

REGULAR MEETING - PLANNING COMMISSION

CITY OF NOVI

January 25, 2017

Proceedings taken in the matter of the PLANNING COMMISSION, at City of Novi, 45175 West Ten Mile Road, Novi, Michigan, on Wednesday, January 25, 2017

BOARD MEMBERS

Mark Pehrson, Chairperson

Ted Zuchlewski

David Greco

Robert Giacometti

John Avdoulos

Tony Anthony

ALSO PRESENT: Barbara McBeth, City Planner

Rick Meader, Landscape Architect, Kirsten Mellem, Planner,

Thomas Schultz, City Attorney, Darcy Rechtien, Staff Engineer

Certified Shorthand Reporter: Jennifer L. Wall

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

Novi, Michigan.

Wednesday, January 25, 2017

7:00 p.m.

** ** *

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Call to
order the January 25th, regular meeting of
the Planning Commission.

Kirsten, call the roll.

MS. MELLEM: Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Here.

MS. MELLEM: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Here.

MS. MELLEM: Member Giacobetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Here.

MS. MELLEM: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Here.

MS. MELLEM: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Here.

MS. MELLEM: Member Zuchlewski?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Here.

With that, if we could rise
for the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Pledge recited.)

1 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

2 With that, we will look for a motion to
3 approve the agenda or any modifications
4 thereof.

5 MR. GRECO: Motion to approve.

6 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Second.

7 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a
8 motion and a second. Any other comments?
9 All those in favor.

10 THE BOARD: Aye.

11 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Any
12 opposed?

13 Have a motion.

14 Presentations? Any?

15 Audience participation?

16 We do have one public hearing
17 tonight.

18 If anyone in the audience
19 wishes to address the Planning Commission on
20 something other than that public hearing,
21 please step forward at this point.

22 Seeing none, we will close
23 the first audience participation.

1 I don't believe we have any
2 correspondence?

3 MR. GRECO: No correspondence.

4 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Any
5 committee reports? I don't believe so.

6 City Planner, Ms. McBeth.

7 MS. MCBETH: Good evening.

8 Just a couple things that
9 happened at Monday night's Council meetings.

10 Council did consider two
11 development plan requests, that was also
12 recently considered by the Planning
13 Commission.

14 First Council approved the
15 revised preliminary site plan for the
16 expansion of the Suburban Collection
17 Showplace, and associated parking lot and
18 other site improvements.

19 Council also granted a
20 tentative approval of the requested Hadley's
21 Towing for the Zoning Map Amendment and the
22 Concept Plan for a vehicle towing business.
23 That's for property located on the south side

1 of Grand River between Beck and Wixom Road.

2 Once that PRO is drafted and
3 approved by Council, the preliminary site
4 plan will return to the Planning Commission
5 for their consideration.

6 Council also approved the
7 second reading for two text amendments. The
8 Planning Commission recently recommended the
9 Text Amendment to allow drive-thru
10 restaurants in the Town Center district and
11 the amendments intended to accommodate the
12 use for residential developments in that Main
13 Street area. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

14 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you,
15 Barb, appreciate that.

16 We come to our first and only
17 public hearing.

18 It's the Learning Experience,
19 JSP16-19. It's a public hearing at the
20 request of Lockard Development, Inc. on
21 behalf of the Learning Experience for special
22 land use, preliminary site plan, storm water
23 management plan.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

The subject property is located in Section 14 on 2.2 acres in the City of Novi and is located on the northeast corner of Eleven Mile and Town Center Drive in the OSC, office service commercial zoning district.

The applicant is proposing a 10,000 square foot day-care facility for 150 children and 24 employees with associated site improvements.

Kirsten.

MS. MELLEM: Good evening. The applicant is proposing to construct a single story day-care building consisting of 10,000 square feet, outdoor recreation area and associated site improvements.

The project is 2.2 acres located on the northeast corner of Town Center Drive and Eleven Mile Road in Section 14. To the north is the new Homewood Suites hotel, to the west is Town Center, to the east is Courtyard Marriott hotel and to the south is vacant property.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

The subject property is currently zoned OSC, office service commercial and surrounded on the northeast and southeast by OSC as well.

To the west and southwest is zoned TC, Town Center.

