



PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

CITY OF NOVI

Regular Meeting

December 11, 2013 7:00 PM

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

CALL TO ORDER

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

ROLL CALL

Present: Member Anthony, Member Baratta, Member Giacometti, Member Greco, Member Lynch, Chair Pehrson

Absent: Member Zuchlewski (excused)

Also Present: Barbara McBeth, Deputy Director of Community Development; Kristen Kapelanski, Planner; Sara Roediger, Planner; Gary Dovre, City Attorney; Adam Wayne, Staff Engineer.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Moved by Member Lynch, seconded by Member Anthony:

VOICE VOTE ON THE AGENDA APPROVAL MOTION MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER ANTHONY:

Motion to approve the December 11, 2013 Planning Commission Agenda. Motion carried 6-0.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

No one in the audience wished to speak.

CORRESPONDENCE

There was no Correspondence.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

There were no Committee Reports.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPUTY DIRECTOR REPORT

Deputy Director McBeth mentioned a couple of items that the City Council recently considered and approved that the Planning Commission had also considered. The Socialite Bistro awning addition was approved at the November 25th Council meeting. Also at the meeting, the revised Planned Rezoning Overlay Agreement for the Medilodge group was approved. That was simply to relocate the sanitary sewer for that development.

CONSENT AGENDA - REMOVALS AND APPROVAL

1. Tom's Bar & Grill JSP13-45

Consideration of the request of Tom P LLC #6 for Revised Stormwater Management Plan approval. The subject property is 1.88 acres in Section 16 of the City of Novi and located at 27200 Beck Road at the southeast corner of Citygate Drive and Beck Road in the OST, Planned Office Service Technology District. The applicant is proposing a 5,700 square foot sit-down restaurant.

ROLL CALL VOTE ON THE STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN APPROVAL MOTION MADE BY MEMBER ANTHONY AND SECONDED BY MEMBER LYNCH:

In the matter of Tom's Bar & Grill, JSP13-45, motion to approve the Revised Stormwater Management Plan, based on and subject to:

- a. City Council DCS variance required for areas with less than 3 feet of cover to top of storm sewer pipe; and
- b. 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 Final Site Plan.

This motion is made because the plan otherwise in compliance with Chapter 11 of the Code of Ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance. *Motion carried 6-0.*

2. Indo Fusion, JSP13-78

Consideration of the request of Marygrove Awning for a recommendation to City Council for a Preliminary Site Plan and Section 9 Façade Waiver. The subject property is located at the 12 Mile Crossing at Fountain Walk shopping center in Section 15 at 44175 12 Mile Road in the RC, Regional Center District. The applicant is proposing to add black fabric canopies over the west and north elevations near the entrance of Indo Fusion restaurant.

ROLL CALL VOTE ON THE PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN APPROVAL MOTION MADE BY MEMBER ANTHONY AND SECONDED BY MEMBER LYNCH:

In the matter of Indo Fusion, JSP13-78, motion to recommend approval of the Preliminary Site Plan and Section 9 façade waiver to allow an overage of fabric awnings on the basis that the proposed alteration represents an improvement in the existing façade that is compatible with the existing façade and with adjacent buildings, and is generally in keeping with the intent and purpose of Section 2520. *Motion carried 6-0.*

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Berkshire Pointe JSP13-47

Public hearing at the request of Ivanhoe Companies for Preliminary Site Plan, Wetland Permit, Woodland Permit and Stormwater Management Plan approval. The subject property is located in Section 18, on the west side of Wixom Road, south of Grand River Avenue in the RM-1, Low Density Low-Rise Multiple-Family Residential District (with a Planned Rezoning Overlay). The subject property is 29.20 acres and the applicant is proposing an 86 unit single-family residential development.

Planner Kapelanski said the applicant is proposing to develop 86 single-family homes on a 29.2 acre site on the west side of Wixom Road south of Grand River. The parcels are currently made up of vacant land and vacant industrial property. To the north in the City of Wixom is an existing shopping center. To the east across Wixom Road are a car dealership and a shopping center. And to the west and south is property owned by Catholic Central High School that includes the school building, athletic fields and vacant land. The subject property was recently rezoned to RM-1, Low Density, Low-Rise Multiple-Family Residential with a Planned Rezoning Overlay. The site is bordered by B-3 and FS zoning to the north in the City of Wixom, B-3 and I-1 zoning to the east, R-4 zoning to the west and R-1 and I-1 zoning to the south.

The future land use map indicates community commercial uses for the subject property and the properties to the east. The properties to the north are planned for Village Center Area on the City of Wixom's Future Land Use Map. The properties to the west and south are planned for Educational Facilities. The recent rezoning was contrary to the current recommendations of the Future Land Use map. The applicant's concept plan shows an 86 unit detached single-family development. The plan shows on-site detention on the north side of the site, open space areas and the preservation of a large wetland area along the site's northern property line. The Preliminary Site Plan is consistent with the approved PRO concept plan. The planning review recommends approval noting there are minor items to address on the Final Site Plan submittal. The engineering review also recommends approval. The applicant must verify the development's stormwater discharge does not exceed the capacity of the proposed outlet.

Additionally, a City Council variance from the Design and Construction Standards is required to permit a water main stub in excess of 800 feet.

Planner Kapelanski concluded noting the traffic review recommends approval stating a Planning Commission waiver for opposite-side driveway spacing related to the boulevard design is required and supported. The wetland review recommends approval and states a non-minor use wetland permit is required along with an Authorization to Encroach into the 25 foot Natural Features Setback. A woodland permit is also required and the woodland review recommends approval of the plan. The Planning Commission has been asked to grant a waiver to allow greater credit for upsized woodland replacement plantings. The façade, fire and landscape reviews all recommend approval with items to be addressed on future submittals.

Gary Shapiro of the Ivanhoe Company said it's been a long road. We've enjoyed working with your staff and tonight we respectfully request your approval. This is also a good transition from high quality residential to the existing uses instead of the commercial and industrial uses that were originally planned. We spent a lot of time working on making this a unique development with pocket parks and accenting and protecting the natural features. We're quite proud of it. We look forward to making it happen.

Chair Pehrson opened the public hearing.

No one from the audience wished to speak and Member Lynch read the correspondence into the record.

Steven Weiner, Vice President of Cadillac Asphalt, supports the plan.

Jefferson Thompson, of 27225 Wixom Road, also supports this plan. We are in general support of the proposed site plan which we feel is a more desirable transition from the educational use of the adjacent school property.

There was no additional correspondence and Chair Pehrson closed the public hearing.

