



# PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

CITY OF NOVI

Regular Meeting

**January 13, 2016 7:00 PM**

Council Chambers | Novi Civic Center | 45175 W. Ten Mile Rd.

(248) 347-0475

## CALL TO ORDER

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

## ROLL CALL

**Present:** Member Greco, Member Lynch, Chair Pehrson, Member Zuchlewski

**Absent:** Member Anthony (excused), Member Giacometti (excused), Member Baratta, (excused)

**Also Present:** Barbara McBeth, Community Development Deputy Director; Sri Komaragiri, Planner; Chris Gruba, Planner; Rick Meader, Landscape Architect; Jeremy Miller, Engineer; Gary Dovre, City Attorney, Matt Klawon, Traffic Engineering Consultant; Matt Carmer and Pete Hill, ETC Consultants

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

## APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Moved by Member Greco and seconded by Member Lynch.

## ROLL CALL TO APPROVE THE JANUARY 13, 2016 AGENDA MOTION MADE BY MEMBER GRECO AND SECONDED BY MEMBER LYNCH.

**Motion to approve the January 13, 2016 Planning Commission Agenda. *Motion carried 4-0.***

## AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

No one in the audience wished to participate and the audience participation was closed.

## CORRESPONDENCE

There was no correspondence.

## COMMITTEE REPORTS

There were no committee reports.

## COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPUTY DIRECTOR REPORT

Deputy Director McBeth stated that at Monday evening's City Council meeting the City Council granted tentative approval of the request for Dunhill Park. It was a Zoning Map Amendment with Planned Rezoning Overlay to rezone property at the northwest corner of Beck Road and Eight Mile Road to allow a 31-unit single-family residential development. The City Council will consider the agreement and the Preliminary Site Plan will come back to the Planning Commission. She also wanted to remind the Planning Commission of upcoming meeting that will be held. On January 20<sup>th</sup> are two meetings; the Master Plan and Zoning Committee meeting at 4:00 pm in the Police Training Center and immediately following that will be the 2016-2022 Capital Improvement Program Committee meeting in the Council Conference Room from 6:30 pm until 9:00 pm. The draft CIP is available online for viewing.

## CONSENT AGENDA - REMOVALS AND APPROVAL

There were no items on the Consent Agenda.

## **PUBLIC HEARING**

### **1. VALENCIA SOUTH JSP13-0075**

Public hearing at the request of Pinnacle Homes for approval of the Preliminary Site Plan, Wetlands Permit, Woodlands Permit and Stormwater Management Plan. The subject property is located in Section 29, at the southwest corner of Ten Mile Road and Beck Road. The applicant is proposing to construct a 64-unit single-family residential development.

Planner Gruba stated this is the proposal for the Valencia South single-family residential development at the southwest corner of Beck Road and Ten Mile Road. It is approximately 41 acres and consists of 64 homes. The applicant is proposing to combine eight separate parcels and take some of the land from the existing church property and one single-family residential house. There is a long history and the PRO agreement has been to the Planning Commission before. There was a lot of discussion about being sensitive to the existing subdivision to the west and to the south. The PRO agreement includes a 30 foot landscape buffer along the western and southern boundaries of the project which will be maintained and enhanced. There have been some variations of the plan over time and they are getting closer to the final site plan approval. It is currently undeveloped with the exception of some homes that will be demolished for the project.

The subject parcels were rezoned last year from R-1 to R-3 to allow for setback reductions. The density as proposed is 1.59 units per acre which is below the 1.65 units per acre allowed in the R-1 zoning district, and it is below the 2.7 units per acre for the R-3 zoning district. There are wetlands and woodlands on the site which will require permits from the Planning Commission tonight. No new wetlands will be created but there will be new detention ponds in the northwest and the southeast.

The zoning map shows there are existing single-family residential homes on all sides to the north, east, south and west. The site plan shows 64 separate lots which started out as 66 lots. As part of the PRO Agreement there were several things included as part of the plan; one being a pedestrian connection from the subdivision to Ten Mile Road to the north. The earlier incarnation of the plan had a horseshoe shape for the subdivision, having two entrances onto Beck Road. At that time, there was no way to conveniently walk from the subdivision directly to Ten Mile Road so the Planning Commission recommended a pedestrian connection, which was also mentioned in the PRO Agreement. Since that time, the site plan has changed and there is a road connection to Ten Mile Road and Beck Road. As such, it makes more sense to have the pedestrian connection go from the northeast cul-de-sac out to Beck Road. At previous Planning Commission meetings there was discussion about completing the sidewalk as part of the PRO Agreement. An 80' section of sidewalk will be required along Beck Road in front of the Poinsett property. This section of sidewalk is not on the Valencia South development but is being requested to be completed to connect with the existing sidewalks in front of the church and along Beck Road and Ten Mile Roads.

Tonight it is requested that the Planning Commission hold the advertised public hearing and consider approval of the Site Plan, Wetland Permit, Woodland Permit, and the Stormwater Management Plan. Planner Gruba stated one comment was received from the public. Jerry and Margo Smith, 23962 Forest Park, are in support of the development.

Chair Pehrson asked the applicant to come to the front to address the Planning Commission.

Howard Fingerroot was present and said he is the managing partner of Pinnacle Homes. He stated that the site plan presented today, as part of the PRO Agreement, has changed in three ways of interest as requested by City Council. Additional buffer space was added between the subdivision to the south and the west. They worked with the neighbors and City Council to make this happen. Two of the lots were removed, and the second entrance was moved to be off of Ten Mile Road instead of Beck Road. When the Planning Commission previously saw the plan, both entrances were on Beck Road. He went through the review letters from the consultants and they all seemed to recommend approval. He is happy to answer any questions anyone may have.

Chair Pehrson opened the public hearing. No one in the audience wished to speak and he asked if there was any correspondence.

Member Lynch stated there are three letters that were received. James McGuire, 48028 Andover Drive, objects to the request. He wrote to keep it R-1 with larger lots and fewer houses. He is against woodland destruction and disturbance to the wetlands. Paul Albanelli, 47500 Iroquois Court, stated that the traffic engineer looked at the problem regarding no center left turn or bypass lane at Iroquois Court. He also asked if the gap at Iroquois Court could be addressed. Gerald T. Harris, 23918 Forest Park is in objection. The development is overly dense for the area. He is concerned about the habitat, specimen trees, wetland issues drainage, groundwater, and congestion. Member Lynch stated that these letters will be made part of the public record.

Chair Pehrson closed the Public Hearing and turned the discussion over to the Planning Commission members for consideration.

Member Lynch confirmed that the PRO is a legal agreement between the City and the developer. Although it can be an R-3 density, the development proposed is less dense than what the zoning would allow. He confirmed that if the density were to be changed in the future it would be required to go back to City Council and the agreement would need to be updated with another public hearing. In regards to traffic, Beck Road has always been an issue at Ten Mile Road. He asked if a Traffic Study has been completed and had questions for the Traffic Engineer.

The City's Traffic Consultant Matt Klawon was present and stood before the members. He stated they looked at the access points and turn lanes as commented.

Member Lynch stated he knows a Traffic Study was done at some point and the property was originally zoned R-1. There was not an issue as to whether they would allow R-1 density. Since they are putting in less than R-1 density, one would assume that the traffic would be acceptable and asked if that is a fair assumption.

Matt Klawson confirmed.

Member Lynch inquired about the sidewalk between lots 59 and 60 and asked why a sidewalk is required here.

Planner Gruba stated that it was referred to in the PRO Agreement in the earlier configuration to have a pedestrian access onto Ten Mile Road. With the change, it makes more sense to bring it onto Beck Road.

Jeremy Miller stated they are trying to provide pedestrian connectivity from the northern half of the sub out to Beck Road, otherwise someone would have to walk up to Ten Mile Road then double back along Beck Road to go south on Beck Road.

Member Lynch asked the applicant if he has already agreed to this.

Mr. Fingerroot stated he has not. He does not believe it was part of the PRO Plan and their strong preference is not to put it in. They provided pedestrian access points at Ten Mile Road and Beck Road through the entry ways. Being a home builder and dealing with a lot of home buyers, they have found that buyers do not like sidewalks between their houses because it reduces privacy.

Member Lynch was in agreement and his preference is to not have the sidewalk between the lots. The project is better than what he expected and it is better than the R-1 density which has always been a concern of his. He likes the idea of having one access point along Beck Road, especially for rush hour traffic. Overall, the project has come together well and he is in support of it.

Member Greco stated that he thinks the plan looks good. The give and take between the City Council, developer, and residents played a role in coming up with a good plan that matches the visions of both the developer and the City, and doing the best for the residents and surrounding subdivisions. He can see the reasoning for the pathway onto Beck Road as being a fill-in or addition since there is not a pathway going up to Ten Mile Road, but he assumes that is taken away because they have the roadway there now and the walkway is no longer necessary. Looking at the subdivision and the access points, he does not see a need for a pedestrian pathway between lots 59 and 60, especially with a way to get out to the north onto Ten Mile

Road. He commends everyone for getting this done, including the developer and residents for coming up with something workable. They have a good developer for the project and they have done the best they can do given the circumstances and the way it is zoned.

Chair Pehrson stated he does not feel the pathway is necessary between lots 59 and 60. It does not serve a purpose since there is access to Ten Mile Road.

Motion by Member Greco and seconded by Member Lynch.

