



PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

CITY OF NOVI
Regular Meeting
June 10, 2026 7:00 PM

Council Chambers | Novi Civic Center
45175 Ten Mile Road, Novi, MI 48375 (248) 347-0475

CALL TO ORDER

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

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Pehrson, Member Avdoulos, Member Lynch, Member Reddi, Member Dismondy, Member Roney, Member Verma

Staff: Lindsay Bell, Director of Planning; Elizabeth Saarela, City Attorney; Diana Shanahan, Planner; Rick Meader, Landscape Architect; Kate Purpura, Project Engineer

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Pehrson led the meeting attendees in the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion made by Member Lynch and seconded by Member Avdoulos to approve the June 10, 2026, Planning Commission Agenda.

ROLL CALL ON MOTION TO APPROVE THE JUNE 10, 2026, PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER AVDOULOS. *Motion carried 7-0.*

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

Chair Pehrson invited members of the audience who wished to address the Planning Commission during the first audience participation to come forward. Seeing no one, Chair Pehrson closed the first public audience participation.

CORRESPONDENCE

There was not any correspondence.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

There were no Committee reports.

CITY PLANNER REPORT

Director of Planning Lindsay Bell stated that the City's Landscape Architect, Mr. Rick Meader, may have an announcement he would like to share at the conclusion of tonight's meeting.

CONSENT AGENDA - REMOVALS AND APPROVALS

There were no Consent Agenda Removals and Approvals.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. TEXT AMENDMENT 18.307 – PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO LANDSCAPING STANDARDS

Public hearing for Text Amendment 18.307 to amend the Landscape Ordinance (Section 5.5) and update the Landscape Design Manual.

Landscape Architect Rick Meader stated that the document before the Planning Commission this evening contains a few revisions to the Landscape Ordinance along with several additions. One such addition is a dedicated section for urban multifamily housing. This was a change that former Member Becker suggested quite some time ago as it makes sense to have a particular section of the ordinance that can only be used in certain zoning districts where increased density is desired. This new section reduces the requirements for street trees and allows additional shrubs to balance the reduction in street trees. Alternative green development options have been included such as green roofs, green walls, and butterfly gardens that developers could utilize to enhance the green aspect of the development. Another notable change relates to parking lot landscape requirements. The ordinance currently contains two levels of requirements, one for industrial development and one for all other developments. Industrial developments are currently subject to fewer requirements. The 2025 Master Plan requested we work to reduce heat islands, so the change proposed is a single set of requirements for all developments. Finally, a section has been included to allow for administrative granting of minor supported waivers if a plan is otherwise eligible for administrative approval.

Chair Pehrson opened the public hearing and invited members of the audience who wished to speak to approach the podium. Seeing no one, and confirming there was no correspondence received, Chair Pehrson turned the matter over to the Planning Commission for consideration.

Member Lynch stated the proposed changes make sense. The more that can be done administratively outside of Planning Commission meetings is beneficial to the applicant and staff alike. It was noted the specific requirements for urban developments are warranted and he is in support.

Member Reddi stated she is in support.

Member Dismondy stated he is in support.

Member Avdoulos stated he appreciates staff taking a look occasionally and updating all our ordinances.

Motion to recommend approval of Text Amendment 18.307 – Proposed Amendments to Landscaping Standards to the City Council made by Member Avdoulos and seconded by Member Lynch.

In the matter of Text Amendment 18.307 – Proposed Amendments to Landscaping Standards, motion to recommend approval to the City Council of the proposed ordinance amendment.

ROLL CALL ON MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL OF TEXT AMENDMENT 18.307 - PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO LANDSCAPING STANDARDS MADE BY MEMBER AVDOULOS AND SECONDED BY MEMBER LYNCH. Motion carried 7-0.

2. PBR25-0096 41619 STEINBECK GLEN WOODLAND PERMIT

Public Hearing at the request of Andi Kareem for consideration of a Woodland Use Permit to impact 4 trees.

Planner Diana Shanahan stated that the proposed Woodland Permit as requested by the applicant, Andi Kareem, is to permit encroachment into the critical root zone of four regulated woodland trees located in a conservation easement abutting a single-family lot at 41619 Steinbeck Glen in order to install a pool and fence. The site is located west of Meadowbrook Road and south of Thirteen Mile Road in Section 11

of the city.

