

**CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF LYON
PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
February 9, 2004**

Approved as corrected March 8, 2004.

DATE: February 9, 2004
TIME: 7:00 PM
PLACE: 58000 Grand River

Call to Order: Chairman Hemker called the meeting to order at 7:05 pm.

Roll Call: Present: Brent Hemker, Chairman
Michael Barber, Vice Chair
Laura James, Secretary
Ray Bisio, Trustee
Jim Hamilton
Ted Soper
Laura Williams

Also Present: Matthew Quinn, Township Attorney
Chris Doozan, Township Planner
Megan Masson-Minock, Township Planner
Chris Olson, Township Superintendent

Guests: 50

1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The following was requested to be added to the agenda as the last line under new business:
- Amendment to Lyon Towne Center – schedule a public hearing

Mr. Soper made a motion to approve the agenda as modified. Ms. James supported the motion.

Voice Vote: Ayes: All
Nays: None

Motion approved unanimously.

**2. APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA
- January 12, 2003 Meeting Minutes**

Mr. Hemker noted some typographical errors for the Recording Secretary to fix.

Mr. Barber made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda consisting of the minutes from the January 12, 2004 meeting as corrected. Ms. Williams supported the motion.

Voice Vote: Ayes: All
Nays: None

Motion approved unanimously.

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS: NONE

4. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

Mr. Bisio made a motion to hold the BMB Ventures, L.L.C. public hearing first. Mr. Soper supported the motion.

Voice Vote: Ayes: All
Nays: None

Motion approved.

AP-03-31, BMB Ventures, L.L.C., rezoning request from R-03, Residential Single-family to O-1 for part of 58560 Grand River, west of Milford Road (continuation of the January 12, 2004 public hearing).

Ms. Masson-Minock reviewed the comments indicated in the McKenna Associates, Inc. letter regarding this issue.

Bob Langan, BMB Ventures, stated that he would be happy to answer any questions that the Commissioners may have.

Ms. James asked Mr. Langan if he has gotten any comments from the public regarding this change. Mr. Langan responded that he has not.

Mr. Hemker opened the public hearing at 7:13 PM. There were no public comments. He then closed the public hearing at 7:13 PM.

Mr. Barber made a motion to consider AP-03-31, BMB Ventures, L.L.C., indicated under New Business before the AIS Property public hearing. Mr. Soper supported the motion.

Voice Vote: Ayes: All
Nays: None

Motion approved.

OLD BUSINESS:

AP-03-31, BMB Ventures, L.L.C., rezoning request from R-03, Residential Single-family to O-1 for part of 58560 Grand River, west of Milford.

Ms. James made a motion to recommend approval of the rezoning request for BMB Ventures to the

Board on the following specific grounds:

1. The current zoning for residential use is impractical considering the traffic on Grand River Avenue, the fact that it is next to a landfill and that it is adjacent to nearby commercial uses.
2. The future land use map has this property zoned for future public use but with less than two acres this is extremely unlikely to happen.
3. If this is rezoned to an office use there would be virtually no traffic impact.
4. There is a demonstrated need for office use in the Township.

Mr. Barber supported the motion.

Voice Vote: Ayes: All
 Nays: None

Motion approved.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

AP-03-37, AIS Property, public hearing to consider rezoning request for parcel #21-03-127-002, from RM-2, Multiple-family to B-3, General Business, located south of Pontiac Trail, north of I-96.

Ms. Masson-Minock reviewed the comments indicated in the McKenna Associates, Inc. letter dated January 14, 2004 regarding this issue.

Seymour Mandell, Attorney, stated that he represents both the seller and the purchaser with regard to this application. He stated that he has read and listened to the comments of the Planning Consultants and for the most part he concurs with the findings and recommendations.