Member Greco said he is happy that residential is going in at this corner since we've got commercial all around there and I think more commercial could congest the area. My one concern is the two outlets to Wixom Road and none to the north. There will be a lot of traffic because of all the new units.

Member Lynch said this is the best use of the property based on the other alternatives as far as not only the beauty of that area, but the traffic congestion. The other alternatives that we had were for more traffic. This is probably the most desirable alternative and I'm looking forward to this project. I think you guys did a good job. I appreciate you working with staff and getting all this stuff wrapped up before coming to the Planning Commission.

Member Baratta said the at a previous meeting there was discussion about the access being in line with Sam's Club and he had a chance to go out there and just look at that project and the applicant made the right choice with those two access points. It would be a much more difficult left turn coming out of the mile road just north of the property than having those two access points where they're currently at. It is a good project and will be a good transition from to the school and the rest of the properties.

Member Anthony said I think you're going to find that all of us are in support of this. Could you expand on the pedestrian connection to the north?

Mr. Shapiro said if you go down to the end towards the cul-de-sac, there's going to be pedestrian connection. There's a gate for emergency access for fire protection. It will be a low-key, landscaped

area. There will be a pedestrian sidewalk within our community going over to the shopping center.

Moved by Member Anthony and seconded by Member Lynch:

ROLL CALL VOTE ON THE PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN APPROVAL MOTION MADE BY MEMBER ANTHONY AND SECONDED BY MEMBER LYNCH:

In the matter of Berkshire Pointe, JSP13-47, motion to approve the Preliminary Site Plan based on and subject to the following:

- a. City Council Design and Construction Standards variance to allow a water main stub in excess of 800 feet;
- b. Planning Commission opposite-side driveway spacing waiver for the off-set boulevard entrance, which is hereby granted;
- c. Planning Commission waiver to allow greater credit for upsized woodland replacement plantings, which is hereby granted;
- d. The findings of compliance with Ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters and the conditions and the items listed in those letters being addressed on the Final Site Plan.

This motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with the PRO Agreement and PRO Concept Plan, Article 4, Article 6, Article 24 and Article 25 of the Zoning Ordinance and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance. *Motion carried 6-0.*

Moved by Member Anthony and seconded by Member Greco:

ROLL CALL VOTE ON THE WETLAND PERMIT APPROVAL MOTION MADE BY MEMBER ANTHONY AND SECONDED BY MEMBER GRECO:

In the matter of Berkshire Pointe, JSP13-47, motion 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 the PRO Agreement and PRO Concept Plan and Chapter 12, Article V of the Code of Ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance. *Motion carried 6-0.*

Moved by Member Anthony and seconded by Member Greco:

ROLL CALL VOTE ON THE WOODLAND PERMIT APPROVAL MOTION MADE BY MEMBER ANTHONY AND SECONDED BY MEMBER GRECO:

In the matter of Berkshire Pointe, JSP13-47, motion to approve the Woodland Permit based on and subject to the following:

- a. Planning Commission waiver to allow greater credit for upsized woodland replacement plantings which is hereby granted; and
- b. 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 the PRO Agreement and PRO Concept Plan and Chapter 37 of the Code of Ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance. *Motion carried 6-0.*

Moved by Member Anthony and seconded by Member Greco:

ROLL CALL VOTE ON THE STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN APPROVAL MOTION MADE BY MEMBER ANTHONY AND SECONDED BY MEMBER GRECO:

In the matter of Berkshire Pointe, JSP13-47, motion to approve the Stormwater Management Plan, subject to:

- c. The applicant verifying the development's stormwater discharge does not exceed the capacity of the proposed outlet; and
- d. The findings of compliance with Ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters and the conditions and the items listed in those letters being addressed on the Final Site Plan.

This motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with the PRO Agreement and PRO Concept Plan and Chapter 11 of the Code of Ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance. *Motion carried 6-0.*

2. **Fox Run JSP13-64**

Public hearing at the request of Erickson Living for Planning Commission's recommendation to the City Council of a Revised Preliminary Site Plan with a PD-1 Option, Revised Special Land Use Permit, Revised Phasing Plan, Revised Woodland Permit and Revised Stormwater Management Plan approval. The subject property is 102.8 acres in Section 1 of the City of Novi and located north of Thirteen Mile Road and west of M-5 in the RM-1, Low Density Low-Rise Multiple-Family District. The applicant is proposing to revise the original approval and layout of the remaining buildings in Phase 2.

Planner Kapelanski said the applicant is proposing changes to the Fox Run Village project, mainly focusing on the remaining parts of Phase 2. The Fox Run development is located north of Thirteen Mile Road and west of M-5. It is surrounded by Haverhill Farms and The Maples of Novi residential developments to the north, Lenox Park and Brightmoor Tabernacle to the east, Hometown Novi to the west and single-family homes and vacant land to the south. The subject property is currently zoned RM-1, Low Density, Low-Rise Multiple-Family Residential. To the north is RA, Residential Acreage and R-2, OneFamily Residential zoning. To the east is MH, Mobile Home zoning with RA zoning to the south and west.

The future land use map indicates community commercial uses for the subject property with office uses to the west and although not shown on the map, expressway service and quasi-public uses in the City of Farmington Hills. There are existing natural features on the site, both woodlands and wetlands, mostly located in the north portion of the site. The applicant is proposing to revise the layout of the remaining portions of Phase II and to eliminate a proposed building in Phase III. Phases I and IV have been constructed. The building footprints and surface parking lots in Phases 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5 have been revised. The total number of units on the site has not changed but some units have been shifted from one building to another as part of this submittal. The planning, engineering, traffic, landscaping, façade and fire reviews all recommend approval of the plan with items to be addressed on the next plan submittal. Although there are natural features on the site, no new impacts to those natural features are proposed as part of the new site plan. The Planning Commission is asked to approve the Revised Woodland Permit this evening as the previous permit for the entire site has expired. The plan was approved using the Planned Development Option which includes several factors noted in the planning review letter the Planning Commission should consider. All plans using this option must be approved by the City Council after a recommendation from the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission is asked to recommend approval of the Revised Special Land Use Permit, Revised Preliminary Site Plan with PD-1 Option, Revised Phasing Plan, Revised Woodland Permit and Revised Stormwater Management Plan.

Mathew Quinn, attorney appearing on behalf Erickson Living Fox Run, said their team is available to answer questions.

JJ Wilhour, representative of Erickson Living, said he appreciated the planning staff's help in getting us to this point.

Mr. Quinn said he'd also like to thank the Building Division for working on tying up loose ends related to the phases already constructed.

