

CITY OF NORTHVILLE  
Planning Commission Meeting Minutes  
October 2, 2018  
Hillside Middle School – Forum Room  
775 N. Center Street  
Northville, Michigan 48167

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

Chair Kirk called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m, and gave introductory remarks regarding process.

**2. ROLL CALL:**

Present: Steve Kirk  
Andrew Krenz  
Carol Maise  
Dave Mielock  
Christopher Miller  
Mark Russell  
Ann Smith  
Donna Tinberg

Absent: Jeff Snyder (excused)

Also present: Sally Elmiger, Planning Consultant  
Ken Roth, Mayor  
Pat Sullivan, City Manager  
Loyd Cureton, Department of Public Works Director  
Stephen Dearing, Traffic Consultant  
Approximately 150 residents

**3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:**

**MOTION by Maise, support by Russell, to approve the agenda as published.**

**Motion carried unanimously.**

**4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING:** September 4, 2018

**Motion by Mielock, support by Tinberg, to amend the September 4, 2018 minutes as follows:**

p. 12, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, last line: *...and it would direct traffic to a . . .*

**Motion carried unanimously.**

**5. CITIZEN COMMENTS:** None.

**6. REPORTS:**

**A. CITY ADMINISTRATION:** None.

**B. PLANNING COMMISSION:** None.

In response to a question from Commissioner Russell, Planning Consultant Elmiger said the Building Official had followed up with the applicant representing the building at Wing and Dunlap Streets regarding the floor elevation there, and the applicant was being asked to return to the Historic District Commission to discuss any discrepancy between what the HDC approved and what was constructed in the field.

**C. OTHER COMMUNITY/GOVERNMENTAL LIAISONS:** None.

**7. P.U.D. ELIGIBILITY: NORTHVILLE DOWNS – 301 S. CENTER – HUNTER PASTEUR**

Chair Kirk disclosed that his mother owned shares in the Driving Club at the Downs. However, he had no direct interest and his mother lived in Phoenix.

Commissioner Russell disclosed that he was the design architect for the project located to the northwest of this property; however he was not involved in the project being discussed this evening.

It was the consensus of the Commission that Chair Kirk and Commissioner Russell did not need to recuse themselves from tonight's discussion and action.

Chair Kirk invited the Planning Consultant to give her review.

Planning Consultant Elmiger explained the Planned Unit Development (PUD) Process, as found in Section 20.05 of the Zoning Ordinance. A flow chart outlining the PUD process was placed at the entry door this evening.

A PUD was a zoning technique where the developer asked for certain deviations from zoning requirements in exchange for features in their project that offered public benefit. The intent of this process was to allow flexibility in application of the ordinance in order to encourage innovation in design, layout, and land use, and create a project that otherwise couldn't be accomplished without such flexibility.

The first step in the PUD process was a pre-application meeting with the developers, city staff, and consultants to discuss the developmental concept. Tonight's development team had two pre-application meetings, in February and July 2018.

The next step in the process was a meeting before the Planning Commission, which was happening tonight. The purpose of tonight's meeting was to determine whether the project was eligible for a PUD, based on 9 criteria listed in the Ordinance. The development was still relatively conceptual in nature.

Once the Commission considered a project PUD-eligible, the developer would submit a preliminary site plan, which was a more detailed plan than was submitted for PUD eligibility.

After preliminary site plan approval, the next step would be to hold a formal public hearing to solicit public comment. After the public hearing, the Planning Commission would make a recommendation to City Council regarding the PUD site plan. The City Council then considered the PUD and the site plan and either approved it, approved it with conditions, or denied it.

If the PUD and preliminary site plan were approved by City Council, the developer would submit a final site plan for Planning Commission consideration and action.

Even though tonight was not a public hearing, the Planning Commission would take public comment during the meeting. It was important for the public to remember that there would be a number of chances to share their opinions, in addition to the formal Public Hearing that would be scheduled later in the process. Comments could be given at meetings, or via letter or email to the Building Department. The entire process was still in its beginning stages.

Referring to her September 12, 2018 Carlisle/Wortman review letter, Planning Consultant Elmiger gave a summary of her review of the proposed project:

The proposed project was a mixed-use, commercial/residential project, on approximately 48 acres of land that was currently vacant or occupied by the Northville Downs Racetrack. Vacant parcels on the south side of Cady Street between S. Center and Griswold, the Northville Downs racetrack property south of Cady Street between S. Center and River Street, and two areas on the west side of S. Center Street were included. The project was proposing approximately 19,000 square feet of commercial space along Cady Street, and a mix of different residential units. Proposed were:

- 306 apartment units along Cady Street.
- 49 single-family units within the racetrack property
- 222 townhomes units across the southern portion of the racetrack property.