Mr. Mandell stated that when one is purchasing property for a specific purpose that is allowed in current state of the zoning it is necessary before the deal is closed to get the appropriate zoning classification for the property. He stated that they cannot come before the Commission with formal plans for the car dealership without having this property in the appropriate zoning classification. He stated that it is not that they don't want to present the plan, but that it would not be appropriate until the proper zoning is in place.

Mr. Mandell stated that he would like to comment on a few issues that have been raised through various means of communication. He stated that they have done an environmental study on this site. He stated that the present owners of the site do not have a contamination problem. He noted that there was a landfill to the west of this property and the monitoring done on this site was on the advice of an environmentalist who believed that there could possibly be some contamination. He stated that the current owner is in the process of getting the contamination issue resolved with the DEQ and the Department of Health. He stated that the current owner has stopped monitoring the wells in this area.

Mr. Mandell displayed a drawing of the site. He stated that they are proposing to put a GMC Pontiac dealership on a portion of the site. He stated that other than the dealership use, they have no other plans for the remaining portion of the site. He stated that if the zoning moves along, they would expect to have a completed site plan before the Commission within 30 to 60 days. He felt that they could submit plans that would be quite satisfactory to the community.

Mr. Mandell briefly discussed the lighting of the proposed dealership. He stated that by appropriate planning, engineering and shielding of the light fixtures they can do a tremendous job of controlling the light and footcandle power limits. He stated that they will certainly comply with the Township's lighting ordinance.

Mr. Barber asked Mr. Mandell who he represents. He responded that officially he represents Kevin Mechigian, who is involved with Bob Saks in Farmington Hills. He stated that he is also speaking on behalf of the present owner of the property.

Mr. Bisio stated that originally there were two sites that were being looked at for this dealership, the AIS site and a site at Lyon Crossing. Mr. Mandell stated that this is correct. He noted that General Motors has given up the option on the site at Lyon Crossing. He stated that they came in initially and spoke with the Township Superintendent and were led to believe the Township preferred the AIS site for this dealership.

Ms. Masson-Minock stated that on October 4, 2004 the applicant appeared before the Planning Commission to discuss two possible sites, the AIS site and the Lyon Crossing site. At that time the applicant was told that Lyon Crossing was more pedestrian oriented and that perhaps the AIS site would be a better location for a dealership.

Ms. James questioned why the applicant wants to rezone the whole parcel when they are only going to use the western portion of the parcel for the dealership. She noted that if they rezone all of this parcel to B-3, anything can be built there. She felt that they should not rezone the eastern half of the site because the applicant does not know what they are going to do with it at this time. Mr. Mandell responded that on the basis that the Master Plan does call for the entire parcel to be zoned B-3 and if you start chopping the parcels up into separate slivers, it is not good planning. He stated that eventually they were hoping to put some sort of car dealership type use on the eastern portion of the site.

Mr. Hemker discussed the buffer issue. He stated that everything is compatible except for that side. He stated that if that side remains RM-2 zoning then that could almost provide the buffer between the B-3 zoning and the residential.

Ms. James questioned if the applicant would be willing to revise their request and just ask for rezoning on the western half. Mr. Mandell stated that they need more than half of the site for the dealership. He stated that this would not be such a bad idea because they could always come back and petition the Township to rezone the remainder of the parcel when they have a specified use for it.

Mr. Mandell stated that they would be willing to grant an easement on the 40' in perpetuity subject to their maintenance on it. He stated that it would still be an intensive landscape area that would not be built on.

Mr. Mechigian stated that they have no problem with everybody getting involved with the plans. He stated that they are going to leave the 40' and have the landscape engineers make it nice

and

dense. He stated that the only concern he has with RM-2 would be that the land would become useless land because he has paid for it and it does not have sewer. He stated that even if he decided to develop it into an RM-2 piece at a later date, there are no sewers available. Mr. Bisio stated that they knew this when they came in.