The City's Woodland Consultant reviewed the request and prepared a letter dated June 13, 2025. The review letter indicates that the 4 trees proposed to be impacted require 12 replacement credits. The review letter provides a detailed count and explanation of the required replacements.

As noted in the letter, approval of the Woodland Permit does not authorize the removal of any trees. The 4 trees identified as having potential critical root zone impacts from the proposed pool and fence installation are also subject to potential critical root zone impacts resulting from the applicant's previously unauthorized fill placement and the installation of play structure equipment within the conservation easement. It should be noted that the conservation easement is not located on the applicant's property, rather, it directly abuts it.

The Planning Commission is asked to hold the public hearing and approve or deny the Woodland Use Permit. Andi Kareem, the homeowner, is present and is available to answer any questions. Staff are also available for any questions.

Chair Pehrson invited the applicant to address the Planning Commission.

The applicant was present and available to answer questions but did not make a presentation.

Chair Pehrson opened the public hearing and invited members of the audience who wished to speak to approach the podium.

Mr. Michel Duchesneau at 1191 South Lake Drive stated it is unclear based on the packet what the approval would entail. The packet indicates the removal of 4 trees. However, Merjent has made a strong recommendation that the trees should not be removed. Mr. Duchesneau requested that when the applicant returns the details of the request are clarified.

Seeing no one else, Chair Pehrson requested that Member Lynch read into the record the correspondence received. Member Lynch relayed correspondence was received from Seta Afacanyan at 41601 London Court who is in support. Chris Evink at 41632 Steinbeck Glen objects as he feels most of the neighborhood lives humbly and respectfully placing high value on the woods. Families with young children can go to Lakeshore beach or swimming clubs. Julian Wargo at 41637 Steinbeck Glen objects as encroachment is not essential. Pool size and shape should be re-configured to avoid potential damage to existing woodlands.

Chair Pehrson turned the matter over to the Planning Commission.

Member Lynch inquired about the ownership of the conservation easement.

City Attorney Elizabeth Saarela stated that the development is partially platted. Phase 2 is a plat and Phase 3 is a site condominium. The subject property is in Phase 2 of the development. The dedication of the conservation easement is on the plat; the area is owned by the association, and the City has a dedicated conservation easement over the area.

Member Lynch stated he has noticed that there has been a great deal of encroachment into the conservation easement in this subdivision. It was noted that most conservation easements are demarked by monuments or signs, however no signs were observed in this case. He inquired how the homeowner would know where their property ends and the conservation easement begins.

Attorney Saarela stated for this part of the development the conservation easement would be shown on the plat. The homeowner should have a copy of the plat with their closing documents, along with a site survey.

Member Lynch stated in looking at the subdivision as whole encroachment into the conservation easement appears to be prevalent. Preservation of natural features was identified as a priority in previous surveys of taxpayers. Conservation easements ensure that natural features are protected. Member Lynch stated he is not prepared to consider the request until the association rectifies the encroachment into the conservation easement.

Attorney Saarela stated in this case the association is the owner of the open space by deed.

Member Lynch inquired if the association refers to a group of owners.

Attorney Saarela stated that is typically the case with a site condominium where each homeowner owns a portion of the open space. In this case with the plat the proprietor of the plat which was Singh Development deeded the open space to the association.

Member Lynch inquired if the association includes more than one member.

Attorney Saarela stated that must have been established under the Declaration of Covenants or another document that has not been located at this time due to this development predating our representation of the City.

Member Lynch inquired if we could establish the fact that there should be no encroachment into the conservation easement.

Attorney Saarela confirmed that there should be no encroachment into the conservation easement and that is clear from the plat.

Member Lynch stated with consideration to the taxpayer's feedback regarding the woodlands and wetlands he is not prepared to make a recommendation on this application until the encroachment is rectified.

Member Reddi stated she is in agreeance with Member Lynch.

Member Dismondy inquired if the applicant is present for questions.

Mr. Francis Kashat with Fiure Construction stated he is representing Mr. Kareem on behalf of this project. It was noted they have been in contact with the management of the HOA. In this project additional trees will be planted for remediation, and the property will be fenced in ensuring there will be no encroachment in the future.

Member Dismondy inquired about whether the trees are being cut down because we think the root system may be compromised by the installation of a pool.

