

**CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF NORTHVILLE  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
February 12, 2018**

**DATE:** February 12, 2018  
**TIME:** 7:00 PM  
**PLACE:** Northville Township Hall  
44405 Six Mile Road

**APPROVED:** March 27, 2018

**CALL TO ORDER:** 7:04 PM

**ROLL CALL:**

**Present:** Richard Allen, Lisa Anderson (7:08 p.m.), Eric Lark, George McCarthy, Jane Watson, Tim Zawodny

**Excused:** Tim Guerriero

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

**Approval of Minutes:** None.

**Other Minutes:** None.

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

**Brief Public Comments:** None.

**New Business**

**1. JPUD17-003 Village at Northville**

Representative: Brad Botham, Pinnacle Homes  
Location: Northwest Corner, 5 Mile and Beck Roads  
Request: Planned Unit Development Agreement – Amendment #1  
Action: Recommend to Board of Trustees

Members of the development team present:

John Ackerman, Project Manager, Atwell, 2 Town Square, Southfield.

Gary Cooper, Atwell, 2 Town Square, Southfield.

Howard Fingeroot, Managing Partner Pinnacle Homes, 1668 South Telegraph, Bloomfield Hills.

Utilizing a PowerPoint presentation, Mr. Fingeroot and Mr. Ackerman described the conceptual plan they were requesting for the commercial and loft components of the Planned Unit Development for the Village at Northville. Mr. Fingeroot explained that the original plan did not find traction in the marketplace, and tonight's concept plan grew from market demands. The applicants felt they were maintaining the spirit of the original plan.

Mr. Fingerroot compared the proposed plan with the original plan. Commercial space had been reduced from 92,500 square feet to 86,600 square feet. Parking had basically stayed the same, with the original plan showing 6.8 spaces/1,000 square feet, and tonight's plan showing 6.7 spaces/1,000 square feet. Shared parking was more prevalent, with the hotel parking at night and the market use parking during the day.

Mr. Ackerman went into more detail, describing the commercial site with its 6 buildings:

1. An anchor grocery-type market with a restaurant/café that fronted on the Village Square and with an outdoor market that sold seasonable items.
2. A multi-use 3-story building at the southwest portion of the boulevard, with the upper 2 floors housing 16 loft-style residential units, and the first floor housing garages on the south, and commercial/office space on the north.
3. A 6,700 square foot full service restaurant, with the front door facing north to the parking lot.
4. Two retail buildings fronting on Beck Road, with a pedestrian plaza in between, and a coffee shop at the southeast corner. The drive-through for the coffee shop would be on the south side of the building fronting on 5 Mile Road.
5. A hotel fronting on 5 Mile Road, with customer entry on the south side.

Mr. Ackerman pointed out that Beck Road had a warmer feel than 5 Mile Road, and the hotel will shield 5 Mile Road from the site.

Mr. Ackerman showed renderings of several internal views of the new concept plan, noting that there was no direct access from the gateway corner at Beck and 5 Mile, and that the architecture of the buildings included a variety of facades, undulating rooflines, etc.

Six pedestrian gathering points were shown in light green, including a market café area and small pedestrian park across the street, an internally-facing outdoor eating area for the pizzeria, the plaza area, the new area between the two buildings facing Beck, and the outdoor hotel area.

An interior pedestrian route was provided within parking lot islands. The width of the islands with a sidewalk have been increased to 15'.

In response to a question from Commissioner McCarthy, Mr. Ackerman said that loading areas facing into the site would have what amounted to an extra front façade with pedestrian interface. The goal was to welcome pedestrians. Wayfinding signs would be added later.

Regarding the loft area, Mr. Ackerman pointed out the "B" buildings, which would have 16 loft units above with non-residential first floors, and one-car garages internal to the buildings. "C" buildings would have 20 units with internal garages. "A" units would have 24 units, and would utilize carports. The goal was to have one covered car space per unit.

The loft buildings had been rotated so that they were facing east/west. There was a central green space with the outdoor pool and a maintenance shed close to Beck Road, which would also house his/her changing rooms at the rear. The carports were removed from the Beck Road frontage.

Mr. Ackerman emphasized the boulevard entrance that terminated at the Village Park, the additional sidewalks, and the pedestrian connections. The developers thought it best to utilize open space within the development, rather than have large swaths of open space at the perimeter.

Chair Lark opened the meeting to Commissioner comments.

Commissioner Allen said that the location of the coffee shop created a tortuous route to get in and out. Mr. Fingerroot said the proposed location offered stacking space for 10 cars and good traffic flow. The coffee shop's entry would be on the north side, and the drive-through window would be on the south side.

