed site has frontage on a freeway (as reviewed and recommended by the Planning Commission at the introduction to the ordinance amendment on July 24, 2019), and if the required building and parking setbacks can be met.

Tonight the Planning Commission is asked to hold the Public Hearing and make a recommendation to the City Council for reading and adoption. Thank you.

Member Avdoulos said thank you Lindsay. This is a Public Hearing, if there is anyone that would like to speak on this particular item, you have the floor. Seeing none, I'll close that and hand it over to the Planning Commission members.

Member Lynch said we are only talking about one site. In this particular location, I believe we all agree that it makes sense. It is adjacent to a freeway. Also, I think in this particular site, a hotel will certainly support the businesses in the area. There's no residential in the area. It's not going to be sticking out like a sky scraper. Although, we do have a property in the Adell Center that is higher than that, but that is a unique development. I personally think it makes sense. The other two areas, from my understanding, would not apply because one of them abuts residential and the other one does not have a freeway. So really, were just talking about this particular site.

Planner Bell said yes, as it's written now.

Member Lynch said I think it makes sense in this particular area. If this is what we need to do as far as the zoning text amendment goes, we should probably do it.

Member Maday said I'll go on record to say I agree with Mr. Lynch.

Member Gronachan said I concur as well, I think the staff did a thorough job and I think this meets the criteria in this area. So, I support it.

Member Avdoulos said do we have a motion?

ROLL CALL VOTE TO MAKE RECOMMENDATION TO CITY COUNCIL MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY GRONACHAN.

Motion to make a favorable recommendation to the City Council for reading and adoption. Motion carried 4-0.

2. JSP 17-52, TERRA associated with Zoning Map Amendment 18.718

Public hearing at the request of Cambridge of Novi, LLC for Planning Commission's recommendation to the City Council for the First Amendment to the previously-approved Planned Rezoning Overlay (PRO) Plan, JSP 17-52, Terra, formerly known as Villa D'Este, associated with Zoning Map Amendment 18.718. The subject property is approximately 30.14-acres and is located east of Napier Road and on the north side of Nine Mile Road (Section 29, 30). The applicant proposed a 41-unit single-family ranch housing development (for sale). The current amendment is required as the applicant is seeking some additional deviations for building elements to allow greater flexibility for construction of individual homes, alternate pavement material for sidewalks and driveways and other minor changes.

Planner Komaragiri said thank you for that introduction. So, I'm going to move straight to the items the applicant is asking for deviations for. The current amendment is not proposing any changes to the approved layout, storm water management, impacts to the wetlands or woodlands, traffic, and landscape design. The plan is still subject to the previous approval for all the other items.

The first item the applicant is requesting is to use exposed aggregate as surface material for the residential driveways and sidewalks within the development boundaries. The private road network, Villa Drive and Villa Court, are still proposed to be asphalt. The engineering review notes that the proposed aggregate is adequate for the intended use and supports this request.

The second item the applicant is requesting is prairie style architectural buildings that use low sloped roof pitches, integrated planter bases, and large overhangs. The applicant states that the overhangs are critical to the style and the architecture of these residential homes. The maximum projection of fifteen inches is allowed into the side yard based on the existing side yard setback of fifteen feet, seven and a half feet for each building. The applicant is proposing up to thirty-six inches of projection with the proposed overhangs within the red boundary shown on the exhibit map that is displayed. The current proposal does not affect the approved deviation for the façade with regards to the similar and

dissimilar ordinance. The elevations will be reviewed for compliance with the ordinance requirements at the time of individual building permits. The City's façade consultant, Doug Necci, who is here tonight, notes that the proposed overhangs will enhance the design of the buildings and, in fact, are essential in obtaining the unique appearance of the prairie style architecture. Staff recommends approval of this deviation, subject to our façade consultant's determination that the proposed buildings to match the prairie style architecture at the time of building permit review.

The applicant is also proposing wing walls that could be attached or detached from the building. A maximum of four and a half feet of projection is proposed to occur within anywhere of the blue line in the image shown on the screen. Wing walls attached to the building are subject to building setbacks. Staff recommends that this could be a condition in the PRO agreement provided that the proposed walls are compatible with the building design and architectural style to be determined by the City's façade consultant. The applicant has provided some images that indicate the kind of planter boxes or wing walls they intend to add to the elevations.

The previously approved plan refers to two boundaries when referencing a building: a unit boundary, which is the actual building footprint, and an accessory unit boundary, which are the limits of construction for accessory uses. It is twenty-five feet from the back façade and then the same extent of the building.

The approved PRO agreement allows no more than two regulated tree removals to accommodate the construction or installation of any pool or any other accessory uses noted. The applicant is now currently requesting up to three tree removals. The previous plan proposed a total of five hundred and fifty-two trees to be removed for both phases of the development, resulting in a total of seven hundred and twenty-eight replacement trees. Staff recommends not adding any more removals to the previously approved number. The applicant notes that the development will most likely not use the maximum allowable number as the removal will be determined based on accessory features each individual home owner may desire. If the home owner does not want to build anything within the accessory boundary they may not need to remove any trees. Staff is currently not supporting this deviation, but is deferring it to our Planning Commission's recommendation to City Council on this item.

The applicant is also requesting to allow covered decks as a permitted use within the accessory unit boundary for the area of units 7-36, which are all the units backing up to the regulated woodlands to the north and to the west. All covered enclosed decks are not considered an accessory use. They are considered a part of the building and will be subject to building setbacks. The applicant did not provide any reasonable justification to allow them within the accessory boundaries other than this would provide an additional option to the home buyer. Staff is currently not supporting the request as it would increase the maximum lot coverage beyond fifty percent previously approved because it is unclear whether the covered decks would have enclosed walls.