Attorney Saarela clarified that no trees would be removed. There is a concern that the work will damage or kill the trees that are preserved by the conservation easement.

Member Dismondy stated it is reasonable to plant additional trees or replace the trees if they are damaged since the pool is proposed on the homeowner's property.

Member Roney inquired if the pool could be repositioned, so it does not affect the conservation easement.

Mr. Kashat stated the uniqueness of the lot size is considered when designing the pool. He noted an adjustment may be possible; however, it was stated the request is reasonable and precautions will be taken to ensure there is no damage to the woodland area.

Member Roney stated the purpose of the conservation easement is to preserve the woodlands and

wetlands within the easement. It was stated the pool should be repositioned as to not affect the conservation easement.

Member Avdoulos stated what is being discussed is the root zone impact to four trees that are in a conservation easement but outside of their property related to the proposed pool and fence. It was noted a sketch was provided with some dimensions. The concern is that we are creating something that may or may not work. He inquired what the current concrete pad that is installed is used for.

Mr. Kashat stated the concrete pad is a seating area which is approximately 13' x 16'.

Member Avdoulos inquired whether the proposal is contingent upon the removal of the play structure that is currently in the conservation easement.

Mr. Kashat stated that the play structure will be removed and the area will be remediated.

Member Avdoulos indicated he would like to hear Chair Pehrson's thoughts on the proposal.

Chair Pehrson stated he is in agreeance with Member Lynch and Member Roney. We are discussing the conservation easement that will be affected by the inclusion of a pool because of the root structure. He stated if the pool could be relocated or resized as to not affect the root systems of the trees, he would be more inclined to approve the request. This is one of the more unique applications that we have seen where are trying to protect what is there. It was stated postponement of a decision is recommended as we find a middle ground.

Motion to postpone a decision regarding PBR25-0096 41619 Steinbeck Glen Woodland Permit and leave the public hearing open until such a time as the applicant submits an amended application made by Member Avdoulos and seconded by Member Roney.

In the matter of PBR25-0096 41619 Steinbeck Glen Woodland Permit motion to postpone a decision and leave the public hearing open until such a time as the applicant submits an amended application.

ROLL CALL ON MOTION TO POSTPONE A DECISION REGARDING PBR25-0096 41619 STEINBECK GLEN WOODLAND PERMIT AND LEAVE THE PUBLIC HEARING OPEN UNTIL SUCH A TIME AS THE APPLICANT SUBMITS AN AMENDED APPLICATION MADE BY MEMBER AVDOULOS AND SECONDED BY MEMBER RONEY. Motion carried 7-0.

3. PBR25-0215 24190 TRAFALGAR COURT WOODLAND PERMIT

Public Hearing at the request of Brian Sears for consideration of a Woodland Use Permit to remove 23 trees to install a fence.

Planner Shanahan stated the proposed Woodland Permit as requested by the applicant, Brian Sears, is to remove 23 regulated woodland trees from a single-family lot located at 24190 Trafalgar Court in order to construct a fence. The site is located east of Beck Road and south of Ten Mile Road in Section 28 of the City.

The City's Woodland Consultant reviewed the request and prepared a letter dated May 1, 2026. The review letter indicates that the 23 trees proposed to be removed require 39 replacement credits. The review letter provides a detailed count and explanation of the required replacements. The applicant has elected to plant 17 deciduous trees, 11 large evergreen trees, 30 small evergreen trees, 9 large shrubs, and 28 small shrubs, for a total of 95 plantings, to account for the 39 woodland replacements.

The proposed removals are not located within any recorded conservation or preservation easements. Pursuant to Section 37-31 of the Woodland Protection Ordinance, no tree removals are permitted until after the required 10 day waiting period following the date of approval.

The Planning Commission is asked to hold the public hearing and approve or deny the Woodland Use Permit. Brian Sears, the homeowner, is present and is available to answer any questions. Staff are also available for any questions.

Mr. Brian Sears stated that Ms. Shanahan has summarized the project perfectly. The project consists of planting considerable greenery, primarily along the road perimeters along with the fence. The fence is for safety as there is a lot of foot traffic coming from CVS and minimal privacy on the corner. Privacy is diminished particularly in the winter, so evergreens are proposed to provide privacy. It was noted that the undergrowth has caused the yard to become unusable at this time.