Mr. Olson stated that with regard to the environmental situation, he received an e-mail from Pam Deer which was provided to the Commissioners. He stated that to his knowledge there is not any sort of environmental emergency on this property. He noted that they did grant Ms. Deer the ability to put in a regular well instead of an encased well. There was further brief discussion with regard to the well.

Mr. Hemker opened the public hearing at 8:01 PM.

Carol White, 55664 Pontiac Trail Court, read a letter that she wrote. She stated that a lot of the questions she had got answered but there she still has some concerns. She stated that she is very concerned that this change will change her property values. She is also concerned about the loss of trees and water runoff. She noted that she can actually sit in her yard at night and read a book because of the lights from the other dealership. The traffic now between 4:00 and 6:00 PM is terrible.

Antonio Artise, 56135 Pontiac Trail, stated that he has a problem with the Planning Commission approving this change from RM-2 to B-3. He felt that Ms. James' suggestion of only changing half the parcel zoning would better guarantee the residents that there won't be industrial next

to a residential area.

Joanna Firestone, 30993 Pammar Drive, read a letter that she wrote in opposition to this rezoning change. She discussed the drainage, traffic and the property values that will be affected by this development. She submitted a petition opposing this rezoning request with many signatures of residents that could not be present at the meeting this evening. Mr. Olson made copies of the petition and distributed it to the Commissioners.

Troy Lapine, 56079 Pontiac Trail, stated that he moved to the Township a year ago and this is his first house. He stated that he is strongly against the rezoning request. He was concerned with the traffic and the number of trees that will be removed. He stated that he is committed to the Township and recently joined the Fire Department as a volunteer. He stated that if he wanted to live in a community that was all developed, he would have gone to Livonia or other suburbs, but he does not want to, he wants to live in a community where there are open green spaces.

Greg Adkins, 56199 Pontiac Trail, stated that he just bought his home in November and probably would not have bought it, if he knew then what was proposed to go on this property. He discussed the traffic issue. He stated that he likes seeing the deer going through his backyard and felt that the deer would go away if this development goes through. He stated that he is strongly opposed to this.

Delbert McDonald, 55755 Pontiac Trail Court, stated that he has lived in this home for 30 years. He discussed the traffic issue and felt that this development would make the traffic worse. He stated that he is opposed to the rezoning.

Terry Lawrence, 31004 Pammar Drive, stated that he is concerned that this development will decrease the value of his property. He was also concerned about how the drainage will be affected. He stated that he liked Ms. James' suggestion to rezone only the portion of the site that they plan on using for the dealership.

Phyllis Knight, 55711 Pontiac Trail Court, stated that she has seen a lot of growth in this area since she has lived in her house for twenty years. She discussed concerns with her well and how it will be affected. She stated that she does not feel that there is enough water in the area to accommodate another car dealership.

Andrew McCord, 30993 Pammar Drive, stated that nobody has said anything about the amount of noise that this dealership will make. He stated that having AIS as a neighbor stinks. He stated that dealerships are noisy and dirty and he does not want a dealership here.

Delbert McDonald, 55755 Pontiac Trail Court, noted that if houses were built in this area there would be a lot more traffic than if a dealership was built here.

Mr. Hemker closed the public hearing at 8:21 PM.

5. OLD BUSINESS:

AP-03-37, AIS Property, rezoning request for parcel #21-03-127-002, from RM-2, Multiple-family to B-3, General Business, located south of Pontiac Trail, north of I-96.

Mr. Soper stated that one of his biggest concerns is that if they rezone this area to B-3 there is no guarantee that a dealership will go in there. He stated that what they would have done is open this up for anything that is allowed in a B-3 to be built there. He stated that he knows that the applicant has the best intentions in putting in a dealership, but nobody knows what is going to happen with the economy a few years down the road. He stated that with regard to the

comments about cutting down trees, the owner of this property now has every right to develop it and the Planning Commission has no right to tell them that they cannot develop it. He stated that no matter what goes in here, trees are going to be lost.

