

**CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF NORTHVILLE
PLANNING COMMISSION
December 5, 2017**

DATE: December 5, 2017
TIME: 7:00 PM
PLACE: Northville Township Hall
44405 Six Mile Road

APPROVED: January 30, 2018

CALL TO ORDER: 7:00 PM

ROLL CALL:

Present: Richard Allen, Lisa Anderson, Tim Guerriero, Eric Lark, George McCarthy, Jayne Watson, Tim Zawodny

Excused: None

Staff: Jennifer Frey, Township Planner
Tom Casari, Department of Public Services Director

Approval of Minutes:

Planning Commission – October 3, 2017

Approval postponed until January 30, 2018.

Other Minutes:

Zoning Board of Appeals – September 20, 2017
Board of Trustees Regular – September 21, 2017
Board of Trustees Special – October 12, 2017
Board of Trustees Regular – October 29, 2017

MOTION by Allen, support by Guerriero, to receive and file the minutes from the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting of September 20, 2017, the Board of Trustees Regular meetings of September 21 and October 29, 2017 and the Board of Trustees Special meeting of October 12, 2017.

Voice Vote: Ayes: All
Nays: None

Motion approved unanimously.

Correspondence: Township Planner Frey confirmed that no additional correspondence had been received.

Brief Public Comments: None.

New Business

1. JSPR 17-008 Belle Tire

Representative: Christina Davidson, Allen Industries (Harmon Signs)
Location: 39931 8 Mile Road (Meijer Outlot)
Request: Site Plan Amendment – 2nd Wall Sign
Action: Approve, Approve with Conditions, Postpone, Deny

Township Planner Frey gave the background for this request for a site plan amendment for a second wall sign on the north elevation of the Belle Tire building at 39931 8 Mile Road. She explained that at the August 2016 Planning Commission meeting the Commission had heard a similar request. At that time there had been some uncertainty regarding the request, and the Commission suggested waiting until the building was constructed before making a final determination regarding the sign. Tonight's request was to have a second wall sign on the north elevation, which faced 8 Mile Road. The building was an internal outlot within the Meijer complex and had an 8 Mile Road address, but the primary sign was on the south side of the building, giving visibility from within the site.

The proposed sign would be 106.16 square feet, and complied with the requirement that the sign be no greater than 60% of the size allowed for the primary sign. The Planning Commission had the discretion to approve or modify the request.

The corner of the building was visible from both 8 Mile Road and the shared along the west side of Belle Tire. Given that orientation of the building, the second sign would assist customers to locate the front of the business on the south side.

Quentin Jefferies, Belle Tire, 1000 Enterprise Drive, Allen Park MI 48101 was present on behalf of this application. Dave Brink, Allen Industries, 7844 W. Central Avenue, Toledo OH 43617 was also present.

Mr. Brink pointed out that the north side of the building was very visible from 8 Mile Road, and Belle Tire was lacking identification from 8 Mile. He asked for approval of tonight's request.

Commissioner McCarthy noted that he was not present at the August 2016 meeting. He thought the primary sign should be on the wall facing 8 Mile Road. However, the applicants had made a decision to put the primary sign on the south side where it did little to identify the location, and he did not support the addition of a second sign.

Chair Lark said the southern sign was to provide exposure on Haggerty Road.

Township Planner Frey asked the applicants to explain why one sign was chosen as primary and the other as secondary.

Mr. Brink explained that the sign facing south was visible for a small window on Haggerty Road. Belle Tire had to make a decision based on whether or not they would be allowed a second sign. If they were only allowed one sign, they preferred the exposure on Haggerty, even though that exposure was not optimum. They did understand that the Planning Commission could approve a second sign, visible from a second road.

Commissioner Zawodny said he had visited the site; the long solid brick wall on the north side gave no apparent indication of what the building was. He had been surprised at how visible the wall was from 8 Mile Road and the Meijer service drive entrance. He felt the north façade was an appropriate place for the second sign, which would enhance the appearance of that side of the building. Additionally, driving down Haggerty he counted at least 3 other businesses that had signs on 2 sides of their buildings, and that didn't have anywhere near the broad exposure that this building had. He was in favor of the request.

Commissioner Anderson said she also supported the request for the second sign. It was important to support Township businesses, and with the volume of traffic at that intersection, it made sense to have a second sign.

Chair Lark said he thought the objection from the August 2016 meeting was not to having the second sign, but rather the confusion about where the sign would be located.

Commissioner McCarthy emphasized that he felt the logical place for a primary sign was along 8 Mile Road. The applicant admitted that the primary sign as placed on the south side gave Belle Tire very little exposure to Haggerty Road.

Commissioner Allen felt Belle Tire needed the visibility on 8 Mile Road. He understood Commissioner McCarthy's point about having the primary sign on 8 Mile Road, but he also felt the applicants were the ones to make the decision about where the primary and secondary signs were placed. A customer in the parking lot needed to be able to figure out how to get to Belle Tire, and people driving on 8 Mile Road needed to understand the access there.