In response to questions from Chair Lark, Mr. Ackerman said the buildings along Beck would have 7-8 users, including 4-5 restaurants, a paint store, a nail salon, etc. The first floor commercial spaces under the lofts had not yet been marketed.

Township Planner Frey noted that the parking sheet data showed parking for office uses under the lofts, but tonight the developers were referring to commercial as well as office use, which would require different parking calculations. Additionally, the full-service café/restaurant by the market was not included in the parking calculation either.

Commissioner Watson felt the concept plan should show space for the outdoor patio at the market location, as was verbally described this evening. As part of the approval process the patio should be required so that the view from the park was not a front building façade, and the building envelope should be pulled back. Mr. Ackerman explained that after they had a tenant for that space, they would complete the details on the patio area. Mr. Fingerroot added that they would be back before the Commission for final site plan approval.

Mr. Ackerman said he agreed with Township Planner Frey's concerns regarding parking and the minimal setbacks to the three residential buildings that front onto Towne Square Road. Mr. Ackerman said changes should be made to reflect improvements in that area, including providing an increased setback from the sidewalk to the 3-story building.; the buildings could shift 10 feet to the east. Mr. Fingerroot reiterated that details would be provided at site plan approval.

Chair Lark asked if that shift would leave enough room for the required parking. Mr. Ackerman said they would return with an answer regarding parking.

Chair Lark asked the applicants to explain why they had changed the product type of the loft units, at the cost of so much green space. Mr. Fingerroot explained that they felt the lower buildings were a better transition to single family, and to the 30-foot commercial buildings. They had tried to maintain the open space at 20%. They had not lost any meaningful open space; they had just rearranged it.

Regarding meaningful open space, Commissioner Zawodny said that this had been discussed at both meetings in December. One of the strong early selling points for this development had been the significant open space along the perimeters. He was not yet sold on reducing that

open space in order to drop building heights and push buildings out to the perimeter. The comments to those earlier discussions had not been fully addressed.

Commissioner Zawodny said that at the earlier meetings, they had discussed the village concept, the desired retail/commercial environment, streetscapes, etc., along with offering examples of other similar village-type developments. But those conversations did not seem to bear fruit. Five-foot wide sidewalks through the parking lot, with grass on either side, did not provide a great pedestrian experience. Pedestrian paths crossed islands. Retail was not yet integrated from a pedestrian standpoint. The renderings were nice but did not show things such as gas meters. The view from the restaurant looked at a delivery area. When the leaves dropped the predominant view from the corner would be a drive-through window of a coffee shop.

The earliest discussions had seen the corner at 5 Mile and Beck being a gateway for the MITC corridor, yet tonight the developers had talked of 5 Mile as having no value; the MITC corridor was important to both Northville and Plymouth Townships.

Commissioner Zawodny continued that the hotel would have no problem with visibility. There was no reason to have its front door facing 5 Mile Road, especially since the developers were talking about screening everything along 5 Mile. The vibrant activity at the front door entrance could face inward toward the market and other shopping.

While there had been conversation and some movement, Commissioner Zawodny felt they were still pretty far apart on how successful the overall concept plan was. He was not sure the developers were meeting the original intent, including concerns about not having apartments in the Township. The retail now being provided was of a drive in, get your product, and leave variety, and did not encourage customers to stay and meander the area as a village experience.

Commissioner Zawodny said he agreed with Commissioner Watson's earlier comment, in that all open space, including that at the corner of the market, needed to be clearly identified at the concept plan level, so that battles were not fought later on or a claim made that the open space was merely a place-holder.

Commissioner Watson commented that while traveling she had seen new developments where buildings were in close proximity and parking was pushed out away from the buildings; this decreased cross-through traffic and enhanced the pedestrian experience. She thought the concept plan provided this evening was closer to what the Commission wanted, but still needed work. The placement of the pizzeria seemed to be driving the placement of everything else. She suggested moving all the buildings closer to the northern corner of the commercial area, getting them closer to the park and creating a parallel dynamic.

Mr. Fingerroot said they had been through many iterations of building placement and concept plan configurations. It was important to have proximity of parking to the uses. The restaurant to the north needed parking spaces close to the restaurant. Increasing pedestrian traffic also forced parking to be further away. They felt they had addressed things that had come out in

previous meetings: pedestrian pathway, open space preservation, parking, interaction of different components, etc.