**ROLL CALL VOTE ON THE PRELIMINARY SITE PLANS APPROVAL FOR VALENCIA SOUTH, JSP13-75 MADE BY MEMBER GRECO AND SECONDED BY MEMBER LYNCH.**

In the matter of the request of Beck South LLC for Valencia South JSP13-75 to approve the Preliminary Site Plan based on and subject to the following:

- a. A residential entranceway light must be added to each entrance along Beck Road and Ten Mile Road. A copy of the four pre-approved types of entranceway lights has been included in the packet;
- b. The construction of an 80 foot long section of off-site sidewalk across the Poinsett property on Beck Road as required by the PRO Agreement shall be done at the same time as the Beck Road sidewalk on the property which shall be provided for in the final site plan. In cooperation and consultation with the city, the applicant shall diligently pursue obtaining any easement required for that construction. The final site plan shall not be approved until any such required easement has been obtained or applicant has donated a sum of money to the City's sidewalk fund that is sufficient to pay for the cost of acquiring the easement and constructing the sidewalk as determined by the City at the time of final site plan approval;
- c. Master Deed/Covenant restrictions will be required to be submitted for review during Final Site Plan review;
- d. Lot combination/split will have to be completed with the church and Poinsett properties prior to final site plan approval; and
- e. All City and consultant comments addressed prior to final site plan approval.

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. *Motion carried 4-0.*

Motion by Member Greco and seconded by Member Lynch.

**ROLL CALL VOTE ON THE WETLAND PERMIT APPROVAL FOR VALENCIA SOUTH, JSP13-75 MADE BY MEMBER GRECO AND SECONDED BY MEMBER LYNCH.**

In the matter of the request of Beck South LLC for Valencia South JSP13-75 to approve the Wetland Permit 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 12, Article V of the Code of Ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance. *Motion carried 4-0.*

Motion by Member Greco and seconded by Member Lynch.

**ROLL CALL VOTE ON THE WOODLAND PERMIT APPROVAL FOR VALENCIA SOUTH, JSP13-75 MADE BY MEMBER GRECO AND SECONDED BY MEMBER LYNCH.**

In the matter of the request of Beck South LLC for Valencia South JSP13-75 to approve the Woodland Permit 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 37 of the Code of Ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance. *Motion carried 4-0.*

Motion by Member Greco and seconded by Member Lynch.

**ROLL CALL VOTE ON THE STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PLANS APPROVAL FOR VALENCIA SOUTH, JSP13-75 MADE BY MEMBER GRECO AND SECONDED BY MEMBER LYNCH.**

In the matter of the request of Beck South LLC for Valencia South JSP13-75 to approve the Stormwater Management Plan based on and subject to the findings of compliance with Ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters, and the conditions and items listed in those letters being addressed on the Final Site Plan. This motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance Chapter 11 of the Code of Ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance. *Motion carried 4-0.*

**2. DIXON MEADOWS JSP14-0046 AND ZONING MAP AMENDMENT 18.709**

Public hearing at the request of Pulte Homes for Planning Commission's Recommendation to City Council for a Planned Rezoning Overlay associated with a Zoning Map amendment, from RA (Residential Acreage) to RT (Two-Family Residential). The subject property is approximately 22.36 acres and is located in Section 10 on the east side of Dixon Road, north of Twelve Mile Road. The applicant is proposing a development of a 90-unit single-family residential detached site condominium.

Planner Sri Komaragiri stated that the proposed concept plan for Dixon Meadows was formerly known as Trailside. The applicant is now requesting a Zoning Map amendment for this 22.36 acre property from RA (Residential Acreage) to RT (Two-Family Residential) utilizing the City's Planned Rezoning Overlay (PRO) option to allow the development of a 90-unit single-family site condominium.

The subject property is located east of Dixon road and north of Twelve Mile in Section 10. It is zoned Residential Acreage and is surrounded by the same zoning on all sides. The Future Land Use map indicates Single Family for the subject property and the surrounding properties. There are few regulated wetlands and considerable regulated woodlands on the property.

Planning Commission held a Public hearing on August 26, 2015 and postponed their decision to give the applicant more time to make further modifications to the concept plan as per staff and consultant recommendations. The applicant has since made two revised submittals. The first one was reviewed by staff and additional comments were provided. Staff and the applicant felt that further revisions will be required before holding another public hearing. The second revised submittal is being presented today. The Planning review letter addresses the progression of changes in detail in the review letter.

Planner Komaragiri explained that the screen in front of the Commission shows the previously presented plan and what is being presented currently. The changes are easy to see. The applicant has made the following changes;

- Changed the rezoning request to RT from RM-1.
- Reduced the number of lots from 95 to 90, thus reducing the density from 4.4 units/acre to 4.2 units/acre.
- Changes to the site layout to address staff's concern to break the long lineal pattern along Verona Drive and other design considerations.
- Increased open space from 0.8 acres to 3.35 acres, by preserving high and medium quality woodlands on site.
- Opportunities for active and passive recreation are created on site by proposing a play area for kids, rustic trails, and site amenities within the development.
- Reduced the percentage of tree removal from 89 percent to 83 percent
- The site now has a single point of access with a secondary emergency access exiting onto Dixon Drive.
- Additional clarification with regards to arsenic removal, sanitary sewer capacity study has been provided.
- In addition to the previously offered public benefits, the applicant is now willing to contribute to the design and construction of a five feet wide concrete sidewalk along the east side of Dixon Drive extending approximately 850 feet south from the subject property to the existing sidewalk just north of Twelve Mile Road, provided that the City secures the required easements. Alternatively, the applicant has offered to contribute the amount for the anticipated sidewalk construction to the City for future construction of the sidewalk.
- The applicant is requesting Ordinance deviations, listed in detail in the motion sheet to reduce the minimum lot size, lot width, front, rear, and side yard setbacks, and increase maximum lot coverage.

With the recent modifications, Planning believes they made considerable progress in addressing staff's comments and are recommending approval. A Design and Construction Standards Variance to be granted by City Council is required for the lack of paved eyebrows. Engineering supports this variance request and recommends approval of the Concept Plan with additional comments to be addressed during Preliminary Site Plan review.

The proposed Concept Plan does not contain significant wetlands, and the wetland and buffer impacts are minor. The wetlands consultant recommends approval noting that a City of Novi Wetland Minor Use Permit and an authorization to encroach into wetland buffers will be required at the time of Preliminary Site Plan approval. There are 745 regulated trees on site, of which 620 trees (about 83 percent of the total) will be removed, with 125 trees being preserved. The removal calls for 946 replacement credits. The applicant is proposing to plant about 43 percent of the required replacement credits on site and pay into the City of Novi tree fund for the remaining. With this revised submittal, the applicant tried to preserve high quality woodland trees towards the northeast corner of the site. Woodlands, Traffic, and Fire are recommending approval noting that the applicant needs to provide additional details at the time of Preliminary Site Plan review.

Façade reviewed the renderings of nine models provided by the applicant with the initial submittal. Façade notes that significant design diversity is evident, and the façade elevations provided would be consistent with Section 3.7.1 of the Similar / Dissimilar Ordinance.

The Planning Commission is asked tonight to hold a public hearing and make a recommendation on the proposed PRO and Concept Plan to City Council. The applicant, Bob Halso from Pulte Homes, is here with his Engineer Bill Anderson and would like to make a small presentation and then answer questions. The wetland consultants, Pete Hill and Matt Carmer, are also present to answer any questions the Commission may have.

Chair Pehrson asked the applicant to come to the front to address the Planning Commission.

Bob Halso, representing Pulte Homes and the six owners of the subject property, stood before the Commission. He stated he wanted to give a brief presentation to highlight some of the things the Commission asked them to address. They are confident in their product type. It is an urban infill product that is designed in Seattle and has been widely accepted across the United States and most notably in Berkshire Pointe in Novi. The property sits in-between higher density with multi-family on either side. They started with a multi-family site plan and readily staff recommended they change it to detached units. This is what led to the initial plan brought to the Land Use Committee before they initially started. The Land Use Committee indicated that the density was appropriate given the surrounding area. This was the plan the Planning Commission had previously seen in August with 95 sites, and the plan brought to the Land Use Committee was 102 sites. The sites are precious because of the benefits they are providing to the city; they are short in number but each very expensive.

Mr. Halso's tree consultant went out at the Planning Commission's directive and met with the City's consultant, walked the entire site and identified the high quality trees and where they were. The high quality trees are predominately located in the areas being preserved in the northeast corner, which also is adjacent to some wetland wooded area to the north, which will likely remain as such. This will provide an existing connection. Also, at the request of staff, they have added a neighborhood park, walking paths, pergola feature at the entry, and a rustic trail through the high quality tree preservation area. They are saving 41% of the high quality trees identified by the consultants. They are inserting a traffic calming focal point in front of the children's park to break the linear street, call attention to the park, and save other quality trees. The children's playscape will fit nicely into the trees.

The sidewalk pedestrian connection has also been added to Twelve Mile to the south which will get these residents and the residents of Liberty Park down to Fountain Walk and to Twelve Mile conveniently. It also extends the City of Novi's non-motorized vehicle safety paths at least up to the northern boundary. They have retained McDowell and Associates, one of the finest geo-technical firms in the state to do an extensive study for arsenic remediation, which they believe is a benefit. They have conservatively estimated remediation to be 1.2 million dollars, but will be removing a lot of soil and replacing it with clean soil. Removing the contaminated soil will cause the removal of many of the trees.