Commissioner Guerriero asked if there was landscaping planned or installed on the north side of the building. Mr. Jeffries replied that there was very little landscaping there.

Chair Lark asked if any public wished to speak on this matter. Seeing that no one came forward to speak, he brought the matter back to the Commission.

Commissioner Allen said he usually didn't support second signs, but in this instance the business needed support from the south and the north, and he was ready to offer a motion.

MOTION by Allen, support by Guerriero, in the matter of JSPR 17-0008, that the Planning Commission approve the site plan amendment for a second wall sign on the north side of the building at 39931 8 Mile Road as requested this evening, with the square footage as described.

Roll Call Vote: Ayes: Allen, Guerriero, Lark, McCarthy, Watson and Zawodny
 Nays: McCarthy

MOTION APPROVED 6-1 (McCarthy opposed).

Township Planner Frey instructed the applicant that the approval was subject to a full review and approval of the sign permit application.

Noting that agenda item #2 JPUD17-0003 *The Village at Northville* was likely to take some time, Chair Lark suggested hearing agenda item #3 JDO16-0003 *Mill Ridge* next. It was the consensus of the Commission to move JDO16-003 *Mill Ridge* to item #2 on the agenda.

2. JDO16-0003 Mill Ridge

Representative: Tim Loughrin, Robertson Brothers

Location: 49800 6 Mile Road

Request: Planned Unit Development (PUD-AAC) Amendment

Action: Recommend to Board of Trustees

Township Planner Frey gave the background for this request for Planned Unit Development (PUDA-AAC) Amendment for Mill Ridge, 49800 6 Mile Road. She explained that the applicant was actually seeking 2 amendments:

- 1) To increase the size of the duplex unit to 2586 square feet, from the 2500 square foot maximum allowed in the PUD. Also, if the Commission decided to act favorably to this request, the square footage of the garage and basement should be formally excluded from the area calculations.
- 2) To substitute LP SmartSide siding for the approved Hardie Plank siding.

Commissioner Allen said he thought the applicant had been vague about how many 1.5 story units would be included in this development. The implication was there would be a lesser number, but there was no guarantee of this and it appeared the number of those units was increasing. Previously there had been a lengthy discussion about the size of the 2500 square foot units, which did not really represent downsizing for many seniors. Could the Township specify a maximum number of the larger units?

Township Planner Frey explained that the larger units were an optional floor plan; no more than half at this size were anticipated. However, the original agreement did not place a numeric restriction on the larger units.

In response to questions from Commissioner Guerriero regarding the square footage excluding the basement and garage, Township Planner Frey said this was simply to clean up and clarify the wording in the PUD agreement, since the garage is not typically counted but was not specifically excluded.

Commissioner Allen reiterated his concern about potentially half of the units being the larger size, although he understood that tonight the applicants were asking for an extra 86 square feet only for those units.

Tim Loughrin, Manager of Land Acquisition, Robertson Brothers Homes, 6905 Telegraph Rd., Suite 200, Bloomfield Hills, MI 48301 was present on behalf of this application. He reviewed the Mill Ridge Development, saying that the development would contain 82 total duplex units, and be age-targeted toward active adults who were downsizing.

Mr. Loughrin said they viewed this request as a minor modification. Each duplex unit would have a 2100 square foot ranch, usually to the left side, with a smaller 1852 square foot ranch on the right. The smaller ranch would have the option of adding a second story, making it a

Cape Cod design. If everyone with the smaller ranch took the option to expand, 50% of the duplexes would be that design. However, they anticipated that 25-30% of the residents would choose that option.

Mr. Loughrin continued that the drawings for the PUD approval had been conceptual, and the larger units were slightly less than 2500 square feet on those drawings. Tonight they had included a letter from Architect Alexander Bogaerts explaining why they were requesting the additional 86 feet, and how that request had been calculated. They were trying to line up the lines of the house for the most efficient construction and pleasing aesthetic design. The final design was almost identical to that seen in the conceptual drawings in the original PUD.

Township Planner Frey agreed that the footprint didn't change; the additional square footage was all under the 2nd story roof.

Commissioner Guerriero asked if an owner could opt for the addition after purchasing a single-story ranch unit. Mr. Loughrin explained that this would not be permitted; they were selling the units as is. The bylaws and guidelines would prohibit later modification. The HOA would not be allowed to approve such a modification request.

Commissioner Watson asked if the roofline changed if a buyer chose to upgrade. Mr. Loughrin said the roofline did change. From the front it would look exactly the same; the back would be a little higher.

Mr. Loughrin emphasized that the only difference being requested this evening was the additional 86 square feet for the 2nd floor units.

Chair Lark asked about the request for change of siding material.

Mr. Loughrin showed a sample of the LP SmartSide siding, which they were requesting to use rather than the originally approved Hardie Board. The LP SmartSide siding would have more of an engineered wood look – a grainier appearance. It would function the same, cost about the same, and had a better warranty than the Hardie Board. The biggest difference was the labor involved. LP SmartSide siding did not require as much cutting or generate as much dust on site as Hardie Board.