The future land use map indicates office commercial for the subject property and the properties to the north and the east. To the west is TC commercial and to the south is TC gateway.

The site does not contain any wetlands or woodlands.

The applicant is proposing a day-care facility for approximately 150 children in a 10,000 square foot building. They are providing 7,227 square feet of outdoor recreation spaces, which is deficient by about 15,273 square feet and is the only ZBA variance the applicant is seeking.

The applicant is providing 44 parking spaces and internal sidewalk connections to Town Center Drive and Eleven

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

Mile Road.

There is an existing sidewalk along Town Center Drive and an existing pathway along Eleven Mile Road.

Traffic has noted that the entrance island is below the required 15-foot radius and fire has noted that the south end of the parking lot does not meet fire department standards to insure that large trucks and emergency vehicles can maneuver throughout the site.

The applicant has responded they will adjust the radii to meet the minimum requirement on the final site plan submittal.

The applicant is also requesting a traffic waiver for same side, opposite side driveway facing to permit less distance between entrances along the private drive to the north. It should also be noted that the ingress, egress issue has also been resolved.

The landscape plan shows the

1 applicant is providing a landscape berm along
2 Town Center Drive and Eleven Mile Road as
3 required by ordinance.

4 There are a couple of
5 landscape waivers the applicant is requesting
6 which is supported by staff.

7 The first one is to permit
8 fewer parking lot perimeter canopy trees than
9 required, 18 are required, three provided.
10 And second is to permit less building
11 foundation landscaping and to allow
12 foundation landscaping to be located away
13 from the building foundation and away from
14 the play area due to conflicts with the
15 children.

16 The facade elevations show
17 that the applicant is requesting a Section 9
18 facade waiver of the overage of asphalt
19 shields on all sides. The required minimum
20 is 25 percent and the applicant is providing
21 between 40 and 42 percent.

22 This is supported by staff
23 because it is consistent with overall design

1 of the building and is in context with the
2 existing single story office building located
3 to the east.

4 The Planning Commission is
5 asked tonight to consider the special land
6 use permit for the proposed day-care use
7 taking into consideration the factors that
8 shall be considered in review of any special
9 land use, which is provided in the motion
10 sheet.

11 If a favorable outcome is
12 obtained in the Planning Commission it is to
13 consider a preliminary site plan and storm
14 water management plan including the requested
15 waivers.

16 Representatives Paul Riordan
17 from Lockard Construction and Shiloh Dahlin
18 from Alpine Engineering and the staff from
19 the Learning Experience are also here to
20 answer any questions you may have.

21 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.
22 The applicant wish to address the Planning
23 Commission at this time?

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

MR. RIORDAN: We just want to thank you for your time tonight and we are available to answer any questions that you may have.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: This is a public hearing.

If there is anyone in the audience who wishes to address the Planning Commission on this matter, please step forward.

Seeing no one, we will close the public hearing at this time and turn it over to the Planning Commission for their consideration.

Anyone? Member Anthony.

MR. ANTHONY: This is for the applicant. In looking at the site plan, I see that there is a proposed fence that's around the play area.

What would that fence be constructed of, are there plans now?

MS. SCHWEIKER: Good evening. My name is Charlotte Schweiker. I am with

1 (unintelligible) Architects, the architect of
2 record for the project.

3 The fence that's going to
4 surround the playground will be a six-foot
5 tall privacy PVC fence and it's going to be
6 white.

7 MR. ANTHONY: You don't have any
8 pictures of it?

9 MS. SCHWEIKER: We submitted a
10 rendering of the building that does show the
11 fence. It's also detailed --

12 MR. ANTHONY: Very good.

13 The other question I have is
14 for the pathway that's along Eleven Mile.
15 That pathway right now, I guess, first, to
16 the City, do you guys remember, is that an
17 asphalt pathway right now?

18 MS. MELLEEM: Yes.

19 MR. ANTHONY: So in the
20 construction of your development, with the
21 sidewalks and pathways that are there, will
22 they be care taken in order not to damage
23 those pathways?

1 MR. RIORDAN: We will do
2 everything we can to make sure they don't get
3 damaged. If they do get damaged during
4 construction, we will make sure they get
5 fixed.

6 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Member
7 Zuchlewski?

8 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: I have a
9 question for the architect.