Positives of this project:

- The development was laid out in a traditional grid pattern that extended existing streets, which was consistent with this part of Northville and was consistent with the Master Plan for Future Land Use. The project did include some commercial space on Cady Street and it also included a mix of different types of housing units, including apartments and townhomes, which would increase the diversity of Northville's housing stock.
- The development included a large green space in the vicinity of where the Rouge River flowed underground.
- Green space was included at the terminus of Hutton Street; the applicants proposed to extend Hutton Street south; there were two open spaces there that the public could use.
- The development included an area for the Farmers Market to relocate, along with a pedestrian pathway extending from Cady Street to the Beal Street extension.

Concerns included:

- The proposed density was higher than proposed in the Master Plan. The PUD proposal stated that density was calculated exclusive of road rights-of-way. Therefore taking the road rights-of-way out, the density was 15 dwelling units (du) per acre. Individually the apartments were 27 du/acre, the townhomes were 13.6 du/acre, and the single-family residences were 4.6 du/acre. The Master Plan called for 6-12 du/acre in this area. As the Master Plan was just recently changed, there was not yet a density requirement for the Cady Street Overlay, and dimensional requirements in the Ordinance were used to determine density.

Specific recommendations were offered on page 18 of the review letter regarding reducing the density.

- Density was driving the parking requirements along Cady Street; this was the densest part of the project. The applicant was proposing one parking space per bedroom. They were also proposing to build 96 spaces to replace the City lot in that location. Based on ordinance requirements, the apartment/commercial portion of the project was deficit by 206 spaces.

The Planning Commission had flexibility under the PUD ordinance regarding parking requirements.

- The proposed parking structure was a very positive part of the plan, but locating a surface lot at Griswold and Cady was not the best use of that property and was inconsistent with the vision for the City.
- Density also created additional traffic in the area. The applicant had supplied a traffic study and had responded to a number of questions regarding traffic. The city's Consulting Engineer had reviewed the study and asked for more information about the 7 Mile/South Main Street/Northville Road intersection, and solutions to the 7 Mile/S. Center Street intersection.
- Regarding consistency with the Master Plan, the project was organized in a grid pattern, which was consistent. The Master Plan also called for the highest density along Cady Street and a reduction in density as the project moved to the south. The proposed plan, because of the topography, placed single-family homes in the center of the area, with townhomes along the south boundary at 7 Mile Road.
- The Master Plan also called for a large park along River Street and 7 Mile so that the Middle Rouge River that currently ran through a culvert could be daylighted. Daylighting the river was not in the proposal, but the applicant had stated that there was enough room left for the City or County to do this in the future. However, after homes were built on each side of the proposed park, property owners were not likely to support daylighting the Rouge after their homes were built. Eliminating the 13 homes along River Street was recommended, which would allow more room for daylighting the river later, if daylighting was not part of this project.
- One PUD criteria was that the PUD be under single-ownership and/or control such that there was a single person, corporation or partnership having responsibility for completing the project. Since there were a number of different companies involved with this project, the applicant should describe how single ownership would be achieved.

Planning Consultant Elmiger completed her review, and Chair Kirk invited the development team to speak.

Members of the development team present this evening included:

Randy Wertheimer, CEO, Hunter Pasteur Homes, 32300 Northwestern Highway, Suite 230, Farmington Hills MI.

Andrew Milia, President, Franklin Property Corporation, 300 South Old Woodward Avenue, Birmingham, MI

Jim Allen, Allen Design LLC, Northville, MI

Robert Emerine, Seiber Keast Engineering, LLC, 100 MainCentre, Suite 10, Northville MI.  
Robert M. Carson, Carson Fischer, P.L.C., 4111 Andover Road, West-Second Floor, Bloomfield Hills, MI  
Justin P. Rose, PE, Fleis&Vandenbrink, 27725 Stansbury Blvd. Ste 195, Farmington Hills MI

Mr. Wertheimer gave some introductory remarks, explaining that they were excited about this project; their goal with the project was to continue Northville's charm and even add to it.

Tonight they were seeking PUD eligibility only. They were not asking for preliminary site plan approval.

Utilizing overhead slides, the development team gave an overall explanation of the development:

- An aerial of the overall site plan showed how the proposed development was consistent with the surrounding area. They felt the development was also consistent with the Master Plan.
- There would be 19,000 square feet of commercial space with apartments above along Cady Street. Parking behind those buildings was for the commercial space; a parking structure would be provided for the apartments. The parking structure would be behind the apartments and therefore not visible from the street. Overall there would be 306 apartments in this area. The commercial space would be geared toward local retailers and local restaurants.
- Single-family residential lots were at the center of the site.
- A 6.4-acre park was proposed toward the east of the site, where the river ran underground.
- While their goal was to daylight the Rouge River in this area, the \$5.5 million price tag was daunting and too expensive for the developers to take on by themselves. They were seeking a private/public partnership in order to fund daylighting the river. They were willing to contribute significant money toward the project. However, the park would be constructed whether the river was daylighted or not. At 6.4 acres, the park would be the largest in the City.
- Townhomes would be located on the southern end of the parcel; this was a deviation from the Master Plan, which called for density to be the highest at Cady Street and lowest at 7 Mile Road. However, there was an 18-foot drop in topography that prohibited the construction of townhomes at the center of the site.
- The developers had met with neighborhood groups to get input prior to tonight's meeting.
- The Farmers Market was proposed to be relocated to the northeast portion of the site, at the end of Beal Street. The parking lot had 30 spots that would be open to the public for Market use, and there were other on-street parking spots that would be created along Center Street and Hutton Street, creating an abundance of parking for the Farmers Market. All of that parking would be open to the public 7 days a week.