In addition to the deviations, the applicant is also requesting to make some minor additions to the PRO agreement, they're not deviations. The first one is that they want to make sure the numbers in the approved MDEGLE permit matches the numbers in the PRO agreement for the compensating cut shown on the plan. It is the same as approved before they are just changing the numbers from square foot to cubic yards. Staff is in

agreement with this update. The applicant has added about ten feet worth to unit six, which is indicated here in the red shaded area on the map. This is an administrative change, but since the plan is coming to Planning Commission this is just an update indicating the change happened. The applicant also made a change to the number of units within the red box shown on the map. There were six units before and now the applicant replaced them with five wider units.

The Planning Commission is asked tonight to consider the mentioned deviations and make a recommendation to hold the public hearing and then make a recommendation to City Council based on the individual deviations. The motion sheet provided gives an option for the two deviations, when making a recommendation please pick one of those two. Thank you.

Member Avdoulos said thank you, Sri. Is the applicant here and would they like to add to Sri's presentation?

Applicant, Mark Guidobono of Cambridge Homes, 47765 Bellagio Drive, said hello everyone. Just a couple of comments here, and I'll be happy to answer any questions anyone may have. The first comment: we have decided to go with prairie style architecture. I have more pictures if you would like to see them. But, on the overhangs, just for clarification, the dimension we are looking at, in our minds, is that nine foot area. In this subdivision we will have overhangs that are thirty inches, thirty-six inches, and forty-eight inches. There are some sites that will be bigger or have more space between units, which will allow us to go to forty eight inches in some instances, but we will maintain that nine foot minimum. I did want to make that clarification because the way the memorandum reads talks about having thirty-six inch overhangs and we are using three different sizes.

The other thing we can talk about is tree removal. Our goal is to not remove any more trees. Staff did put, knowing if somebody did want to install a pool or something like that, we would agree to allow two regulated trees to be removed per unit up to that amount. Probably, maximum ten to twenty percent of the units would have this condition. This is not super important for us; it just gives us some flexibility and one way to look at it from our stand point, we could cap it at twenty trees maximum over and above the two and I doubt we would even get to that number. That's our feeling on that. It just gives us more flexibility, if home owners want to add some things. We've gone out of our way to move that tree fencing in as tight as we can to save some really nice trees behind the development. We really brought that in tight, we would hate to have that cost us a couple of sales. That's the only reason why we're thinking of this. We can go either way with it; it just gives us a little more flexibility.

With the covered decks, it's the same thing. Most of our footprints are a fairly good size, we feel ninety percent of these homes will be able to keep the covered portion of these decks within that footprint, there might be a couple of instances where the design calls for a covered deck that extends beyond that footprint. We were just proposing it because we're backing up to the city woodlands. For us, the setbacks do not come into play and this will not affect any of the residents here because were mainly talking about the units that back up to the property we donated to the city, the units that back up to Nine Mile do not apply, and the units that back up to each other on the site plan would not apply there either. Again, were talking maybe two houses, we want more flexibility, we don't

think it is a deal killer for us, but we feel it is such a minor thing that it would be nice to have. I'm happy to answer any questions that you may have.

Member Avdoulos said thank you. This is a public hearing, if there is anyone that would like to comment or discuss this issue you have the floor. Seeing that there is no discussion, I'm going to turn this over to the Planning Commission.

Member Lynch said we have one response from Ronald Valente, 49100 West Nine Mile Road, he supports. He feels the changes are minor and improve the development.

Member Avdoulos said thank you, with that, anyone from the Planning Commission?

Member Lynch said I am going to defer my decision until I hear from our architect. My personal opinion; let's start with the aggregate, looks great and it is going to work out just fine. Now let's go to the trees, yeah we can dig our heels in and say no, you're not going to remove any more trees, but we're only talking about three to four trees, so not a lot. The practical matter is once these home buyers move in, somebody's going to want a pool in their backyard and they're going to take the tree down, then we open up a can of worms and we have to go to the ordinance officer and they will have to go out there and inspect it. My personal feeling is that it is such a heavily wooded site and I have been out there and it's a beautiful site, in this particular area, I don't think one or two trees is going to make a big difference. The overhangs and such, I'm going to rely on Mr. Necci to give feedback. They look great to me, but I'd like an expert to talk about the architecture and know what your thoughts are.

City façade consultant, Doug Necci, said I think Sri summarized it very well. The overhangs are the essential ingredient to the prairie, Frank Lloyd Wright, style of architecture. Without that, you do not have prairie style architecture. Frankly, the bigger the overhang, the better it is. I think three foot is really a minimum overhang, in order to get that visual effect. So I support it completely.

Member Lynch said I'm glad I got your feedback because, personally, I don't know what the drawbacks are. One thing I do want to say upfront, with all the changes, is I know this builder will do it and it is going to look great, but my fear is if this builder decides to walk away and sell to a less capable builder. There is a PRO associated with this property, right?

City Attorney, Thomas Schultz, said yes there is. This PRO is between this current builder and the city.

Member Lynch said OK so I can go ahead and approve this as part of the PRO and if this developer says he's going to change his mind and sell to a different company, there's going to be a new PRO that's going to come back to us, right?

City Attorney, Thomas Schultz, said the PRO runs with the land so the developer is fully permitted to convey the property, but whoever buys it is subject to all the same terms of the PRO.

Member Lynch said that's the only risk and I'm willing to take it because I've seen the work and I know the company is financially solvent and I expect it to be a spectacular

development, but I do want to express my fear in approving all these changes and some less capable builder takes it on, it will be a little risky, but I'm willing to accept that risk. I appreciate everyone's comments. The architecture looks great and it seems more prevalent to have these covered decks now, especially, in upscale developments like this. I don't really have a problem with that. I don't know what the ramifications are or if we're setting precedent and for this particular site I think it makes sense, knowing the demographics of the development so I don't have any problems with anything the developer is proposing, however, I do want to discern the difference between the staff recommendation in the sheet and the applicant's recommendation. So for item three, what's the bottom line here? Take subline A, for example, they want to put in the covered decks, it extends fifteen feet in the accessory unit boundary, what am I making a decision on? Allowing them to come out a little more on those four decks?