Commissioner Allen agreed that the open space at the corner of the market needed to be clearly shown on the concept plan, or should be in a written agreement.

Commissioner Allen asked how the coffee shop would be screened when leaves were down. Mr. Ackerman said landscaping could include arborvitae. They would provide a 4-season screen.

Commissioner McCarthy asked how tall the walls were at the southeast corner. Mr. Ackerman said they were 4-6 feet high, with ornamental trees behind them. However, the landscape plan was also conceptual. They could look at spruce that would grow to 25 feet.

Chair Lark said a fundamental issue for him was that the tenants wanted to face the main roads, which took away from encouraging people to be inside. With this concept plan, people on the inside were staring at the back of buildings. That was not the original intent.

Commissioner Watson pointed out that the restaurant now faced in, but the other retail uses faced primarily outward. Mr. Ackerman said they would have 4-sided architecture. The building rears would have architectural elements and patios would be accessed from side entrances.

Commissioner Zawodny said that the developers had presented a solution to the concern about having all the market and retail facing one side by moving it to face Beck Road, because the retailers were strip center retailers. This did not meet the original vision of being a gateway coming into Northville, with a destination shopping experience. While the developers were using words to mimic what the Commissioners wanted, the actual development didn't support those words.

Mr. Fingerroot said that they had upgraded the architecture, and the result was different from other strip centers. He couldn't force tenants to come here. What they could do well was an architectural integration of uses, along with providing lofts, resulting in a nice community feel.

Commissioner Watson said a big question in her mind was how this was marketed – as a village or as a traditional strip development. If it was marketed as a village and that was rejected, the Commission needed to understand that.

Mr. Fingerroot said the development was 3 years in the making. For 2 years a parallel street village presentation was marketed, without one retail/commercial commitment.

Commissioner Watson said it was wise to turn buildings to the inside. Citing personal experience, she said that people would not park and walk around a building to enter a front door. Buildings facing in encouraged shoppers to spend more time and hit more uses.

Commissioner Allen was concerned about dumpsters along Beck Road. How would the hotel handle its trash? Mr. Ackerman said the hotel would have an internal compactor with rear

access. Regarding the commercial buildings along Beck Road, right now they were showing trash collection along 5 Mile Road. They had been discussing putting dumpsters more internal to the site.

Commissioner McCarthy addressed the loft units as presented this evening. He felt there had been improvement there. Carports had been moved off of Beck. Configuring the buildings perpendicular to Beck was an asset, as was moving the pool area perpendicular to Beck. He wondered if the loft area could be acted on separately.

Chair Lark agreed there had been some improvement in the loft component. His concern was the loss of the green space. He was struggling with the commercial buildings along Beck facing out. This was directly opposite of what the Commission was looking for. There were other developments where retail was not seen from the road.

Mr. Fingerroot argued that street-facing retail provided a vibrancy that could not be found when backs of buildings faced the street.

Chair Lark said he understood why tenants would want to face out, but outward facing retail did not meet the goal of a destination village where people would want to stay and cross-shop.

Commissioner Watson said this development had been promoted for years as a mixed-use village environment, not a mirror image of what was on the other side of the road and throughout the country.

Commissioner Allen asked about Sheet L5, which showed almost 50 feet of 5-foot high fencing. Mr. Ackerman said that fencing was in a few locations, and consistent throughout. If it was a concern, they could modify that.

Commissioner Allen said he didn't want to set a precedent for future development in terms of that type/height of fencing.

Township Planner Frey said the renderings gave the appearance of a 3.5-foot fence, since people appeared taller than the fence. Mr. Ackerman said they would address the fencing.

In response to discussion comments, Township Planner Frey noted that overall signage was part of the PUD agreement; individual tenants would have their signs reviewed administratively.

Commissioner Allen agreed with Commissioner McCarthy that the lofts were an improvement over the last submission. He did not understand, however, how the greenbelt was shown at 35 feet but the average was 50+ feet.

Mr. Ackerman explained that they took the total acreage area of the greenbelt and divided it by the lineal footage to get the average. This was how the original PUD was calculated as well.

Commissioner Anderson agreed that the loft section was an improvement over what the Commission had seen before. Regarding the retail component, she would also like to see the buildings turned in, and she would like to see uses that would bring people in and help them want to stay. While the Commission had no control over the users, the users mentioned this evening did not meet that goal.

Commissioner Allen suggested acting on the loft component this evening. Township Planner Frey said this could be done.

