



PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

CITY OF NOVI

Regular Meeting

March 28, 2018 7:00 PM

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

CALL TO ORDER

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

ROLL CALL

Present: Member Anthony, Member Avdoulos, Member Lynch (Chair), Member Maday

Absent: Member Greco (excused), Member Howard (excused), Chair Pehrson (excused)

Also Present: Barbara McBeth, City Planner; Sri Komaragiri, Planner; Darcy Rechtien, Staff Engineer; Thomas Schultz, City Attorney; Peter Hill, Environmental Consultant

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Moved by Member Avdoulos and seconded by Member Anthony.

VOICE VOTE TO APPROVE THE MARCH 28, 2018 AGENDA MOTION MADE BY MEMBER AVDOULOS AND SECONDED BY MEMBER ANTHONY.

Motion to approve the March 28, 2018 Planning Commission Agenda. Motion carried 4-0.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

Gary Zack, 359 South Lake Dr, said I have lived at 359 South Lake Drive for 26 years. I am here to speak to you regarding a proposed development by Robertson Brothers Homes on Old Novi Rd and Thirteen Mile. I attended both neighborhood meetings that Robertson Brothers had in February and March of this year and applaud Robertson Brothers for reaching out to the neighbors.

Unfortunately, the Lakeview Townes development that they are proposing is completely out of character with the surrounding neighborhood and I do not feel it should be allowed. The proposed density that they've mentioned of 50 homes per acre is almost five times the density that the area is zoned for. The elevations they're proposing will tower over the existing neighborhood and make the entrance to the lakes area look an urban street in Royal Oak.

In both meetings, neighbor after neighbor expressed their concern that this area right next to their homes be developed in a manner that is in harmony with the existing neighborhood so as not to detract from the neighborhood. I feel the same way and stand in support of my

neighbors.

Mr. Zack said I am hopeful that the Planning Commission will not allow high-density development in this area zoned R-4. We already have high-density at Thirteen Mile and Novi Rd. The Old Novi and Thirteen Mile area deserves a development that better fits the rural and eclectic nature of the community.

This area is one of the oldest and most interesting parts of Novi and is also the gateway to the greatest natural asset of Novi. I hope the Planning Commission will consider and respect this when reviewing plans for development in this area. We are a desirable area and there is really no need to accept development that does not fit the community. If Robertson Homes can't find a way to fit in, some developer down the road will. Thank you.

Dorothy Duchesneau, 125 Henning Dr, said I too am here regarding that development. If you have followed the front page article in the Novi News of March 22, 2018, you will be aware there was a residents' meeting with a developer regarding those properties located South of Thirteen Mile, east and west of Old Novi Rd.

These properties are located in two subdivisions which have existed as platted residential subdivisions near the shores of Walled Lake Lake, as of 1926 and 1927, that's when they were recorded in Oakland County. They are Shawood Walled Lake Heights and Howell's Walled Lake. Yes, some of these lots are small by today's standards, others are larger. But most are still lots that individual homeowners can build on. What they need is a 'for sale' sign on them and some creative architects. No one can build on something that is never offered for sale.

Your 2016 Master Plan refers to using "a set of use and design guidelines to keep the residential character of an area and minimize the effect that the transitional uses would have on nearby single-family residential properties." This qualifies. It also states in your Master Plan "planned residential densities will remain the same in most neighborhoods. This plan recognizes that the preservation of existing neighborhoods and the way of life they provide is key to preserving the character of Novi." Those are your words from your Plan.

Ms. Duchesneau stated therefore, these lots need to be looked at as part of existing R4 density subdivisions that they are. They are not rural acreage with nothing built around them. They are surrounded by longtime residents whose opinions count, so before you slice and dice their existing subdivision into what a developer thinks the city wants, be aware.

When this or any other project for this area finally comes before you, do not just consider what is just within the lines of the project. Please consider the existing surrounding area. In this case, high density three-story attached townhomes that are actually built on the property lines so the developer can make more money, are not appropriate. Thank you.