Regarding public benefits:

Public benefit: Traffic

- The developers had retained a traffic consultant, Fleis&Vandenbrink, prior to starting the project. Fleis&Vandenbrink had submitted a detailed traffic study, which had been reviewed by the city's Traffic Engineer Consultant (OHM). They had also consulted with Wayne County. Dialogue regarding traffic mitigation would be ongoing.
- The traffic study looked at 12 intersections around the project site. Eight intersections had no issues and were operating at an acceptable level of service. Four did have issues:
  - Main/Hutton
  - Main/Griswold
  - Center Street at 7 Mile
  - 7 Mile at Hines

- Fleis&Vandenbrink had made recommendations as to how to mitigate conditions at those intersections, and the developer had agreed to help fund that mitigation. If the recommendations were implemented, traffic conditions would actually be improved after the full build-out of this development.
- Proposed improvements were:
  - Optimize traffic signals at Main/Griswold and Main/Hutton.
  - 7 mile/Hines Drive: to increase the capacity provide a northbound right turn lane on Hines Drive turning onto eastbound 7 Mile Road.
  - Center/7 Mile: Restripe the northbound and southbound approaches to provide an exclusive left-turn lane. (Note: on the northbound approach the left-turn storage length would be limited by existing geometric constraints of the bridge.) Upgrade the existing signalized intersection to provide a fully actuated signal with permissive/protected left-turn phasing for all approaches.

#### Public Benefit: Park

- Creation of a 6.4 acre first-class park; this would be the largest park in the City. The park would be deeded to the City at no cost and would be public. The annual maintenance costs of the park area would be borne by the Downs' homeowners' association. The park would connect 7 Mile Road to Beal Street, providing connectivity from Hines Park to Ford Field Park.

#### Public Benefit: Gateways

- Significant landscaping, heavy signage and architectural features were proposed at the 3 major entrances to the development. Creation of gateway signage and an entrance feature at the northeast corner of 7 Mile Road and Center Street was proposed.

#### Public Benefit: Long term protection and preservation of natural resources

- Protection of the Johnson Drain. The proposed development would feature storm water retention ponds and bio-swale improvements that would filter storm water runoff into the Rouge River. Currently the Northville Downs drained all its storm water undetained and untreated directly to the Johnson Drain and to the Middle Rouge River.
- Relocation of an exposed sanitary sewer pipe perpendicularly crossing the river and impeding its flow.

#### Public Benefit: Reclassifying the 100-year flood plain

- Storm water management improvements allowed for the reclassification of the floodplain area, which should aid in lowering home insurance costs for homeowners to the east of the site, currently located in a classified flood plain zone. This should also increase the marketability and value of those homes.

The development team discussed this reclassification in some detail, explaining that since the flood plain was established in 1979, the City had installed a bridge at the Beal Street river crossing, improving the hydraulics of the river significantly. Seiber Keast had performed a new flood study that evaluated the improved hydraulics created by the Beal Street bridge, updated the topography, and the removal of the sanitary sewer pipe that was just discussed. The result of that analysis was that the 100 year flood plain would be completely removed from the Northville Downs site and from the existing properties on the east side of River Street. The flood plain study had been submitted to MDEQ, been reviewed by the City of Northville, and subsequently was submitted to FEMA for final approval.

Public Benefit: Clean up of Downs site

- Elimination of all outdated building structures, outdoor storage uses and general unsightly conditions of the current Northville Downs track operation.

Public Benefit: the Farmers Market

- The proposed design provided an area of land located at the northern portion of the park for the relocation of the Farmers Market in a prime area, closer to the downtown.

Public Benefit: Parking

- 96 spaces were provided in close proximity to downtown. The parcel being purchased from the City had 92 spaces; the development was providing 96 spaces.

Public Benefit: Public Revenue

- Creation of over \$5,440,000 in annual taxes for the taxing jurisdiction, broken down as follows:
  - City Operating: \$798,961
  - DDA Tax Levy: \$85,336
  - DDA Tax Capture: \$1,228,430
  - Northville Schools: \$1,334,424. Northville Public Schools would receive about \$500,000 in addition to any revenue that they would get from the State on a per pupil basis.
- The tax revenue would be significantly greater than any offsetting expenses for police, fire and public safety.