Mr. Halso discussed Dixon Road and its features, showing what it looks like now and what it will look like. (He

presented a slide to the board showing how it currently looks.) They are proposing to do tree replacements as much as staff and consultants and their consultants can work out, because they have excess trees they are removing and would like to replace and plant on Dixon Road. This will be a nice benefit. (He presented a slide showing how Dixon Road looks today.) He stated he feels the trees will enhance the road, and they will work with staff and the City to accomplish that.

Mr. Halso stated that he pulled the demographics of the Berkshire Pointe community thus far, and the average sale price in Berkshire Pointe is in the high four's, approximately \$470,000, and the buyers range in age from the early 30's to early 50's, with the average age being 40. Per home, they have slightly less than two kids on average and they are young urban professionals who are seeking this type of housing which is not readily available in metro Detroit. The taxable value is approximately 42 million dollars, and these are well paid families living in these homes. They pulled National Housing Information on projected revenue to local businesses in the area, Fountain Walk being a principal recipient; based on this project approximately two million dollars. He feels they are being consistent with many of the objectives of the Novi Master Plan, providing a diversity of housing, interconnecting the pedestrian pathways and providing some functional open space. It fits in nicely with the existing uses in the area of either side of them and to the south. Based on their research, this particular location and its walkability is what people are looking for today, and they are pleased to be able to offer it within the City of Novi. He thanked the Planning Commission for their time and stated he is happy to answer any questions that they might have.

Chair Pehrson opened the public hearing and asked anyone that wished to address the Commission to step forward at this time.

Tim Prieur, 28191 Dixon, stated that he disagrees with the proposal, and any changes and deviations to the zoning required to have this development be in place. There are existing homes in the area and this development will not match with what is existing in the direct area around Dixon Meadows. He feels it will not be part of the community that is already there. He assumes an easement will be required for sewers again to drain off for the retention ponds, and he does not want it running behind his home, which is where it would run because the wetlands are currently located there. Mr. Prieur stated that he originally purchased his home because he wanted to be on a quiet road, and this development is going to dramatically increase traffic flow. Twelve Mile Road already has traffic issues during certain hours where it backs up past Dixon Road and you cannot get off of Dixon. The developer claims there is a demand for this type of housing, yet in Liberty Park, they just redeveloped a unit and had to drop the price because it had not sold. It has been on the market since August. There are other homes in Liberty Park and Carlton Forest for sale, and the prices are steadily dropping due to them not selling. He stated that the developer mentioned residents needing to use the parks and shopping area, but plenty of people are using Lake Shore Park on a regular basis. You cannot park in a reasonable close distance to Fountain Walk during the weekend. In regards to the arsenic remediation, he feels his water is safe since he has had it tested, and it does not contain arsenic that is above levels. The ground and the soil containing arsenic is not going to hurt anything as long as it is not disturbed and it is covered with ground cover. Parents also try to encourage their children to go play outside, and he doesn't know how they will be able to do so if there is no land left to play on. He feels the developer is just trying to make money and is not trying to benefit the community. He stated that he had additional notes that the board was welcome to look over.

Chair Pehrson asked his notes to be made part of the public records.

Sanjay Singh, 28370 Clymer Drive, stated that he is against the proposal. This proposal is going to cause traffic to increase on Dixon Road, and the back of his home faces Dixon Road. He and his neighbors are concerned about their safety and security as well as the security of his children who play in the backyard. Once the traffic increases, there will be additional noise and it is going to increase pollution and dust. He feels the value of his property is going to decrease because his home will be on the road instead of off the road. He is also concerned about the number of trees that are going to be removed versus what will be left. The proposal is going to destroy the natural beauty that exists in this area.

Ravi Chiluka, 28395 Clymer Drive, is against the proposal. One of the reasons he purchased his home is because he loves nature and he was drawn to the property's natural beauty. If the proposal is allowed, it will draw traffic to the area, and it will affect the ecosystem around Lake Shore Park.

Violette Tuck, 28300 Dixon Road, stated that she is in favor of the development. When Old Orchard was being built, she was not in favor of it because it was near her apple orchards but it was built anyways. Another forty years later, a development was built on Dixon Road. She was against that as well, but once again it was built anyways, and everything turned out okay. Lastly, a subdivision was being built across the street from her and she was against it, but it was built. After all of this, the residents and contractors have not caused any problems. She has no intentions of leaving of home if Dixon Meadows obtains approval. She is in favor of the development because she understands that the developer knows what they are doing.

Nick Marini, 28180 Dixon Road, stated that he is the owner of the southern parcel. He has been here since 1960, and over the years there was construction to the east, and he likes the development.

Chair Pehrson asked the audience if there was anyone else that wished to speak. No one else came forward.

Chair Pehrson then confirmed that there is correspondence. A letter was received from Debra Cox who is in objection to the proposal. Surya Poliseti, 28394 Clymer Drive objects to the proposal due to a number of reasons; the destruction of the large area of natural vegetation; loss of greenery; overcrowding; Dixon Road is a natural beauty road; high density; and cutting down huge trees. Nicola Marini and Florence Marini are in support of the development. An objection letter was received from Muthuraman Swaminadhan, 28358 Clymer Drive. His letter stated he is concerned about potential health hazards of any arsenic when the earth is dug up. Venkata Gunturi objects because Dixon Road is a designated beauty road. They are concerned about existing wetlands and density. An objection letter was received from Yasuaki Watatani, 28460 Witherspoon Drive, stating they would like to keep the natural beauty road as is. Another objection letter was received from Anand S. Raichur, 28376 Clymer Drive, and is in objection because Dixon Road is designated natural beauty. The maintenance of a fifty foot vegetation buffer area is unclear. The area is a quiet and serene place, and there are concerns about Twelve Mile Road, the health and safety of residents and children, removal of the arsenic, wetlands, and a dramatic zoning change. The next objection letter was from Takahito Kakiuchi, 28507 Carlton Way, who objects because more traffic is not needed and nor are more condos. He also does not want constant construction and recommends widening Twelve Mile Road first. Stelian Birou, 28160 Dixon Road, objects because he does not want a subdivision behind him because of heavy traffic and arsenic. This person purchased their home because of the privacy. Richard Katterman, 23481 Middlebelt Road, wrote a letter stating that he is writing in support of the proposal by Pulte Homes for the redevelopment of the polluted property that he owns on Dixon Road. It is unfortunate about the arsenic that he did not know was in the ground when he purchased the property 20 years ago. The plan for the development seems to be consistent with the surrounding area. A letter was received from Meiling Shih, who is in objection to the development. The development will result in the reduction of trees, especially the ones bordering Dixon Road. If Dixon Road is paved, it will cause an issue with traffic.

Chair Pehrson closed the audience participation for this case and turned it over to the Planning Commission for their consideration.

Member Greco stated that they have looked at this before. After listening to the petitioner, and knowing that Pulte Homes is a great developer, there is no doubt in his mind that these homes would sell. The homes look great and he is sure that the promises and representations of the developer will be met. That being said there is still zoning in the City of Novi. This property is zoned R-A, and this is a significant jump in density, so he feels this may be a plan they need to look at and study. He is not against the higher density despite the representations from the community that this is a natural beauty road. It is in an area off of Twelve Mile Road where Residential Acreage or large lots is probably not something that is appropriate for the area with the way things have grown there, in accordance to Fountain Walk, the mall and Twelve Mile Road being a major road in the area. There are sections of Novi, particularly the southwest section, which they have tried to keep lower density with larger homes in that area. He is going to reserve his judgement until he hears the rest of the comments from the other Commissioners. His inclination is not to support the plan for the reason of the major jump in density from the way it is currently zoned, even though it is a beautiful plan, and he feels the demographics spoke about would fill it up. It is just not zoned right, and he they have an obligation to the residents and people moving into the community, to look at what they have and stand by what they have without there being a major study or change. He may not be against it in the future, because for those that are opposed to this project, with the location that is there, it will be developed at some point.

Member Lynch asked what the density is that surrounds the property.



Planner Komaragiri stated that Liberty Park is a single-family development to the west which is approximately 3.5 units/acre; and Carlton Forest to the east which is 5.6 units/acre. The proposed density of 4.2 units/acre provides a reasonable transition between the lower density at Liberty Park and Carlton Forest to the east.

Deputy Director McBeth clarified that Liberty Park has a combination of single-family and attached units. The area for Liberty Park in its entirety is Master Planned for fifteen units to the acre, but overall about 12.3 units/acre.

Member Lynch stated that there is 12.3 units/acre on one side, and 5.6 units/acre on the other side. This plan is projected to be 4.2 units/acre. In regards to Dixon Road, there was mention of removal of multiple trees. He feels that if the trees are removed from that area, the trees should be replanted in that area instead of having money go into the Tree Fund. He asked if there is any way possible that the vegetation be used to buffer both sides of Dixon Road instead since there is an issue with Dixon Road and what appears at the back at one of the subdivisions. He asked how many trees are being required for the Tree Fund.

Planner Komaragiri stated that the total replacement trees required is 946 trees. The applicant is proposing to replace 405 trees on site and pay into the Tree Fund for 541 trees. There are woodlands replacements being proposed along Dixon Road and some are within the property around the corners.