Michel Duchesneau, 1191 South Lake Dr, said I provided some guideline to the parcel that is being discussed. We are concerned about a proposal for developing the area south of Thirteen Mile Rd and east of Old Novi Rd. This area is currently zoned R-4 and B-3. We are requesting the Planning Commission and the City Council to strictly adhere to the current zoning ordinance setbacks for any single family attached homes built in this district.

This is taken out of the Zoning Ordinance, it's kind of like the Easy Reader as I see it for what's allowed in a building district and I've added the maximum number of stories to this from other portions of the Ordinance. Currently the properties are zoned R-4 and they allow maximum height of 2.5 stories of single-family detached houses. And RM-1 allows a maximum of 2 stories for multiple-family attached homes, and it requires 50-foot front yard

setbacks and 75-foot rear and side yard setbacks.

The developer's proposals that we've been looking at, and that's what I'll talk about tonight, show garages on the ground level, living space on the other floor, living space on the third floor. And for the building department, these are considered three-story homes. That makes this a request to go and put RM-2 buildings in this particular area. And the thing to note is 75-foot front yard, rear yard, and side yard for setbacks. That kind of sets the guideline before you look at any layouts or whether buildings should be facing Old Novi Rd or Thirteen Mile Rd.

Mr. Duchesneau continued and these are basically three one-acre parcels and I call them Parcel #1, Parcel #2, Parcel #3. Parcel #1 is 100 feet deep and the developer is proposing 27 homes on this with no setbacks basically, they can't meet the 75-foot front yard or side yard setbacks required. And it couldn't even be built under the guidelines for RM-1, which allows only 50-foot front yard setback. So Parcel #1 should never see multi-family attached homes.

Parcel #2 is 144 feet by 200 feet, they are proposing again three-story homes. You can't fit 150-foot required setbacks in a 144-foot space. They should never be allowed to be built as RM-3.

Then the next parcel is Parcel #3, which is more interesting. This one is 200 feet deep by 260 feet wide on Old Novi Rd. Walled Lake is up here and Shawood Lake is this here. So Parcel #3, when you do the setbacks for RM-2, forget about the 200 other ordinances and requirements for building in Novi, when you do the 75-foot and the perimeter, you're left with an area that's 115 feet roughly by 50 feet. Ok. Conceivably, a building could be put there if that's what everybody wants and allows and it meets the other 200 ordinances. But basically this would allow about 4-6, 4-5, homes to be built there. If it's developed under R-4, it just coincidentally turns out you could build four homes on that lot.

Mr. Duchesneau said I don't know which way this goes, but I just want everybody to know that building that's R-4 or RM-1 are inappropriate for this location per the City's ordinances, the Easy Reader format. Basically, I've also included from the Zoning Ordinance the rules as to what RM-2 is intended for and basically it's for abutting areas of high intensity business and office space. I appreciate your time and consideration if a proposal such as what we've been seeing comes forward here and hopefully you are able to support our interests. Thank you.

Todd Keane, 2300 Austin Dr, said I've been at 2300 Austin Dr for 25 years. My house is right there. I don't know if this has ever been considered or not, and first of all, I want to echo basically the exact same thing everybody has said on this issue.

I don't know if the Master Plan has actually looked at the topography of the area, as well. So where I'm at right here, I'm assuming or guessing – it's within a few feet – this area appears 20 feet higher. So when I'm down in my backyard I'm looking up at these hills and all of this development is going to be on top of those hills, and I just think not only is it going to look bad for my area but going up Old Novi Rd, it's just going to look like a – I think we really ought to look at a more three-dimensional view of this before even considering allowing something like that to happen.

Mr. Keane stated another thing, too, is if this development does go through, it's just a matter of time where everybody here is going to sell and they're just going to knock all those homes and put up a bunch more apartment-looking homes. It's a shame, nice lakes around that area, but. Anyway, I'd like to think that the Commission recognizes the

importance of maintaining this neighborhood by not allowing this zoning on Old Novi Rd and Thirteen Mile.