Chair Pehrson opened the public hearing and asked if anyone in the audience would like to address the Planning Commission on this matter.

Edward Braun, president of one of the associations' boards of The Maples of Novi, said they thought that the buildings were going to come a lot closer than they are but they met with planning staff before the meeting and are comfortable with what is being proposed. It will not really have too much of an effect on them.

Jason Mardues, resident of Maples of Novi, said I'd like it to be known that in 1991 my family chose to move out here from Southfield where our property backed up to a cement factory, which then again backed up to Eight Mile Road. As you can imagine, not the most hospitable place to raise a family. My parents chose to move us here to get us into the wilderness, to have a place to run and not be afraid of traffic and so forth. I find that over the past twenty some years, even more families have come out here and are enjoying the wilderness. I don't see that encroaching upon that is necessary.

Norman Schmidt, resident of Lenox Park, said he sent a letter regarding the planning of this. I simply wanted to emphasize paragraph number two which indicates that the current plan does not address the east edge of the area; east of Fox Run Drive and then over toward the chain linked fence and then from the area around where Lanford Drive intersects Fox Run Drive and further north. We strongly request that the plans be changed to increase the density of the trees to provide screening between Fox Run and Lenox Park. And furthermore, that additional screening would also help in mitigating the construction noise and dust. Then it would serve further as the residents move in.

No one else from the audience wished to speak and Chair Pehrson asked the secretary to read the correspondence into the record.

Member Lynch read the correspondence.

Norman Schmidt objects saying that we are concerned about loss of privacy due to the high rise proposed locations. The plan does not address the area between the east edge of Fox Run Drive and the chain linked fence, starting from approximately 20 feet south of the Lanford Drive emergency gate and proceeding north to where Fox Run Road bends west. Also, regarding the existing and planned parking lots, although the plan shows significant amounts of evergreen trees, additional effective screening can be provided by a berm between the parking lots and Fox Run Drive. Additionally, water run-off may impact the wetlands in back of Lanford Drive and the Lanford Drive road. We are concerned with large amounts of noise and dust during construction. Also, project timing is unknown so we request more information regarding the timing of each building and parking area as it pertains to each phase. Finally, we would like to request continued information and involvement and are pleased that Novi works with affected residents.

Lawrence Altomare, a resident of Lenox Park objects to the plan. He is concerned with the loss of privacy due to the new high rise proposed location, also his home directly faces the proposed property changes and this proposal has a negative impact on his privacy and the value of his property. Also, the parking lot and road do not appear to have sufficient or effective traffic screening. Then, he is concerned with the large amount of dirt that will enter the windows and air conditioning unit and the dirt that will deposit on the roof and siding. Next, there is a concern with the water run-off that might impact the wetlands in back of Lanford Drive as well as the sewer and draining of the streets. Finally, they would like more information regarding the timing of the building as it pertains to each phase.

Jack McMinn is a Lenox Park resident. He says that the site plans of the planned development of Fox Run do not acknowledge or show the homes on Lanford Drive. Also, the parking lot would need adequate screening to block the lights and obscure the view from the buildings. He wants to line the east side of the Fox Run Road with tall evergreen trees to provide privacy. Concerns were raised with the wetlands because he doesn't want a swamp created that could flood their basements.

Coren Fifer, Timothy Fifer, and Norman Frechette all live on 13 Mile Road and approve of the project.

Amy Patterson objects because of the disruption to wildlife and potential decrease to property values. There was no additional correspondence and Chair Pehrson closed the public hearing.

Member Lynch said he read through this packet and it appears there aren't any detrimental traffic impacts. From the engineering review, it says that it's water and sanitary sewer service and stormwater management is acceptable. It is compatible with the natural features. The applicant should keep the information flowing between the neighbors in the development and the neighbors adjacent to the property. Certainly, with a project this size, you should be able to at least speak to them and try to work things out. Overall, I'm in approval of the proposal.

Member Baratta said he agreed with Member Lynch. After reading all the comments, I wonder if the petitioners listened to the other residents and really I boiled down their concerns to 1) the height of the trees for better screening, 2) the timing of the construction and 3) ideas to keep the dust down. Could the applicant summarize the issues of the residents to answer their questions?

Mr. Wilhour said we certainly want to be neighborly and take into consideration keeping our neighbors apprised of what we're doing, construction wise. Regarding the berm, Ken Weikal, our Landscape Architect may be able to talk more about what we have planned. I can speak to the construction. We plan to build Residential Building 2.3 starting this spring with the help of the Building Department to get an early foundation and footings permit to start work. We don't have an exact time table for the next two buildings, but we're expecting to build them within the next two years, following Residential Building 2.3. They are listed chronologically, so we'd follow with Residential Building 2.4 and then Residential Building 2.5.

Member Baratta asked is there a specific time that you'll construct?

Mr. Wilhour said they would adhere to the local ordinance regarding times.

Staff Engineer Wayne said the City's work hour requirements are 1am to 7pm Monday through Saturday.

Member Baratta said as a means to keep the dust down, do you pour or spray water to keep the dust down? Or do you do other things?

Mr. Wilhour said it's going to depend on the conditions that we see on the site.

Ken Weikal, Landscape Architect for the project, said there are evergreen screen plantings between the parking lot and the sidewalk. The reason we didn't include any additional landscaping between the road and the Lenox Park property was that the required landscaping was installed with the Phase 1 plan. I'm going to review this with Erickson but we'll plan on meeting with the homeowners and strengthening that planting along there.

Member Anthony said he wanted to comment on the chain linked fence that was in that area. I'm not sure if that is owned by Fox Run or not. With the way that it is now, that could be an eyesore. Could you

comment on that if you're aware of it at all?

Ken Weikal said with the original approvals of Fox Run, and this was well before Lenox Park was developed, the chain linked fence does run down along the property line. There's a fire lane over closer to the church around the south and there's a future proposed fire lane to the north where the Lenox Park Road comes up and stubs just at the fence. So I think we're still working out with this phase if that's going to be required by the Fire Department. Originally it was, but now I'm not so sure that it is. In the landscape, it pretty much disappears with all the landscaping on both sides and the woods but it's that sort of open area at the end at the road. If it's not required by the Fire Department, I would add landscaping there.

Member Anthony said so you're going to work with staff on the status of screening in that area?

Mr. Weikal said yes.

Chair Pehrson said it is encouraging to see senior developments to come to Novi and in this case, expand. I think it's exciting to see that this property is growing up as opposed to out. It's nice to see higher rise buildings to protect some of the natural features that the property has, so good luck with your project. I am concerned though with some of the concerns of the residents so I hope you can work those out.