General comments

- The development could not be accomplished under traditional zoning. The overall parcel was a combination of 3 separate parcels, each of which could be developed separately by separate owners. Combining the parcels and developing them under a PUD agreement provided continuity for the entire site.
- They were proposing private roads within the development, maintained by the homeowners' association. The development would be self-contained from a maintenance standpoint.
- Providing a diversity of housing stock would be a great benefit to Northville.
- The apartment community was a tried and tested urban product, successful in many different communities throughout the country.
- The apartment buildings would blend and provide continuity with what already existed in downtown Northville.
- People that visited the Northville Downs track did not actually shop or eat in Northville. This development would provide a mix of renters, townhome buyers, and homeowners who would all use Northville's downtown, as well as the local mix of retail that would be provided within the development, adding to the vibrancy of the City.
- Regarding the PUD eligibility requirement of single ownership, the principals involved were collectively buying the 3 parcels of land, which would be under single ownership and governed by a development agreement entered into with the City.
- The development team believed that the proposed development was consistent with the goals and policies of the City's Master Plan, and was consistent and complementary to the adjoining zoning districts. The commercial part of the development was designed to be consistent and complementary and not challenging or competitive with the other merchants in the City.

- The team had met with neighborhood groups, and would continue to meet with them, as well as with city staff and consultants. They recognized this was an important parcel in the City, and would like to be part of the effort to design something that worked for Northville.

Seeing that the development team had concluded their presentation, Chair Kirk opened the meeting for Commissioner comments.

In response to a question from Commissioner Miller, Planning Consultant Elmiger said this development would be very difficult to accomplish without the flexibility a PUD offered.

Commissioner Miller asked the applicants to elaborate on the need to arrange the single-family homes to the north of the townhomes. Mr. Emerine explained that the site dropped about 30 feet from Cady Street to the center of the track property. Most of the grade drop was in the northern half of the site; constructing townhome units was extremely difficult with that kind of grade change.

Commissioner Tinberg noted that the applicants spoke of providing 96 parking spaces as a public benefit. However, only 4 of those spaces were new, as the proposal was replacing 92 existing spaces.

Commissioner Tinberg asked about the cost of daylighting the Rouge River. The applicants had quoted a cost of over \$5 million; the report in the packets showed a cost of \$3 million.

Mr. Wertheimer explained that the cost of the land was approximately \$2.1 million. Also, the feasibility study regarding daylighting the river was completed 4-5 months ago; in that time construction costs had risen about 15%.

Commissioner Tinberg asked if the applicants would buy the land whether the river was daylighted or not. Mr. Wertheimer said they would buy the land. However, it appeared that even providing for future daylighting was going to cost the development the loss of 13 homes in that area.

Commissioner Tinberg pointed out that while the new location for the Farmers Market was closer to downtown, it was less than half the size of the existing Market. Mr. Wertheimer said that parking would be provided on the side of the market; currently the space used for the Farmers Market included parking. The Chamber of Commerce had also committed to their members parking elsewhere.

Commissioner Tinberg said the 51% reduction was specifically a reduction in vendor space, not counting the parking. Mr. Milia said that was true. The current sales area was approximately 30,000 square feet. The proposed vendor area would be 17,000 square feet.

Commissioner Tinberg thought that all the parking close by might not be available since it was public parking.

Commissioner Maise asked if the Chamber approved of the proposed Farmers Market location and size. Mr. Milia said they had an initial meeting with the Chamber and received input; the next step was tonight's discussion. They had not gone back to the Chamber with definitive plans.

Mr. Wertheimer commented that they had thought about closing Beal Street once a week for the Farmers Market, but this has not been discussed with the Chamber or anyone else except some community groups.

Commissioner Maise asked if any amenities would be added to the Market area other than pavement, i.e., a pavilion, restrooms, etc. Mr. Milia explained that the cost of the improvements and the land was very significant; they were not planning on adding buildings. Also, they wanted to keep the area flexible so it could be used for concerts or other things; adding a pavilion did not lend itself to that kind of flexibility.

Commissioner Maise was interested in the Chamber's reaction to this location and plan, as it was being offered as a public benefit under the PUD eligibility application.

Commissioner Krenz asked the applicants to provide sizes of Farmers Markets in other communities; was a 17,000 square foot space even viable for a Market? Also, the plans showed that daylighting the river would pull a wedge of land from the Farmers Market area. Last, was there a possibility of the vendors using the adjoining green space by the commercial area?

Mr. Wertheimer said the question about the Chamber's reaction would have to be answered by the Chamber. Commissioner Krenz was correct – if the river was daylighted the Farmers Market might have to be relocated to another location within the site.

Chair Kirk closed the discussion and opened the meeting to public comment.