CORRESPONDENCE

There was no correspondence.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

There were no Committee Reports.

CITY PLANNER REPORT

City Planner Barb McBeth had nothing to report.

CONSENT AGENDA

There were no items on the consent agenda.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. TODAY'S DENTAL JSP16-47

Public hearing at the request of Dr. John Halmaghi for approval of Preliminary Site Plan, Woodland Permit, and Stormwater Management Plan. The subject property is located in Section 15 of the City of Novi, south of Grand River Avenue and east of Taft Road, at 44911 Grand River Avenue. The applicant is proposing to construct a 6,688 square foot single-story office building with two tenant spaces and associated site improvements.

Planner Komaragiri said the applicant Doctor John Halmaghi would like to construct a single story office with two tenant spaces on a vacant property located in Section 15, southside of Grand River, east of Taft Road. The property is zoned I-1 and surrounded by the same on all sides. The south east tip of the property abuts residential. The Future Land Use map indicates industrial research development technology for the subject property and the surrounding properties and single family for the property at the south east corner. The subject property contains a majority of wetlands and woodlands on the southern part of the property.

The current site plan proposes a 6,688 square feet office building with two tenant spaces, one of which is proposed to be a dental office on this 1.37 acre property. Associated site improvements such as landscaping and underground storm water storage system are proposed. City regional storm water system is located south of the subject property.

For I-1 properties, a berm is required along the property line abutting the residential district. The applicant is requesting a waiver from Planning Commission for the earth berm requirement because of adjacent woodlands and existing regional detention basin easement on the south side of the property. Woodland areas shall provide sufficient width and density to provide the visual and audio screening that a berm or wall would provide. The applicant is requested couple of minor landscape waivers due to limitations posed by the small site size and fire truck turning requirements. Our landscape architect supports the waiver and recommends approval.

The Plan proposes a total wetland buffer impact of 560 square feet and 26 cubic yards of fill for the purpose of constructing a retaining wall and two (2) storm water outfalls. No impacts are proposed to wetlands.

Planner Komaragiri said the Plan indicates a total of thirty-one total surveyed trees on-site and proposes the removal of thirteen of the eighteen regulated trees on-site, about 72% removal. However, the plan also proposed to preserve 4 existing non-woodlands trees

along Grand River and has received 14 woodlands replacement credits for that preservation.

The plan would also require a Section 9 waiver as the percentage of brick is below the minimum amount required by the Ordinance on the West and East facades. The waiver is supported by our façade consultant as the overall design exhibits a well-balanced selection of materials with significant percentages of masonry. The façade board is included in your packet.

Planner Komaragiri said all reviews are recommending approval with additional comments to be addressed at the time of Final site plan submittal. The Planning Commission is asked to hold the scheduled Public Hearing and make a motion to approve subject to conditions listed in the motion sheet. The applicant Doctor John Halmaghi is here tonight if you have any questions for him. We will be glad to answer any questions you have for us. Thank you.

John Halmaghi with Today's Dental said where should I begin? I've been a resident of Novi for thirteen years, my kids have been in school here since second grade. We have and do own four other properties in the City of Novi so we have a lot of financial as well as personal investment in the City of Novi.

I have been a practicing dentist for thirty years now, I have owned Comfort Dental in the City of Southfield and the Michigan TMJ/Headache Institute in Bloomfield Hills. I have sold those businesses and we are using those funds for this construction and this development.

Dr. Halmaghi said as you know, the section of Grand River Ave where the proposed development is is more of an industrial area and we felt that this development would definitely bring a cosmetic improvement to the vicinity. It's a project that we feel will bring value to the area, we'll continue to practice here. My son is applying to dental school, he is going to school here, he lives here, and he plans on staying in the community for a long time. My wife is a real estate agent, she sells properties in the area, so everything we're doing we feel is the best for the City.