Chair Lark said the northeast entrance detail seemed very traditional. Commissioner Watson agreed, saying it had a colonial appearance. Mr. Ackerman said the entrance amenity was complimentary to the plans that had been approved for the Phase 1 monument at 5 Mile Road.

Chair Lark said he liked the appearance of the lofts, with their big windows and overall look. Commissioner Watson suggested having some brick elements in the loft portion to give continuity, and streamlining the monument signs. Small changes could make significant differences.

Commissioner Zawodny said he still struggled with how much of the greenbelt was lost. The original plan included tradeoffs in order to get the green space, and that was specific enough that the green spaces were dimensioned. People took that at face value. While rotating the internal buildings to be perpendicular to Beck was a good approach, he questioned having the pool so visible from Beck Road, along with the changing rooms being at the rear of that section, so people could be seen walking in and out of the changing rooms.

Having the carports off Beck was also better, but the carports had not been shown in the renderings, and the visual in his mind was standard out-of-the-box typical carports. Would the carports have any character that matched the buildings?

Mr. Fingerroot said they hadn't got there yet; they wanted this to look nice.

Referring to Township Planner Frey's review letter of January 30, 2018, Commissioner Zawodny noted that reducing the height of the loft building and therefore adding buildings and making them 3 stories created more impervious surface, more rooftop, less greenbelt, and less buffer. What was driving this change?

Mr. Fingerroot said there was more than one driver. Taller buildings were being constructed in more urban areas such as Detroit, offering what was basically an apartment structure. What was being shown on this concept plan was more conventional living. The tenants that would be at Village at Northville were more conventional. The developers thought the lower buildings more appropriate and helped create a more pedestrian concept.

Commissioner Zawodny said it was important to create a distinction between the retail and loft living area so they did not look alike. While this could be helped with choice of materials and colors, he still preferred the higher density with the tall building that would free up the buffer space – that would add meaningful open space to the project.

Mr. Fingerroot emphasized that the renderings were conceptual in nature. At site plan approval they would offer specific materials. They saw the Township park as the meaningful open space in this situation. The Township park surrounded the town homes, single family residential, and was in close proximity to the lofts. That is where people were going to go.

Commissioner Allen said the loft area as now seemed congested. Could the 3 north/south buildings be brought up to 4 stories, thus allowing the elimination of the building at the entrance?

Mr. Fingerroot said proximity to parking was critical. When buildings went up, covered parking gets reduced.

Chair Lark said he was thinking along the same lines. Was there a way to get the desired density and the original greenbelt buffer?

Commissioner Watson suggested putting in a parallel building along the boulevard by moving the furthest northern building parallel to the other loft building at the main entrance. Mr. Fingerroot said moving the building there would create a shortfall in parking.

On the retail side, Commissioner Watson said mixed use was lacking. There was one mixed-use building. Instead of adding an additional building to the lofts, could there be lofts over the retail?

Mr. Fingerroot said they would not mix upper story residential with food uses. Commissioner Watson said she had seen that mix happen. Mr. Fingerroot replied that they were offering the best product possible. Mixing food with upper story residential eventually generates complaints.

Commissioner Allen said he was ready to offer a motion on the lofts portion of the site.

Chair Lark asked the applicants if they had any issues with Township Planner Frey's conditions as listed in her review letter.

Mr. Ackerman said they felt there was a lot of subjective comment the review letter. They agreed that needed to be remedied. They were close to the 20% open space requirement, but their intent was also to maximize and combine the development with the large Township park that surrounded the site. They were creating an urban design with a linear pedestrian connection to open space pocket parks that connected with the Township park.

Chair Allen asked how the applicants were proposing to address the shortfall in guest parking for the loft area. Only 16 guest parking spaces were provided for 8 buildings.

Mr. Ackerman said that overall the parking count was similar to what was shown before. The approved plan had shown 2.08 spaces per unit in the loft area and they were still close to that.

Township Planner Frey said that there simply wasn't enough guest parking spaces. Loft guests would not utilize the retail area for parking.

Township Planner Frey said the applicants were asking for consideration on the parking. However, with the shift to more fast casual dining and service uses on the retail side parking would peak at the same time. The shared parking with the hotel was not optimum, as the hotel parking was isolated and would probably not be used. Loft parking would not utilize the retail area.

Mr. Fingerroot said retail users could access the east side of the hotel parking.

Mr. Ackerman pointed out that 40% of the loft units were 1-bedroom; those units did not need 2.5 cars per unit. The specific mix was 50% 2-bedroom, 40% 1-bedroom, and 10% 3-bedroom. The approved PUD had 406 parking spaces for the loft area; now they were asking for 396, or 10 fewer.