Moved by Member Greco and seconded by Member Anthony:

ROLL CALL VOTE ON THE SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT APPROVAL MOTION MADE BY MEMBER GRECO AND SECONDED BY MEMBER ANTHONY:

In the matter of Fox Run, JSP13-64, motion to recommend approval to the City Council of the Revised Special Land Use permit based on the following findings:

Relative to other feasible uses of the site:

- **The proposed use will not cause any detrimental impact on existing thoroughfares as indicated in the traffic review letter;**
- **Subject to satisfying the requirements in the Engineering Review the proposed use will not cause any detrimental impact on the capabilities of public services and facilities because the plan adequately addresses and provides for water and sanitary sewer service and management of stormwater volumes;**
- **The proposed use is compatible with the natural features and characteristics of the land as no new impacts to natural features are proposed;**
- **The proposed use is compatible with adjacent uses of land as indicated in the staff and consultant review letters;**
- **The proposed use is consistent with the goals, objectives and recommendations of the City's Master Plan for Land Use;**
- **The proposed use will promote the use of land in a socially and economically desirable manner; and**
- **The proposed use is listed among the provision of uses requiring special land use review as set forth in the various zoning districts of this Ordinance, and is in harmony with the purposes and conforms to the applicable site design regulations of the zoning district in which it is located.**

This motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Article 6, Article 24 and Article 25 of the Zoning Ordinance and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance. Motion carried 6-0.

Moved by Member Greco and seconded by Member Anthony:

ROLL CALL VOTE ON THE PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN APPROVAL MOTION MADE BY MEMBER GRECO AND SECONDED BY MEMBER ANTHONY:

In the matter of Fox Run, JSP13-64, motion to recommend approval to the City Council of the Revised Preliminary Site Plan with a PD-1 Option based on and subject to the following:

- a. City Council finding that the standards of Section 2404.4.A of the Zoning Ordinance are adequately addressed;
- b. Applicant providing a material sample board that demonstrates that the proposed colors will be harmonious with the existing buildings;
- c. 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 Revised Final Site Plan; and
- d. The developer's commitment to work with the adjacent properties and follow through on their comments made at the December 11, 2013 Planning Commission meeting, which the Planning Commission recommends the Council require.

This motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Article 6, Article 24 and Article 25 of the Zoning Ordinance and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance. *Motion carried 6-0.*

Moved by Member Greco and seconded by Member Anthony:

ROLL CALL VOTE ON THE PHASING PLAN APPROVAL MOTION MADE BY MEMBER GRECO AND SECONDED BY MEMBER ANTHONY:

In the matter of Fox Run, JSP13-64, motion to recommend approval to the City Council of the Revised Phasing 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 Article 6, Article 24 and Article 25 of the Zoning Ordinance and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance. *Motion carried 6-0.*

Moved by Member Greco and seconded by Member Anthony:

ROLL CALL VOTE ON THE REVISED WOODLAND PERMIT APPROVAL MOTION MADE BY MEMBER GRECO AND SECONDED BY MEMBER ANTHONY:

In the matter of Fox Run, JSP13-64, motion to recommend approval to the City Council of the Revised 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 6-0.*

Moved by Member Greco and seconded by Member Anthony:

ROLL CALL VOTE ON THE STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN APPROVAL MOTION MADE BY MEMBER GRECO AND SECONDED BY MEMBER ANTHONY:

In the matter of Fox Run, JSP13-64, motion to recommend approval to the City Council of the Stormwater Management Plan, subject to the findings of compliance with Ordinance standards in the

staff and consultant review letters and the conditions and the items listed in those letters being addressed on the Final Site Plan. This motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Chapter 11 of the Code of Ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance. Motion carried 6-0.

3. THE PRESERVE AT ISLAND LAKE (PHASE 8) JSP13-69

Public hearing at the request of Toll Brothers, Inc. for recommendation to City Council for approval to include the subject property in the existing Island Lake of Novi by amending the Residential Unit Development (RUD) Plan and for Preliminary Site Plan, Woodland Permit and Stormwater Management Plan approval. The subject property is 48.95 acres in Section 19 of the City of Novi and located at the northeast corner of Ten Mile Road and Napier Road. The applicant is proposing a 45 unit development that would be Phase 8 of the existing Island Lake of Novi development. The applicant has also proposed to modify the number of units permitted in the RUD Agreement from 884 to 903 in order to allow for this development.

Planner Sara Roediger said the applicant is proposing to add a 48.95 acre parcel to the existing Island Lake of Novi Residential Unit Development (RUD) in order to construct 45 single-family detached homes. The subject property is located at the northeast corner of Napier and Ten Mile Roads. The subject property is zoned RA, Residential Acreage and is surrounded by RA zoning to the north and east, with R-1 One-Family Residential zoning to the south. To the west is land zoned Agricultural Residential in Lyon Township. The Future Land Use map indicates single-family uses for the subject property with single-family and park uses planned for the surrounding properties. There are regulated woodlands on the vast majority of the property and seven wetland areas that are not shown on the natural features map but have been identified in the field and are shown on the site plan. Many of these features are located on the western portion of the site and over 65% of the regulated trees and 96% of the regulated wetlands are being preserved. The proposed development will result in 45 single-family detached homes that would connect to the existing Orchards phase of Island Lake through Kennebee Drive to the east and Nepavine Drive to the north, extending the road south to Ten Mile Road. The applicant has proposed over 20 acres, or roughly 45% of the site, as open space. The applicant has also offered to construct a new kiddie pool and bike racks at the Island Lake Clubhouse. The planning review recommends approval of the proposed RUD Plan amendment and preliminary site plan to allow development of the subject property. As a discretionary review, the Planning Commission should consider the various standards from Section 2402 outlined and listed in the planning review letter. In response to some of the concerns from the public that have been received, staff has worked with the applicant to increase landscaping along the northern property line to better buffer existing homes.

Planner Roediger continued saying that the applicant has requested a City Council modification of lot size and width consistent with the other phases of Island Lake and a City Council variance for the local street width standard to be reduced for the purposes of a traffic calming device. The applicant has also requested City Council variances for the location of the pathway along Napier Road and the sidewalk along Ten Mile Road to deviate from the one foot from the right-of-way requirement to protect natural features. Staff supports this deviation, with the exception of the south portion of Napier Road as depicted in Option A. The applicant maintains their preference to continue this deviation south to Ten Mile Road as depicted as Option B. All reviews are recommending approval of the proposed plan with items to be addressed on the final site plan. There is a landscape waiver required for the discontinuation of the berms in the location of existing vegetation and wetlands, with the exception of lots 1, 2 and 45 which is supported by staff. The Planning Commission is asked to hold a public hearing and make a recommendation to City Council for approval to include the subject property in the existing Island Lake of Novi and to modify the number of units permitted from 884 to 903 by amending the RUD Plan. The Planning Commission is also asked to approve the Preliminary Site Plan, Wetland Permit, Woodland Permit and Stormwater Management Plan, subject to the RUD amendment being approved by the City Council.