If you have any questions, my architect Bob is here, our civil engineer is here, and I can answer things about teeth and toothbrushes but I'm not sure I can answer things about the building.

Chair Lynch asked if there was anyone in the audience that wished to address the Planning Commission regarding this project. Seeing no one, he asked if there was any correspondence.

Member Anthony said yes we have one correspondence. Dan Mansfield, 45033 Grand River Ave, is in support of the project.

Chair Lynch closed the public hearing and turned it over to Planning Commission for their consideration.

Member Avdoulos said when I first looked at the project, I know we've got some waivers that are required and a lot of them deal with the landscaping issues, but I trust our landscape architect Rick is very thorough in what he will work with and what he will allow, so I didn't have any issues with that.

I thought the same thing that this development will enhance that Grand River area and I think it'll spur on other projects to create and maintain that same aesthetic, so I

appreciate that. I think there is a waiver for Section 9 related to brick but I think the layout of the building with the materials that it's using has been nicely done and our façade consultant has indicated as such. So I'd like to make a motion.

Motion made by Member Avdoulos and seconded by Member Anthony.

Member Maday said I would just like to say that I'm excited, I'm happy for your family, and I think it's going to be a great development.

Chair Lynch said thank you for working with the staff. I know it's a somewhat arduous process but this will enhance that area. I did review the area, I drove out and took a look at it and what you're proposing. I think that it's going to enhance the area and good luck to you.

ROLL CALL VOTE TO APPROVE PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN MADE BY MEMBER AVDOULOS AND SECONDED BY MEMBER ANTHONY.

In the matter of Today's Dental, JSP16-47, motion to approve the Preliminary Site Plan based on and subject to the following:

- a. Section 9 Façade Waiver to allow reduction of percentage of minimum brick on West (30 percent minimum required, 20 percent provided) and East façades (30 percent minimum required, 27 percent provided) because the design is consistent with the intent of Façade Ordinance, which is hereby granted;**
- b. A landscape waiver from Sec. 3.14.5.E and Sec. 5.5.3.A.vii for not providing a berm along the southern edge of the property adjacent to residential due to significant wetland and woodlands already existing, which is hereby granted;**
- c. A landscape waiver from Section 5.5.3.C. for not meeting the minimum required square footage for landscape end island and not providing a tree within the island due to conflict with location of proposed fire hydrant, which is hereby granted;**
- d. A landscape waiver for allowing a painted island in lieu of landscape end island to allow for convenient fire access within the site, which is hereby granted;**
- e. A landscape waiver from Section 5.5.3.E.i.c and LDM 1.d. of Zoning Ordinance for absence of required street trees due to conflicts with utility lines, which is hereby granted;**
- f. A landscape waiver from Section 5.5.3.D. for providing 276 square feet of required building foundation landscape in an area not adjacent to the building as it meets the intent of requirement, which is hereby granted;**
- g. The findings of compliance with Ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters, and the conditions and items listed in those letters being addressed on the Final Site Plan.**

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

ROLL CALL VOTE TO APPROVE THE WOODLAND PERMIT MADE BY MEMBER AVDOULOS AND SECONDED BY MEMBER ANTHONY.

In the matter of Today's Dental, JSP16-47, motion to approve the Woodland Permit based on and subject to the findings of compliance with Ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters, and the conditions and items listed in those letters being addressed on the Final Site Plan. This motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Chapter 37 of the Code of Ordinances and all other applicable

provisions of the Ordinance. Motion carried 4-0.

ROLL CALL VOTE TO APPROVE THE STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN MADE BY MEMBER AVDOULOS AND SECONDED BY MEMBER ANTHONY.

In the matter of Today's Dental, JSP16-47, motion to approve the Stormwater Management Plan to the City Council based on and subject to the findings of compliance with Ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters, and the conditions and items listed in those letters being addressed on the Final Site Plan. This motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Chapter 11 of the Code of Ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance. Motion carried 4-0.