Aaron Cozart, 654 Horton Street and Chair of the Economic Development Committee, distributed a document: *Downtown Development Authority (DDA) Economic Development Committee (EDC) Comments in response to "The Downs" PUD Eligibility Application October 2, 2018.*

Mr. Cozart explained that the EDC was designed to be a resource for the Planning Commission, the City and developers. The EDC did have comments regarding the request for PUD eligibility for this project:

- Traffic: Congestion was a major concern as were north to south entrances. The EDC recommended the developers look at extending Hutton Street to the mouth of East Hines Drive, where there should be a roundabout. This would reduce the congestion.
- Parking: The 96 spaces included 92 spaces that already existed. The parking plan did not reflect the neighboring communities in terms of streetscape parking.
- Green and public space: Daylighting the river would be a huge public benefit, and the EDC supported looking at a private/public partnership for that. The zoning ordinance, master plan, overlay district, all included daylighting the river. The EDC was concerned that the proposed plan really didn't actually allow for that possibility. The path where the river would be opened up went through the Farmers Market and into other parcels. Tonight's discussion was that this was something that could be done potentially after the project was developed, but with the current drawings that wasn't possible.
- Farmers Market. The discussion said the Farmers Market was reduced by 50%; the EDC thought the reduction was closer to 75%.
- Commercial retail space. The proposed plan showed 18,700 square feet. In 2017 a retail study was completed that showed the viability of new retail space of 35,000 square feet, to include a boutique hotel, not including commercial or office space.
- Design of the Residential Products: The EDC hoped that most of the provided designs served as placeholders. The designs had a very suburban feel that didn't reflect the City's character.

- The developers said their project was consistent with the Master Plan, but the proposal left out the Center Square, didn't include daylighting the river, and the grid system didn't properly reflect the surrounding neighborhoods.
- Regarding the development being an attractive entry to the City, the EDC thought there could be further opportunities for appropriate gateway emphasis.
- Within the application several items were listed as public benefits that would need to be done anyway.
- The EDC was concerned with the phasing of the project. It was the EDC's understanding that the first phase did not include some of the items that were being listed as PUD eligibility benefits; if the project were for some reason delayed it was important for the public to have access to those things that were being offered as a public benefit.

Mr. Cozart concluded his remarks.

David Marold, 443 Grace Street, was concerned regarding the traffic flow and parking. What were the developers' assumptions about the demographics of the people who would live there: age, family size, etc.? This was important information specifically in terms of traffic during peak times.

Jeff Gaines, 334 Yerkes, distributed a handout entitled *Missed Opportunities*, and *Alternative planning suggestions for Northville*. He expressed enthusiasm about the process represented this evening and the possibility of a quality development at the Downs, and was appreciative of the proposed connectivity to other areas of the City. He was not concerned about the proposed density, nor was he alarmed about the added traffic, if enough benefit was provided in exchange. However, he did feel there were missed opportunities:

- 7 mile/Center gateway needed more monumentality than the typical row house found in other communities.
- He was excited but also concerned regarding the connectivity from Main Street into the development. The stair that ran alongside the existing parking structure next to the Town Square was not incorporated into the Plan. He would like to see more robust development in terms of pedestrian interactions that would link the current downtown by Main Street to at least Cady Street and hopefully down to Beal Street and points beyond.
- Most important, the linear park in its current configuration would be perceived as private. The entire length of the linear park should be fronted by a public street. Otherwise people would think the park was private, as it would be neighboring people's rear yards.
- Another major gateway opportunity was at the trailhead of Hines Drive, the bicycle drive.

Greg Swanson (phonetic), Cabbagetown, did not think the look of the proposed development was at all complementary to the historical nature of the rest of the City. Were there any plans to preserve the Log Cabin House? There was historical value associated with that structure.

Nancy Chiri, 661 W. Main, handed out copies of a SEMCOG spread sheet showing traffic patterns at different intersections in the City. She was concerned about the proposed density of the project. In the approximate square mile that was located in Wayne County, the City had 1,000 – 1,200 housing units. This project was 40 acres, and added 50% more housing. That level of density would change not only the character of Northville in terms of architecture but also the social factor. Regarding the Sencog information, Ms. Chiri specifically called out the traffic at 7 Mile/Sheldon junction, which received 16,000 car trips a day. 10,000 cars a day drove north/south on Main Street. Those counts came from 2004 and 2009. There was a lot of development going on west and east of Northville over which the residents had no control; they did have control over

their own City. She advocated for a reasonable, responsible build that would complement the downtown. Last, she asked that any building project in the Downs area provide mitigation for the disruption of the rodent population likely to be living there.

Russ Dore, 409 Larry Drive, thought that 300 apartments would generate 400-450 cars. Where would they all park?

Mary Oberts (phonetic) asked that any infrastructure be put in place before any other development took place. The development should reflect the charm and beauty of Northville.

Amy Luebke, 421 Horton Street, Northville, asked when the traffic study was done – what time of day, of year, etc. Also, she was concerned about the proposed builder, Pulte, who had generated a number of documented concerns from other communities. She was concerned that Pulte would provide shoddy construction.

Deb Moga, 17729 Wildflower Drive, Northville Township, did not like this proposal, which was too dense, and would alter the fabric of the City.

A resident asked that proposed developments at the McDonald Ford Site, the site at 7 and Main Street, and the Downs site all be studied together. All 3 were within close proximity to each other and should be studied at the same time.