10 I am looking at the
11 dimensions on the parking lot, parking spaces
12 specifically.

13 And the spaces up against the
14 sidewalk are at seven feet in depth. Then
15 the ones in the middle are 19. I am just
16 wondering, that's not standard by any means,
17 isn't it normally 20 feet?

18 MS. SCHWEIKER: I think site
19 engineering will address that question.

20 MS. DAHLIN: Good evening. My
21 name is Shiloh Dahlin. I'm with Alpine
22 Engineering.

23 It guess it was my

1 understanding that it's 19 and 19.

2 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Then, what do we
3 do with that 17-foot?

4 MS. DAHLIN: The 17-foot is
5 because --

6 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Overlap --

7 MS. DAHLIN: The sidewalk is a
8 four inch curb. Typically there is a two
9 foot --

10 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Overhang?

11 MS. DAHLIN: Overhang.

12 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Then that really
13 cuts the sidewalk down to five feet then, is
14 that correct?

15 MS. DAHLIN: Correct. It is a
16 seven foot walk. So with the two foot
17 overhang it would be a five foot walk.

18 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: All right. And
19 the dumpster location, is there any other
20 place to put that dumpster? Could it go
21 parallel with the front of the building only
22 in the green space to the south, instead of
23 having the traffic run all the way around it,

1 and enter vehicles -- you know, for that
2 dumpster to come in and the truck to come in
3 here and pick that up and be pumping the
4 asphalt there, it would just seem it would be
5 better if it was in a green belt to the
6 south, is there a potential for that?

7 Is there any reason it was
8 put where it is?

9 MS. DAHLIN: You are talking
10 about moving it south?

11 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Moving it south
12 and anywhere along that south property on the
13 other side.

14 MS. MELLEEM: If I can interject,
15 that requires a ZBA variance since it would
16 be in one of the exterior side yards. We do
17 prefer the location where it is. They did
18 have it along the east property line, but
19 there was some -- it would have been in the
20 building -- or the parking setback too close
21 to the property line, so the location where
22 it's at now works best.

23 If they were to put it south

1 of the building, they would need to go to ZBA
2 to get a variance for that.

3 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Then the other
4 question I have is that the handicapped spots
5 up against the building, those widths are
6 eight feet?

7 MS. DAHLIN: Yes.

8 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: What's the
9 normal required width for those spaces?

10 MS. DAHLIN: It's eight feet.

11 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Because they
12 have got the common area in between them?

13 MS. MELLEM: We require I think
14 one van accessible for the number of spaces
15 that you have and two handicapped spaces, so
16 we just decided to make both of them van
17 accessible.

18 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Then we have
19 a -- we have got an loading unloading space.
20 What's that about?

21 MS. MELLEM: It's a requirement
22 of the OSC and the day-care facilities. Many
23 day-cares actually just request that they get

1 a variance from that from ZBA, since no one
2 is dropping off their kids, everyone requires
3 them to actually physically bring their
4 children into the building.

5 So they chose to kind of put
6 the loading zone there, probably to
7 accommodate the dumpster location. I don't
8 know if that answers --

9 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: That was my next
10 question, was the cueing of dropping off. So
11 many of these facilities there is eight, ten,
12 12, 20 cars dropping the kids off at one
13 time. How is that handled here?

14 Are the parents actually
15 parking and dropping off the children?

16 MS. MELLEM: That was my
17 understanding.

18 MS. SCHWEIKER: Yes.

19 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Was there any
20 thought given to just circular traffic here
21 coming in from the entranceway, going across
22 the building, going around the dumpster and
23 leaving? So that we don't have two-way

1 travel, we can get more space for mobility on
2 the lot moving around?

3 MS. DAHLIN: I wouldn't be
4 opposed to doing one way traffic, but that
5 would kind of tie into the question or the
6 concern that the fire chief had in regards to
7 being able to get a fire truck circulated
8 through the parking lot.

9 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: I would almost
10 think it would be easier to circulate, with
11 coming in here, being able to go around, then
12 exit not having two-way traffic on both
13 sides. Just tossing it up really.

14 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: It's really
15 just a radius for the trucks that we care
16 about.

17 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: It wouldn't
18 matter one way or the other?

19 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Unh-unh.