Chair Pehrson opened the public hearing and invited members of the audience who wished to speak to approach the podium.

Ms. Judith Plasencia at 24142 Trafalgar Court stated her home faces the subject property and many trees were lost when the homes were built there. It was stated there is concern that the new plantings may not reflect the growth that is already there regarding height. The increased noise and loss of the view is also a concern. Ms. Plasencia inquired whether the request is only for the removal of the trees or also includes the approval of the fence. It was noted that the home is not a part of the association, but they are a direct attachment to the association and use Trafalgar Court to enter their property. The association has restrictions on their property however these homes do not have the same restrictions. It was stated if we begin allowing these kinds of things that sheds, RV's, etc. could be next. Additionally, there is concern regarding aesthetics as fences are not allowed in Broadmoor Park. It was expressed that people in the subdivision have the same concerns, such as dogs and protecting children, however fences are not permitted. The property owner was aware of the difficulties of the property at the time of purchase and is now trying to deal with those difficulties by changing the area.

Chair Pehrson requested that Member Lynch read into the record the correspondence received. Member Lynch relayed correspondence was received from Madhu Nair at 47330 Baker Street who objects due to many trees already being removed the build the house. Removing the remaining trees will have an impact on the natural resources in the area. Chris Harrell at 47145 Northumberland Street objects as removing 23 trees in addition to the many that were already removed to build the home will not improve the value of surrounding homes. The erection of a fence is not congruous with the surrounding homes where fences are not permitted. The fence could be an eye-sore and devalue surrounding properties. Eric Gudeman at 23738 Broadmoor Park Lane objects as the home is not part of the Broadmoor Park HOA and does not pay dues yet they enjoy the landscaping of the subdivision. Many trees were already removed from the corner to build the house; additional trees should not be removed to construct a fence that will hurt surrounding property values. Lisa Riegel objects due to the trees serving as a natural buffer for neighboring homes while maintaining the character of the area. Many residents of Broadmoor Park opposed the original approval of the two homes constructed on the corner. The two homes benefit from proximity to Broadmoor Park, yet they remain stand-alone properties and seek exceptions to standards that have long been observed by HOA members. Allowing the fence would be inconsistent with longstanding restrictions that prohibit fences throughout the subdivision. John Kuenzel at 23819 Heartwood objects as the removal of the trees and construction of a fence negates the reason the trees were preserved for their beauty, shade, and preservation of nature. A barrier fence on the corner would be an eyesore to those passing through our community. Renata Michez De Grande Swenson at 24154 Trafalgar Court objects due to the construction of the home resulting in many trees being removed. The loss of more vegetation and trees would be unfair to surrounding neighbors.

Chair Pehrson turned the matter over to the Planning Commission.

Member Lynch inquired whether installing a fence is permitted in Novi and if there are requirements related to the material and height.

Planner Shanahan confirmed fencing is permitted and would be subject to ordinance standards.

Member Lynch asked how many trees are proposed to be planted.

Planner Shanahan stated there are a total of 95 plantings proposed with 17 deciduous trees, 11 large evergreens, 30 small evergreens, and shrubs.

Member Lynch stated the evergreens will stay full throughout the year helping to soften the road noise. It was noted there was controversy when these two homes were approved being adjacent to a subdivision. It was relayed that the review letter from the environmental consultant suggested possibly encumbering the perimeter trees within an easement.

Mr. Jason Demoss, the City's environmental consultant stated that the easement note is included in all their reviews because preserving as much woodland as possible is beneficial. It was noted that in single family residential cases establishing an easement is not typical.

Member Lynch stated in this case an easement may be appropriate because that corner had a lot of woodlands originally. It was noted that going from 23 trees to 93 plantings with the addition of evergreens is likely aesthetically preferable. It was expressed that the request is reasonable and will be an improvement to the corner.

Member Reddi requested clarification regarding the fence and tree line.

Mr. Sears stated the fence will follow the property line with evergreens.

Member Dismondy expressed that the two homes on the corner are separate from the adjacent neighborhood therefore subject to different regulations.

Mr. Sears confirmed that his property is subject to the City's regulations and is not part of the HOA.

Member Dismondy stated it looks as though a significant amount of money is being invested in landscaping. He inquired about the height of the large evergreens.