Member Lynch stated that he feels this is an area of the Master Plan they have not looked at in quite some time. He agrees with Member Greco that it will be developed at some point in time. His suspicion is that if it goes into the Master Plan, the density is going to be much higher than what is currently being proposed based on the surrounding areas. He feels the issue is that there are surrounding subdivisions that buffer homes, and they are fairly isolated from anything else. Knowing that those lands can probably be developed since everything gets developed sooner or later, he is trying to figure out a way that we can maintain some semblance of isolation through the vegetation, and at the same time put a high quality subdivision from the area, remove the arsenic from the ground, and make it profitable for everyone. He is wondering if they can have much more vegetation along Dixon Road since it is an issue. He would like to ask the developer if this is doable.

Mr. Halso came to the podium and stated that he loves the idea. They would be happy to work with the City and plant as many or all of the requirement replacement trees on both sides of Dixon Road, not just on their side. The one side of Dixon Road definitely could use more trees, and this is a great opportunity to add them. From the slides that were seen previously, it is pretty open, and in addition to granting the right-of-way, which they will be doing across the entire frontage including Mrs. Tuck and Mr. Marini's properties which they have agreed to provide, their frontages will have an additional fifty feet of buffer, all of which they intend to plant as heavily as city staff will support. They have also worked with Engineering on the road design and the design is a smaller and narrower profile intended to calm the traffic. Adding a walkway will give pedestrians and children something to walk on besides an unpaved street. He thanks Member Greco for his comments and stated that he thought they were using the PRO to address the change in the Master Plan.

Member Lynch stated that looking at the density right now, with the Master Plan being opened up for review and with the density going up, he feels that 4.2 is reasonable for this area based on the 15 on one side and five on the other. He also thinks isolation is an issue since the neighbors are used to having the forest behind them, and when it gets removed, they have nothing. He is in support of this request if he can see an agreement between the City and the developer to increase the density of trees and foliage on Dixon Road to maintain the isolation that the existing homeowners have come to enjoy, instead of putting money into the Tree Fund, which goes elsewhere in the city. If this can be done, a high quality subdivision can be developed, which will happen at some point in time. With the density of the Master Plan, when it goes to the committee and they review five on one side and twelve on the other, maybe it will be required to have eight homes per area. In his opinion, it will be a good solution if they can increase the density on Dixon Road because the homes presented by Pulte will sell. There is only one entrance and he asked if the Fire Department has agreed to this or if there is a secondary entrance.

Planner Komaragiri stated that they have provided a second emergency access off of the cul-de-sac on the other side. They will be calling it a temporary secondary access because the other connection north of the site where the rustic trail and woodlands are preserved is hoped to become a permanent through access at

some point. If it becomes a permanent access, the temporary access will no longer be in effect. Member Lynch stated that Skip made a valid point and he has been in a similar situation where homes have been built, he was nervous about it, and at the end of the day they turned out okay and there was nothing to worry about.

Member Zuchlewski asked the Traffic Engineer if there are 'numbers' on Dixon Road.

Matt Klawson told him to "fire away".

Member Zuchlewski stated that his question is similar to one heard a while ago. The density of this has had all kinds of numbers; 102 and originally down to 95 and now down to 90. If the zoning wasn't changed, how much of an increase of traffic flow would they have on Dixon Road?

Mr. Klawson stated that he pulled together the numbers proposed but he does not have the numbers in front of him that match the condition of not changing the zoning. The site as the study reads now during the peak hour adds about 100 new vehicles to the system, so those vehicles would exit the site and go either down to Twelve Mile Road or over to Novi Road. The questions came up of accessing Twelve Mile Road southbound on Dixon Road. It is proposed that the volume in the morning, which would be the peak period for exiting onto Twelve Mile, would go up to 58 cars per hour, and the existing number is currently 18 vehicles per hour. All the delay calculations are all within acceptable levels and essentially the changes would not be that discernable for the average motorist approaching the intersection to make their exit.

Member Zuchlewski stated that he has seen it before and has seen it in different configurations and it seems to him that the rezoning was never really an issue. They have worked with the developer and the developer has provided them with what they wanted the best that they could get. He feels this developer has done an awful lot with what he has, and the developer has tried to work with the City in all the different reviews that have been required and everyone says that they approve it. Based upon how long this project has been going along and the encouragement they have given the developer, this is where he would be coming from.

Chair Pehrson stated he feels their hand is forced relative to zoning density in this particular area and the consent agenda that occurred in Liberty Park. (He looked to Deputy Director McBeth for confirmation.)

Deputy Director McBeth stated that the consent judgement allowed a maximum of fifteen units to the acre. She also clarified that the multiple family portion of that development is at about 12.5 units/acre and the single family portions are constructed at about 3.5 units/acre.

Chair Pehrson stated that the Master Plan allows applicants to come forward using the PRO tool as a method that can be used to provide a reasonable discussion to sway the Commission regarding why their development would work. He feels that is what the developer has done in this case. Given the fact that the consent judgement set the tone and the standard for what the density is, 12 and 15 to the west, and ~5 to the east, we will not see RA zoning in this area. He does not think that what has been presented is out of the norm, and it serves as a transition between the two areas. He also agrees with Member Lynch, that if the developer and the City can use the PRO tool to get together and continue with the formulation of trees along Dixon Road, so it can continue its natural beauty road status, it will be prudent for them to do so at this point in time. He is glad to hear the developer wanting to do this. He is not sure why it is not already part of the proposal.

Chair Pehrson stated that he is a big proponent of density changes when it makes sense, and with this case being unique, they will probably always end up right where they are now. He has heard what the residents have to say about the case, and the Commission takes very seriously what has been discussed and brought forward to them, and they are not able to do anything about traffic per se. The Planning Commission asks for Traffic Consultants to give their opinion, and it is based on worst case scenarios. The Commission does not have the ability or the authority to make specific roads wider or have a center turn lane installed. But they do have the ability to make some changes based upon this particular developer coming forward with a PRO, where they get to work with them to develop the language and what this proposal might look like. The things talked about need to be part of the PRO, and Chair Pehrson has no problems with the mitigation going on since they are working with a company that has done this many times before. He cannot do anything relative to construction that takes place; they have ordinances as to when trucks cannot go up and down roads, so

as not to bother people. People have recourses in the area if there is dirt or dust, they can contact the City so something can be done about it to mitigate the issue. This is a quality development and they have asked the developer to come back with certain amenities in the PRO, which he has provided. For these reasons, he is in support of this particular motion given that they tweak the PRO language to add a few more things; to address the concerns and some of the thoughts that have been brought forward on the Planning Commission.

Chair Pehrson asked if there were any additional comments.

Member Lynch stated that he wants to make a motion, but he asked how he includes the trees as a condition.

Attorney Dove stated that if he wants to make a motion to approve, looking at the motion form they have been provided, the second part states that 'if Council approves the rezoning, Planning Commission recommends the following conditions'. At that part, there is already an 'a' and 'b' condition, and he could add a 'c' that might say, "subject to City approval, the applicant planting required replacement trees in the Dixon Road right-of-way on both sides of the road, rather than satisfying his responsibility for those trees by payment into the City Tree Fund".

Member Lynch stated that he could paraphrase that condition, but he wants what the attorney just stated to appear in the record.

Attorney Dove stated that he could say 'with a new condition 'c' as outlined by the City Attorney'.

Motion by Member Lynch and seconded by Member Zuchlewski.

**In the matter of the request of Pulte Homes for Dixon Meadows JSP14-46 with Zoning Map Amendment 18.709 motion to recommend approval to the City Council to rezone the subject property RA (Residential Acreage) to RT (Two-family residential) with a Planned Rezoning Overlay. The recommendation shall include the following ordinance deviations for consideration by the City Council:**

- a. Reduction in the required minimum lot size and minimum lot width for one-family detached dwellings reviewed against R-4 Zoning standards to allow for smaller lots (10,000 square feet and 80 feet required, 5,400 square feet and 45 feet provided);
- b. Reduction in minimum front yard setback for one-family detached dwellings reviewed against R-4 Zoning standards (30 feet required, 20 feet provided);
- c. Reduction in minimum rear yard setback for one-family detached dwellings reviewed against R-4 Zoning standards (35 feet required, 30 feet provided);
- d. Reduction in minimum side yard setback and aggregate side yard setback for one-family detached dwellings reviewed against R-4 Zoning standards (10 feet with 25 feet aggregate required, 5 feet with 10 feet aggregate provided);
- e. Increase in maximum lot coverage permitted per Zoning Ordinance (maximum of 30 percent of total site required, 35 percent of total site provided); and
- f. A Design and Construction Standards (DCS) waiver for the lack of paved eyebrows as per Engineering review.

**If the City Council approves the rezoning, the Planning Commission recommends the following conditions be requirements of the Planned Rezoning Overlay Agreement:**

- a. Acceptance of applicant's offer of Public benefits as proposed:
  - i. Maximum number of units shall be 90.
  - ii. Minimum unit width shall be 45 feet and minimum square footage of 5,400 square feet
  - iii. Paving of 1,800 linear feet of Dixon Road.
  - iv. Planting of woodland replacement trees along the Dixon Road frontage.
  - v. Remediation of on-site arsenic contamination.
  - vi. Pocket parks/tree preservation within the development.
  - vii. Housing style upgrades as shown on the elevations enclosed with the PRO Application.
  - viii. Dedication of public right-of-way along Dixon Road.
  - ix. Financial contribution for the design and construction of a meandering five foot wide concrete sidewalk along the east side of Dixon Drive extending approximately 850 feet south from the

subject property to the existing sidewalk just north of Twelve Mile Road, provided City secures the required easements. Alternatively, the applicant has offered to contribute the amount for the anticipated sidewalk construction to the City for future construction of the sidewalk.