Planner Komaragiri said what staff is unclear about is, when they are proposing a covered deck, are they going to enclose it with walls as well? Once they enclose it with walls, it is essentially a building. So anything that is considered a building, it is supposed to be limited within the unit boundary. What they're proposing is extending the building outside of the unit boundary into the accessory boundary by calling it a covered deck. Like Mark had mentioned, they are only proposing that to the units that are backing up to the regulated woodlands not where they are backing up to each other so the buildings are not getting closer together. We do have a building setback of thirty-five feet in the rear yard.

Member Lynch said, but there's nothing but woods back there, right?

Planner Komaragiri said yes, that is correct. The difference between subline A and B is A is what the applicant is requesting to be able to extend up to fifteen feet. Earlier their request was to extend within twenty-five feet, they cut back on the request and said we will only have the covered decks within fifteen feet.

Member Lynch said my inclination right now is to go with the applicant's request for the following reasons: the setback does not bother me because they back up to heavily wooded areas and there's only a few, I think there's four?

Planner Komaragiri said no, this is just an indicator; it depends on the individual home owner. If that home owner wants to do a covered deck, they have an option to do it.

Member Lynch said with the woods, odds are, people are going to want to screen it in. I think for this development it makes sense. So my inclination, unless I hear otherwise from the rest of the commissioners, is to go with the applicant request. I don't see any harm in that, just my opinion.

Member Avdoulos said just for clarification, so the highlighted area on the map, what were you showing?

Planner Komaragiri said it is the change in units from six to five, but the covered deck is for all these units that are backing up to the woodlands.

Member Lynch said OK, so then all the units backing up to the woods, not the units on Nine Mile Road?

Planner Komaragiri said yes.

Member Lynch said my inclination is to go for 3A, unless I hear a compelling argument from the rest of the commissioners. I can go either way. The next one is the woodland trees. My opinion is that they are going to come down anyway. We're only talking three.

Planner Komaragiri said up to three. The previous approval is up to two trees, there are forty-two units in the development so they're adding one additional tree per unit.

Member Lynch asked have you ever been out to this site?

Planner Komaragiri said yes.

Member Lynch said so you know. You're picking out one straw in a haystack, basically. I guess my inclination is to go with the applicant's request. I don't want to go much more than that, this makes sense, but I just want to prevent what I can see happening in the future because it's just more of a burden on the City Staff. At the end of the day somebody's going to come in and say I really want to put a pool in the backyard and out goes the tree and then you have an ordinance violation. Let's stop it right here. So my inclination is for subline B, the applicant requested. I'll turn it over to the rest of the commissioners. Thank you.

Member Avdoulos said anybody else?

Member Maday said I struggle with the two big ones; the trees as well as the enclosed screens. I tend to agree with Mr. Lynch, but I do know the emotions that are brought on with cutting trees down. Logically speaking, it's not many trees overall. It sounds a lot worse to me when I read it and then I look at how many trees were actually talking about. What I don't understand is, and you can explain it to me, I realize that when you have a lot and they want to build something with the builder, that's just going to be an option the home buyer may not even opt to do it. So were probably talking even less trees.

Member Gronachan said I concur with the first speaker. I'm very familiar with this site from my past experience on the Zoning Board for a number of years. I think the one thing I really want to reiterate to everyone is this is an extremely unique site. It is a unique shape and has a unique location and I think this particular builder has matched a sense of uniqueness to this property. When you're talking about taking two or three trees with the amount of woodlands that are back there, it's to improve the quality of life for that resident that's going to be living there. I know what the struggle is when people throughout the city claim were allowing all these trees to go, that's not what this case is about. In regards to the overhangs, I happen to be from the area where Frank Lloyd Wright produced most of his homes, and I'm very familiar with that architecture and they have stood the test of time. My concern is that this is really new for Michigan and I hope it takes off. I do not see any negative impacts with what the petitioner is requesting so I would also support this based on all the testimony and discussion.

Member Avdoulos said thank you Member Gronachan. I would also like to make a few comments. The deviation related to the aggregate on the sidewalks, I see no issues, I think it blends in well with what the development is trying to do. The prairie style

architecture I think, in this particular area, lends itself better to this kind of development. I think the major concern when this development was first brought forth, I thought it was going to be more like small Tuscan villas, hence the original name. But the prairie style architecture fits in with the rural character of the site and I applaud that. The overhang is not an issue, as our façade consultant indicated. There has to be some kind of care though when the homes are close together that they don't look like they're fighting with each other because the overhangs extend so far out, they'll be closer together. I don't want it looking like what I see sometimes in big cities, especially like Toronto where the overhangs are on top of each other, but I know this type of development will take care of that. Are the covered decks going to be fully enclosed, screened, or glassed in?

Applicant Mark Guidobono said the covered decks will not have heating or air conditioning. Because we're in the woods, some of these people may want to do Panda screens and that's what we're going to do in our model, where you can push a button and the screens come up and down, so that's what will be allowed in the subdivision. And we're talking maybe two houses this impacts. Most of these footprints will fit ninety percent of what we're going to be building there. It's just giving me a little more flexibility if somebody needs a little extra space for their covered terrace.

Member Avdoulos said OK and we've limited that to fifteen feet in lieu of the twenty-five?

Planner Komaragiri said yes.