Mr. Sears stated that the evergreens will start out at approximately six feet. The maples that would be planted would be approximately 12'-14'.

Mr. Rick Meader stated depending on the species the maples could reach approximately 30'.

Member Dismondy inquired if it is realistic to leave what is currently there and incorporate the new plantings.

Mr. Sears stated that 14 of the 23 trees are black locusts, which is an invasive species.

Mr. Demoss stated that this is a unique property and is a protected woodland. However, many municipalities do not count invasive species in their woodland ordinance, but Novi does. Black locusts are invasive but still protected because they still function as a woodland. It was noted that the proposed plantings would be more diverse than what is currently present.

Member Dismondy stated the plantings that are proposed seem to be an improvement. He expressed understanding of why existing homeowners who are subject to the HOA are unclear on the process for this particular property.

Member Verma inquired if the adjacent home that was built at the same time is proposing a fence as well.

Mr. Sears stated the adjacent home is not proposing fence at this time.

Member Verma inquired why Mr. Sears feels the fence is required at this time.

Mr. Sears stated the adjacent property's yard is significantly different than his and does not have the same challenges and the fence is for safety purposes.

Member Verma inquired if the fence will be parallel to Beck Road and Ten Mile Road.

Mr. Sears confirmed the fence would be parallel to Beck Road and Ten Mile Road.

Member Verma inquired about why the request is being brought forward after two years.

Mr. Sears stated the process has taken a significant amount of time and has been a lot of work.

Member Verma inquired what benefits the fence will provide.

Mr. Sears stated the fence will provide safety for his family from the foot traffic and busy intersection.

Member Verma inquired if the fence could be adjusted as to not disturb the trees.

Member Roney stated certainly those who have lived in Novi for some time know that this corner changed significantly when the two homes were built. Many people commented on how many trees were removed at that time. It was expressed that the corner as it stands today needs to be improved. Member Roney inquired if the required buffer between the road and home has been satisfied.

Mr. Meader stated because this is a single-family home as opposed to a development there is not a specific ordinance that would apply.

Member Roney expressed that if his memory serves him correctly when the two homes were approved it was communicated to the Commission that the homes would be part of the HOA. It was noted that the Commission does not review matters related to homeowners' associations. He expressed that improvement to the corner would be beneficial. However, exception is taken regarding the fence if the installation will affect trees. It was suggested that the new trees be planted to fit in with the existing trees with exception of the invasive species. He stated he does not see the necessity of the fence.

Member Avdoulos stated he wished the tree removal plan and the proposed planting plan were both in the packet to provide a clear representation of the project. He noted he was ready to deny this proposal because the corner is heavily wooded and that is something that the City has been working on for years. The proposed planting plan helps to define what is happening at that corner and will be an improvement in the winter months. However, what the corner looks like now in the summer season is appreciated. It was noted the information presented in the packet only shows the fence line and reads as if all the trees would be removed. Member Avdoulos expressed appreciation to the homeowner for respecting the current easement as it allows the shrubbery outside of the property line to remain and provides an enhancement to the corner.

Motion to approve Woodland Use Permit PBR25-0215 made by Member Avdoulos and seconded by Member Lynch.

Motion to approve Woodland Use Permit, PBR25-0215, for the removal of 23 regulated woodland trees within an area mapped as City Regulated Woodland at 24190 Trafalgar Court for the purpose of constructing a fence. The approval is subject to on-site planting to the extent possible of 39 required woodland replacement credits. If necessary, any outstanding credits may be paid into the City's Tree Fund. In addition, any other conditions as listed in the Woodland Consultant's review letter shall be addressed.

Chair Pehrson inquired if there are any other comments.

Member Roney stated we are removing trees for the purpose of constructing a fence which does not seem right.

Chair Pehrson stated the fence is secondary and requested Planner Shanahan call the roll.

ROLL CALL ON MOTION TO APPROVE WOODLAND USE PERMIT PBR25-0215 MADE BY MEMBER AVDOULOS AND SECONDED BY MEMBER LYNCH. Motion carried 5-2 (Roney, Verma).

MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION

1. FORMA BEAUTY SALON PARKING EXPANSION JSP26-14

Consideration at the request of Forma Beauty Salon for approval of the Preliminary Site Plan. The subject property is located at 26179 Novi Road, north of Grand River Avenue (Section 15). The applicant proposes site improvements including the addition of 10 parking spaces and a new dumpster enclosure.