- b. Applicant complying with the conditions listed in the staff and consultant review letters.
- c. Subject to City approval, the applicant planting required replacement trees in the Dixon Road right-of-way on both sides of the road, rather than satisfying its responsibility for those trees by payment into the City Tree Fund.

This motion is made because:

- a. The applicant has presented a reasonable alternative to the proposed Master Plan designation of a maximum of 1.65 units/acre to an actual 4.2 units/acre, and which supports several objectives of the Master Plan for Land Use as noted in this review letter.
- b. The proposed density of 4.2 units/acre provides a reasonable transitional use and density between the lower density Liberty Park – Single Family development to the west (approximately 3.5 units/acre), and the Carlton Forest development to the east (approximately 5.6 units/acre).
- c. The roadways and surrounding intersections are expected to maintain acceptable levels of service with the addition of the site generated traffic, and the proposed paving of approximately 1,800 linear feet of Dixon Road from the existing terminus point at Twelve Mile Road to the northern entrance of the proposed development may be seen as a public benefit to the potential residents of the new development, as well the residents who currently use Dixon Road.
- d. The site will be adequately served by public utilities.
- e. The City's Traffic Engineering Consultant has reviewed the Rezoning Traffic Impact Study and notes a minimal impact on surrounding traffic as a result of the development as the current traffic volume on Dixon Road is relatively low.
- f. Submittal of a concept plan, and any resulting PRO Agreement, provides assurances to the Planning Commission and to the City Council of the manner in which the property will be developed.

*Motion carried 3-1.*

### 3. MONTEBELLO ESTATES JSP15-0076

Public hearing at the request of Mirage Development for Planning Commission's approval of Preliminary Site Plan, Woodlands Permit, Wetlands Permit, and Stormwater Management Plan. The subject property is currently zoned R-3, One-Family Residential and is located in Section 27, west of Novi Road and north of Nine Mile Road. The applicant is proposing a 33 unit single-family detached residential development on a 26.94 acre property.

Planner Sri Komaragiri stated that the subject property is located north of Nine Mile between Novi Road and Taft Road. The subject property is zoned R-3 one-family residential and is surrounded by the same zoning east, west and south. It is also surrounded by R-4 partly in northeast corner and southwest corner. It is abutted by Novi Township to the north. The Future Land Use map indicates Single Family for the subject property and the surrounding properties.

There are regulated wetlands and regulated woodlands spread throughout the property on the property. The applicant is proposing to construct a 33 unit conventional site condominium with associated site improvements. The site access is provided by a proposed public roadway with a single curb cut from Nine Mile Road. A secondary emergency access is provided to Cottisford road. The proposed preliminary site plan addresses all of the Planning requirements.

The applicant is requesting two variances from Design and Construction standards for not providing a water main and a five foot sidewalk along the entire Nine Mile Road frontage. The missing sidewalk segment along subject property frontage is identified as segment 93A and is ranked 15 in 2015-16 Annual non-motorized prioritization update. There is no existing sidewalk on the south side of the Nine Mile as well. Engineering believes that there are alternate means to accommodate a water main such as directional drilling to preserve natural features along the frontage. Staff is requesting applicant to provide more details to justify

their request. For reasons stated above, Engineering does not support the variance requests and is recommending denial.

Landscape has identified some waivers that are required for reduction and absence of greenbelt planting, street trees and required berm along Nine Mile Road and Cottisford Road. The details are listed in the motion language. Landscape supports the requests for these and is recommending approval. The current site plan is proposing impacts to the existing wetlands and the buffers on site. However, our consultants are unable to make a proper determination to the extent of the impact due to deficiencies in the plan.

There are a total of 970 regulated trees on the site, of which 58 percent are proposed to be removed resulting in a total of about 1,011 replacement trees required. The landscape plan appears to indicate a total of 143 trees to be planted on site, and the remainder to be paid into City's Tree Fund. Staff is asking for additional information to justify the tree removal and desires an effort to reduce the tree removal. Due to reasons stated above, the Wetlands and Woodland Consultant is not recommending approval, and is requesting additional information. The applicant has been working with the consultant to resolve those issues and staff believes that they are making headway.

Traffic and Fire are recommending approval with additional information to be provided during the next submittal. The Planning Commission is asked tonight to hold a public hearing to approve or postpone or deny the Preliminary Site Plan, Wetland Permit, Woodland Permit, and Stormwater Management Plan.

The applicant has provided a letter further explaining the concept and it has been provided this evening. The applicant Claudio Rossi with Mirage development is here with his Engineer, Cliff Seiber to answer any questions that you might have.

Cliff Seiber, the Project Engineer, stated that Claudio Rossi of Mirage Development is present with him. He stated that it is an amazing piece of property with entirely mature trees, two streams flowing through it; there is a lot of topography on this site. For this reason, Mr. Rossi decided not to apply for a PRO or a preservation option or any open space option that would enable him to increase density on this property. Under the R-3 zoning Mr. Rossi is allowed 2.7 units per acre. He is at 1.27, which is less than half the density that is permitted on this property under the current zoning. In order to further preserve the property and open it up, the minimum lot size for the zoning is 90 feet. They are averaging over 100 feet in width for all of the lots, and in addition, the minimum lot size is 12,000 square feet, and they are averaging at about 15,200 square feet. The lots are more open and larger which enables them to save more of the mature trees on the site. It also has a number of amenities, including an existing tennis court on the site which will be preserved. There are walking trails which have been introduced throughout the site that tie into some of the existing trails or driveways that are on the site. He also believes that there is a gazebo near the entrance that is being proposed as part of the park system.

There are a few issues as a result of the topography that they are requesting some relief from. The first is the requirement for a sidewalk along Nine Mile Road. Nine Mile Road is purposely narrow to preserve as many trees as possible due to the fairly sulfuric topography going through that hill. If they were to construct a sidewalk along the side of the trees, it would require the clearing of a large amount of trees and the installation of retaining walls which would destroy the current appearance of that roadway. They thought an applicable alternative would be to create a river walk. This means they would introduce a sidewalk system that ties into the sidewalk just to the west, and extend the sidewalk into the site along Thornton Creek. Toward the east side of the property, there is an existing bridge that the prior owner used and that walkway would back out to Nine Mile Road and continue east to the easterly edge of the property. The existing asphalt pathway that runs along Thornton Creek is in very good shape and if the City Engineer believes that it needs some improvement, it can be done. The development team feels this is a better alternative, it is scenic, and blends in with the existing topography. This would give people the opportunity to see Thornton Creek as it flows through the property, along with its existing waterfalls.

The second request is the requirement that the City has for landscaping regarding the provision of a berm along the road right-of-way. If they were to introduce the berm, which is typically for screening purposes, they would have more than enough screening and will not need to remove trees. Nine Mile Road running through that hill is much lower and provides existing topography and the trees provide all the screening that they may need.

The third item requested relates to the engineering and the water main. They had proposed a 12 inch water main through their site, tapping into the City's water main on Nine Mile Road and running it thorough the site, and back out to Nine Mile. They have shown that they provide the proper flow rates per City requirements in order to fight fires and serve the fire hydrants. One of the disadvantages of that proposal is that they do not provide water service to all the properties on the south side of Nine Mile Road. They think that they may have an alternative that would resolve that, and are requesting if the Planning Commission sees fit to approve this project, that it would be subject to them meeting further with the Engineering Department in order to see if they can satisfy them. They would still bring the 12 inch water main to their site, but also serve the other properties on the south side of Nine Mile Road to ensure they have future potential for connecting to the municipal water system. He stated that he and Mr. Rossi are available to answer any questions.

Chair Pehrson opened the case for public hearing.

Stan Williams, 43635 Cottisford Road, stated that he and his wife live 417 feet immediately to the east of the property. The access road on Cottisford is adjacent to the north end of their property, and their property goes down into Thornton Creek. They are against the proposal and wish the owner would donate the land and make it a wildlife wilderness area. They would even be willing to support a millage increase if he would want to buy the land, and turn it into a wildlife refuge. He told Commissioner Lynch that he wrote a letter and he does not need to read it since he is going to be speaking. Along Cottisford, they are all on well water, and they have great water right now. If the area turns into concrete and road, he is concerned they are going to end up minimizing the ability of the land to recharge their aquifers beneath and impact the ability to supply them with well water. The plan also dramatically increases the opportunity for hazardous waste from the community from roads, construction runoff, and fertilizers. The second major objection is that it will destroy a huge habitat for wildlife; they see deer and small mammals every day. He realizes the Commission's job is to look for variances and reasonable plans that would call for variances to the regulated woodland ordinance, but for them, they have trouble giving the City approval for them to knock down one tree on the property because it endangers their house, and he is concerned about all the mature trees being destroyed on the property. Third, there will be a rise in the flood plain located behind their property. It is not an issue at this time, but it could become an issue with the cement and land being developed since that property is upstream from where their property is located. Fourth, they have seen two different descriptions of the access to Cottisford Road, and they are against the regular access to Cottisford. This road is safe for kids to walk on and for bikers and joggers because there is only one access to that subdivision. It also prevents criminals from entering and creating mischief since there is only one way in and out. They do not object to the other plan they saw, showing a pathway to Cottisford, or if it were a breakaway gate for emergency vehicles. Lastly, he loves the plan about protecting the trees on Nine Mile, and thinks a sidewalk should not be installed, but be tied in with the pavement that already exists by the creek.