Mr. Soper stated that since there are no plans for the eastern portion, the only way he would consider the rezoning is if it were only for the western portion.

Mr. Barber stated that with regard to the possibility of flooding, they have to be assured by the engineers that there won't be any flooding before anything can be constructed. He stated that there is nothing that they can do about too much traffic. He noted that the Commissioners are residents of the Township and they too, feel the traffic impacts. He stated that other than saying no more development until Oakland County fixes all the roads in the Township, there isn't much that they can do.

Phyllis Knight, 55711 Pontiac Trail Court, stated that there is flooding in this area now. She noted that Pontiac Trail near AIS is flooded every year.

Mr. Barber stated that it would be a lot easier to handle if they only rezoned the portion of the site that is needed rather than rezoning the whole parcel and now knowing what else will go in there besides the dealership.

Ms. James stated that the residents have brought up several very legitimate concerns, the trees, the water, etc. She noted that most of the items will not be addressed today but they will be addressed at site plan review. She reassured the residents that the Commissioners are very sensitive with regard to the lighting issues. She stated that as it stands today, this property is either going to be condos or apartments or retail. She stated that it will probably not be condos or apartments because there is no sewer.

Ms. James stated that she felt that they should vote down rezoning the entire parcel. She felt that the applicant should come back with a proposal for just the western portion of this site. She stated that she does not believe that they should rezone the whole thing.

Mr. Mandell stated that since he can not provide the Commission with a use of what would happen on the eastern portion of the property, the suggestion that the rezoning recommendation for only the 400' on the western side of the property is not something that he would object to. He stated that it is not their objective to be obtrusive.

Mr. Quinn stated that another possible alternative would be in the purchase agreement to have AIS give a restriction on the eastern 100 or 150 feet for no development at all and possibly donating it for a conservation easement. He stated that this would be a contractual way between the applicant and the owner to state that whatever that footage is that it would never be used.

Mr. Mandell stated that he does not have any objection going back and talking to the owner, but he cannot make any decisions for him at this time.

Mr. Quinn noted that the applicant can amend their application for a lesser amount. He stated that because the public hearing was for a larger amount, the applicant can amend for a smaller amount.

Ms. Masson-Minock stated that the Planning Commission has the following three options, they can recommend approval, recommend denial or table for more information. She noted that if the decision is to table, the Planning Commission can keep the public hearing open and then get

more

public comments at the next meeting. She stated that applicant is under a timeline and that she is not sure that this option would fit into their schedule.

Mr. Bisio stated that he felt that to be fair to the residents, this should be tabled with the public hearing left open. Mr. Hemker noted that the Planning Commission recommends to the Board, who makes the final decision.

Ms. Masson-Minock stated that they would attach a copy of the minutes a letter to the Board. She stated that a motion could indicate that during the course of the evening, after comments from the Commissioners and from the public, the petition was amended.

Mr. Soper questioned the width of the property. Mr. Mandell responded that it is 600' wide.

After further discussion, the Commissioners determined that this issue should be tabled and that the public hearing would remain open.

Mr. Soper made a motion to table AP-03-37, AIS Property, rezoning until the March 8, 2003 meeting. The public hearing will be continued at that time. Ms. Williams supported the motion.

Voice Vote: Ayes: Hamilton, Hemker, James, Soper, Williams
 Nays: Barber, Bisio

Motion approved.

AP-03-09, Elkow Farms Planned Development, Eleven Mile and Milford Roads, Applicants: Hitech Building, LLC, and Ivanhoe-Huntley Holding, LLC, preliminary plan review (Tabled after January 26, 2004, at applicant's request).

Mr. Doozan reviewed the comments indicated in the McKenna Associates, Inc. letter dated February 2, 2004 regarding this issue.