Mike Noles, of Toll Brothers said, said it's a pleasure to be back with you again today with an exciting new property to be incorporated into an exciting old property. Last time I was in front of you, we were here proposing the Dinser property, which became the Reserve at Island Lake. We have now developed Phase 7A and 7B of that property. It's looking fantastic and we're very pleased with the way that turned out. This piece of property, I think, is even better. Last time I was here, you recommended that we not come back next time with a plan with less than 20% open space. This plan has 45% open space. This plan is very dynamic. It respects the natural features, we've got some fantastic woodlands and wetlands and we think they're going to be dynamic sites to be incorporated into Island Lake. We held a public meeting with the existing residents of Island Lake at the boathouse. We wanted to make sure that we didn't repeat any of the mistakes of the past where there were some surprises and misconceptions about what we were proposing. As you know, in the motion that you are considering before you tonight, it talks a little bit about varying lot sizes and making them smaller and that created confusion last time, that the lots were going to be smaller than the existing lots in Island Lake of Novi. That was not the case then and that's not the case now. These lots are the same as our executive product line within Island Lake which is directly adjacent to this section. When we met with the residents, we had a site plan that did not have an entrance out to Ten Mile Road. Overwhelmingly, they asked that we include an entrance out to Ten Mile Road. The site distance and engineering criteria for that connection are there so we agreed to do that. I think that biggest concern was without adding the entrance out to Ten Mile; we would create a lot of traffic into the existing neighborhood. The second major thing that the residents were interested in was increasing the capacity of the pool. We took a look at that and one of the most efficient and effective ways to do that was the build a kiddie pool to move the different age groups apart from one another. We already committed to building some additional pool decking with the Dinser proposal and we're doing additional decking plus paying for and constructing the kiddie pool and that was very well received. One of the variances that was mentioned talked about a traffic calming device. There were some residents that said if you introduce an entrance out to Ten Mile Road, there is a possibility that people could come off of Ten Mile Road and cut through the neighborhood. So we wanted to try to dissuade people from making that choice. So one of the things we did was narrow down the road at the tie in streets. The concept is that you narrow it down and so as you approach the connection road, the road becomes narrower and slows down traffic speed and it's a traffic calming mechanism. So we agreed to incorporate those and that should help slow traffic, should anybody want to go back through the neighborhood to cut through. Plus, the city looks at the traffic study and it found that there would be no detrimental effect as a result of the traffic. The last major thing to consider this evening is the path issue. One of the things we looked at with the path was adding some interest to the path. So we wanted it to meander through some of the preserved areas that we're keeping. It makes sense that if you're going to preserve that much acreage, you want to try to enjoy it in some way or another. The path is a low impact improvement so that people can enjoy walking through the woods and around the wetlands. Normally, it's required to be right along the road right-of-way. As you can see, that would go through several wetlands. The problem with going through wetlands is then you need a boardwalk. Staff pointed out some very good considerations. Their concerns were about clearing the paths so the more twist and turns you put into the path, the more difficult it becomes with the snow clearing equipment. So that was one of the major concerns about adding too much undulation within the path. So we think we struck a happy medium. There was just one spot in the very corner where we add the little stub that go directly to the corner, but it was unclear about whether or not that would create confusion if people would end up going to the corner and then having to come back if they wanted to go north rather than just turning directly north from the corner and continue on their way. The issue is one of are people going to be able to figure out the layout of the path or are they going to be able to get to where they're trying to go. The applicant, Toll Brothers, has no objection to either option. I personally prefer the meandering path through the woods without the boardwalk, but it's not a deal breaker for us. Whatever you guys recommend, we're happy to go with that option. We just thought we'd lay both proposals out there for you and let you decide what you want us to do. That's all I have and I'm available for questions if you have any. I also have our civil engineer Tom Gazoni here tonight, if

you have any technical questions. In addition, Jason Minack who is our Assistant Vice President of Operations and he's been a long time member of the Island Lake team.

Rob David, Island Lake Resident, said thanks for taking the time to address this. It's a very important addition to a wonderful development. That's why I moved there a few months ago which is very hard to do. It's very hard to find properties there because everybody wants to live there. It's good to hear from a developer that they've addressed an issue of amenities. Obviously, the amenities were designed for the original 884 lots that were planned and they're asking for additional lots above that. It also brings about additional traffic, and I'm glad they addressed it in the comments that they made about the Ten Mile additional access point. I do drive Napier and Ten Mile often and don't enjoy it. I did talk to the Oakland County Road Commission last week to find out what the plans were for that intersection. I understand that intersection is the most challenging, dangerous and accident prone within the community. There's another development going on in South Lyon at the same intersection so there will be an abundance of new homeowners and new drivers that will come into that area. I know it might not be in your power to address that this evening, but I wonder if there's any thought to that to make it safer because more traffic on Ten Mile is going to make it more of a challenge with people trying to get out onto Ten Mile. The county road commission did say that they are planning on paving that Nine Mile to Ten Mile Napier stretch in 2016 but there are no plans at this point to do any a traffic light at Napier and Ten Mile. I'm just concerned that more traffic at the intersection with more neighbors will cause more trouble and that needs to be addressed in some way. Thank you.

Member Lynch said I need to make a disclosure that I am a property owner in Island Lake. I have no financial interest in this property and I believe that I can judge the project totally on its merits and I can be objective. Now, with respect to the correspondence, we have one from Ken Riley, Island Lake resident, who supports the project. He says that he feels Toll Brothers will do an excellent job with this phase of Island Lake. We have another from Siddharth Sirsikar of Island Lake who objects the plan as the proposed location is right behind his home. The woods behind his house are peaceful and tranquil. This is the primary reason for buying this residence. It defeats their entire concept of a home. Plus construction would be a major nuisance. Finally, they'd lose privacy with having extra neighbors. We have another objection from Hyeong Shim of Island Lake to protect the natural environments. Novi should protect wetlands in every way possible and per that map there is a wetland area behind their house. Next, we have a letter from Glenn and Lauren Sawyer objecting the plan. They are complaining about a buffer and a screen at the rear of their property from lot 31 to Nepavine Road. They feel they are the most impacted of all the Island Lake residents. The corner lot is the most exposed and impacted by additional traffic. They respectfully request that the Planning Commission consider requiring a site plan change for the above reasons. I have a follow up email from Glenn Sawyer, which states that he had a conversation with Jason from Island Lake and he's willing to work with them. Then, we have an email from Ben Abler of Island Lake with three concerns. First, there are over 25 children living on Nepavine Road and with increased traffic it would be unsafe for the children. Second, all residents who use the pool are concerned with the capacity and would like to see a pool expansion not just a deck expansion. Thirdly, unrelated to the expansion, there a concern about Napier and Ten Mile with increased traffic. Finally, we received an objection from Ashok Reddy of Island who is afraid this will take away from the natural open setting and increased traffic on Nepavine.