Chair Lark asked if this siding material had been discussed with the Building Department. Township Planner Frey said the Building Department didn't know much more about the product other than the documentation provided by the applicant.

Discussion followed regarding the characteristics of LP SmartSide siding.

Commissioner Allen had found concerns on the Internet regarding builders not knowing how to install this product, leading to headaches for the homeowners when end margins were not properly matched, end cuts not painted, and the product then not being waterproof. He was concerned that when Mill Ridge was finished the developers would leave and a few years later the HOA would have to deal with inferior construction.

Commissioner Zawodny said that Commissioner Allen's concerns were real. When the product first came out in the 70's and 80's there were complaints regarding construction and product problems, with product failure sometimes occurring within 2-5 years, depending upon moisture exposure. However, more recently improvements had been made, until now there appeared to be little difference in durability between LP SmartSide siding and Hardie Board. The texture of the SmartSide product was a little more pronounced; both products had about the same amount of sheen.

Commissioner Zawodny continued that his first thought when he heard the applicants wanted to use SmartSide was to reject it, but research showed it seemed to be well endorsed and the warranty was strong. However, the Commission still needed to see the panels and colors being considered, and understand the overall aesthetic appearance. Were the trim boards textured, for instance?

Township Planner Frey said that information would be provided to the Board of Trustees should the request be advanced with a recommendation to accept.

Commissioner Zawodny suggested that the Building Department should be comfortable with how the product was installed and that manufacturer's specifications were being followed. Commissioner Allen agreed. He didn't want the HOA stuck with bad construction 10 years from now.

Commissioner Watson asked how long the product had been on the market. Mr. Loughrin said he thought the new product had been introduced fairly recently – maybe a couple of years ago. Commissioner Zawodny said the product had actually been around for 17-20 years, and was gaining market share.

Commissioner Zawodny asked for clarification regarding the area calculations in the letter from Architect Bogaerts. The letter appeared to claim that the first floor area could actually be reduced by 66.33 square feet, depending upon how that area was calculated. Mr. Loughrin said that the calculation method in the letter was what they normally used for all their square footage when they listed their products for sale. Commissioner Zawodny noted that there was room for interpretation in how the square footage was calculated.

In response to comments from Commissioner Guerriero, Township Planner Frey said it was always the intent in the original PUD to allow the 2nd story on one side of the duplex units as an option, with a maximum of 2500 square feet. The agreement did not give a numerical maximum in terms of number of units, though both units of the duplex could not be that floor plan. The Commission might want to make 41 larger units the maximum number allowed for the 2nd story option.

Chair Lark asked if any public wanted to speak on this agenda item. Seeing that no one came forward to speak, Chair Lark indicated he was ready for a motion.

MOTION by Allen, support by McCarthy, that the Planning Commission recommend to the Board of Trustees that PUD-AAC, Mill Ridge, JDO16-0003, be amended as follows:

1. **Allow the substitution of LP SmartSide siding for the previously approved Hardie Plank, with the following conditions:**
 - **An educational program be held with the Building Department regarding manufacturer's specifications and correct installation methods for the SmartSide product.**
 - **The applicant submit a revised material sample board to the Planning Department.**
2. **Increase the square footage of the 2nd floor option to not exceed 2586 square feet excluding the garage and basement, with the following condition:**
 - **No more than 41 units be allowed the second story option.**

Roll Call Vote: Ayes: Watson, McCarthy, Zawodny, Lark, Anderson, Allen, Guerriero
 Nays: None

Motion approved unanimously.

3. JPUD17-0003 The Village at Northville

Representative: John Ackerman, Atwell Group

Location: 47500 5 Mile Road (former Scott Correctional Facility site)

Request: Planned Unit Development (PUD) Amendment

Action: Recommend to Board of Trustees

Chair Lark suggested the applicant present first.

Howard Fingeroot, Managing Partner of Pinnacle Homes, 1668 South Telegraph, Bloomfield Hills 48302, was present for this application for an amendment to PUD 17-0003 The Village at Northville. John Ackerman, Atwell, Southfield MI, Bryan Colburn, Norr Architects, Detroit MI, Gary Cooper, Pinnacle Group, Bloomfield Hills MI, and Zach Weiss, Beztak Companies, Farmington Hills MI, were also present.

Utilizing overhead slides, the development team led the Commission through tonight's proposal.

Mr. Fingeroot explained that they were here to amend the conceptual plan for the PUD for The Village at Northville. A year ago they presented a conceptual plan for the PUD agreement. At that time, they had said there were components that would need to be refined after getting feedback from the marketplace, including speaking with potential tenants.

There were 4 components to the Village:

- Single family toward the west
- Town homes in the middle, surrounding the heavily landscaped central park.
- Retail/commercial
- Loft apartments

Tonight they were focusing on the frontage along Beck Road: the retail/commercial aspect and the loft apartments.