2. AMENDMENT TO WOODLAND TREE REPLACEMENT CHART

Public hearing for consideration of City Code Amendment in order to amend the City of Novi at Chapter 37 Ordinance No. 18.125-24, Woodland Protection Ordinance in order to modify the list of trees provided in the woodland replacement chart, and to set a maximum for credits received in the use of native seed mixes.

City Planner McBeth said you may recall that a few weeks ago, our Landscape Architect Rick Meader set this up for discussion at the meeting this evening. Unfortunately, he could not be here so our consultant Pete Hill from ECT is here and he is very familiar with this, of course, as it relates to the Woodland Ordinance and improvements to that. He has a brief summary of the changes and after that, we will ask you to hold the public hearing.

City Consultant Pete Hill from ECT Wetland and Woodland Consultants said good evening, everybody, I'm here to fill in for Rick Meader. I have a quick summary for you guys and for anyone in the audience that may not have seen this and is interested.

Periodically, the City staff and consultants review ordinances and determine the needs for updates to those, so several amendments are being proposed at this time to the Woodland Ordinance. The amendments are pretty minor and pretty specific and they have to do with the Woodland Replacement Chart and the Reforestation Credit Table.

Basically, there is an ongoing concern in the Woodland Replacement Chart, which has allowed some trees to be planted in the City that aren't consistent with the stated goal of the Woodland Ordinance. And just to review, I'm going to read the first purpose of the Woodland Ordinance, which is "to provide for the protection, preservation, replacement, proper maintenance, and the use of the trees and woodlands located in the City in order to minimize disturbance to them and to prevent damage from erosion and siltation, a loss of wildlife and vegetation, and/or from the destruction of the natural habitat. In this regard, it is the intent of this chapter to protect the integrity of woodland areas as a whole, in recognition that woodlands serve as part of an ecosystem, and to place priority on the preservation of woodlands, trees, similar woody vegetation, and related natural resources over development when there are no location alternatives." So again, these are pretty specific changes.

City Consultant Hill said so the first is to the Woodland Replacement Chart, and it's to restrict some species currently on the list that are not native to Michigan. I might add that native plants are plants that were here before European settlement in the 1700s. Since that time, thousands of plants and animals have been introduced and become naturalized in an area. And these plants that some people may call invasive grow and, in some cases, push out native plants from the area. So that's the first goal of modifying the Woodland Replacement Chart, to restrict non-native plants that were on the list.

The second is to add several plants that are not on the list and are native and would be good options for planting. And the third is to remove from the chart species that are not native. I'll explain a little bit further.

The first is to restrict some plant genera that were on the list, and there are two examples, beech trees and walnut trees. The way it's currently written for Beech, it opens up for developers and landscape architects to propose other beech trees that are not native, so this would limit it to just the American Beech tree, which is what Rick Meader and we recommended.

The second, adding to the chart some native species that are not already on there, include – and I'm not going to leave the genus and species botanical names off because I don't think anyone wants to listen to them – Smooth Shadbush, Pagoda Dogwood, and Flowering Dogwood. Three species that are native to Michigan and are good options to be on this Woodland Replacement List.

And the third goal is to remove these species that aren't native to Michigan that are currently on this list, I'm just going to read them: Yellowwood would come off, Sweetgum would come off because they're both not native, American Bladdernut is actually a shrub and we did not want it on the tree list because it's more of a shrub-like plant, Bald Cypress is not native to Michigan, and Eastern Hemlock, although it's a great tree we're proposing pulling it off the list because of an insect pest that it's my understanding that once this pest reaches the tree within 4-10 years those trees will be dead, so we're proposing that that's not a good option for woodland replacement.

City Consultant Hill said moving on, the Reforestation Credit Table is the next piece that would be modified and it lists types of vegetation, the minimum sizes required when planting as woodland replacement credit, and the maximum percentage that a developer or landscape architect can use those plants for to meet their requirements.