David Morris, 43680 Nine Mile Road, lives two lots east of the site. He thanked the McManus Family. To date, they have been great stewards of the land and makes Nine Mile visually unique. The heavily wooded lot provides a brief moment of serenity and peace. He enjoys the deer, great horned owls and other wildlife that are located on the property. He also enjoys the unique and beautiful trees in the area. When it comes to the Montebello plan to replace the 27 acre nature sanctuary with 33 new homes, he is in objection. From the regulated woodland map and ordinance page on the city website, they are told that native woodlands are one of the most valuable natural resources with the City of Novi. The plan removes half of the 1,100 trees on the site and replants only 143 of them. Using estimates from the 'Trees Pay Us Back' brochure on the Novi City website, they can calculate that it is a loss in capacity with over 154 tons of carbon dioxide, 1,034 pounds of other pollutants, and over 579,000 gallons of rain water per year. The proposal counteracts this loss of City managed woodland with a payoff to plant trees or spend money elsewhere. The loss of trees, increase in dwellings, and increase in paved surfaces will only add to the rainwater runoff. He would like assurance that there will be no decrease in flood retention, since there is already significant erosion to the properties along Thornton Creek. He objects to any change that increases the hydraulic flow down the stream and the by-laws require low phosphorus fertilizer to minimize added pollutants to Miller and Thornton Creeks. He would also like to avoid any property disturbance or drilling if the final plan includes a water main east of the site on Nine Mile Road. Any disturbance to the water table or ground near a well is also a concern. There is no impact to his property that contains the 15 inch sanitary sewer, but would want to ensure that in the final plan. He states that he is disappointed that even though the plan retains the trees along Nine Mile, the look, feel, and animal habitat will be affected forever. He questions why they need to build 33 more new homes in this area when

there are already over 250 for sale in the off-season. He would like to see the land be sold to another family to enjoy the unique beauty and privacy.

Bill Boffman, 43943 Cottisford, is against the proposal. When he looks out his bedroom window, he currently sees the forest. If this proposal goes through, he will look out and see a house about 150 feet away. When you do the math, you need to take the wetlands out, so you are only putting in about four or five houses per acre. There are only about ten to twelve acres that they can build on. He brought his property 30 years ago and originally purchased it because it was next to the forest. There is nothing you can build or plant to make up for the forest. Because he is not completely competent with the process, he is turning it over to his attorneys whom he is meeting tomorrow. He is going to let them handle the legal aspect of it.

John Juntunen, Novi Township's Supervisor, is against the proposal. He stated that Novi Township was not contacted at all regarding the proposal, and most of the township did not receive a mailing or notification. He objects for a few reasons, the first is being concerned about the second entrance onto Cottisford Road. As Cottisford Road runs straight, it belongs to Novi, but as soon as it hits the curve, it is then Novi Township. He has spoken with the Fire Marshal and he stated that it is required by the Fire Department to have a secondary entrance; it would be gated and not a thoroughfare. Since there is only one entrance, a traffic conflict already exists. And once you add construction traffic, it would be a problem for everyone. He is requesting that a condition be made that the road can never be turned into a thoroughfare, and that it cannot be used for construction purposes. Secondly, the proposed construction requires the removal of many large trees that provide habitat.

Michael Leavitt, 45177 Dunbarton Drive, feels the traffic study needs to be looked at on Nine Mile. The entrance off of Nine Mile on the proposal is close to Center Street. If you know anything about Nine Mile you know that there is a hill that slopes down and the sight lines are very poor for drivers. If you're going to have traffic that is going to be coming out of that new development, especially cars going across to Center Street, you will have some potential traffic hazards. It is also problematic because there are a lot of bikers and joggers on that road.

Peter Horn, 44119 Brookwood Drive, stated that his property abuts the subject property. He stated that he had a question relative to the description from when it was read. The plan indicates single family units, but the person that read the description stated they were condominiums. He wanted to confirm that it was an error.

Planner Komaragiri stated that they call the project a condominium, but for all practical purposes it is a subdivision. The homes are going to be single family detached homes.

Vitas Sirgedas, 22422 Lydgate Court, stated that for 28 years he has been able to enjoy the view of the woodlands and animals, and now he will be staring at the back of someone's home within 30 feet of his backyard. He is requesting that the woodlands not be removed.

Fred Schlemmer, 44917 Lightsway Drive, stated that he agrees with the recent comment about the traffic. He does think the traffic study took the exits and entrances from the subdivision into consideration. In addition, the entrance to Dunbarton Pines is 100 feet up to the west of Nine Mile Road. He feels there would be a lot of confusion at this area, especially in the mornings. He understands the Planning Commission stated they do not consider traffic issues, but they should because it is a public safety issue. He also feels they are going to lose an aesthetically beautiful piece of property.

Margaret Finn, 22010 Cumberland Drive, stated that when you are on Nine Mile Road going west, it is a peaceful setting and you think you are up north. They love the woods and the wildlife and does not want to see it removed.

Suzette Sellen, 43565 Cottisford, is against the proposal. She was living here before Twelve Oaks was built and it has turned into cement city. There are only a few areas left that are natural. She also helps rescue wildlife and is sick over what is going to happen to the wildlife if the woods are destroyed. One of the homes on Nine Mile across the street from her was recently demolished and then rebuilt; there was a lot of construction traffic and the road is only one way each way and it cannot be widened. Nine Mile Road cannot handle a large amount of construction traffic.

Michelle Taki, 44623 Midway Drive, states that her home backs up to the retention pond for the city. After it rains, they get a lot of water that collects there and is concerned about the new development, whether or not it will be able to tolerate all the extra drainage from the additional homes and concrete that would normally be absorbed by the wetland area. If you drive down Nine Mile Road after a rainy day, there is flooding. This needs to be addressed before more concrete is added to the area. Also, Nine Mile Road does not have a sidewalk that connects between Dunbarton Ponds and Novi Road, so they usually walk south through the subdivisions then come back on Center Street so they can avoid the traffic on Nine Mile. She is also concerned about the entry way to the subdivision because making a left turn off of Center onto Nine Mile Road is very dangerous because of the cars coming down and from Taft Road. She hopes the Commission will take these concerns into consideration.

An unidentified man who lives on Cottisford, stated that he lives two properties away from the development on the east side. On top of everything that has already been mentioned, he is concerned about light pollution.

Chris Kondogiani, 45104 Dunbarton Drive, appreciates some of the things mentioned by the developer to preserve the natural habitat and the view from Nine Mile Road. He and his family moved from Livonia to Novi because they wanted to live near the woods. There are patches of Novi that make the city unique and this area is definitely one of them. If this development is approved, he would like to make sure the developer is required to preserve the unique view of the area.

Chris Bermingham stated that the new homes back up to the retention pond. The area is also a wildlife sanctuary that consists of owls and deer, and Miller Creek is full of fish and minnows. He would like to make sure there is a border or shrubbery along the stream banks so fertilizer and construction runoff does not go into the creek. The area would be good for a park instead of a subdivision.

Jennifer Humphries, 43628 Cottisford, stated that she and her husband just purchased their home about four months ago, and their main attraction to the home was the privacy and woodlands that this area provided. Their home is at the curve on Cottisford, and if that road were to come out, it will look like their circular drive is part of the road. Cottisford Road also seems narrower and the added traffic would not be good.

Sue Sellen stated that she loves Brookland Farms, and recently had fourteen deer in her backyard. She wished that all the residents in Brookland Farms received notification because they all admire that area. She is concerned because they are on a well, and is worried about the water, runoff, and erosion. She is also concerned about the road going into Cottisford and is not clear on what that road is going to be used for. She mailed in a letter and told the Planning Commission that they did not need to read it.

A woman named Lisa, 43643 Nine Mile Road, stated that she lives across the street and thinks that the McManus property is majestic. She is hoping that the proposed development can consider quality instead of quantity. She lives off on 1.5 acres and she and the surrounding homes have similar lot sizes which gives it an up north feel. Two other subdivisions mentioned tonight are going to be packed with houses along with parks and walkways, but what they don't have is the space to have a bigger lot and make a unique subdivision. People will buy houses on bigger lots. If they can condense the plan to have fewer lots with larger properties and keep the woods, everyone could continue to enjoy the existing atmosphere.

Pam Williams, 43635 Cottisford, stated that if there could be a buffer of the original trees all the way around, so they are not looking into someone's yard and they are preserving the wildlife, it would be appreciated.

Matt Guyot, 45039 Dunbarton Drive, stated that he does not abut the proposed property. His major safety concern is the proposed entranceway and how the traffic would flow. When cars come down the hill, it is an issue to be looked at and considered. He enjoys the wildlife and heard the horned owls at 5 a.m. the other morning. He is hoping the Planning Commission will stop this proposal from moving forward.

Joshua Grutza, 43700 Nine Mile, thanked his neighbors for their passionate comments. He purchased his home because of the woodlands and wetlands that surround the area, along with the wildlife. He has seen the creek flood and cannot imagine how much more it would flood if this subdivision were to be built. It is sad that the beautiful land could be developed into another subdivision since there are not many more areas like this left in Novi.