Mr. Fingerroot reviewed what had been completed on site, including demolition and cleanup, grading, single family lots and town homes, and the park, which would be landscaped in the spring. Regional detention basins were also completed, and Johnson Creek Drive had been rerouted. The relocated soccer field was 85% complete. Twenty foot evergreens had been planted along 5 Mile Road, creating a visual shield for the single-family homes there.

Mr. Ackerman, Atwell, led the Commission through the proposed amendments to the PUD. The biggest change from the original plan was the addition of a hotel, providing a destination for consumers and a draw for other tenants. Placed along 5 Mile Road, the hotel would provide a visual buffer for the remainder of the development.

A gateway landscape provided at the southeast corner would give a sense of arrival into the township. Elements would include hardscape, landscape with annual color, a strong vertical element with 3 flagpoles for the American flag, the Northville Township flag, and the Village of Northville flag.

Elements included in the commercial/retail area were a 15,000 square foot retail building with 5 tenants and outdoor dining. Tenants would be a mixture of retail, casual dining, and food service. Additionally, there was a free-standing drive through coffee shop, a 6,000 square foot free-standing restaurant with outdoor eating area, and a yet to be named market anchor.

Two buildings that flanked the main entry boulevard off Beck Road represented the live/work environment, with 1st floor commercial/retail, and 2nd and 3rd floor loft apartment space.

The primary anchor – the grocery store – was shown with the same footprint as before.

Mr. Ackerman noted that they had removed a curb cut from 5 Mile Road and summarized the pedestrian routes.

Mr. Colburn, Norr Architects, pointed out that they were doing 4-sided architecture. He described transitional materials from residential to commercial, the use of earth tones, the massing on the site.

Commissioner McCarthy asked if the buildings were being designed ahead of tenants coming in with their own designs and branding needs. Mr. Colburn said the tenants were looking for a quality product with a conceptual feel; tenants would work with the site as developed.

Mr. Cooper, Pinnacle Group, added that they had interest from national and local tenants who found this site attractive due to the village feel, and the connection to residential development including pedestrian access. They were excited about the architecture, which emphasized earth tones and horizontal lines. Some change would be allowed for tenant branding.

Commissioner McCarthy was concerned that the Commission was being shown a concept that could be tweaked or changed as tenants came in. Mr. Cooper emphasized that there would be continuity across the front in terms of materials, horizontal lines, etc. The developers

would have control over the architecture, including that of the freestanding restaurants. While the drawings were still conceptual, the developers were definitely going to follow the concepts being presented.

Commissioner Watson said the single-family housing and the town homes had a colonial look. The village shops were contemporary. Would these styles be blended?

Mr. Cooper said that while the various components were connected via pedestrian access, each residential component would have a different feel and look. Mr. Colburn added that there would be consistency and blending with the types and warmth of materials. The architecture, including rooflines, would also reflect the transition from component to component.

Mr. Cooper pointed out that the development included a typical urban setting of older style houses, such as the town homes, and contemporary residences, such as loft housing in industrial areas.

Mr. Colburn pointed out bumps and other architectural details in the buildings that broke up the massing.

Mr. Ackerman continued by describing the loft apartments. The apartments would be rear-loaded, with the front of the buildings around the perimeters and the parking hidden inside. A 4,000 square foot community center, with pool, chef's kitchen, plaza, etc. were added. Some carports were identified. Between carports and garages, the goal was for each unit to have one covered parking space.

Mr. Weiss, Beztak Companies, elaborated on the loft design and construction. There would be 210 total lofts, with 3 different types of buildings: 1) mixed use 2) apartments with garages, 3) loft apartments. There were 49 2-car garages contained in the buildings. With the lofts, they were striving for timeless appeal with a modern edge. These would be high end units, with quality finishes, spacious floor plans, balconies, with everything reflecting the village concept. The loft area would create a village within a village, with pedestrian connections to retail and park.

Mr. Weiss gave a brief overview of Beztak Companies, which was 3rd generation and had been in business for 50 years. They managed 16,000 apartment units along with retail and office space in Michigan, Florida, and other areas around the country.

Mr. Ackerman showed a cross section from Beck Road to the lofts, stating that due to topography, the parking lot and carports would not be visible from Beck Road.

Mr. Ackerman pointed out how they attempted to modify pedestrian access and pathways, in response to Township Planner Frey's review.

Regarding open space, a year ago the applicants had met with the Township and discussed this project as an urban village, a gateway development for the township, something that would harmonize with the 75-acre park around it. Mr. Ackerman showed graphics illustrating

open space on this site, pedestrian connections to various areas within the site, central park, and pathways to the adjacent Community Park.

Mr. Ackerman said the PUD called for 20% open space; the revised proposal is about 19%. He again referenced the open space represented by the adjoining 75-acre Community Park.

Mr. Ackerman concluded the presentation by saying the applicants felt they were presenting a strong village feel that utilized their property for what it was meant to be and still made logical transitions into the Township and the public park.

Chair Lark invited Township Planner Frey to give her review.