20 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: It wouldn't
21 matter one way or the other if it was or was
22 not? If you could take a look at that, I
23 think it would make for better traffic flow

1 and people not having to back out because you
2 are going to have -- you got 120, 150
3 children is that the number?

4 MS. SCHWEIKER: We actually show
5 162.

6 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: We have got how
7 many parking --

8 MS. SCHWEIKER: Forty-four is in
9 the total parking count. Yes, 44.

10 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: That's an awful
11 lot of backing in and people going against
12 traffic or holding up people coming in.

13 MS. SCHWEIKER: I think as people
14 start to use the facility, they kind of
15 create their own traffic pattern as to what's
16 easier to come in --

17 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: I was just
18 trying to help them out in creating a flow.
19 It's kind of like salmon.

20 If that could be considered,
21 changing the flow, so it's circular and not
22 going against itself. Those are my only
23 comments.

1 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you,
2 Member Zuchlewski.

3 Anyone else? Member
4 Giacopetti.

5 MR. GIACOPETTI: I have a
6 question for the applicant in regards to this
7 special land use permit requirement.

8 What aspect of this site, as
9 far choosing for the development?

10 MR. RIORDAN: I was not part of
11 the land selection process, but we typically
12 go through a pretty thorough voting process
13 of the locations that TLE selects. So as far
14 as why we actually selected this site, I
15 don't have that information.

16 MR. GIACOPETTI: The reason I ask
17 is, this group has spent a lot of time,
18 looking at plans for a -- to develop a unique
19 center, the Town Center, and a walkable
20 district, you know, a downtown environment.

21 And this doesn't seem to
22 conform with I think the intent of that zone,
23 hence why the special land use permit is

1 required.

2 And it just seems a little
3 unusual that I think a day-care would be
4 wedged between two hotels and Wal-mart. It
5 just seemed like an unusual site.

6 I just wasn't sure what sort
7 of business leaders was here to sort of shed
8 some light on why this site was chosen over
9 say other available sites.

10 MR. RIORDAN: I don't know the
11 answer to that question.

12 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you,
13 Member Giacobetti.

14 Anyone else?

15 Member Greco.

16 MR. GRECO: Just one question for
17 our landscape architect, Mr. Meader.

18 The biggest deviation here
19 has to do with the trees and the canopy
20 trees.

21 I read your report, you're
22 comfortable with this as far as being
23 appropriate for the location?

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

MR. MEADER: Yes, they have done, as far as I am concerned, all that they can do as far as putting in enough trees without having them on top of each other.

Our ordinance requires a lot of trees and I am okay with what they have got there.

THE BOARD: Excellent. With that, I would like to make a motion.

In the matter of the Learning Experience JSP16-19, motion to approve a special land use permit based on and subject to the following items listed in A through G on the motion sheet, and this motion has been made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Article 3, Article 4 and Article 5 and Article 6 of the zoning ordinance and all other applicable provisions of the ordinance.

MR. ANTHONY: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a motion by Member Greco, second by Member Anthony.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

Any other discussion?
Kirsten, can you call the
roll, please.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Giacobetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: No.

MS. MELLEEM: Motion passes five
to one.

MR. GRECO: Next motion I'd like
to make, in the matter of the Learning
Experience, JSP16-19, motion to approve the
preliminary site plan based on and subject to
the following items listed in A through F on
the motion sheet, and this motion has been

1 made because the plan is otherwise in
2 compliance with Article 3, Article 4, and
3 Article 5 of the zoning ordinance and all
4 other applicable provisions of the ordinance.

5 MR. ANTHONY: Second.

6 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Motion by
7 Member Greco, second by Anthony.

8 Any other comments? Kirsten,
9 please.

10 MS. MELLEEM: Member Giacobetti?

11 MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

12 MS. MELLEEM: Chair Pehrson?

13 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

14 MS. MELLEEM: Member Zuchlewski?

15 MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

16 MS. MELLEEM: Member Avdoulos?

17 MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

18 MS. MELLEEM: Member Anthony?

19 MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

20 MS. MELLEEM: Member Greco?

21 MR. GRECO: Yes.

22 MS. MELLEEM: Motion passes six to
23 zero.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

MR. GRECO: In the matter of the Learning Experience, JSP16-19, motion to approve the storm water management plan, based on and subject to the following: The findings of compliance 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.