Mr. Fingerroot thought the coffee shop would more typically be a drive-through use. He felt there was sufficient parking for the retail uses including the fast casual restaurants.

Commissioner Watson said that one benefit of turning the uses inward was the increased use of shared parking.

Mr. Cooper said that he felt they had responded to many of the comments in the review letter. While previously retail was focused along the central park, the result had been more of a strip center. Shifting the buildings and introducing the hotel had created a new dynamic, including having the hotel customers on site. Any large groups in the central park would be looking for someplace to eat, as would people in the loft area. With the outdoor market, proximity to other restaurants, people coming from the north and south to the main restaurant, and other restaurants equidistant from customers, there was good connectivity. While there was some detail to be worked out, he felt they had addressed appearance and usability with the placement of the pizzeria, the market, and proximity to other uses.

Commissioner Zawodny said the Commission would benefit from seeing plans that had been discarded. They were fighting for a dual-loaded street and more of a standout gateway. They had never bought in to a strip mall approach. Tonight they were being shown more buildings that seemed to be a strip mall. They were being told the hotel would bring shoppers, but there was no real connectivity to the hotel. This was a series of developments rather than an integrated village approach.

Mr. Cooper agreed that they could do a better job of integrating the hotel with the rest of the site, and that could be done at the site plan stage. He reiterated that the people using the parks would be looking for the types of uses being proposed.

Chair Lark commented that the plan went from restaurants that had bars where people would spend time socializing, to fast casual. Originally there had been 2 buildings at the corner with restaurants that had bars.

Mr. Fingerroot said bars with restaurants needed 20 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet. Casual restaurants only needed 15 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet. Adding more parking would always take away from something else.

Commissioner Watson asked if the lease agreement with the pizzeria prohibited other restaurants with bars. Mr. Fingerroot said the only exclusion was another pizzeria.

Commissioner Zawodny said things as important as pedestrian circulation and general connectivity should not be left until site plan approval. Otherwise the Commission was likely to hear that certain things being shown tonight were just placeholders, and the final results would be mediocre. He felt this had been discussed at the two meeting in December but no new ideas. This was the first time the Commission heard the developers actually responding to Commission concerns, but they were not yet in agreement.

Mr. Fingerroot said all concerns could not be met. They had addressed pedestrian walkways, open space, and other issues.

Commissioner Anderson asked the applicants if they were open to the Commission acting on the lofts only tonight.

Mr. Fingerroot spoke to the need to move forward, and the costs associated with this project, including planning, correcting and completing demolitions, and environmental cleanup. Their hope was to break ground on the lofts and retail in summer 2018. He felt the plans shown this evening provided a good compromise.

Commissioner Allen asked if Township Planner Frey's parking calculations had taken into consideration the mix of 1, 2 and 3-bedroom apartments as described this evening. Township Planner Frey said the ordinance didn't distinguish parking requirements in that way. The ordinance required 2 parking spaces per unit plus .5 parking spaces per unit for guests.

Commissioner Allen thought any approval of the loft area should stipulate the mix of unit sizes as presented. Also, if the greenbelt being shown was the only greenbelt they would get, that should also be in writing.

Chair Lark was concerned about the main road going into the commercial component having as its end view the back of a hotel; care would have to be taken with that view if the hotel was not flipped. Mr. Fingerroot agreed.

Mr. Ackerman said he had been with this project from the beginning and had been at every meeting. While they heard all the comments, they couldn't accommodate every design request that was made. The hotel tenant requested the parking field and orientation of the hotel as shown.

Mr. Ackerman spoke to the modifications and improvements made to the sidewalks and pedestrian connectivity; they had heard the concerns of the Township and had tried to address those concerns. Additionally, the applicants truly liked the plan presented this evening.

**MOTION by Allen, support by McCarthy, that the Planning Commission approve the loft portion of JPUD17-003 Village at Northville, with the following conditions:**

- **Conditions of the January 30, 2018 review letter be addressed.**
- **The portion north of the main road, along with the 1 building to the south, include the following ratio of dwelling units: 40% 1 bedroom, 50% 2 bedroom, 10% 3 bedrooms.**
- **Developers look at the location of the pool and changing area in terms of its visibility from Beck Road, in order to increase the privacy of the users of that amenity.**

Commissioner Watson said she thought the 1-bedroom units would be good for this development, as that would encourage that demographic to start with a small unit now and later stay in the area and purchase homes here.