Member Avdoulos said I think we're comfortable with that. The only thing I was thinking about on the trees, I know that at two per unit maximum was giving us eighty-four and the request that three gives us one hundred and twenty-six that could be removed. Mr. Guidobono, you indicated that this may affect a maximum of twenty trees or so but I kind of agree with my fellow commissioners because when you initially said that I was going to say how about a maximum of forty trees with no more than three on a particular unit so that could be something we could consider if we wanted to do it that way or we just leave it as indicated so that there's more flexibility per unit.

Planner Komaragiri said I think we would prefer leaving it as indicated because it would be hard to track down the maximum removal. It sounds attractive, but would be hard to enforce.

Member Avdoulos said other than that, I think this is a positive development for the area so we appreciate you coming up. So, do we have any more discussion?

Planner Komaragiri said I would just like to make a small edit to the motion based on what Mr. Guidobono has mentioned. For item 2B and Ci, where we are making a reference to a maximum of thirty-six inches for a roof overhang, as the applicant indicated, there are certain units where the maximum of thirty-six inches with the intent the units are fifteen feet apart, but there are certain units where they're more than fifteen feet apart, so we are OK with the applicants request to change that to a minimum of nine feet shall be maintained between the edges of the overhangs instead of a maximum of thirty-six inches.

Member Lynch said would you like me to make a motion? Before I make the motion, I would like to thank staff for their diligence and please don't see this motion as a sign of

disrespect.

ROLL CALL VOTE TO APPROVE ZONING MAP AMENDMENT 18.718 MOTION MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER MADAY.

In the matter of the request of Cambridge of Novi, LLC, for the Terra JSP 17-52 with Zoning Map Amendment 18.718, motion to recommend approval to the City Council for an amendment to previously approved Planned Rezoning Overlay (PRO) plan, based on following motion:

- 1. This approval is subject to all conditions listed in the original PRO agreement recorded April 09, 2019, unless otherwise amended with this approval;**
- 2. The recommendation includes the following ordinance deviations with this revision for consideration by the City Council:**
 - a. Engineering deviation from Section 7.4.2(d) Engineering Design Manual to allow exposed aggregate as an alternate material for sidewalks pavement in lieu of concrete for the entire development;**
 - b. Planning deviation from Section 3.32.8. to allow for additional encroachment for roof overhangs into the required side yards (A maximum of 15 inches is allowed per the current side yard setbacks, a minimum of 9 feet between the roof overhangs at fascia is proposed); This approval shall be subject to building designed with Prairie architecture style, subject to the City's Façade Consultant approval at the time of building permit review;**
- 3. If the City Council approves the amendment to the PRO Concept Plan, the Planning Commission recommends the following conditions be made part of the PRO Agreement:**
 - a. For Units 7-36, covered decks shall be allowed to extend up to 15 feet into the "Accessory Unit Boundary" from the rear façade; "Accessory Unit Boundary" refers to the area beginning at the rear Unit Boundary and is within the side lines of the Unit Boundary, and extending twenty-five (25) to the rear, as shown on the approved final Concept Plan.**
 - b. No more than three (3) regulated woodland trees may be removed from the Accessory Unit Boundary to accommodate the construction or installation of any pool, or other accessory use.**
 - c. A minimum of 15 feet shall be maintained between two buildings, with the exception of roof overhangs and wing walls as noted below:**
 - i. A minimum of 9 feet shall be maintained between the roof overhangs between two buildings at fascia as shown in the 'Overhang Projection Areas' exhibit on revised PRO Concept plan dated 07-25-19 , subject to the house being designed with Prairie architecture style and subject to the City's Façade Consultant approval at the time of building permit review;**

- ii. **A maximum of 4.5 feet of on-ground projection shall be allowed as shown in the 'Wing wall/planter projection area' exhibit on revised PRO Concept plan dated 07-25-19, subject to the City's Façade Consultant approval at the time of building permit review;**
- d. **The elevations shall comply with the Ordinance requirements and conditions of the PRO agreement, subject to the limitations set forth in the Master Deed as determined at the time of individual building permit review;**
- e. **The applicant shall update the PRO agreement with the following updates:**
 - i. **The ITC comfort station shall be completed within 6 months of Dec. 15, 2019 or within 6 months from the substantial completion date of the ITC trail at Nine Mile and Garfield intersection;**
 - ii. **The compensating cut areas in the approved PRO Agreement shall be updated to be consistent with the MDEGLE permit approval dated 04-09-19;**

This motion is made because the proposed amendment is proposing changes that are consistent with the intent of the original PRO plan and Agreement with additional modification as noted. *Motion carried 4-0.*

MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION

1. **INTRODUCE TEXT AMENDMENT 18.290– Updates to standards for Hotel developments**
Set a public hearing for Text Amendment 18.290 to update at various sections, in order to bring ordinance language up to date, and update standards for minimum parking and loading requirements for Hotel developments.

Planner Komaragiri said thank you. Recently the Community Development department has seen a considerable interest in hotel development in Novi. There are about sixteen built hotels in Novi and one under construction. In the last five years, the Planning Commission has approved two hotels and in 2019, the City Council had approved a development that included two hotels as part of a planned rezoning overlay development. One of these hotels, which was part of the PRO, applied for the reduction in minimum parking and noted that the increase use of networking services and ridesharing services like Uber and Lyft had an impact on parking trends and anticipated that the guests will utilize those services and requested a reduction in parking counts.

Also, based on recent discussion, the Planning Commission has advised the staff to look into the effects of ride sharing services on the parking demand for hotels. We have studied available articles online and then contacted local hotel managers and we also checked in with other planners in the neighboring communities to see if they considered research on a similar amendment. The memo that was a part of the packet included a summary of the research and the conclusions and staff's recommendations. Staff had made some recommendations to reduce the minimum required parking for hotels and made some updates to the categories that are available in the text amendment and then allowed an option for Planning Commission to approve the reduction in parking and the loading area for hotels as part of their preliminary site plan approval.