Referring to her review letter of November 21, 2017, Township Planner Frey outlined the changes proposed by the requested PUD amendment as follows:

- The number of single-family lots was reduced from 111 to 108.
- The number of town home units was reduced from 66 to 64
- The number of lots was increased from 190 to 208
- The amount of retail/commercial space increased from 92,500 square feet to 95,500 square feet.
- A 107-room hotel was added, in addition to the 95,500 square retail/commercial space.

Township Planner Frey said that as a result of the increased square footage of retail/commercial space, including the hotel, somewhere in the range of 71-235 additional parking spaces would be needed as compared to the original PUD concept plan. The requested amendment also included an additional 3,982 square feet of restaurant/food service that would generate extra parking needs.

The proposed amendments stretched the developmental envelope in every direction, resulting in reduced greenbelts along 5 Mile and Beck Roads. With the revised commercial plan, the greenbelt was reduced to 25-27 feet all along the 5 Mile Road frontage and from 35 to 25 feet along the Beck Road frontage.

The maximum building height per the current PUD was 46 feet for a grocery, and 30 feet for all other commercial buildings. The 4-story hotel would be taller than that, so the height would have to be specified and the PUD amended.

The additional 18 loft units also required more parking.

On Beck Road the original 95 foot greenbelt was being reduced to 35-37 feet. The northern setback to the road between the northern property line and the park was reduced from 118 feet to 24 feet for the building and the northwest edge of the parking lot was now only about 5 feet from the property line. Those were significant setback reductions. The Planning Commission spent a lot of time with the original concept plan on that area of the development being the only area that really had any significant vegetation, and the Commission approved the larger setbacks with the loft buildings in that location with the idea that the existing vegetation would provide a wider buffer transition from Beck Road or the signalized intersection from the north coming into the site. Now the loft buildings were still 60

feet tall, but much closer to the road than previously contemplated with none of the existing vegetation being retained.

Mr. Ackerman interjected that the loft buildings were reduced in height to 3 stories. Township Planner Frey pointed out that the plans still had them at 60 feet; this would need to be corrected.

Township Planner Frey asked about the configuration of the lofts facing Main Street, on the western edge. Mr. Ackerman said those buildings were accessed from the sides with corridors down the middle. There would be patios and balconies facing Main Street.

Township Planner Frey said she didn't recall any conversation about carports, and the approved concept plan didn't show any carports.

Township Planner Frey said that pedestrian circulation on the site needed to be comfortable and intuitive; she offered additional pedestrian routes as a starting point.

The proposed amendment would clearly result in more required parking and she was concerned that there about the amount and locations of the parking relative to the uses and the lack of internal pedestrian routes. As outlined in her memorandum, there was a shortage of about 75 parking spaces. The minimum width of parking lot islands without a sidewalk needed to be 10 feet wide; this was not met in some locations. For locations where a sidewalk was located within a parking lot island, a minimum width of 5 feet should be provided on each side of the sidewalk and trees were also required in the landscape area; this standard was not met in some locations.

Regarding the open space, Township Planner Frey said that 20% open space was required; the proposed plan showed 19.5% open space, with some areas – especially parking lot islands - being counted as open space that did not meet open space requirements.

A full landscape plan review would need to be completed during the site plan review process.

The PUD required building design and material guidelines were to be established for use during the site plan review process. Those documents had not been provided.

Township Planner Frey pointed out that if the trees at the northeast corner of the site were approved to be removed, tree replacement per the Township's ordinance would be required, and would need to be reflected with the site plan submittal.

With the reduced greenbelt widths, the average greenbelt width dropped below the 75-foot average that was originally approved. An average greenbelt depth of 52 feet was identified; however almost all of the greenbelt was between 25-35 feet deep so the average calculation was unclear.

Township Planner Frey concluded that there were concerns that with the expansion of additional retail, additional living units, and additional parking needs, there might not be enough room to accommodate the required replacement trees on the site. The amendment

presented this evening stretched the development so that there was a need to again discuss the setbacks and other components the Commission thought were important for the first PUD approval. Improvements should be considered for additional pedestrian connections. The developers should also receive a nod for those things that were being moved in the right direction, including design elements.

Township Planner Frey summarized the other Township reviews as follows:

The Fire Department had some preliminary comments – more would come from them when plans were more definite.

Regarding the concept plan, the Traffic Engineer thought the design of the middle driveway along Beck Road should be reconfigured. Internal circulation made sense from a vehicular standpoint but much less from a pedestrian standpoint. Relative to the shared parking, the inclusion of the loft and town home parking areas as shared parking for the commercial did not seem to be applicable. Assumptions of shared parking depended upon proximity, but more than 300 of the loft/apartment spaces were out of sight from the commercial uses. The Traffic Engineer also had some comments on the traffic review study. Even with proposed improvements and site access measures in place, site traffic would result in unacceptable levels of service at several study area intersection movements during morning peak hours, including eastbound right-turn movement on Five Mile at Beck, westbound left-turn movement on Five mile at Beck, and westbound left-turn movement on Six Mile at Beck.