Mr. Fingerroot said the new building across the boulevard was targeted for younger millennials.

Chair Lark called the vote.

<b>Allen</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Anderson</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Lark</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>McCarthy</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Watson</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Zawodny</b>	<b>no</b>

**The motion carried 5-1 (Zawodny opposed).**

Commissioner Zawodny said he had based his vote on his continued concerns regarding density and the lost green space.

Commissioner Allen said he thought the Commission needed to see more revision of the retail area.

Chair Lark outlined concerns regarding the retail component:

- Market area delineation, including the patio & outside sales area.
- Which way the buildings should face.
- Disliking the drive-through at the southwest corner,
- Screening the corner drive-through, if it remained at that location.
- Continuity between the hotel and restaurants.
- Site flow and desirable pedestrian pathways.

Discussion was held regarding the orientation of the retail and its parking. People would not park in one area and then walk around a building to enter the front door. Different configurations were suggested.

In response to Commissioner comments, Mr. Fingerroot said they were proposing the retail face Beck Road, with the primary parking also along Beck, and secondary parking on the inside.

Commissioner Watson said she was disappointed in the floating hotel placement. Synergy could be created by moving the hotel closer to restaurant and retail uses.

Mr. Fingerroot said he felt strongly about the current placement of the retail facing Beck Road, because that was what the market demanded. He wanted the retail to be successful.

Commissioner Zawodny spoke to the lack of complementary landscaping, only simple grass and rows of trees. With the uses being drive-to uses, and the 5-foot wide pedestrian experience so lacking, would the sidewalks be empty most of the time? That was not the original intent. He remained concerned about the pedestrian flow with the drive-through coffee shop. Landscaping promises should not be offered as a solution to design flaws.

Commissioner Allen said the applicants had responded to the Commission's December request to bring the retail buildings closer together and create more open space, though he wasn't sure it completely worked.

After further discussion, Commissioner Anderson suggested the applicants revise the plan and return to the Planning Commission. Another option would be to refer this matter to a subcommittee.

Mr. Fingerroot said the biggest issue seemed to be the orientation of retail toward Beck Road. The retailers wanted that and he didn't think it could be changed. They could work on better access to the hotel. He emphasized the commitments of retailers with this configuration; he felt they might lose those commitments if the buildings had to face in. He did not want to develop something that was not marketable.

Commissioner McCarthy supported the retail facing Beck. He felt they were not going to get the village concept they had originally desired, and what was proposed made sense. Commissioner Anderson agreed that the village concept had been lost a long time ago, and tonight's plan was an improvement over what was presented in December.

Chair Lark also agreed that tonight's plan was better than what was originally approved. Many Township residents did not like tall buildings, and green space was lost in order to bring the buildings down. While tonight's plan was not perfect by any stretch, he was not sure that more meetings would make it better. One thing was critical: that the entryway structure and amenities at Beck and 5 Mile looked like a true gateway, and that the view of the drive-through was blocked.

Commissioner Allen remained concerned about dumpster placement.

Commissioner Zawodny was most concerned about pedestrian connectivity through parking lot islands, and the location of the drive-through as the corner gateway to this development.

Mr. Fingerroot committed to blocking the drive-through with landscaping. That would be discussed in depth during site plan approvals. Mr. Ackerman also made some suggestions regarding expanding the perimeter island at that location, including additional decorative

stone wall, and making sure the architecture of the wall would harmonize with the retail façade.

Commissioner Zawodny acknowledged the investment the applicants had in this property. However, while it might take a few weeks or months to come to an agreement on the project, once it was built it would be there for decades. He suggested a study session to see what options had been discarded, and to have further conversation regarding improving pedestrian circulation. There seemed to be some agreement that the sidewalk would receive only minimal use, and it seemed counterproductive to approve it as open space. The retail on Beck Road should not create hazards for pedestrians.

Commissioner Watson felt that there was public resistance to the hotel. The way to sell the hotel was to make everything else exceptional.

Commissioner Allen said the Commission had bought into the hotel in anticipation of growth along the MITC corridor; the Commission's charge was to look toward the future.

Commissioner Anderson said that while she had never been wedded to the hotel, the applicant had received the go ahead for the hotel several meetings ago, and there needed to be consistency in the message the applicants were receiving.

Commissioner Allen said that he thought the biggest concern was the location of the drive-through at 5/Beck. Commissioner Watson asked if the coffee shop could be located on the north side of the commercial area.

Mr. Fingerroot reiterated that the coffee shop stacking area and window would be shielded. Mr. Ackerman said that its location at the corner minimized pedestrian conflicts.