Member Barrata said I'm also a resident of Island Lake of Novi. And there's nothing that I'm involved with or have any financial interest that I would be unable to judge this project fairly. After saying that, I think that there are really only a couple of concerns that I have. The first question is the sidewalk out at Ten Mile. I'm not aware of any sidewalks that we have that meander through the woods, they're pretty straight. I guess I don't have an issue with the one that goes north, but the one off of Ten Mile, it would seem just for consistency purpose that if it were a straight sidewalk that would make a little more sense in my mind, particularly for those folks that ride bikes. I guess on the sidewalk, I would like to see that be a little more straightened out. So I can concur with the city staff about that. The one going north, I think it's

fine, I love the pathways that you have within the neighborhood and I love the neighborhood. The other question that I have, on the street where you're going to reduce the width of the street, is there going to be parking on both sides of that street?

Mr. Noles said parking is allowed on one side of that street and it will be posted.

Member Lynch said I looked at the project and I have no issue with it. I appreciate you speaking with the homeowners and resolving the issues before you got here. I think the plan is great. This is a lot less dense than what I initially expected. One question that I have, isn't that a woodchip path?

Mr. Noles said no it's not, that would be a paved pathway.

Member Lynch said so you're going to have a paved path going through the woods?

Mr. Noles said yes sir. The paths on the north side of that lake through the big wooded section, those are woodchip paths. But there's what they call a safety path, which is along the frontage. You can see the one that we installed over at Dinsler, the Catholic Central Runners are using it already at our crosswalk down at Ten Mile, so that worked out very nicely. It's to allow for pedestrian circulation. It's currently an eight foot concrete path, as required. So that would be a hard surface path. Like I said before, if you prefer the straighter path, it's not a great expanse of the board walk, there's not a lot of trees adjacent, it'll be fine anyway that we work it out there.

Member Lynch said my preference is the path that meanders through, but I just thought it was a woodchip path and when they mentioned snow removal I thought it was a woodchip path. So this whole network that you show is all going to be the new surface. I don't particularly care for the boardwalk. I wouldn't mind it being a little more on Ten Mile. I think it's probably a good idea to have a little straighter shot. The second thing is, I appreciate you adding the traffic calming mechanisms since there were so many concerns about that. Some of the other comments had to deal with a common use of the pool and I think you've addressed that. Overall, it's well within the Zoning Ordinance. It's certainly the best proposal that I've seen for that area and I'm going to vote for approval.

Member Greco said I have just a couple of comments. With respect to the objections that we received, with regard to the traffic, construction and the building on open spaces and wood spaces, unfortunately those things do change and they are nuisance, but with respect to this plan I think it's a good use of the property. It looks very nice. It's consistent with the property and the overall plan. I'm so glad to hear that you guys were proactive about going to the residents and seeing what they need, addressing their concerns and even with one of the objections we had it looks like you guys are addressing the concerns very adequately. With regard to the path, I don't have any strong feelings about the Ten Mile one and I guess what we're being asked to do tonight is determine the A or B Option; along Napier road or going into the woods. I guess I don't have strong feelings either way other than perhaps being disoriented a little bit, obviously. Otherwise, I think I'm going to be voting for approval and I guess I'm going to wait for additional comments regarding other commissioners' strong feelings, perhaps, on the paths.

Member Giacometti said I would also like to congratulate you. This is a beautiful plan. I do have a few questions about the path though. I do feel strongly about the straight option as opposed to the meandering one. My question is, is the path that goes through the woods lit?

Mr. Noles said it is not.

Member Giacometti said my philosophy on walkability for the community is that it's not just for recreation, it should be for function. While this is a great asset for recreational transportation, its functionality is lacking for someone interested in non-motorized transportation up and down Napier Road. So I do feel

pretty strongly about this one. I would love to see both because I think it is a very attractive idea, but I will support the staff's recommendation for the straight path.

Member Anthony said it's been said unanimously that the applicant has done a good job in working with the community. When you first came up, I was going to look for what you were doing with the pool and recreational area because last time that was the big issue. More homes means more congestion. So I hope the kiddie pool is enough. The questions that I have though with the sidewalk is not as much as to the direction of rather it meanders or not, but does it meet city requirements? In the event where this sidewalk meanders through the woods but also serves as part of our non-motorized plan within the city, the specifications for the construction of this path, do they still comply with our sidewalk specifications with load bearing capacity, soil, substraight, width, and pavement? That's my bigger concern, so that it makes it a sustainable, longer lasting path.

Planner Roediger said I'll defer to our engineer, but a short answer yes. The only deviation from our ordinance was the one foot off of the right-of-way, but everything else should be fine.

Engineer Adam Wayne said to reiterate what Sara said, yeah. This pathway would be conveyed to the city through a public easement. So after acceptance and the infrastructure, specifically the boardwalk, is deeded over to the city, we would be responsible for maintaining that infrastructure.

Member Anthony said so that brings me to my next question. So the city is responsible for the maintenance of the sidewalk through the wooded area.

Engineer Wayne said yes sir. We would be responsible for abating any ADA trip hazards, winter maintenance, etc.

Member Anthony said so based on our experience in wooded areas where trees get bigger and routes get bigger, what do our maintenance costs and ability look like in a path that meanders through the woods versus one that along the street.

Engineer Wayne said with any pathway, you of course have a finite life span. With something that may meander through natural features, you may have down trees over paved areas whereas boardwalks through open areas, you may be more susceptible to environmental degradation just because it's exposed to the elements. Either way, there's going to be increased maintenance costs.

Member Anthony said so if I hear you correctly, it's six of one and half dozen of the other?

Engineer Wayne said yes to a certain extent.

Member Anthony said you get one path you get a completely new set of maintenance in one area, you do the other one you get a different kind of maintenance.