MR. ANTHONY: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Motion by Member Greco, second by Member Anthony.

Any other discussion?

Kirsten.

MS. MELLEEM: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

1 MS. MELLEEM: Member Giacometti?

2 MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

3 MS. MELLEEM: Member Anthony?

4 MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

5 MS. MELLEEM: Member Greco?

6 MR. GRECO: Yes.

7 MS. MELLEEM: Motion passes six to
8 zero.

9 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: All set.

10 Thank you.

11 Next on the agenda is matters
12 for consideration, item one, Landscape
13 Ordinance Amendment 18.283, it's to set a
14 public hearing for Text Amendment 18.283 to
15 consider amending the City of Novi's zoning
16 ordinance in order to modify Section 5.5 of
17 the zoning ordinance and accompanying
18 landscaping design manual.

19 The changes are proposed to
20 make the ordinance requirement more
21 achievable and realistic given the restraints
22 of most sites and to promote the visibility of
23 buildings and the health of the planted

1 materials through less crowding of plantings
2 to promote the health of non-built open areas
3 by addition of certain invasive species to
4 the list of species not allowed, to clean up
5 inconsistencies in the ordinance from the
6 intent of the ordinance, and to bring the
7 ordinance into agreement with other recently
8 amended ordinances.

9 Ms. McBeth.

10 MS. MCBETH: Thank you,
11 Mr. Chair.

12 Rick Meader has a brief
13 presentation to introduce the ordinance and
14 ask you to set the public hearing.

15 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Good
16 evening, Rick.

17 MR. MEADER: So what you're
18 seeing in front of us is a proposal to change
19 the planting because as in with the last
20 project, I found in doing a lot of reviews
21 last year and a half, two years, that we
22 really have overstretched like reasonable
23 terms, especially in terms of parking,

1 landscape requirements.

2 The assumption was in
3 creating them, I think that people were
4 always going to have long islands throughout
5 every parking lot, they would have room for
6 extra trees, which typically most parking
7 lots don't. Typically there is -- you know,
8 it's smaller, they just don't have room for
9 that kind of island.

10 So, these are focused
11 primarily -- these changes are focused
12 primarily on commercial industrial projects
13 and affect -- with residential I haven't seen
14 any major problems with residential, but I
15 think it's an issue in the commercial and
16 industrial situations.

17 If you look at the example,
18 this is showing the existing that we follow
19 them completely on the top, how many trees
20 would be required for around the parking lot
21 as well as screening in front of the
22 building, in the commercial -- the proposed
23 there is 105 trees required in that

1 situation.

2 The one below with the
3 proposals, it's 64 trees. You can see it's
4 still well landscaped, it still has enough to
5 decorate the site as well as screen the
6 parking lot from the road.

7 But it opens up the building
8 a little bit more to the road and it just
9 makes it feasible to really to support -- to
10 enforce the rules that we have.

11 Now it's really hard for me
12 to enforce the rules that we have and not
13 have trees on top of each other.

14 So, you know, I like to
15 enforce rules and rather have rules that I
16 can enforce, then say, I know you can't, do
17 your best. That's kind of the situation we
18 are in right now.

19 So if you look through the
20 rules, there is changes for commercial, there
21 is changes for industrial, then there are
22 some other rules as I mentioned.

23 Please take a look at it, I

1 will be glad to answer any question you might
2 have. There is a lot there. I am sure you
3 will have questions.

4 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Very good.
5 Turn it over to the Planning Commission for
6 their consideration.

7 Member Avdoulos.

8 MR. AVDOULOS: Thank you. I was
9 part of a similar process back my first tour
10 of the Planning Commission. We were looking
11 landscaping and we had -- I remember, brought
12 in also -- some landscape architects came in
13 to discuss their concerns and what benefits
14 there would be to readjust what we have at
15 that time.

16 And the projects that you're
17 looking at, there are a lot of variances
18 being requested and are you also -- with the
19 information that you're presenting in
20 consultation with some of the landscape
21 architects that bring in the project or is
22 this just something that you have just been
23 noticing, you know, the last year or so?

1 MR. MEADER: Well, you know, I am
2 working with the landscape architects, there
3 is no way we can make this work a lot of
4 times.