Ed Brazen, 370 Fairbrook Street, pointed out that there were only three ways to get in the proposed subdivision, forcing cut-throughs in the neighborhoods. He was also concerned about the impact on the schools, and felt the renderings of the proposed buildings were ugly.

Peter Maise, 729 Grandview Avenue, encouraged the development of a beautiful river walk connecting areas such as the undeveloped city park behind Planet Fitness, Hines Drive, the new development, and downtown.

Lucy Klinkhamer, 430 Lake Street, was concerned about the environmental impact of the new development. Also, the south side of Cady Street was in the Historic District – how would that impact this development? She thought the reclassification of the floodplain was not possible.

Lisa Schon, 306 S Rogers Street, wondered if the proposed commercial space was needed in Northville. Many retail spaces downtown experienced significant turnover.

Kirk Yuhasz, 326 St. Lawrence Boulevard, believed it unthinkable to deviate from some of the principles in the Master Plan, including the daylighting of the river. The plan as presented could make daylighting the river impossible. The development was too dense and out of context with the rest of the City. He was also concerned about traffic, and whether the proposed mitigation efforts would be able to solve traffic problems. He supported the thoughtful development of this property, but wanted the Planning Commission to take their time and take a hard look at the Master Plan.

Carl Giroux, 127 S. Rogers, said that people were attracted to Northville because of its small-town quaintness. The proposed development didn't remotely resemble Northville, and the density far exceeded anything in any of the other neighborhoods within the City. The architectural designs did not mirror the historic image of what had attracted people to Northville, and seemed a typical subdivision design. Opening up the river would be phenomenal, but if the offset of that was a dense development that didn't blend with Northville, it was the wrong approach.

Denise Nash, 417 W. Dunlap, supported the retail on the proposed plan. The parking for the Farmers Market was insufficient. She disagreed that a pavilion would not be flexible for other uses – it would increase flexibility. The project was way too dense, and would cause severe parking problems in the nearby areas, including downtown.

Brian Turnbull, 361 and 365 Eaton, said he was speaking for the old timers. This development was one of the most important things that would happen in Northville in this lifetime. He encouraged the Commission to daylight the river, and to take their time to make sure the right thing was done.

Lenore Lewandowski, 119 Randolph Street, was concerned about the impact on the School District, especially in terms of adding rooms to existing buildings. She was also concerned about the impact the project would have on the City's infrastructure. She felt it important, if the developers wanted to continue and enhance the charm of Northville, to put people first and profits second.

Gail Levan, 132 Randolph Street, Northville, said that many had paid their dues to live in Northville, including seeking permission from the Historic District Commission to paint their homes or make other improvements. She was concerned about the impact the proposed development would have on Northville, as from the renderings it appeared to be just a subdivision dropped into the City. This was not what Northville was about.

Seeing that no one else came forward to speak, Chair Kirk closed this portion of the meeting.

Chair Kirk asked Traffic Consultant Dearing (OHM Advisors) to give a summary of his written review that had been provided to the Commission.

Mr. Dearing said OHM had reviewed the traffic study provided by Fleis&Vandenbrink, and conversation with the applicants was ongoing. It was heartening that the developer knew right away that they needed to do a traffic impact study. On the other hand although Fleis&Vandenbrink evaluated quite a number of intersections, OHM believed that they neglected to include 2 intersections that are already under stress and would likely further degrade based on this development: 7 Mile/Main and 7 Mile/Northville Road.

Mr. Dearing said that the methodology used by Fleis&Vandenbrink was typical in the industry, though some specific questions remained regarding this. He had issues with some of the conclusions in terms of how traffic could be mitigated at stressed intersections, though certainly updating signalization and trying to provide dedicated left turn lanes could help, when that was possible. Creative solutions could include a roundabout with separated right turn lanes at the intersection of Hines Drive at Center/Sheldon. The traffic study was a good first step that needed revisions and additions, and should include the two main intersections that were not included but which were very important.

Mr. Dearing added that he was actively working at setting up a meeting with Wayne County regarding the roundabout solution.

A brief discussion was held regarding the requirements and process for constructing a roundabout. It was also noted that it was desirable for multiple possible projects in the same area to work together on traffic mitigation.

Commissioner Maise asked about other infrastructure: waste water, storm water, etc.

Department of Public Works Director Cureton explained that some time ago City Council authorized a conceptual utility study to determine whether the City's utilities would be able to handle the proposed development, and found that it could with proper design, construction, etc. The City looked at the storm system, sanitary management, and potable water. Once there was a determination of what the development might be at the end of the approval process, rates would be negotiated with the Great Lakes Water Authority (GLWA). Water was not a concern at this point.

Commissioner Maise asked if any increased water rates would be spread across the entire population of the City. Director Cureton said that was the case, but the cost would not be significant overall. He explained the process of negotiation with GLWA. Age also impacted the water system. Many of the pipes were undersized and needed capital improvement.