The Planning Commission is asked to review the proposed amendment and if acceptable set a public hearing at a later meeting. Following the public hearing, the Planning Commission will be asked to make a recommendation to the City Council on the proposed ordinance amendment. Staff will get into additional detail at the public hearing about the actual changes. If you have any questions, I would be glad to answer them.

Member Avdoulos said thank you Sri, any additional discussion from the Planning Commissioners?

Member Lynch said first of all, I want to thank you for doing all of this. I know I asked for it a while ago, and I think the goal, when we had the discussion earlier, it was not just to give the hotel more opportunity to put more stuff in, but to reduce asphalt and replace it with some sort of foliage, we even talked about a land bank. If for some reason, we mess up and thirty years from now Uber and Lyft are gone and people are back driving cars, I would like to have the option of saying, right now we have this wonderful land bank and we have less asphalt, well now it looks like we messed up and have to go back to the old ordinance. It would give the hotels an opportunity to take that land bank and turn it back into asphalt or concrete. My understanding of the discussion was that we want to be reasonable, but we wouldn't want to give that stuff away, we just want to replace asphalt with greenery. Is that where this text amendment is headed?

Planner Komaragiri said not exactly. The text amendment looked at a possible reduction of the minimum parking counts because we looked at the ITE parking generation and everyone noted that the average maximum occupancy is between 70-80%. So we were looking in terms of that and we provided an opportunity to reduce the minimum parking counts and then there's always a shift in employee ratios within hotels. In response to your land banking comment, the current ordinance still gives that as an option for the applicants. It does not necessarily through this amendment, if any hotel applicant wants to come in and propose land banking, they can still do so by providing a parking study justifying the land bank and then Planning Commission can approve that based on the current ordinance requirements.

Member Lynch said in other words, right now the way the ordinance is written, I have a hotel and then I have parking, and that creates a footprint, so what I'm saying is, I want the footprint to stay the same, but the parking portion of that footprint is smaller and the green portion, where it would have been asphalt, is now a green space. Is that what we're doing?

Planner Komaragiri said not with this amendment, but the current ordinance would allow giving that option to the applicant if they want to.

Member Lynch said what if the applicant doesn't want to?

Planner Komaragiri said that's something we may have to look into.

Planner McBeth said right, so with Planning Commission's recommendation we can certainly add that component to the ordinance and say that a certain number of reduction of parking spaces can be allowed with the Planning Commission's approval for hotels provided that the spaces are land banked.

Member Lynch said you're much better at this than I am, I agree with you said.

Planner McBeth said and then there were several other changes included in the ordinance as well. Some of the research that was done indicated that perhaps we do have a little bit of a high parking calculation for hotels based on the other communities. So, allowing it to be green space instead of asphalt is a good idea.

Member Lynch said OK, when I make the motion it is going to be in accordance with what you just said Barbara.

Member Maday said that's what I was thinking too. Why have this huge parking lot if it's not going to be used? But I don't want to make it so people build a bigger building; I want it to be used for green. But this equation is going to change again, in my opinion, in the next ten years, everything's going to be augmented for ride sharing, so I think we're going to be visiting this several times, sooner than later. I like that were working on it and putting a foot forward on it.

Member Avdoulos said I think we're heading towards the direction of minimizing parking as much as we can and I know here we have accessory uses under the hotels so, for business type hotels, I can tell you I travel a lot around the country so when there's four of us going to a meeting and were staying overnight we'll have four rooms but we'll use one vehicle and we see that a lot with our consultants too. The accessory uses I'm thinking more hotels with banquet facilities will need to provide enough parking for their guests overnight so that's where I see it getting tricky, where you want to make sure you have enough parking to satisfy that. So I think this is a step in the right direction and I think Member Maday is correct. We'll revisit the ordinance so we make sure it is applicable and it's up to date. So those are my comments. Do we have a motion on that?

ROLL CALL VOTE TO SET A PUBLIC HEARING FOR TEXT AMENDMENT 18.290 MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER GRONACHAN.

Motion to set a public hearing for the text amendment 18.290 with staff to make to make revisions to the draft ordinance as discussed in the meeting. Motion carried 4-0.

2. INTRODUCE TEXT AMENDMENT 18.288 – UPDATES TO THE B-2 AND B-3 ZONING DISTRICTS

Set a public hearing for Text Amendment 18.288 to update the uses permitted as of right and the uses permitted as special land uses in the B-2, Community Business District and B-3, General Business District, and various other modifications.

Planner Bell said in your packet you have a number of proposed text amendments to the Zoning Ordinance as proposed by staff. City Council's Ordinance Committee recently met and requested that staff review land uses which may be more suited to be considered as a Special Land Use under the Special Land Use permit guidelines. That committee's input has been incorporated into the proposed text. The suggested changes at this time are primarily in the B-2, Community Business District and the B-3, General Business District. Those changes include amending the definitions of the Retail Business Service Uses and Retail Business Uses, and adding a definition for Smoke Shops, reclassifying theaters and other places of assembly as Special Land Uses in the B-2 and the B-3 Districts, clarifying the types of retail businesses allowed in the B-3 District, the

language proposes reclassifying tattoo parlors as a Special Land Use, adding Smoke Shops to the list of Special Land Uses, adding Massage Establishments as a Special Land Use only in the B-3 District, and allowing the Planning Commission to modify the outdoor recreation requirements for day cares in the use standards for commercial districts.

The Planning Commission is asked to review the proposed amendments and if acceptable, set a public hearing for the proposed text amendment at a later meeting. Following the public hearing, the Planning Commission will be asked to make a recommendation to the City Council on the proposed ordinance amendments.

Member Avdoulos said any questions from the members of the Planning Commission.

Member Lynch said does the marijuana dispensaries have anything to do with the smoke shops?