Chair Lark said he would oppose the coffee shop location ever becoming fast food. Mr. Fingerroot said they were looking at a tenant such as Starbucks, Tim Hortons, Dunkin Donuts, etc.

Discussion followed. Fast food was an allowed use in the PUD agreement. However, Township Planner Frey said that fast food had different traffic patterns, and different business hours. While the Township didn't have an issue with those businesses named by the applicant, they did have an issue with them being located at the corner with a drive-through.

Commissioner Anderson said that there were enough outstanding concerns with the retail/commercial area that there needed to be at least one more meeting regarding this. Mr. Fingerroot said that he was opposed to turning the retail inward. He would be happy to look at other things, but in his mind the retail would always face outward.

Township Planner Frey said that there was significant concern regarding the drive-through at the gateway location in the southeast corner, including vehicular issues and the amount of stacking there.

Commissioner Zawodny said that after all the years of working on this project, having a drive-through coffee shop at the showcase location was unacceptable. There was no logic in having that use or any of the uses listed tonight serving as the gateway to the Township. How was this a showcase development?

Mr. Fingerroot reiterated that the use could be handled architecturally, and would be screened with landscaping.

Township Planner Frey cautioned against using landscaping as a screen. Would the tenant accept heavy landscape screening that would hide the use?

Commissioner Allen spoke to the coffee shop access. It appeared the only access would be for southbound Beck traffic. Mr. Ackerman said that northbound traffic would have a single lane left turn into the boulevard.

Commissioner Allen said that the coffee shop could not be screened completely from Beck because the tenant would want their sign to be visible there. There would need to be architectural upgrades for the coffee shop in order for it to work at that location.

Commissioner Watson agreed with Commissioner Zawodny that the Commission should look at discarded plans for the site. For example, the marketing brochure showed 2 buildings at the gateway corner with a plaza in between. Perhaps that would be a better option. She felt there would be significant pushback with the proposed tenant mix, which did not provide a destination experience.

Mr. Fingerroot pointed out that there was list of prohibited uses in the PUD. He suggested that the northern part of the northern building was the most visible component and constituted the actual gateway to this development. Several commissioners expressed disagreement.

Commissioner McCarthy agreed that a drive-through was not a real entryway to the Township. This placement was very disappointing.

Commissioner Allen suggested working with the site and coming up with an alternative placement for the drive-through. Mr. Ackerman said that the pizzeria wanted to be further up and closer to the boulevard. That was the prime location.

Township Planner Frey suggested that if that was the case, why not focus all the retail in that area, thus providing connectivity to the central park, the market, and the commercial loft building. Then the retail would face the boulevard and Beck Road, as well as be centrally located within the development.

Mr. Fingerroot said they would lose the full-service restaurant with that configuration. Commissioner McCarthy suggested putting the restaurant where the drive-through was now located.

Township Planner Frey said what she was hearing from the Commission was a desire for connectivity and the contiguous cluster of uses.

Commissioner Watson emphasized that for restaurants, being on a park was like being on lake front property, and referenced a local restaurateur making a statement to that affect.

Commissioner Anderson proposed having the applicants bring solutions regarding the Beck Road buildings and the location of the coffee shop to a subcommittee, where the issues could be worked out before the plan moved to the Board of Trustees.

A discussion of process followed. Township Planner Frey said a subcommittee would want to look at a variety of concepts, including sketches of discarded designs, as well as new ideas based on the various discussions held regarding this area.

Commissioners Allen, Zawodny and Watson said they would serve on the subcommittee.

Commissioner Allen offered the following motion:

That in the case of JPUD17-003 Village at Northville, a subcommittee composed of Commissioners Allen, Zawodny and Watson be appointed by the Planning Commission and charged with resolving the location of the drive-through restaurant issue, with the discussion being solely limited to the retail businesses fronting Beck Road. The rest of the concept plan is approved subject to the comments in the review letter dated January 30, 2018.

After discussion, the following conditions were added to the motion:

- The final decision of the subcommittee would not return to the full Planning Commission.
- The subcommittee would meet only once, unless it was a mutual decision between the parties to meet again.

Regarding the review comments, Mr. Ackerman sought clarity regarding the open space. The review letter appeared to require a revision of the open space, but the loft area was approved previously this evening.

Commissioner Allen suggested leaving the determination and approval of open space to Township Staff. Township Planner Frey said she could calculate the numbers, but the Commission needed to give direction as to whether the changes in open space from the original PUD were appropriate.