Rob Speyer, 43590 Nine Mile Road, stated that the area is extremely unique and he is against the proposal. The creek butts up to the back of his property line, and he is concerned about the flooding. His neighbor's basements along with others have flooded in the past. When he purchased his home, they thought the area was built out and an additional development would not be built. The wildlife and wooded area is one of the original reasons that they purchased their home. He is also concerned about the traffic at the entranceway.

Bonnie Thrush stated that she is a lifelong resident of Novi. She has heard comments of people stating that 'it is going to happen anyway' and 'it doesn't matter what I say', but she has faith in the City and thinks there is a solution. She feels they have heard a lot of good suggestions and hopes some of them will be considered. Her only issue is that she found out from a neighbor who forwarded her an email about the development, and requests more communication is provided.

David Raub, 22308 North Hills Court, stated that he is responsible for having the deer crossing signs installed on Nine Mile Road. Along with the deer, they have fox and other animals that live in the woods. The drains on Nine Mile Road get clogged with leaves and it floods, and the added water is not a good idea. He is against the development.

Pam Horn, 44119 Brookwood Drive, loves their home and the area that they live in. They did not receive public notice until Saturday evening, and in August she had two surveyors in her yard surveying. The surveyor told her that the owner of the property behind her had sold their property to a developer and they were evaluating the flood plains. She told the Commission and they tried calling everyone to find out what was going on and no one knew anything. She feels that it has been known since July this was going to occur and wishes the property owner would have personally called each of the neighbors. She agrees that this area of the city is a jewel.

Chair Pehrson asked if anyone else wished to speak. Since there was no one, he asked the public correspondence to be read.

Louise Hackett submitted a response and he believed she had already spoken. There is also one correspondence letter that did not have a name, so it could not be read into the record. Susan Sellen submitted a letter and she also spoke at the audience comment. There was an objection letter from Vitas Sirgedas, who also had spoken. An objection letter was received from Krysten and Sean Baligian, and they are disappointed about losing the woodland surroundings, increased traffic on Nine Mile, and worry about property value. There was an objection letter from the Novi Township Superintendent who is concerned about the secondary road entrance, the removal of many established trees, and the density being higher than surrounding properties. Falgun Patel, 43588 Cottisford, is in objection because of increased traffic, negative effect on wildlife, and decreased property values. Christopher Bermingham, whom also spoke wrote a letter of objection. Jason Rauhe, 44500 Louvert strongly objects; however the letter was not legible. Heidi Nielson, objects due to loss of habitat and issues with Thornton Creek including damaging runoff and negative effects on wildlife. Jay Gabriel, wrote an objection letter stating that there are too many buildings across from his subdivision. This letter was also not legible.

Chair Pehrson closed the audience participation and turned the case over to the Planning Commission for discussion.

Member Lynch asked how long the property had been zoned R-3 and Deputy Director McBeth stated that she does not have the date, but she can look into it if necessary.

Member Lynch stated that he thinks he remembers the property and feels it has been zoned this way for quite some time. He noticed that there seems to be a lot of concern about the creek, and asked Matt Carmer and Pete Hill with ECT to answer some questions.

Member Lynch confirmed that the creek flows into the middle branch of the Rouge River. He stated that he did not see any easement, and assumes they would need a wetland permit. He asked how we ensure that there is no phosphorous flowing into the watershed.

Mr. Carmer stated that the plan for the DEQ permit currently does not show a lot of wetland impact. There is a lot of topography, so the water is moving through the site quickly. The wetlands are mostly within the floodplain of the creek itself down in the southeast corner. It would be impacting the creek itself by crossing it, and currently there is 230 feet of stream proposed for enclosure. This is significant since the road would be nearly 30 feet wide.

Member Lynch asked how it will be resolved and Mr. Carmer stated that the applicant needs to obtain a DEQ permit, which will be done at the final site plan. They also need a Wetland and Watercourse Permit through the City, in order to do the enclosure. In relation to the phosphorous and preventing other pollutants from entering the river, the best way is to maintain buffers around the stream itself. When you maintain backyards and lawn within 25 feet, the city has a 25 foot zoning buffer as well.

Member Lynch stated that he did not see anything on the plan that showed the natural vegetation around the waterways. He asked if DEQ requires a conservation easement in order to obtain a DEQ permit.

Mr. Carmer stated that it is not likely. Their jurisdiction ends at the ordinary high water mark of the creek. It is the City Ordinance that protects the buffers.

Member Lynch asked if in regards to the creek flooding if DEQ is responsible for checking on the developer to assure that the water flows.

Mr. Hill confirmed, but with the addition of City Engineering staff looking at the plans, making sure that flood prevention detention basins are adequately sized. There are some questions as to whether or not the DEQ will have jurisdiction over the flood plain due to the amount of upstream drainage area, if it is less than two square miles draining to this area of creek, then the state may not have jurisdiction.

Mr. Carmer added that when the application gets submitted to the State, it would get copied to the City, and there is an opportunity to collaborate with the State at that point.

Member Lynch inquired about the number of trees being added to the Tree Fund.

Mr. Hill stated that the current plan has 143 trees to be planted on site, which is 14 percent of the required number to be planted and 868 trees are proposed for the Tree Fund. The total number of regulated trees comes to 970, and about 50 percent of the regulated trees are being removed while the other 50 percent will be preserved.

Member Lynch asked why more trees could not be planted on site, and Mr. Carmer responded that there are spacing requirements on the planted trees, so when you are developing the larger portion, you run out of space to plant. They are recommending that the applicant provide as many on site replacement trees as possible.

Member Lynch asked the applicant to come up and speak in regards to this matter.

The applicant stated that a lot of residents were concerned about planting trees on the back of the lots in order to provide screening, but the City's current policy states they cannot provide any of the replacement trees on any of the lots. He used Churchill Crossing as an example. They would like to plant the trees there if it would be permitted, because they could stagger them and plant a larger number of trees there.

Deputy Director McBeth stated that the woodland replacements would be located in an area that could have a conservation easement across it, which they would not want to do on the back portion of someone's lot. This would prevent the owner of the property from performing specific landscaping or adding onto their property in the future if it were desired. With a conservation easement, if the homeowner wanted to remove a tree, it would actually be required to be maintained. She used the Valencia South project as an example of how they obtained a conservation easement to allow replacement trees to be planted.

Member Lynch asked if City Council would be allowed to deviate from the policy to allow the trees to be planted on the lots. Director McBeth stated they would need to look into it. This site plan would be reviewed

and approved by the Planning Commission and would not go to City Council, so they would likely not weigh in, but this can be looked into for an answer at a later date.

Member Lynch stated that in regards to the trail, he does not see a reason for a sidewalk to be installed. He does not want to see shaving of the hill or removal of vegetation, and thinks the way it is presented is nice. Lastly, he inquired about the emergency entrance going into the subdivisions, and asked if it is a paved road.

The applicant stated that the Fire Department required it to be paved, and there will be break-away gates. They could also include in the Final Site Plan notes that it cannot be used as a construction entrance. All the construction vehicles will be entering from a different spot.

Member Lynch stated that he likes the fact that they are looking to build less homes than what they potentially could build. The homes are nice, and the way it is laid out will fit in with the area, with the exception that he would like the opportunity to install the woodland replacements around the perimeter of the proposed development to maintain as much as possible and to keep the serene environment.

Member Greco stated he would like to address the concerned residents partially on behalf of the Commission. He drives the stretch on Nine Mile every day and agrees that it is beautiful year round. This is not necessarily a situation where there is a win-win. Unfortunately, this is private property and it can be developed. The laws of the land provide that cities can provide some regulation on where they can put things and on the planning that they can do. This property is going to be developed, and once it is zoned a certain way and a developer comes in with a plan that fits within that zoning, it is impossible to stop the development from happening. After this point, all they are doing is dealing with the details; buffers and making sure they comply with the ordinances, making sure there is enough study going regarding the flood plain, and traffic studies. As far as trees, homes, and density, it is all decided by the Zoning Ordinance. A lot of people are disappointed that there are homes in a development that are going to go onto this property, but there is very little that the City can do. The good news is that they have a developer that has been before the Planning Commission before and has done good work, and seems to be working with the McManus Family. The developer seems to appreciate things from an aesthetic perspective for the residents in the area that are there, particularly the Nine Mile Road area.

With respect to specific things concerning the plan, Member Greco is glad to hear the Cottisford access road will be an emergency access road only. A traffic study is primarily dealing with the flow of traffic going in and out of a development, but there is an issue with whether there is going to be an exit road, Center Street, the hills on both areas and is sure it is a concern for safety. Once a study gets completed and there is some focus on the area, he is not sure they will really want a traffic light or more things that interfere with the aesthetics of the area, but it should be considered. Commissioner Lynch mentioned the trees and having trees replanted on the property; he feels that it sounds like a good idea, but you still have to disturb the area. With respect to Nine Mile Road, the water main issue, and the sidewalk, he is concerned about people walking and biking along Nine Mile Road. The sidewalk would change how it looks throughout the year and he likes the pathway going off the road. He understands that a lot of people prefer there to be no development or less homes, and unfortunately it is not something that we can control. At the public hearing for the site north of Fountain Walk, at the end of the discussion they spoke about a consent judgement, which is something that is entered into after litigation, and in that case the density was different that this proposal. For this current request, they are proposing less density, and he feels they do not have a choice but to support it.