City Attorney, Thomas Shultz said it has nothing to do with it. It primarily intended to pick up a couple of tobacco retailers along Grand River Avenue, but frankly the vape shops.

Member Lynch said OK and the tattoo shops, I have never seen a tattoo shop in Novi. I appreciate you doing this. I wish this was in affect about two months ago, but that's OK, we have to learn. I appreciate you spending the time, I know it's tedious to do all of this and you're much better at it than I am. I personally approve of what you did, and I certainly will support this.

Member Maday said I really appreciate this because it gives the community a little bit more say in the public hearings and that's important especially given of some of the controversial things that have happened so I'm in support.

ROLL CALL VOTE TO SET A PUBLIC HEARING FOR TEXT AMENDMENT 18.288 MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER GRONACHAN.

Motion to set public hearing for Text Amendment 18.288. Motion carried 4-0.

3. INTRODUCE TEXT AMENDMENT 18.291– PAVILION SHORE VILLAGE ZONING DISTRICT

Set a public hearing for Text Amendment 18.291 to establish the Pavilion Shore Village Zoning District, in order to fulfill the Master Plan recommendation for redevelopment near Thirteen Mile Road and Old Novi Road.

Planner Bell said as you may know, The City of Novi 2016 Master Plan Update included recommendations for redevelopment of three sites within the City that were considered vacant or under-utilized given their location, unique features and size. One of those sites is Pavilion Shore Village, named due its proximity to the City's Pavilion Shore Park to the north. The area is located south of Thirteen Mile Road and extends southward along Old Novi Road. Staff, with assistance from consulting group MKSK, has developed the proposed Pavilion Shore Village Zoning District text in response to the Master Plan

recommendation for this area, which is included in your packet.

The relatively small area is approximately 6.02 acres. Of that area, approximately 3.15 acres was recently approved by the Planning Commission and City Council for rezoning and redevelopment using a Planned Rezoning Overlay (PRO) option for Lakeview. The terms of the Lakeview PRO agreement specify that twenty single family detached homes can be developed, and provides specific conditions for development.

Based on the guidance in the Master Plan, public comments from the Pavilion Shore Village workshop held in last year in August, and feedback from residents during the Lakeview PRO process, staff developed the proposed text to address the unique nature of the area and limit the types of uses allowed. The consultant provided an analysis and comparison to existing development in the surrounding area.

Staff proposes the rezoning of the entire 6.02 acre area shown in the Master Plan to the new Pavilion Shore Village Zoning District. As the Lakeview PRO is generally consistent with the recommendations of the Master Plan, and the new ordinance as drafted, this area would be included in the area to be rezoned. However, those parcels would still be subject to the terms and conditions of the approved PRO Agreement for that project.

The proposed district would contain two sub-districts, one for Commercial uses and one for Residential uses. The commercial uses would be limited to those parcels currently zoned B-3 and the residential uses would be permitted on the parcels currently zoned R-4 and those in the Lakeview area. The development standards were crafted to ensure that new development complements the existing community character, promotes walkability, and enhances the overall quality of life in the neighborhood.

On the Commercial parcels, which represent a total of 1.61 acres, the uses permitted would be restricted to a smaller number of categories than currently allowed under the B-3 district in order to be more compatible with the small lot sizes and surrounding uses. Small-scale business types that support the existing residents and park visitors are encouraged, such as restaurants, retail uses like specialty food stores and recreational goods, or services such as bicycle rental and repair. The existing businesses in the area today are also permitted within the new district. Setbacks have been reduced to bring buildings closer to the street in order to enhance the walkable, pedestrian-oriented nature of the area. This also gives more flexibility for development on the small parcels.

In the Residential sub-district, new development standards similar to those that were approved for Lakeview, and in line with existing development in nearby neighborhoods, would allow some additional flexibility due to the unique shape of the available area, while limiting the uses permitted to single family residential or live-work uses. The development potential for the residential portion, excluding Lakeview's twenty units, a total of 1.26 acres, is seven units under the proposed standards if all of the parcels were redeveloped. Under typical R-4 standards, four units could be developed. As currently platted, six units could be developed, however some variances for R-4 setbacks and/or

lot coverage may be required for some lots.

The Planning Commission is asked to review the proposed amendments and if determined necessary for further review, forward the draft to the Implementation Committee for review and additional discussion. Alternatively, the Planning Commission could direct staff to set a public hearing for the proposed text amendments as presented at a later meeting. In the meantime, staff will share the proposed ordinance amendment with those property owners within the district, with a letter explaining the remaining process.

Member Avdoulos said thank you, members of the Planning Commission, any questions or comments?

Member Lynch said did you say there was a PRO on this property already?

Planner Bell said yes, the Lakeview properties are shown on the map in blue that came in last year.

Member Avdoulos said that's the PRO.

Member Lynch said are the areas on the map in red the areas you are trying to consolidate?

Planner Bell said yes. The areas that are shown in red are those identified in the Master Plan as Pavilion Shore Village.

Member Lynch said and right now, the way everything is zoned, you can put six homes up there?

Planner Bell said if you look at the areas that are outside of the Robertson piece, there's four or five small parcels up on 13 Mile Road where it says PSV Residential and then three small parcels that are south of the Lakeview area. Because they are all not together, that's going to further limit the size of the development, even if they were all consolidated and redeveloped, there are existing homes on three of the lots currently.

Member Lynch said I remember what we went through with Lakeview. I think it worked out pretty good, if you talk to the guy who had water gushing out in his backyard; he doesn't have to worry about that anymore. Overall, it was a pretty good process. I do think that development is going to work out pretty well. I have to admit, I haven't driven through that area in the last two months and I'm unclear as to what the goal is. What's the overall goal? Just to make sure it matches the Master Plan?