In response to comments from Commissioner Allen, Township Planner Frey said that in the commercial component there was a provision that if there was a sidewalk with landscape on both sides it could count as open space. The idea was to provide a contiguous pedestrian system in front of the retail. The proposed open space calculation now includes the sidewalks in front of the townhomes. Was the Planning Commission comfortable with that change in order to get the open space to the required 20%?

Mr. Fingerroot pointed out that the loft area was approved with the open space shown this evening. Township Planner Frey agreed, but noted that was also the location of the biggest loss of open space. That was why there needed to be open space somewhere else.

Commissioner Zawodny said that open space was, per ordinance, designed to offset building and pavement. A rendering made attractive by green space did not always translate into reality.

Township Planner Frey said the details of the streetscape were still to be submitted. It was difficult to really know what open space was being provided when the Commission didn't have the final layout of the retail component.

Commissioner Watson suggested adding open space determination to the subcommittee's charge.

Mr. Ackerman said he did not think they would have 20% open space. Would they be required to ask for a variance if the open space were 18 or 19%? He emphasized that they were integrating this development with the surrounding Township park.

Commissioner Zawodny wondered if other developments that abutted public open space were allowed to take that into consideration; such a concept was not in the Ordinance. The idea of the Township park being used as open space for this development was a one-way benefit for the developers. If approving the loft space put the developers in a position of not meeting the open space requirement, the developers would need to find a solution.

Mr. Fingerroot said he was at a loss to know what the solution would be.

In response to a question from Commissioner Allen, Township Planner Frey said that the detention pond was a necessity of development, and could not be counted as open space.

In response to a comment from Mr. Ackerman, Township Planner Frey said the townhouse area counted sidewalks as open space. She continued that none of the original open space approval was done in isolation. Trade-offs were made. For example, higher buildings were allowed because of the greater open space offered.

Chair Lark said he was comfortable leaving open space approval to the subcommittee.

Mr. Ackerman was concerned that the subcommittee was only dealing with the 3 retail buildings along Beck Road; there was very limited open space associated with that. Everything else would stay the same.

Commissioner Zawodny disagreed. Open space was required to be at 20%, and either there had to be a recommendation to amend that requirement or a way had to be found to reach 20% open space. The 20% requirement was not relinquished as a condition of approving the loft component.

Commissioner Allen said he would add the determination of open space to his motion.

The subcommittee meeting was tentatively set for Thursday, February 22 at 1:30 p.m.

Further discussion was held regarding the charge to approve the final open space determination. Commissioner Zawodny summarized that the subcommittee would need a clear understanding of how the open space was shown on the plan. If it met the 20% requirement or something close to that requirement (18 or 19%, for example), the subcommittee would evaluate that and make a recommendation. But if the open space was significantly reduced they were not obligated to make a recommendation to approve that to the Township Board. In fairness to the applicant, any methodology that was used at the original approval should be applied to this new concept plan also.

The motion now read:

**MOTION by Allen, support by McCarthy, that in the case of JPUD17-003 Village at Northville, a subcommittee composed of Commissioners Allen, Zawodny and Watson be appointed by the Planning Commission and charged with resolving the location of the drive-through restaurant, the location of the buildings on Beck Road, and evaluating the open space to determine whether the applicants had met their open space obligations under the approved PUD plan, with the following determinations and conditions:**

- **The rest of the concept plan regarding the commercial component is approved, subject to the comments in the review letter dated January 30, 2018.**
- **The subcommittee will make a recommendation to the Board of Trustees; the matter does not have to return to the Planning Commission.**
- **The subcommittee will meet once, unless there is a mutual agreement by the parties to meet again.**

Township Planner Frey said in order to make the best use of the subcommittee's time, the applicants should come to the meeting prepared to show more than one option, including previous plans.

Mr. Ackerman said previous plans were not viable options. The Subcommittee would see at least one and possibly two new concepts.

Discussion of process followed, in terms of when the application could be heard by the Board of Trustees. Township Planner Frey cautioned that review of new plans would take time, and involved several departments. She could not commit at this time because she did not know what would be involved until a concept was determined. Timeframes regarding new submissions were given.

Chair Lark called the vote.

<b>Allen</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Anderson</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Lark</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>McCarthy</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Watson</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Zawodny</b>	<b>yes</b>

**The motion passed unanimously.**

Chair Lark noted that no one had been in the audience to comment on the issue.

**Other Business:** None.

**Department Reports:** None.

**Extended Public Comments:** None.

**Adjournment:** 11:16 p.m.