Engineer Wayne said to a certain extent, the boardwalks do cost more to maintain but you also get the visibility from Napier Road and the accessibility and conveyance versus the area meandering more into the woods.

Member Anthony said so if I had to pick one, I'm leaning more towards the straight as well. My last question also has to do with one of the neighbors' concerns up near lot 30 and 34. Can you describe to me in more detail about the buffer that the drawing has depicted.

Mr. Noles said we specified of our own accord a fifty foot minimum buffer from the existing property line. That is not a City of Novi specification, it's something less than that, but we wanted to ensure that we

had an adequate buffer between the existing residents and the new residents. The area just north of lot 31 and runs along lot 34 and lot 30 as well, is a fifty foot wide existing wooded area. The area on the east side of the property, which would be lots 36 through 45, is a field. So on our landscape plan, you'll see that we made it full of new plantings. Right next to lot 31, behind the Sawyers' property, there really aren't any tagged trees. There's not really any regulated, tagged trees back there. So there's a lot of smaller and regenerative growth right behind their property so there's plenty of opportunities to clear out some scruffy, small unregulated trees in that area and add some additional conifers that'll provide a little bit better screening quality for those residents. And that's what we talked about today. Jason spoke with the Mr. Sawyer a couple times today and agreed to plant some additional pine trees through there to bluster the screening. It will require a little bit of clearing in that fifty foot buffer that we're talking about.

Member Anthony said so in that fifty foot buffer, is the rendering realistic with the density of plantings that you're showing there?

Mr. Noles said well it is extremely thick. With any rendering, there's a little bit of art and science involved with that. It's hard to tell the difference between new plantings and existing plantings although they don't look much different in a rendering. I wouldn't say it's a woodlands map, but we do have one of those and we do have a detailed landscape plan. Also, we meet all the requirements of the woodland ordinance and the buffering required. I think there are a couple hundred trees that we're going to plant on this property. We're always willing to plant a couple of more to keep people happy. It's a relatively inexpensive improvement to do. A lot of the work that I do is underground and nobody can really enjoy or appreciate the value of a new sanitary sewer or city water or something like that. So yeah, we agreed to plant a couple of additional trees over there and everybody wins.

Chair Pehrson said I appreciate you listening to the residents and bringing forward what I think it is a great plan. In looking at the rendering, I think I would rather see the straight boardwalk, configuration A, for this plan. I think it's just because people are creatures of habit and like to come to a corner and make 90 degree turns. But overall, it looks like a wonderful plan. So I'd be in support of somebody making a motion.

Moved by Member Anthony and seconded by Member Greco:

ROLL CALL VOTE ON THE AMENDED RESIDENTIAL UNIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN APPROVAL MOTION MADE BY MEMBER ANTHONY AND SECONDED BY MEMBER GRECO:

In the matter of The Preserve at Island Lake (Phase 8), JSP13-69, motion to recommend approval of the Amended Residential Unit Development (RUD) Plan subject to and based on and subject to the following findings and conditions:

- a. The site is appropriate for the proposed use;
- b. The development will not have detrimental effects on adjacent properties and the community;
- c. The applicant has clearly demonstrated a need for the proposed use;
- d. Care has been taken to maintain the naturalness of the site and to blend the use within the site and its surroundings;
- e. The applicant has provided clear, explicit, substantial and ascertainable benefits to the City as a result of the Amended RUD.
- f. Relative to other feasible uses of the site:
 1. All applicable provisions of Section 2402 of the Zoning Ordinance, other applicable requirements of the Zoning Ordinance, including those applicable to special land uses, and all applicable ordinances, codes, regulations and laws have been met;
 2. Adequate areas have been set aside for walkways, playgrounds, parks, recreation areas, parking areas and other open spaces and areas to be used by residents of the development;

3. Traffic circulation features within the site and the location of parking areas have been designed to assure the safety and convenience of both vehicular and pedestrian traffic both within the site and in relation to access streets;
 4. The proposed use will not cause any detrimental impact in existing thoroughfares in terms of overall volumes, capacity, safety, travel times and thoroughfare level of service;
 5. The plan provides adequate means of disposing of sanitary sewage, disposing of stormwater drainage, and supplying the development with water;
 6. The Amended RUD will provide for the preservation and creation of open space and result in minimal impacts to provided open space and natural features;
 7. The Amended RUD will be compatible with adjacent and neighboring land uses;
 8. The desirability of conventional residential development within the City is outweighed by benefits occurring from the preservation and creation of open space and the establishment of park facilities that will result from the Amended RUD;
 9. Any detrimental impact from the Amended RUD resulting from an increase in total dwelling units over that which would occur with conventional residential development is outweighed by benefits occurring from the preservation and creation of open space and the establishment of park facilities that will result from the Amended RUD;
 10. The proposed reductions in lot sizes are the minimum necessary to preserve and create open space, to provide for park sites, and to ensure compatibility with adjacent and neighboring land uses;
 11. The Amended RUD will not have a detrimental impact on the City's ability to deliver and provide public infrastructure and public services at a reasonable cost;
 12. the applicant has made satisfactory provisions for the financing of the installation of all streets, necessary utilities and other proposed improvements;
 13. The applicant has made satisfactory provisions for future ownership and maintenance of all common areas within the proposed development; and
 14. Proposed deviations from the area, bulk, yard, and other dimensional requirements of the Zoning Ordinance applicable to the property enhance the development, are in the public interest, are consistent with the surrounding area, and are not injurious to the natural features and resources of the property and surrounding area.
- g. City Council modification of proposed lot sizes to a minimum of 14,440 square feet and modification of proposed lot widths to a minimum of 91.22 feet as the requested modification will result in the preservation of open space for those purposes noted in Section 2402.3.B of the Zoning Ordinance and the Amended RUD will provide a genuine variety of lot sizes;
 - h. City Council variance from Section 11 Table 8-A of the City's Code of Ordinance to permit a local street reduction from 28 feet in width to 20 feet in width for traffic calming chokers as depicted in the proposed plans.
 - i. City Council variance from Section 11.278 (b)(5) of the City's Code of Ordinance to permit a sidewalk along Ten Mile Road to vary more than 1 foot from the right-of-way in order to protect natural resources while still maintaining a comprehensive non-motorized transportation system as depicted in the proposed plans.
 - j. City Council variance from Section 11.258 (d) of the City's Code of Ordinance to permit a bicycle path along the northern portion of Napier Road only to vary more than 1 foot from the right-of-way in order to protect natural resources while still maintaining a comprehensive non-motorized transportation system as depicted as Option A in the proposed plans.

This motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Article 3, Article 24 and Article 25 of the Zoning Ordinance and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance.

Moved by Member Anthony and seconded by Member Lynch:

ROLL CALL VOTE ON THE PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN APPROVAL MOTION MADE BY MEMBER ANTHONY AND SECONDED BY MEMBER LYNCH:

In the matter of The Preserve at Island Lake (Phase 8), JSP13-69, motion to approve the Preliminary Site Plan based on and subject to approval by City Council of the amended RUD Agreement and Plan and the following:

- e. Planning Commission waiver of the required berms in the locations of existing vegetation and wetlands with the exception of lots 1, 2 and 45; which is hereby granted; and
- f. The conditions and items listed in the staff and consultant review letters being addressed on the Final Site Plan.

This motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with the approved 6th Amendment to the RUD, Article 3, Article 24 and Article 25 of the Zoning Ordinance and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance.

Moved by Member Anthony and seconded by Member Lynch:

ROLL CALL VOTE ON THE WETLAND PERMIT APPROVAL MOTION MADE BY MEMBER ANTHONY AND SECONDED BY MEMBER LYNCH:

In the matter of The Preserve at Island Lake (Phase 8), JSP13-69, motion to approve the Wetland Permit based on and subject to approval by City Council of the amended RUD Agreement and Plan and 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.

Moved by Member Anthony and seconded by Member Lynch:

ROLL CALL VOTE ON THE WOODLAND PERMIT APPROVAL MOTION MADE BY MEMBER ANTHONY AND SECONDED BY MEMBER LYNCH:

In the matter of The Preserve at Island Lake (Phase 8), JSP13-69, motion to approve the Woodland Permit based on and subject to approval by City Council of the amended RUD Agreement and Plan and the conditions and items listed in the staff and consultant review letters being addressed on the Final Site Plan. This motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with the approved 6th Amendment to the RUD, Chapter 37 of the Code of Ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance.

Moved by Member Anthony and seconded by Member Lynch:

ROLL CALL VOTE ON THE STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN APPROVAL MOTION MADE BY MEMBER ANTHONY AND SECONDED BY MEMBER LYNCH:

In the matter of The Preserve at Island Lake (Phase 8), JSP13-69, motion to approve the Stormwater Management Plan, based on and subject to approval by City Council of the amended RUD Agreement and Plan and the conditions and items listed in the staff and consultant review letters being addressed on the Final Site Plan. *This motion is made because it otherwise in compliance with the approved 6th Amendment to the RUD, Chapter 11 of the Code of Ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance*

MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION

1. PLANNING COMMISSION 2013 END OF YEAR REPORT

Deputy Director McBeth said the annual report presented to the Planning Commission represents most of the activities considered and reviewed over this last year, 2013. This is an enhanced report from the previous years' reports with a lot more detail included. Inside it states the makeup of the Planning Commission, terms of the commission, meeting schedules for the Planning Commission, the state statute that indicates that the report is needed and that is a report to the City Council. It also includes the functional duty of the Planning Commission and the current membership.

Page three has some interesting information on it with regard to the site plans that were reviewed this year compared to 2012 and 2011. It shows that there was a sustainable increase in the number of site plans; 40 site plans reviewed in 2013 versus 20 reviewed in 2012. Also, there was an increase in special land use permits, woodland permits, wetland permits, section 9 façade waivers, and stormwater management plans. All of that was done in 14 meetings instead of 15 meetings as shown in the prior year. The report continues with just a brief summary of most of the items that were considered by the Planning Commission over the last year and it's broken down into sections: ordinance amendments, rezonings, site plans and their associated activities. Finally, the report looks forward to what will be expected to take place next year. There are two big projects. The zoning ordinance reformatting project, referred to as ClearZoning, has been going on primarily behind the scenes. That's a reformatting of the old fashion code to something that's new and updated and hyperlinked. The intent is not making significant changes to the ordinance, but reformatting it into a system that will be much more user friendly and readable. The other big project that the Planning Commission is expected to work on in the beginning of next year is the Town Center Area Study. We'll be looking at various items associated with that: the public input, the master plan, update possibilities, design guidelines, wayfindings, and the zoning ordinance amendment.

Chair Pehrson said he appreciated the work that staff did this and was looking forward to another productive year.

Member Giacometti said staff should also be congratulated because they did all this with reduced staff too. With reduced staff it has certainly been much more efficient.

2. APPROVAL OF THE NOVEMBER 13, 2013 PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Moved by Member Lynch and seconded by Member Giacometti:

VOICE VOTE ON PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES APPROVAL MOTION MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER GIACOPETTI:

Motion to approve the November 13, 2013 Planning Commission Minutes. *Motion carried 6-0.*

CONSENT AGENDA REMOVALS FOR COMMISSION ACTION

There were no Consent Agenda Removals.

MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION

1. TOWN CENTER STUDY

Deputy Director McBeth said in the packet is a partial preliminary draft that was prepared by our consultant. We've been working with them behind the scenes but also bringing forward updates to the Planning Commission periodically. This time we wanted to roll out this preliminary draft and let everybody have a chance to review and absorb what it contains. It's got quite a bit of information about the land use and master plan aspects of the study. It looks at the ten sub areas in relation to the individual intent of those areas; the desirable land uses and the urban form that's provided for each of those areas. We're looking at possible future adjustments to the City's Master Plan and we're also looking for a detailed list of desirable land uses for each of these sub areas. In January we're expecting that this

project will move forward with other documents from our consultants and additional discussions and comments before it's finalized.

Member Anthony said he talked to a property owner in the Atrium building and they are unaware of this project and would like to be a stakeholder in it.

Deputy Director McBeth said we had reached out to certain members of that group there and had an individual meeting with them and we will also forward them this update. So it may be that we're just crossing paths here.

SUPPLEMENTAL ISSUES

Chair Pehrson said in the paper, Detroit is following the lead of Novi relative to non-motorized master plans and they're thinking about closing down I-375 and making it a walkable path, which is pretty interesting. It's an interesting read that you could find in the Free Press about how big cities are trying to follow trends of the suburbs.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

No one in the audience wished to speak.

ADJOURNMENT

Moved by Member Anthony and seconded by Member Greco:

VOICE VOTE ON MOTION TO ADJOURN MADE BY MEMBER ANTHONY AND SECONDED BY MEMBER GRECO:

Motion to adjourn the December 11, 2013 Planning Commission meeting. Motion carried 6-0.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:52 PM.

Transcribed by Valentina Nuculaj
January, 2013
Date Approved: January 29, 2014

Signature on File

Richelle Leskun, Planning Assistant