Planner Shanahan stated the subject site is approximately 0.57-acres in size and is located on the west side of Novi Road, north of Grand River Avenue. The property is zoned TC: Town Center, and all adjacent properties to the north, south, east, and west are also zoned Town Center. The Future Land Use map contemplates the property, as well as the surrounding properties, as Town Center Mixed Use. There are no natural features located on the site.

The applicant is proposing site improvements including increasing the parking lot from 13 spaces to 23 spaces, removal of the existing dumpster enclosure, and construction of a new dumpster enclosure to be located at the northwest corner of the site, along with landscape improvements.

Zoning Board of Appeals variances will be required for the deficiency on parking setback in the north side yard and west rear yard and for the location of the dumpster enclosure in the parking lot setback. Landscape waivers are required for the deficiency in parking lot perimeter trees and for the deficiency in perimeter parking lot landscape area.

Representing the project are Engineer Alex Orman, and Landscape Architect Theresa Pardington. Staff are also available for any questions.

Chair Pehrson invited the applicant to address the Planning Commission.

Mr. Alex Orman stated he is the Engineer representing project this evening as the owner of the property is currently traveling. He stated Ms. Shanahan presented the project thoroughly and he has no additional comments.

Chair Pehrson turned the matter over to the Planning Commission.

Member Lynch stated he appreciates the improvements being made. He noted that based on the information in the packet, Mr. Meader is not recommending approval.

Landscape Architect Rick Meader stated that the reason approval is not recommended is related to the upper edge of the site where the pavement goes right up to the property line and perimeter trees are not provided. He expressed understanding of the limitations on the site, however from a landscape perspective the ordinance requirements have not been met.

Member Lynch stated given the background information Mr. Meader provided he does not have an issue. He inquired what effect not having perimeter trees would have beyond aesthetics.

Mr. Meader stated perimeter trees would provide shade and help cool the parking lot.

Mr. Orman stated the property to the north is encroaching onto this property with their parking lot so there are no trees currently there.

Member Reddi inquired if trees would be removed for the parking expansion.

Mr. Meader stated no trees are being removed. There are several existing and proposed trees on the other side of the site. The site may be short one tree which is of no consequence.

Member Dismondy stated the parcel is challenging and the proposal is acceptable.

Member Verma inquired if the site is accessed from Novi Road only.

Mr. Orman confirmed that access to the site is exclusively from Novi Road.

Member Roney stated the proposal looks fine.

Member Avdoulos stated he appreciates the improvements that are being made and the fact that the salon is expanding is a good thing for business.

Motion to approve the JSP26-14 Forma Beauty Salon Parking Expansion Preliminary Site Plan made by Member Avdoulos and seconded by Member Lynch.

In the matter of Forma Beauty Salon Parking Expansion JSP26-14, motion to approve the Preliminary Site Plan based on and subject to the following:

- 1. The Zoning Board of Appeals granting the following variances:**
 - i. Section 3.1.25.D for deficiency in parking setback in the north side yard (20 feet required, 3 feet proposed) and rear yard (10 feet required, 3 feet proposed).**
 - ii. Section 4.19.2.F.iv for the location of the dumpster enclosure in the parking lot setback (10 feet setback required, 0 feet proposed).**
- 2. A Landscape waiver under Section 5.5.3.C.iv.a for deficiency in parking lot perimeter trees (17 trees required, 15 trees provided) due to spatial limitations of the site which limit the ability to comply, which is hereby granted;**
- 3. A Landscape waiver under Section 5.5.3.C.iv.b for deficiency in perimeter parking lot landscape area along north property line (10 feet required, 0 feet provided) due to spatial limitations of the site which limit the ability to comply, which is hereby granted;**
- 4. The findings of compliance with Ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters and the conditions and the 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.

ROLL CALL ON MOTION TO APPROVE THE JSP26-14 FORMA BEAUTY SALON PARKING EXPANSION PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN MADE BY MEMBER AVDOULOS AND SECONDED BY MEMBER LYNCH. Motion carried 7-0.

2. 44725 GRAND RIVER (DAMAS BUILDING) PARKING EXPANSION JSP26-07

Consideration at the request of Versa Real Estate for approval of the Preliminary Site Plan. The property is located east of Taft Road and south of Grand River Avenue (Section 15). The applicant proposes site improvements including the addition of 20 parking spaces.