Commissioner Mielock asked about fire suppression. Director Cureton said that would also be looked at, and explained the process of cost sharing with GLWA. He noted that Northville was one of the few communities in the area that had a bright outlook for development; most nearby communities were experiencing flat growth.

Commissioner Maise said that the Commission would be looking at density and density-related costs to the City. In terms of public benefit, the infrastructure cost to all City residents needed to be considered.

Director Cureton said that the City would look to the developer to pay the costs related to the development.

Regarding PUD eligibility standards, Commissioner Mielock asked the developer for further clarification regarding the traffic study, and also to provide information on the impact to Northville Public Schools. Also, he would like to see a development schedule, especially in terms of phasing.

Mr. Milia said they could provide those things. They believed the proposal would represent a net gain for the Schools. For tonight, they were requesting PUD eligibility. Once they received that they could spend more resources on further studies. They would continue to work collaboratively with the City moving forward.

Commissioner Mielock said that the ownership issue was critical. Could the applicants explain the role of the development agreement? Did the agreement mean that Hunter Pasteur would not be part of this project until the end? Would Hunter Pasteur hand off the development agreement for someone else to complete the project?

Mr. Milia explained that Hunter Pasteur Homes was the master developer on the project. Three separate parcels were being combined to a single entity. That entity, assuming approval by the Planning Commission and City Council, would be governed by a development agreement. Whatever was agreed for roads, parks, size of the homes, all those issues – once approved – would be incorporated into the development agreement, which ran with the land. The townhomes would be built by a townhome builder; a separate entity would construct the apartments. There would be separate builders that would all be governed by the development agreement.

Commissioner Mielock said the development agreement did not appear to meet the terms of the ordinance, which called for single ownership as a requirement of PUD eligibility.

Commissioner Maise noted that this same issue had come up with a different project. Had the City Attorney given an opinion regarding that requirement? City Manager Sullivan explained that the City had not received a formal application that included a development agreement; as a result the attorney had not yet been brought in.

Mr. Milia said that their attorney Mr. Carson made the point that there would be single ownership to own the land initially and be the master developer. But all the products within the development were for-sale products, and would be sold to individual builders and homebuyers. Again, the development agreement would run with the land.

Mr. Milia emphasized that the development agreement represented a contractual relationship with the land. Anyone building within the development had to abide by the agreement. The parks and other amenities had to be constructed and built as agreed upon.

Commissioner Russell said that it appeared the City could be dealing with several owners; this appeared to contradict the ordinance.

Mr. Wertheimer explained that the community was actually better off without one entity having the entire financial obligation for a project this size.

Planning Consultant Elmiger advised that the intent of the ordinance criterion of single ownership was to ensure that the public benefits and infrastructure which were not part of any of the developed portions of the site were built. If a PUD was not under one ownership it was very difficult to have a responsible party. A development schedule might help clarify this issue.

Planning Consultant Elmiger suggested that the applicants provide a sample development agreement as an example of what they were proposing.

Commissioner Miller spoke to the necessary steps that would impact the determination of PUD eligibility, including (1) having the developer's team and OHM agree on what was needed for traffic mitigation and (2) coming to better alignment with Carlisle/Wortman as to what constituted a true public benefit.

Commissioner Miller continued that issues around density needed to be resolved, and that progress needed to be made toward daylighting the river. Regarding the latter, some determination needed to be made as to how the daylighting could happen and what kind of a collaborative effort might be needed to achieve that.

Commissioner Maise agreed that daylighting the river was one of the biggest issues. The applicants should look at Brownfield development, and should bring information to the Commission regarding possible paths forward.

Mr. Milia asked for PUD eligibility this evening. If daylighting the river was critical, and it later was found not to be feasible, the Commission could deny later site plan requests. They needed PUD eligibility approval in order to move forward on further costs for this project.

Mr. Milia said that providing a development agreement usually came much later in the process.

Commissioner Tinberg said that she was not ready to support PUD eligibility. There were too many inconsistencies with the Master Plan; the fact that the developers perceived the plan to be consistent with the Master Plan was concerning. There were very key elements in the Master Plan that seemed to have been missed. She did not feel the public benefit described tonight was enough to balance the cost to the community in terms of density, parking, traffic problems, etc. Also, the single ownership issue needed to be resolved before PUD eligibility could be moved forward.

Mr. Wertheimer asked for specifics as to where the plan was not in line with the Master Plan.

Commissioner Tinberg said that daylighting the river and providing a central park were important in the Master Plan. Relocating the Farmer's Market at the cost of cutting it in half or more provided little value. The architectural features didn't seem consistent with ordinance requirements.