So the first recommended change is to limit the percentage of credits that can be gained through the use of native seed mixes on-site, not just trees but native seed mixes that create a seeded area – perhaps woodland, perhaps prairie. It's already on the Reforestation Credit Table, but there was no maximum percentage on the table for use. And actually that native seed mix option hasn't been used very much by developers. So the change that you see here is to take that line item from no maximum percentage of use to 5% of the total woodland replacement credits required. Currently, the ordinance allows one replacement credit per 70 square yards of seeded area but again there's no limit on the percentage of the overall woodland credits that could be met with that. But again, there aren't many projects coming through that are using that provision. And again, the change proposed here is to limit it to 5%.

And the final point is another change to the reforestation table, a line item has actually been added to it. A new category is being added that would now enable projects to get one woodland replacement credit for the planting of 50 tree or shrub whips at least 24 inches tall. So these are 2.5-inch diameter trees, these are ¾ inch or 1 inch diameter small pieces of vegetation.

City Consultant Hill continued I'd like to add that the proposed changes were shared with landscape architects that frequently do business in the City, and this change was actually recommended by one of those folks. And the reason is that the 2.5-inch replacement trees that are generally used by developers to meet these woodland replacement credit requirements, you can't get as many species or varieties of acceptable material in the 2.5-inch size, so this proposed change is for that reason that not all preferable species are

available in nurseries in sizes that we require for tree replacement. So this will allow much more species diversity to be included in woodland replacement plantings. And for now, just like I was mentioning in the other category, we'll restrict this use option to 5% of the overall woodland replacement credit requirement. That's all I have.

Chair Lynch asked if there was anyone in the audience that wished to address the Planning Commission regarding this matter. Seeing no one, he turned it over to the Planning Commission for discussion on this matter.

Member Anthony said so on the section where it allows a seeded area, what size area does that have to be to be equivalent to one tree credit?

City Consultant Hill said 70 square yards.

Member Anthony said 70 square yards, so a football field is 100 square yards, so that's really big.

City Consultant Hill said and that's probably why it hasn't been used much.

Member Anthony said it seems that would be a really unusual circumstance in which that would be used. And then same with the tree whips, is there something similar as far as the size area for that?

City Consultant Hill said there's not, just a quantity of 50 total whips equals one woodland replacement credit.

Member Anthony said so in dealing with the whip, what do you think the likelihood of success of, say, half of those whips making it to three years?

City Consultant Hill said it's true that some of them die, but the City will be covered in that there will be a two-year maintenance guarantee through the developer for all vegetation, including the woodland replacement and that would include the whips.

Member Anthony said that's all I have, those were the only things that caught my eye, but other than that, that was really good work that you guys did on this. And with that, I'd be prepared to make a motion.

Member Avdoulos said I had the same questions as Member Anthony, especially with the 50 whips and how they would be allocated on the piece of property. I guess if it's one replacement tree and then you have 50, you don't have to combine them into one area and you could spread them out and use it that way.

I like the fact that we are also getting some of the landscape architects that are working with the City to help make recommendations. I think we were doing that all along throughout the years when we get recommendations so that's a good thing to at least provide in our ordinances because that's what the professionals are going to be using so there's no issue related to that. That's all of my comments.

Chair Lynch said I have one other comment. Are you comfortable now that everything is out of the chart that's non-native to Michigan right now? When you say native, some of the natives are Ohio, Illinois, into that region – just native to Michigan is the only thing that's on the Woodland Replacement Chart, correct?

City Consultant Hill said correct, the bad ones have been honed out and a couple good

ones have been added.

Chair Lynch said so this will give us a higher probability of fully thriving and not dying off after five or ten years. I appreciate your efforts.

Motion made by Member Anthony and seconded by member Avdoulos.

ROLL CALL VOTE TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO CITY COUNCIL MADE BY MEMBER ANTHONY AND SECONDED BY MEMBER AVDOULOS.