Planner Bell said yes, it would match the Master Plan and if anything were to come up for redevelopment there are still those remaining parcels. So if anything were to come up for redevelopment we would have those standards to be able to deal with it.

Member Lynch said okay. So where the old gas station was, you're saying that's going to be residential?

Planner Bell said no, that's within the red area shown on the map which is for commercial.

Member Lynch said okay, it's a tough strip there. From what I remember, when I drove through the last several times, trying to understand the Robertson development, as much of a change that I think happened in that particular area, I think a lot of good came out of it. A lot of issues home owners were having to deal with, like drainage and other issues were resolved as a part of that development. Overall, I think it was a good development. I guess, I'm not real clear on the need for this, but I'll have to take your word for it. We need something. I mean, somebody's going to want to develop that property.

Planner Bell said there's nothing submitted at this time, there's nothing proposed at this time, but we want to be prepared.

Member Lynch said I rely on the Planning Department's direction on this. I did drive through the area, from what I recall, I know exactly where the store is and where the restaurant is, it's very quaint. There was not as much traffic issues as I was led to believe and I had to go out there and kind of hang around for a few hours, it's a nice area. If what we're trying to accomplish is avoiding the early stages of the Robertson development, which was really tough, it starting out as a humungous condo complex and ended up being something more palatable, if that's what we're trying to accomplish, that's fine. I just don't want to have to go through a strenuous process.

Planner McBeth said that is one of the goals. So the Master Plan review area as a potential redevelopment area and the Robertson Brothers came in a little bit in advance of that so now if we get any more redevelopment possibly spurred by development that we're anticipating then we'll have some standards in place to help deal with that.

Member Lynch said so we'll have limits so we don't have to deal with some developer who comes in with a gargantuan project and we can say that doesn't fit.

Planner McBeth said that's the other idea. It limits it more so, as Lindsay said, from the B-3 businesses, which has an extensive list, it narrows it down to be more manageable for the smaller parcels that were talking about. And the residential also compliments the Robertson Brothers plan. So that was the idea, it seems fairly straight forward, from staff's point of view, but if Planning Commission wants to discuss it more, we can have a public hearing, or if you want, it can go to the Implementation Committee for further discussion, but we thought, based on the fact that a lot of the rules are covered in the PRO, there's just a little bit left. So were just setting some standards for the future.

Member Lynch said I have no problem cleaning it up and letting the Implementation Committee get into the granular detail. I think it makes sense to avoid a situation like that. I don't have a problem sending this to the Implementation Committee and getting more home owner input.

Planner McBeth said and that was just a suggestion. It is fairly straight forward. It's in the language in front of you right now. And also if you see it and decide it's pretty straight forward you can address changes at the public hearing.

Member Avdoulos said yes so we can either decide to go to the Implementation Committee for further review or set the public hearing or ask to have a date set and then in the meantime the city is going to connect with the surrounding neighbors to advise them what this is prior to the public hearing so there's more input and then residents of the area will also have the opportunity during the public hearing to discuss this so it's not an open and shut case and after public hearing it goes to City Council.

Member Lynch said so what I'm trying to get to is I want more transparency. In other words, I think what we learned the last time is the best way to develop is to get as much input as we can before we start casting things in stone. Are you recommending this go to the Implementation Committee or go straight to the public hearing, but in the meantime the city staff will provide the home owners with the letter explaining the process and they'll be able to come to the public hearing to provide input? The more transparency the better, if it's just to clean things up and avoid future problems, that's fine. I have no problem with that.

Member Maday said the only thing I worry about a little bit is the fact that we're limiting what businesses we can put on those properties, but I don't want to limit them too much either. So I guess that would be discussed with the home owners that are living there now and what they would like to see I'm assuming. I don't want to make it impossible to develop either because someone might not want to put a bike shop there.

Planner McBeth said so some of the ideas went into this draft were collected through the public hearing and the public workshop we had last year and so some of those ideas were taken in, and of course, were open to comments on any of those. So if somebody says they would like to bring in a different use to add something else, were happy to get that process going.

Member Gronachan said I need some help understanding new development standards to the residential sub-district. So currently, what could be built there?

Planner Bell said so the areas that would be for residential? It's zoned R-4 currently so it could develop under the R-4 standards of the Zoning Ordinance.

Member Gronachan said so that would be four units?

Planner Bell said yes.

Member Gronachan said because it says currently platted six units could be developed.

Planner Bell said there are six current lots.

Member Gronachan said so not all the lots are compliant?

Planner Bell said right.

Member Gronachan said which is typical up there. But under the R-4, four lots could be built without any problem out of six, am I reading that correctly?

Planner Bell said 3.33 per acre is what the R-4 standard allows and we would have to look exactly at the lot size for each of the lots to see how many could fit.

Member Gronachan said so there really is not going to be any non-buildable lots, there isn't such a thing? A variance could be granted for it. I guess what I was not clear on when I read this by making this change and I tend to think it should go to the Implementation Committee, is that were not creating more houses. Is that what it is doing?

Planner Bell said it would allow some additional density, the Master Plan recommended a density of 7.3 dwelling units an acre. The Lakeview development is coming in at about 6.3 to 6.4. So it is higher than the R-4 3.3 dwelling units an acre.

Member Gronachan said that would be my concern for up there and what type of impact that would have by changing that. Again, coming from the ZBA and listening to residents up there, I don't know that more is better up there. Those are my comments.

Member Avdoulos said do we have a motion?

MOTION TO SEND THE DRAFT ORDINANCE TO THE IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER GRONACHAN.

Motion to send the draft ordinance to the Implementation Committee, with the understanding that the Committee will work with staff and notice will be given to the affected property owners for additional input, prior to setting the public hearing. Motion carried 4-0.

4. PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING CALENDAR FOR 2020

Planner McBeth said it's that time of year where we try to establish dates for the Planning Commission. City Council already established their meeting dates, which is provided on the calendar in your packets. So the meetings are primarily on the second and fourth Wednesday of each month. We are also suggesting one meeting in November and one meeting in December and two for each of the other months.

MOTION TO APPROVE THE PRESENTED PUBLIC MEETING SCHEDULE MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER MADAY.

Motion to approve the presented Planning Commission public meeting schedule for 2020. Motion carried 4-0.

5. APPROVAL OF THE JULY 24, 2019 PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

ROLL CALL VOTE TO APPROVE THE JULY 24, 2019 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER GRONACHAN.

Motion to approve the July 24, 2019 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes. Motion carried 4-0.

CONSENT AGENDA REMOVALS FOR COMMISSION ACTION

SUPPLEMENTAL ISSUES

There were no supplemental issues.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

Dorothy Duchesneau, 125 Henning, I just wanted to clarify a couple of things with the Pavilion Shore Village District. When the Master Plan came out in 2016, nothing was happening out there. The fact that the Master Plan came out and had some visions is what spurred Robertson and spurred many of the owners of those properties to put things together and come up with their project. With this section here on the map, which is Robertson, and these other two sections that are Robertson, the only residential that is left is the tip which already has two houses on it. You really don't want to tear those down, they're really nice houses. The section on this part of the map has two vacant lots that can be built on under current guidelines with slight modifications. The third lot happens to be the Tullican house, it's existing, that one should probably go on the historical registry when the woman lives there passes on and her kids do not want to keep the house because they live out of the country. Then there's a little skinny twenty-foot wide lot that goes from 13 Mile Road to the back center line. That's owned by the city. There's another forty foot lot, it goes back to Wainwright Street that is also owned by the city. Those two ought to be vacated. This piece on the map is what we call a wet lot, good luck building on it unless you like swimming. It's highly unlikely that's going to turn into very much of anything. That takes care of all the residential. The only thing left is the business section, which is what needs the help.

The three businesses that have been there since the days of the casinos and the days of the amusement park, stay viable, stay alive, they are non-conforming uses, they don't meet practically anything the city currently has, but they are useful to the residents they are part of the character of the lake. This entire parcel to the north is Pavilion Shore Park, that's the water, that's Walled Lake, the businesses that ought to come into there ought to help support the park, support the party store, support the bar and grill, something where people can get a cup of coffee during the winter, make it a walkable district. That's walkable Novi. If this becomes Walkable Novi and the park is to the north and you have Lakeshore Park an eighth of a mile down the road, that's walkable Novi. That's what needs to be developed and yes it does need a lot of tender love and care because nothing conforms to anything the city currently requires. The parking for the party store is literally on the city property. The Lakeview Bar & Grill is going to love those ten parking spaces Robertson is putting in because they can't expand to the east and they can't expand to the west and when the people who are using Pavilion Shore Park park in their parking lot, but don't go in to eat, they don't get any business because they don't have any parking for anybody. That's the kind of development that's going to have to happen up there. We've got that fantastic picnic shelter area, we've got the kids playscape there. Trust me you go by there on a Saturday on a warm day or during the week, you'll see 50, 60, 80 people at that park, but there's not much to do there or not much that they can use out of that red circled area on the map. That's what needs to be worked on. The rest of this, Robertson is coming in, the others are already houses, they're out of the picture already, were in 2019 were not in 2016 anymore. Thank you for sending it through to the Implementation Committee.

Michel Duchesneau, 1191 South Lake Drive, said I look forward to attending the Implementation Committee and I didn't realize it's been six to seven years since they've met because I've never seen that and I've tried to make my rounds throughout all the committee meetings. Basically, I would like to talk about an upcoming proposal called Scenic Pines and that will be south of Walled Lake. It has some potential drainage issues, it's got a lot of wetlands and it's basically the property south of 1207 Pembine Street, there's going to be a subdivision that will probably end up in there and its largely woodlands and wetlands and the neighborhood is very concerned about flooding and potential impacts to their backyard. There is no engineered drainage in that area, but the video I was going to share with you basically shows all along the front of that house, water drains and basically just goes into the front yard of 1207 Pembine Street and if you have the opportunity to go out and look at that parcel, you'll be able to visually see the slope and the way that the elevations drain to the house and the developers to build houses in the wetland is raising everything up in the back and making all the water flow to the front. So the only comment I wanted to make here today is to sensitize you that another develop is coming and we have concerns as far as drainage and I'll leave it at that for today. I do appreciate the opportunity to look a little more in Pavilion Shore Village, I've spent quite a few hours reading the details in your packet and there are many items that either don't belong there or need to be revised. As I said earlier, there's a very small portion of land that's undeveloped and the B-3 portion could be redefined or let the non-conforming businesses become conforming businesses. Thank you.

Member Avdoulos said I would like to thank you for indulging me for a moment of silence in respect for Brian Berk on behalf of the Planning Commission I want to express our deepest sympathies with the family. I got to know Brian through Planning Commission, he was on City Council, and he was on quite a few other committees. He was just a real sincere person and it was kind of sudden, I just saw him maybe about three months ago and it's sad, but it was great we had someone like that be a part of the city and are blessed to have known him. I just want to again, express our deepest sympathies and wanted to do that prior to the pledge of allegiance because I know he was a vet and I know he's appreciative wherever he is looking down on us.

Member Lynch said very well put, Brian is going to be missed. When you look at Novi and look at the people that really contributed to the city and have been here through thick and thin and volunteered, that's Brian.

ADJOURNMENT

Moved by Member Lynch and seconded by Member Gronachan.

VOICE VOTE ON THE MOTION TO ADJOURN MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER GRONACHAN.

Motion to adjourn the August 28, 2019 Planning Commission meeting. Motion carried 4-0.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:44 PM.