The subject site is approximately 2.15 acres in size and is located east of Taft Road, and south of Grand River Avenue. The property is zoned I-1: Light Industrial, along with adjacent properties to the north, east, and west. Property to the south is zoned R-4 One-Family Residential. The Future Land Use map designates

the site and surrounding properties to the north, east, and west as Industrial/Office. To the south is designated Public/Quasi Public. Natural features are located on southern portion of the subject property.

The applicant proposes an expansion of the parking lot serving the existing office building for medical office and business office use. The project includes combining the adjacent vacant 0.13-acre parcel to the west with the larger parcel containing the existing building. The existing site currently provides 66 parking spaces; upon completion of the proposed improvements the combined site would contain a total of 86 parking spaces.

The project also includes an approximately 95-foot extension to the existing retaining wall along the western property line. No regulated trees are proposed to be removed, and no impacts are proposed to the regulated woodland or regulated wetlands located at the southern end of the site.

Zoning Board of Appeals variances will be required for the deficiency in 22 parking spaces and for the deficiency in parking setback on the west side of the property. Landscape waivers are required for the deficiency in parking lot perimeter trees and for the deficiency in parking lot landscape area along the west property line.

Representing the project tonight are Chad Holdwick and Eric Modell. Staff are also available for any questions.

Mr. Chad Holdwick with the Umlor Group stated he is the Civil Engineer working on the project. He relayed that the building is currently being used for office purposes. The first floor contains medical and commercial offices. However, currently the commercial offices are vacant with the intent of filling them. The second floor is being remodeled as medical office. Currently the site is deficient in parking based on the use, so the applicant is looking to improve upon an existing issue with the property. As was mentioned, the ten-foot green belt is lacking from the property line. Mr. Holdwick stated they have worked closely with Mr. Meader to try and satisfy that requirement, the proposed plan is 6.2 feet from the property line. Along the west property line are two island trees that were added to provide shade.

Chair Pehrson turned the matter over to the Planning Commission.

Member Lynch stated that he does not like going against staff recommendations however in this case there is not a suitable place to put additional trees. He noted the expansion is positive and he is in support.

Member Reddi stated she is in support.

Member Dismondy stated he is in support.

Member Avdoulos stated he likes the fact that they are being proactive and business is growing.

Motion to approve the JSP26-07 44725 Grand River (Damas Building) Preliminary Site Plan made by Member Avdoulos and seconded by Member Lynch.

In the matter of 44725 Grand River (Damas Building) JSP26-07, motion to approve the Preliminary Site Plan based on and subject to the following:

1. **The Zoning Board of Appeals granting the following variances:**
 - i. **Section 3.1.18.D of the Zoning Ordinance for the deficiency in parking setback on the west property line (10 feet required, 6.2 feet proposed).**
 - ii. **Section 5.2.12.D of the Zoning Ordinance for the deficiency in 22 parking spaces (108 total parking spaces are required for medical office and business office use, 86 spaces are provided).**
2. **A Landscape waiver under Section 5.5.3.C.iv.a for deficiency in parking lot perimeter**

trees due to site layout conditions which limit the ability to comply (6 trees required, 3 trees provided), which is hereby granted;

3. A Landscape waiver under Section 5.5.3.C.iv.b for deficiency in parking lot perimeter landscape area along west side due to site layout conditions which limit the ability to comply (10 feet required, 0 feet provided), which is hereby granted;
4. The findings of compliance with Ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters and the conditions and the 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.

ROLL CALL ON MOTION TO APPROVE THE JSP26-07 44725 GRAND RIVER (DAMAS BUILDING) PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN MADE BY MEMBER AVDOULOS AND SECONDED BY MEMBER LYNCH. Motion carried 7-0.

3. ICHIBAN FACADE JF25-13

Consideration at the request of Crown Realty & Management for approval of a Section 9 Façade Waiver. The existing building is located on a portion of the 5.86-acre parcel at 42050 Grand River Avenue (Section 23). The applicant requests approval for the application of asphalt shingles on a mansard roof.