Motion to recommend approval to City Council of the Amendment to the City of Novi Ordinance Chapter 37 – Woodlands Protection Ordinance No. 18.125-24, Woodland Tree Replacement Chart. *Motion carried 4-0.*

MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION

There were no matters for consideration.

SUPPLEMENTAL ISSUES

There were no supplemental issues.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

Michel Duchesneau, 1191 South Lake Dr, said Novi is a beautiful city. It doesn't matter if you're in Island Lake or Walled Lake or Shawood Lake. And I'd just like to ask everybody to think about where you're at, where you live, and would you be able to replace your home with a log cabin? And what would that log cabin look like? And where would you put a log cabin in Novi? What would it look like and where would it go?

Well it just turns out that I have some pictures of a log cabin. This is my absolute favorite house in the City of Novi. Don't know the owner, took these pictures this morning. It was built in 1984 on three 40-foot lots. It's got antlers on it and you probably can't see it very well from these pictures, but there's a little bench on the front porch. I'm glad I got through this without crying. And you can see this house from Old Novi Rd, it's the second house. It's in the Shawood Walled Lake Heights subdivision.

Mr. Duchesneau said so you hear our group here occasionally say it's like living up north, it's country, rustic, it's bohemian, you name it. I recommend that if the Planning Commission members get a chance to go drive the streets, Wainwright, Austin, Linhart, go visit the Lakeview Bar by the shore and either have a fish fry there on Friday, they have an excellent fish fry, in my opinion they have steaks as good as Moe's on 10. I just want you to realize that even though they're 40 foot lots, when you combine them and you get creative you can build a nice home. And I appreciate your time.

Gary Zack, 359 South Lake Dr, said I'm not going to talk about the Lakeview Townes but I did want to make a comment that I was glad to hear you guys asking questions about the survival rate of the whips, because I see so many of the trees replaced in Novi that are dying. Even if you look around at Pavilion Shores Park, there's a lot of trees that the City planted that didn't even make it past a year or two, they were probably not even 2.5 inches. But I think that's a concern.

If we're going to replant trees, it's not going to do us a lot of good if they don't make it past a year or two so I was really glad to hear those concerns. I thought about getting up but

then I thought well I don't really know that much about this but if you look around you see a lot of trees that have been replaced that have died, especially along the roads. It's unsightly and that's not what I think we want. Thank you.

John Kerakea, said I didn't want to sit there and you not know what I was here for. I'm here supporting my neighbors who are not too much in favor of this Shawood Heights development on Novi Rd. I just wanted you to know I'm personally supporting them and not in support of this development. I live more than 500 feet from the development but in the Shawood Heights sub.

I'm just going on opinion, I don't have a lot of facts that I would need but just my opinion and feel is that I wish the development didn't have to be there but if it did have to be there, it could be more attractive. I think down the street on the corner of Old Novi and Novi Rd, the developer is building a single-family homes up to 500,000 and more. I just think it's a little confusing that right down the street these townhomes are going to go in so close to the lake, a nice viewing area and the City would want something to match that up to 500,000 kind of thing. I think it would be better for the City, it's closer to the lake, I think we'd like it because it would bring up our property values for the traffic we'd have to put up with. So maybe you ought to consider that.

They're going to be very close to the lake, they're going to have a view, I don't think those townhouses in my opinion are not attractive enough for the vision that Novi has. I think it's downgrading the look. Those are my thoughts but the main thing I want you to know is that there is someone here supporting my neighbors and I didn't want to sit here and let that go unsaid.

ADJOURNMENT

Moved by Member Avdoulos and seconded by Member Anthony.

VOICE VOTE ON THE MOTION TO ADJOURN MADE BY MEMBER AVDOULOS AND SECONDED BY MEMBER ANTHONY.

Motion to adjourn the March 28, 2018 Planning Commission meeting. Motion carried 4-0.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:47 PM.