5 That was -- you know, before
6 I did this job, I actually developed parking
7 lot landscape plans. That's what I was
8 familiar with, some of the issues.

9 So yes, I have been talking
10 with them, but I haven't really relied on
11 them to come up with what I have come up
12 with.

13 I kind of now -- I have my
14 own -- (unintelligible.) But I have had
15 complaints from many landscape architects,
16 our rules are just pretty much impossible to
17 work with. In terms of parking lots,
18 especially.

19 MS. MCBETH: I think, too, the
20 intention is if you're going to share the
21 draft of the landscape architects that
22 frequently do business with the city.

23 MR. MEADER: Yes, there is

1 probably five or six that work with the
2 districts, send it onto them once it became
3 public to get their comments.

4 MR. AVDOULOS: I think the last
5 go-around that was the issue, too, we had
6 quite a few landscape architects that did a
7 lot of work in the city and they provided
8 their comments and feedbacks, and if we can
9 maintain an ordinance that will allow us to,
10 you know, continually enhance our sites, but
11 also limit the amount of variances that come
12 forth, then that's a win for all of us
13 because the one thing -- even from a
14 architectural standpoint, just looking at
15 building the projects and then there is a
16 variance, a variance, variance, you know,
17 requested all the way along, that means,
18 either our process is too tight or nobody is
19 willing to follow the rules, and they just
20 want to, you know, go through the process of
21 getting what they want.

22 But landscape is a good way
23 to do it, a lot of projects. It's a low

1 hanging fruit for value engineering so they
2 can reduce costs.

3 But I think if we provide
4 something that's reasonable and can stick to
5 it, then it will really help out, you know,
6 what we have already got started.

7 I think it's done well, you
8 know, in the last ten years or so.

9 So I think this is a good
10 process and I appreciate your going through
11 this and helping us streamline it.

12 MR. MEADER: Thank you.

13 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Anyone
14 else? Member Greco.

15 MR. GRECO: Yes, I would like to
16 make a motion to set the Landscape Ordinance
17 Amendment 18.283 for a public hearing.

18 MR. ANTHONY: Second.

19 CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: We have a
20 motion by Member Greco, second by Member
21 Anthony.

22 Any other discussion?

23 Kirsten, can you call the

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

roll.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Giacopetti?

MR. GIACOPEPPI: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. MELLEEM: Motion passes, six

to zero.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Second item

is the approval of the December 7, 2016

Planning Commission minutes, any

modifications, changes?

Motion to approve?

MR. GRECO: Motion to approve.

MR. GIACOPEPPI: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Motion by

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

Greco and second by Giacobetti.

Any other comments?

Kirsten, please.

MS. MELLEM: Member Avdoulos?

MR. AVDOULOS: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Chair Pehrson?

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Zuchlewski?

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Anthony?

MR. ANTHONY: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Giacobetti?

MR. GIACOPETTI: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Member Greco?

MR. GRECO: Yes.

MS. MELLEM: Motion passes six to
zero.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you.

Any matters for discussion? Supplemental
issues?

There is no one in the
audience, close the last audience
participation.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

Look for a motion to adjourn.

MR. GRECO: Motion to adjourn.

MR. ZUCHLEWSKI: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PEHRSON: Thank you,
gentlemen. We are adjourned.

(The meeting was adjourned at 7:28 p.m.)

** ** *

1

2

STATE OF MICHIGAN)

3

) ss.

4

COUNTY OF OAKLAND)

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

I, Jennifer L. Wall, Notary Public within and for the County of Oakland, State of Michigan, do hereby certify that the meeting was taken before me in the above entitled matter at the aforementioned time and place; that the meeting was stenographically recorded and afterward transcribed by computer under my personal supervision, and that the said meeting is a full, true and correct transcript.

12

13

14

15

I further certify that I am not connected by blood or marriage with any of the parties or their attorneys, and that I am not an employee of either of them, nor financially interested in the action.

16

17

18

19

IN WITNESS THEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand at the City of Walled Lake, County of Oakland, State of Michigan.

20

2-28-17

21

22

23

Jennifer L. Wall
Date Jennifer L. Wall CSR-4183
Oakland County, Michigan
My Commission Expires 11/12/22