Member Zuchlewski commented that he hates to see all the trees go, but he agrees that it is not a decision they can make. He feels if they get buffers around the subdivision on all the lots that are around the property line, it would help tremendously. He will support the plan with these recommendations, and is asking that they have a traffic study. If there is not a light installed, maybe they can install signs that read 'Caution' at the intersection. The proposal is beautiful, and he likes the water, greenbelt area and the walkway through the site.

Member Greco inquired about the fact that the developer and City are close to resolving the wetland permit and woodland permit issue requirements.

Planner Komaragiri stated that they are asking for additional information because they couldn't complete the review. The applicant has been providing the updated calculations with regards to how much impact

they are making and where the replacement trees are going to be located. The staff is not able to recommend or not recommend at this time.

Pete Hill stated that the applicant has been addressing the comments that were written up in the preliminary site plan letter. They are looking to see that those things are covered in the revised preliminary submittal. It is not complete at this time.

Member Greco stated that since these two things are not done yet, he suggests they table those items and request that the City do a more specific traffic study regarding the three roads coming from west to east, because the traffic study that was done relates more to the traffic impacts on the number of houses coming in and out, and may not address some things. Looking at the report, it does not necessarily address the Dunbarton Pines exit, along with the apartment complex, Center Street, and now the new development. A clarification on those issues would be a good idea.

Chair Pehrson stated that he too wants the traffic study to understand why there is not a better alignment with Center Street. He thinks the hill presents a problem trying to turn in and out, and he does not want to create a bigger problem if they can avoid it. He asked Deputy Director McBeth to comment on the concern about the noticing, and what the policy is to those in and out of the general area.

Deputy Director McBeth stated that the state law requires public notice, typically noticing properties within 300 feet of the perimeter property line. The time frame is to send those notices out five business days prior to the public hearing. A notice is also placed in the Novi News and there is a spot on the City website that speaks of public hearing notices, as well as the Planning Commission agenda. The agenda is also posted in the lobby of the Civic Center.

Chair Pehrson stated that he would support the postponement at this time to get more pieces of information relative to the trees, the traffic and the wetlands, to make certain those items are finalized prior to granting approval.

Attorney Dove stated that he had a question for the developer regarding the trees. He asked about his willingness to place them on the perimeter and if he is willing to do it within conservation easements.

The developer stated that he is not ready to answer that question at this time. He prefers to plant the trees without the restriction on the homeowners.

Attorney Dove advised the Commission that he has seen it done in absence of conservation easements by a homeowner that feels they do not have enough room in their backyard to do what they want, and will remove trees that were required at the time of approval. Without a conservation easement, the municipality has little if any enforcement mechanism. That would be a key if it were to be explored; to have that in place, then it could explain the City's policy. A homeowner might read their Master Deed and there might be a conservation easement there and the association may have the ability to enforce it. At the end of the day, if the homeowner wants a swimming pool or a playground installed, there may not be enough room, so there may be some logistical problems with that solution.

Chair Pehrson asked with this being a condo association, anything relative to low phosphate fertilizers, would it be in the association paperwork as well.

Deputy Director McBeth confirmed that it could be in their documents.

Attorney Dove stated that if they motion to postpone, there is no harm in asking for a report from staff on the city's policy regarding the location or replacement trees.

**ROLL CALL VOTE ON THE PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN, WETLAND PERMIT, WOODLAND PERMIT AND STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN TO POSTPONE MADE BY MEMBER GRECO AND SECONDED BY MEMBER LYNCH**

**In the matter of Montebello Estates, JSP 15-7621, motion to postpone the Preliminary Site Plan, Wetland Permit, Woodland Permit and Stormwater Management Plan because the City and the developer are coming in with more final plans or at least decisions regarding the wetland determinations, the wetland**

permit, and the woodland permit. A report is being requested by the staff regarding the location or placement of replacement trees. The City is also to use its consultants to do a study of the traffic on Nine Mile Road to the west of the proposed entranceway, taking into consideration the streets going into and out of the subdivisions, and the driveway to the apartment complex. *Motion carried 4-0.*

Deputy Director McBeth stated that prior to the next hearing for this case they would like to send out another public notice so those interested will be informed. Residents can also contact the Community Development Department to find out the status of the plans if they choose to do so.

#### 4. AUTONEUM JSP14-0080

Public Hearing at the request of Dembs Development, Inc. to approve the Preliminary Site Plan and a Stormwater Management Plan for Autoneum. The subject property is located in Section 12, south of Thirteen Mile Road, between Haggerty Road and Cabot Drive. The applicant is proposing to construct a 2-story office/research & development building, consisting of 47,170 square feet of office space, 31,404 square feet of high bay and technical areas, and 8,132 square feet of warehouse area.

Planner Gruba stated that the subject property is south of Thirteen Mile located between Cabot Drive and Haggerty Road. The property is currently vacant and it is two parcels. The parcels are approximately 4.5 acres and 5.0 acres. The applicant plans to combine the two parcels, and then split them again into approximately a 7.6 acre parcel and a 2.4 acre parcel. The 7.6 acre parcel would be for Autoneum, and the 2.4 acre parcel would remain vacant at this time.

The surrounding land uses are zoned OST, Office Service Technology. To the east is single-family residential in Farmington Hills, to the south and the north is research and development, and to the west it is vacant.

The building would be approximately 81,000 square feet with the option for a second story mezzanine which would add approximately 10,000 square feet. The site was built to accommodate this addition which would be on the second floor, so it would not be an expansion of the footprint but an expansion of the floor area on the second floor. The plan has been reviewed by all applicable City departments as well as the traffic consultant, façade consultant, and environmental consultant.

The City's traffic consultant, AECOM, reviewed the plan and recommended approval, however they are also requiring that a traffic study be performed for the site. There are no wetlands or woodlands on site. There are some small unregulated wetlands on site, but they do not require a permit. The façade consultant reviewed the plans, and there is a rendering for viewing tonight and it meets the code in terms of the amount of brick material, split face block, and no waivers are required.

For the vacant parcel to the west, the Planning Department is recommending that the sidewalk be completed. It is one of the last two incomplete sections on the east side of Cabot Drive between Thirteen Mile and Twelve Mile. They are also recommending a sidewalk to connect the building to the sidewalk on Cabot.

The applicant has offered a response letter to all the consultants' outstanding comments which are minor in nature, and the applicant has stated that all items will be addressed in the Final Site Plan review.

The traffic consultant has also recommended that stub street connections be provided to the vacant parcels to the west, to the northeast and to the southeast. They feel now is the time to have them installed, ready for new developments. The Planning Department is requesting that the Planning Commission take the action of holding the advertised public hearing and approve the site plan and stormwater management plan.

Chair Pehrson asked the applicant to address the Planning Commission.

Glen Jones with Dembs Development was present. He stated that Chip Faudie with Faudie Architecture and Tom Gizoni with Alpine Engineering were here with him. They are happy to present another project they are sure to be successful. Autoneum is a large tier one automotive supplier, and is a research and development testing firm that specializes in automotive heat transfer as well as sound and acoustic testing. They are a Fortune 500 company with locations around the world, and are based out of Switzerland. This will be one of their main headquarters for their corporate offices as well as the research and development section. They

presented a finished board with a rendering and provided some additional views for the Commission.

Chair Pehrson opened the case to public hearing. No one in the audience wished to speak, and he asked if there was any correspondence.

Member Lynch stated there was one letter and he thinks he may have read it for the previous case. The letter is from Jay Gabriel who is in objection to the proposal. He feels there are too many commercial buildings across from his subdivision.

Chair Pehrson closed the public hearing, and turned the case over to the Commission.

Motion by Member Greco and seconded by Member Lynch.

**ROLL CALL VOTE ON THE PRELIMINAR SITE PLAN APPROVAL FOR AUTONEUM, JSP14-80 MADE BY MEMBER GRECO AND SECONDED BY MEMBER LYNCH.**

In the matter of the request of Autoneum JSP14-80 to approve the Preliminary Site Plan based on the subject to the following:

- a. Traffic Impact Statements required with Final Site Plan submittal;
- b. Vehicle stub street connections and easements provided to the vacant OST-zone parcels to the northeast and northwest as per the traffic consultant's recommendation. A stub street connection should also be provided to the OST-zoned parcel to the southeast with an existing house;
- c. The findings of compliance with the Ordinance standards in the staff review letter and the conditions and the items listed in that letter being addressed.

This motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Article 3, Article 4, Article 5, and Article 6 of the Zoning Ordinance and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance. *Motion carried 4-0.*

Motion by Member Greco and seconded by Member Lynch.

**ROLL CALL VOTE ON THE STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN APPROVAL FOR AUTONEUM, JSP14-80 MADE BY MEMBER GRECO AND SECONDED BY MEMBER LYNCH.**

In the matter of the request of Autoneum JSP14-80 to approve the Stormwater Management Plan based on and subject to the findings of compliance with Ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters, and the conditions and items listed in those letters being addressed on the Final Site Plan. 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. *Motion carried 4-0.*

**MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION**

There were no matters for consideration.

**MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION**

There were no matters for discussion.

**SUPPLEMENTAL ISSUES**

There were no Supplemental Issues.

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION**

No one in the audience wished to speak.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Motion to adjourn by Member Greco and seconded by Member Lynch:

**Motion to adjourn the January 13, 2016 Planning Commission Meeting. *Motion carried 4-0.***

The meeting was adjourned at 10:25 PM.

Transcribed by Stephanie Ramsay

Date Approved:

---

Richelle Leskun, Planning Assistant  
Signature on File