Township Planner Frey said the Township Civil Engineer had the following concerns. Item #3 was a housekeeping matter but Items #1 and #2 needed to be addressed:

1. Sanitary sewer capacity of the WTUA lines was a concern. The applicant would need to have Stantec model this project to verify the adequacy of the existing system. Any approval would need to be contingent on adequate sewer capacity.
2. The utilities were to be located in 20-foot easements free of structures. This appeared to be violated with the water main in the area of town homes 1-6.
3. Identify the volume of the pond constructed as part of phase 0/1. This was to be utilized to compare the volume of storage provided versus required.

Township Planner Frey concluded her review.

Department of Public Services Director Casari noted that Stantec was looking at the capacity of the sewer lines; he didn't think there would be an issue there but that needed to be verified.

Chair Lark commented that the hotel was the biggest change to the site. He asked Mr. Fingeroot to give more detail regarding the work/live units in the development.

Mr. Fingeroot said the original PUD showed live/work units in one of the 6-unit town home buildings; if that was a market success they would move to a 2nd building. However, after working with the revised plan, they felt the live/work environment would be better in the retail side closer to Beck Road. They were open to Commission input, and could develop the previously approved town homes as straight residential, or as live/work units.

Commissioner Allen said moving the live/work away from the town homes gave the town homes continuity of appearance.

Chair Lark asked about the different buildings on the apartment graphic – some appeared to have a yellowish roof. Mr. Fingerroot explained that there would be three types of units: Type A with no garages, Type B with garages in back, and Type C with garages in back and commercial on the first floor and 2 stories of apartments above.

Commissioner Guerriero asked Township Planner Frey what she thought of the pedestrian access as shown this evening. Township Planner Frey said tonight was the first time she had seen the proposed pedestrian access and pathways. She felt there were some areas that needed additional conversation. For instance, in the loft area there was a strong pedestrian pathway but no way to get out to Beck Road. While this might be because of grade issues there, if a pedestrian was on the interior of the site they would need access to Beck Road. The addition of appropriate landscaping and island widths would help. The changes presented tonight were a change in the right direction, especially the pedestrian access from the residential to the retail component. From the Township's perspective, pedestrian access was critical. Increased development square footage at the expense of reduced pedestrian pathways and reduced greenbelts remained a concern.

Commissioner Guerriero expressed concern that the Commission had a 3.5 page list of issues from staff, most of which issues went to the heart of the matter: setbacks, parking, green space, vegetation, and density. He felt tonight's presentation represented a wholesale change from what was approved last year. This was too much to discuss this evening. He suggested further point-by-point review between staff and the development team.

Chair Lark agreed.

Township Planner Frey said that she would need further direction from the Commission regarding the reduced setbacks, the additional density, loss of vegetative buffer, the additional retail space, etc.

Chair Lark said he thought the developers would offset the hotel – which was a large addition – with fewer rather than more residential units. But tonight the proposal was to add the hotel and add 20 more lofts to the plan.

Mr. Fingerroot pointed out that the hotel was a permitted use, and after they had done the research, found it to be a good use on this site.

Regarding the loft units, the previous approval was for a 4-story, 60-foot high building. The applicants thought it would be better and more village-like to bring that down in scale to 3 stories, and spread it out, creating pedestrian pathways. They had met with Township staff and members of the Board of Trustees and the Planning Commission regarding this before proposing the change.

Mr. Fingerroot said that he felt they ended up with a better product. He acknowledged it was a balancing act – they did reduce the setbacks and went into some of the natural buffer. He

pointed out that there was a large open space around the village with the 75-acre Township park.

Mr. Fingerroot continued that they had increased density by providing mixed use in the commercial zone – something the Board wanted to see.

Commissioner Watson said that the clubhouse was a nice feature but it took up 4,000 square feet footprint and pushed buildings into the green space.

Mr. Fingerroot said they were seeking to provide as many amenities as they could and offer the most desirable product possible, in terms of demographics that would be interested in this development.

Commissioner Watson suggested putting the sales center inside one of the commercial buildings and utilizing a rooftop for the swim pool, or use other options that wouldn't cut into the green space. Those were urban solutions for an urban-feel development.

Township Planner Frey said that at the meeting mentioned by Mr. Fingerroot, the feeling was the hotel was a good use, but there was no conversation about adding a hotel at the expense of other things. The same held true for changing the footprint of the lofts – there had been no conversation about doing this at the expense of other important factors.

Mr. Fingerroot reviewed the possible tenants for the commercial spaces, all of which were in negotiation. The hotel would be a Hilton flagship brand. They still didn't have a grocer – they were talking to several high-end grocery providers, who might or might not need a smaller space than what was approved.

They wanted to build the retail in two phases. The retail perimeter would be constructed in summer 2018.

Commissioner McCarthy was concerned that some tenants were close to being locked in to a configuration that had not had been approved by the township, and that was violating the setback requirement in the original agreement. Right now the Commission was concerned about setbacks and open spaces.