Commissioner Russell made the following points:

- There was a divergence with the Master Plan along Cady Street, in terms of commercial and streetscape elements, and he referred the applicants to Planning Consultant Elmiger's review of the Cady Street area portion of the development in her September 12 letter. The Cady Street Overlay included a commercial element along Cady Street as well as parking and streetscape components. The plan showed on-street parking, but he was concerned about not having commercial there. He felt more commercial could be accommodated.
- The Master Plan showed the highest density at Cady Street and the least density at 7 Mile. This plan reversed that, putting the least dense development in the center. More detailed justification needed to be provided for this change.
- Regarding the public benefit of the park, having the residential lots along River Street did not open the park to the public. Placing parks in people's back yards was always a big issue.
- The scale of the single-family homes needed to be looked at relative to the size of the homes in Beal Town.
- The key element from a public benefit standpoint was daylighting the river. It had to be done. If the land were deeded to the City the City could seek grants to help fund this project.
- In the Master Plan the park element wrapped and encompassed the entire development; the proposed project did not do that.
- The detention pond was not a public amenity; it was a requirement.
- Public benefit would also address traffic. Eliminating cut-throughs in other neighborhoods also had to be addressed.
- The plan was too dense – denser than provided for in the Master Plan.
- Commissioner Russell did not want to enter Northville driving through a residential neighborhood. Some component of downtown needed to be brought to the entrance intersection, rather than offering a strip of a townhome. Entering into a community as quaint as Northville through a development like this spoke negatively about the community. It was not open and welcoming.
- The plan showed parallel parking on Center Street where none now existed. Would there still be room for the bike path on Center Street?
- Creating connectivity between Edward Hines Park, Ford Field, and the neighborhoods would provide a true public benefit.

Commissioner Krenz said that during PUD eligibility they were looking at public benefit and requested deviations. He felt the plan showed potential. However, the plan showed about 1100 people on 48 acres, which equaled about 14,000 people per square mile. Northville had 6,000

people in 2 square miles, which was about 3,000 people per square mile. Therefore this project was asking for a density about 4.5 times the density of the rest of the City. While he was sympathetic to the need to make a profit, the density needed to be walked back, so that any public benefit could balance that.

Regarding Criterion 1.b: *long-term protection and preservation of natural resources* . . . Commissioner Krenz agreed that daylighting the river was an absolute. The City had one shot at that, and if it didn't happen now it would never happen.

Commissioner Krenz thought these things could be worked out, but he was not yet ready to move forward.

Mr. Milia asked if there could be subcommittee work on the traffic and school issues, and if there could be a subcommittee that would include one or more Commissioners and other key community members including the Planning Consultant regarding a public/private partnership for daylighting the river.

Planning Consultant Elmiger advised that a member of the Commission could not represent the entire Planning Commission.

Mr. Milia emphasized the need to get appropriate people in the same room to talk about a potential private/public partnership.

Commissioner Maise suggested involving the Economic Development Committee.

Commissioner Tinberg said daylighting the river was an important public benefit that she would look for in exchange for granting a PUD.

An audience member asked if any meetings regarding the partnership would be open to the public.

Planning Consultant Elmiger said she would need time to research this question, as well as how much decision-making such a group would have.

Commissioner Miller did not think PUD eligibility would be granted this evening. It was important to look at what conditions might be attached in the future so that the PUD could move forward, or alternatively, how the Commission would reach a determination that it was not going to move forward.

Commissioner Mielock agreed. He thought the PUD proposal represented a positive direction, but the Commission needed more information to fill in gaps regarding traffic, density, daylighting the river, the development schedule, etc. The Commission needed to know those things in order to get a bigger picture, so that ground rules could be established as to how to proceed with approvals with or without contingencies.

The consensus of the Commission was that the application should be referred back to the applicant, in order to give them time to address comments made at tonight's meeting, as well as comments from the September 12, 2018 Carlisle/Wortman review memorandum. Chair Kirk said he would entertain a motion to that effect.

Mr. Wertheimer said that while they understood most concerns, he did not see a way forward without further action on a public/private partnership regarding daylighting the river.

Commissioner Maise suggested getting together with the EDC and other entities and figure out what the options were. As far as the Commission was concerned, they needed more detail on such a partnership in order to be able to assess if the daylighting of the river represented a true public benefit.

Mr. Milia said that they would accept the direction of the Commission; they would continue to work with the City consultants and come back with more information.

Commissioner Tinberg emphasized the importance of reducing the density of this project.

After a brief discussion of process, Commissioner Maise offered the following motion:

**MOTION by Maise, support by Tinberg, to refer the application for P.U.D. ELIGIBILITY: NORTHVILLE DOWNS – 301 S. CENTER – HUNTER PASTEUR back to the applicant.**

<b>Kirk</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Krenz</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Maise</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Mielock</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Miller</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Russell</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Smith</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Tinberg</b>	<b>yes</b>

**Therefore the motion carried unanimously.**

**8. ADJOURN**

Seeing that there was no further discussion, Chair Kirk asked for a motion to adjourn.

**MOTION by Maise, support by Russell, to adjourn the meeting at 10:05 p.m.**

**Motion carried unanimously.**

Respectfully submitted,

Cheryl McGuire  
Recording Secretary

Approved as submitted 10/16/2018