Planner Shanahan stated the subject site is located at 42050 Grand River on north side of Grand River Avenue, west of Meadowbrook Road. The applicant is requesting approval of a Section 9 Façade Waiver for the application of asphalt shingles installed on a mansard roof. The ordinance does not permit asphalt shingles on mansard roofs. The applicant is requesting the waiver in tandem with proposing to meet ordinance standards by screening the roof top units (RTUs). The Façade review notes that given the unsightly nature of the RTUs, the screening will improve the overall appearance of the building more so than replacing the asphalt shingles with a compliant material. The waiver is supported contingent upon adequate screening of the RTUs. The applicant had previously proposed a screening material with circular perforations, but it was determined to not provide adequate screening. The applicant is currently working with the City's Façade consultant on a material that meets ordinance standards.

Representing the project are Grant Chen with Crown Realty and Management and Jenny Shee, owner of Ichiban. Staff are also available for any questions.

Chair Pehrson invited the application to address the Planning Commission.

Mr. Grant Chen with Crown Realty and Management stated that Ichiban has been secured as the new tenant of the former Wasabi restaurant. It was noted that over the past year they have worked in conjunction with both the Planning and Building Departments regarding rooftop screening. Based on feedback from staff the architect has revised the plan to include solid panel screening. Mr. Chen relayed that when Crown Realty and Management took over the plaza, they were not aware that rooftop screening was a requirement. At the time they acquired the property, the roof required repairs due to water damage. It was noted that the roof was replaced with asphalt shingles as they were not aware of the material requirements.

Chair Pehrson turned the matter over to the Planning Commission.

Member Lynch relayed that the façade consultant Mr. Doug Necci indicated in his review letter that the applicant is going to abide by his recommendation regarding rooftop screening. Member Lynch stated he has no issues.

Member Avdoulos stated he appreciates the applicant working with the staff.

Motion to approve the JF25-13 Ichiban Façade Section 9 Façade Waiver made by Member Avdoulos and seconded by Member Lynch.

In the matter of Ichiban Facade JF25-13, motion to approve the Section 9 Façade Waiver based on and subject to the following:

- a. **Provision of adequate screening of all rooftop units (RTUs) to effectively screen the RTUs from all vantage points and comply with roof top screening requirements of Section 4.19.2.E of the Zoning Ordinance, as the proposed material in the packet has been determined to be inadequate for screening.**
- b. **All elevations of the building are painted with the approved paint colors.**

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.

ROLL CALL ON MOTION TO APPROVE THE JF25-13 ICHIBAN FAÇADE SECTION 9 FAÇADE WAIVER MADE BY MEMBER AVDOULOS AND SECONDED BY MEMBER LYNCH. Motion carried 7-0.

4. APPROVAL OF THE MAY 13, 2026 PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Motion to approve the May 13, 2026 Planning Commission Minutes.

ROLL CALL ON MOTION TO APPROVE THE MAY 13, 2026 PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES MADE BY MEMBER LYNCH AND SECONDED BY MEMBER AVDOULOS. Motion carried 7-0.

CONSENT AGENDA REMOVALS FOR COMMISSION ACTION

There were no consent agenda items.

SUPPLEMENTAL ISSUES/TRAINING UPDATES

There were no supplemental issues or training updates.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

Chair Pehrson invited members of the audience who wished to address the Planning Commission during the final audience participation to come forward.

Mr. Michel Duchesneau at 1191 South Lake Drive stated that the topic of conservation easements may become more prevalent. He expressed that it is his understanding that the developer promises to permanently preserve woodlands and wetlands as a result the City retains the natural features. The developer and future homeowners do not pay taxes on these areas. The projects presented this evening are likely the first in a series of similar projects. It was noted that there is a possibility for approving critical root zone impact with a mechanism for paying into the tree fund for potential damages therefore allowing the trees to stand without cutting them. Mr. Duchesneau expressed appreciation for staff's involvement and support in looking at our policies and procedures.

Chair Pehrson asked Mr. Meader to share his announcement.

Mr. Meader announced that he will be retiring and tonight's meeting will be the last that he will be in attendance for. He expressed appreciation to the Planning Commission for all their support for the ordinance and to him personally.

Chair Pehrson wished Mr. Meader all the best in his retirement.

Seeing no one else, Chair Pehrson closed the final audience participation.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn the June 10, 2026, meeting made by Member Lynch and all in favor said aye.

Meeting adjourned at 8:14 PM.

DRAFT