Mr. Fingerroot said the rule of setbacks was for an average 50 feet, and their average was 52 feet. Township Planner Frey interjected that she didn't see much area greater than 37 feet of greenbelt.

Commissioner Zawodny agreed that there were too many wholesale modifications to discuss tonight. Regarding the concept of a village, a lot of conversation had been offered by the development team tonight regarding the village-type environment, but the actual proposal was moving away from the village concept in a big way. There was a loss of open space, setbacks, pedestrian ways, green spaces, etc. The commercial area looked like a village of outlots, with no pedestrian scale. Commissioner Zawodny liked the idea of the hotel, which provided a captive audience to feed retail, but the front door of the hotel faced the service area of the adjacent retail. The outdoor space fronted to 5 Mile Road, across the parking lot.

The one retail building development that was contiguous had a pedestrian way that couldn't be seen from the rest of the development, on Beck Road adjacent to a single bank of double-loaded parking. What had been a dynamic corridor space planting – the gateway – looked like a forest in the rendering but was actually just three ornamental trees and one or two larger ones. The new proposal reduced the gateway entrance.

Commissioner Zawodny pointed out a pedestrian path that led past a drive-through driveway twice to go north, crossed an entry/exit drive, and then led through landscape beds in the parking lot in order to get to a restaurant. There was a loss of cohesive, contiguous movement throughout those spaces. Calling it a village did not make it one – the development seemed like a suburban development.

Commissioner Zawodny concluded that the streetscape had lost its definition, and, again, seemed like a typically planned suburban development, including the carports. Was the clubhouse even necessary? A clubhouse by its nature invited people to stay in the clubhouse area and not go out to the village. The vegetation buffer was a big loss. The pedestrian walkways seemed a myriad of miscellaneous pathways that in some cases would encourage driving rather than walking. There was increased hardscape and parking. The proposal seemed to have strayed very far from the original approval, and he could not support it this evening.

Commissioner Allen said at the joint meeting the loft plan looked nothing like it did this evening.

Mr. Fingerroot said he appreciated the comments and feedback. They felt they had created interaction among the four components of the development. The essence of the village concept was the central park that was accessed by all four components.

Commissioner Anderson agreed with the comments made so far. She felt the proposal showed a massively overbuilt development. This was not the village concept originally discussed. And while the hotel was a permitted use, it was not a permitted use at the requested height. What was driving the wholesale changes presented this evening?

Mr. Fingerroot asked the Commission if they were comfortable bringing the massing of the loft building down to 3 stories and spreading out those spaces. They had taken one huge building and brought it down to separate it into other buildings, but that did require a loss of setback. Could the Commission be comfortable with that change?

Commissioner Anderson said she could be comfortable with some changes, but not with reducing setbacks, greenbelts, increasing parking, decreasing open space, etc. Also, she did not agree with referencing the Township park as open space for this development.

Chair Lark agreed that tonight's proposal was completely different than the concept plan in terms of density and green space. He did not want to lower the 4-story building at the expense of green space. Tonight's proposal was a little too dense and too different than the original plan.

Commissioner Guerriero said he was inclined to make a motion not to recommend this amendment to the Board of Trustees. Before he did that, what did staff need in terms of direction?

Township Planner Frey said that if the Commission wanted the development team to go back to the original village concept, the application would be referred back to the applicant. She noted for the benefit of those who had not been present at the joint meeting that no decisions were made there. The applicants had received written comments, many of which were central to the discussion occurring this evening: work out pedestrian access, maintain the village feel, the addition of the hotel. Carports never came up.

Chair Lark suggested that in future, any comments that came out of a meeting like that should be shared with the entire Commission.

Mr. Fingerroot asked for a way forward. Did the Commission agree that:

- The hotel could be added if everything else worked.
- The lofts could be lowered and spread out.
- They would work with staff to get to an acceptable greenbelt.
- They would work with staff to get to an acceptable pedestrian network.
- Make sure densities and parking would work within those agreements.
- Setbacks would be discussed and agreed upon with staff.

Mr. Fingerroot asked if those things were resolved, would the Commission feel more comfortable? They had the outside of the retail ready to go, with great tenants.

Commissioner Watson said she shared the concerns of the Commission. There were five separate buildings that were not flowing, individual parcels that were not coming together in the concept of a village. How many retailers vs. restaurants would there be? How many commercial tenants? People in a village wanted somewhere to linger.

Mr. Fingerroot said everything was in negotiations at this point. There would be a full service restaurant with a bar, a drive-through coffee shop, fast casual dining, retail shops, etc.

Commissioner Watson asked if the hotel was being considered because tenant options had been reduced. Mr. Fingerroot noted that the nature of retail was changing, and this development would not support discount retailers. The hotel provided definition and a visual shield from the inside the village, looking out.

Commissioner Watson said that one of the things not in Mr. Fingerroot's list was the garages and carports. The visual of looking at garages and carports in the area in front of the grocery store needed to be addressed.

Mr. Fingerroot said the goal was for each unit to have at least one covered parking space.

Commissioner Zawodny liked the idea of the live/work area, but the first floor storefronts were too homogeneous.

After a further discussion of how to go forward, Mr. Fingerroot asked to table action this evening. Township Planner Frey suggested scheduling a study session, and possible dates were discussed.

Commissioner Allen indicated he was ready to offer a motion.

MOTION by Allen, support by McCarthy, in the case JPUD17-0003 The Village of Northville Planned Unit Development Amendment, that the Planning Commission postpone a decision, in order to give the developer opportunity to present alternative concepts based on this evening's discussion.

Roll Call Vote: Ayes: Watson, McCarthy, Zawodny, Lark, Anderson, Allen, Guerriero
 Nays: None

Motion approved unanimously.

Noting that there was public present, Chair Lark asked if anyone would like to speak on this matter.

Carl Peters, South Glacier, Northville, MI, was concerned that with one exit to 5 Mile Road and three exits to Beck Road for this development, the intersection at Beck and 5 Mile would be overburdened, especially because trucks were required to use the landfill off of 5 Mile Road. Could a bridge be constructed? Also, having experience with the restaurant industry, he was also concerned about the plans for a 6,000 square foot restaurant. How much parking would be required for a restaurant that size?

Chair Lark said the parking would need to meet ordinance requirements. He asked DPW Director Casari to address the 5 Mile and Beck intersection.

DPW Director Casari said the Township had recently received an \$800,000 CMAQ (Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality) grant for improvements to that intersection, and design was underway. They hoped to receive another \$500,000 early next year. The actual improvements would not be fully under construction until 2019. The Township was also working with the MITECH Corridor on a joint project with Plymouth to seek funding for improvements to 5 Mile all the way to Napier Road. State and federal legislators were aware of and seemed to be supportive of this work.

As no one else came forward to speak, Chair Lark closed this agenda item

Other Business:

1. Article 21, Lighting Standards - Discussion

Township Planner Frey reviewed ordinance lighting standards, which regulated maximum mounting height and maximum spacing between units if streetlights were installed, but did not require streetlights in subdivisions except at pedestrian intersections and entrances to the

subdivisions. If the Commission wanted to require streetlights, that language would need to be added.

2. Future Land Use – Discussion

Township Planner Frey said she had provided a map with the changes that were discussed at the March 20, 2017 Planning Commission meeting, along with the memo dated March 24, 2017, that captured that discussion. The plan was to update and publish a future land use map that reflected current thoughts. Township Planner Frey said she would also put together a list of 10-12 guiding principles. This work would help guide the Township when rezoning requests were submitted. The last time the future land use map was updated was in 2009.

The process would be to update the future land use map, send it to neighboring communities for comment, after which the Board of Trustees would adopt it. When that was complete, the Commission could look at possible Township-initiated rezoning so that the zoning reflected what was envisioned for future land use.

Department Reports:

Tom Casari, Director of Public Services

- Demolition and remediation at the Northville Psychiatric Hospital site had begun. The first floor would be encapsulated for asbestos remediation. When that was complete, the first floor would be used as staging for remediation for the rest of the building. Demolition of the buildings would begin in April, and was projected to be completed by the end of September.
- At the MITC meeting DTE announced it was doing its due diligence in order to purchase property on Napier Road directly south of the railroad tracks for a new substation that would service the new projects being constructed in that area.

Eric Lark

- Wayne County was doing mitigation on the part of 6 Mile Road that had been icing up. The contractor had never punched out on that project, and the County had decided to do the work itself.

Commissioner McCarthy asked what was happening with the bridge on Ridge Road between 5 and 6 Mile Roads. DPW Director Casari said the bridge was structurally deficient and had been closed. It was scheduled for repair and would hopefully re-open for traffic September 2018.

Jennifer Frey, Township Planner

- Several projects were under construction, including two at 5 Mile and Beck Road, and Stonecrest Senior Living at 5 Mile and Sheldon Roads.
- Following the recent Wayne County Road reconstruction project, the township is piloting a project for street tree plantings on 6 Mile Road between Haggerty and Northville Roads. The township will plant the trees if associations and businesses would maintain the trees after planting. In early January a meeting would be called for all interested parties, with planting scheduled in the spring.

Eric Lark, Zoning Board of Appeals Liaison

- Two cases were heard. A variance request for a taller fence on Woodhill Drive was denied. A request for a lot split on Marilyn Avenue was approved with conditions.

A short discussion was held regarding *no solicitation* stickers available to residents. If residents put the stickers near their front door, solicitation for products for sale was prohibited; this was enforced by the ordinance department. The prohibition did not include the religious freedom act or political speech.

Extended Public Comments:

Township Planner Frey welcomed Jayne Watson to the Commission. Commissioner Watson offered a few introductory comments, including her experience in Atlanta with multifamily housing, and her work with Habitat for Humanity.

Adjournment: 10:25 P.M.