Representing Elkow Farms Planned Development:

- Paul Elkow
- Allen Green, Ivanhoe-Huntley
- Ron Cook, Cook Development
- Gary Shapiro, Ivanhoe-Huntley
- Rick Elkow

Paul Elkow using a displayed plan, explained the revisions that they have made to the plan. He noted that they have done the following:

- they now have 114 100' lots,
- they have increased the space between the duplex units to 30',
- they have added the road connections,
- they have addressed the oil issues on the donated land and have contacted Oakland Land Conservancy
- they have cut density

Mr. Elkow asked the Commissioners if they look at the plan as a whole, do they like the plan. Mr. Soper responded that as a whole, he does like the plan. Mr. Elkow stated that what it comes down to is the "d" word (density). He discussed the density using M&M's to represent the following: - 114 Almond M&M's - 100' lots, 478 plain M&M's - 90' lots and 78 peanut M&M's - duplex units. He stated that if you reached in and took out 50 of the plain M&M's there really would not be a noticeable difference in the jar. He noted that if you took out 50, it would be the landowners and the developers that would really notice a difference.

Mr. Elkow questioned if they really want to give up the grand plan without looking at it and deciding. He stated that he felt that the biggest problem the Planning Commission has is the defensibility of the Master Plan in terms of what other people will ask for in the future. He stated that if he can show that the benefits are so dramatic, the Township may want this plan the way it is right now without slimming it down. He briefly discussed the size of the project and the numerous amenities that they are proposing.

Mr. Elkow stated that they have looked at the other PD's that are proposed, they have looked at the dollars that are going to be spent and the amount of amenities that they are going to give back. He noted that they fall so short of what the Elkow project is. He stated that the other PD's proposed were given 20%. He noted that if the Elkow project was given the same 20%, he would feel offended. The dollars that are being given back by the other PD's is so much smaller per unit than what they are doing. He stated that they believe that they have \$8,000,000 worth of amenities.

Allen Green, Ivanhoe-Huntley, clarified a statement that was indicated in the review letter with regard to the duplex units. He briefly discussed the duplex portion of the proposed development.

Mr. Bisio questioned the value of the housing in the five different areas. Mr. Green stated that first section, the Shuman/Cogger parcel, is going to be around \$329,000 to \$450,000. Gary Shapiro, Ivanhoe-Huntley, stated that condos will be in the low \$200,000, the homes will be \$350,000 to \$400,000. Paul Elkow stated that they are proposing a ten to twelve year build-out on this project.

Mr. Soper stated that he likes the duplexes. He felt that there are still too many, but he likes them. He noted that there are three items indicated in the McKenna letter that could possibly help reduce the density. He questioned how these items would impact the development. Mr. Elkow stated that they are still struggling for costs. He stated that what they found out in the last thirty days is that the intersection is a disaster from a developer's point of view. He noted that the intersection is not centered, it is offset. He stated that at the end of Eleven Mile road the edge goes into the dirt. In order to pave this road they are going to have to buy easements and relocate the drain. He further discussed the work that is involved in the road paving.

Mr. Olson questioned if the Road Commission, at any time, has provided an estimate of what it would cost to rehabilitate that corner. Mr. Elkow responded that they have not. There was further discussion with regard to the costs incurred.

Ms. James stated that they have been working on this project for 1-1/2 years and everytime the developer leaves the Planning Commission they shave off a few units and then they come back. She felt that if they really wanted to guard against other developers coming in here and asking for mass density bonuses, they have to rely upon the density criteria in the Master Plan. She stated that the Commission's decision on this plan must be based on the Master Plan. The Master Plan has specific mechanisms for getting density bonus. She compared this development to the to the density criteria in the Master Plan. She stated that according to her mathematics, she would be willing to support a 25% density increase. She felt that this density bonus could be justified when other developers come in and ask for increases in density.

Ms. James noted that the plan indicated 8' bike paths and the requirement is for 10' bike paths. She stated that if the developer put in 8' bike paths, she would be thrilled because 10' bike paths are a problem. A 10' bike path is large enough for cars to drive on them.

Ms. James stated that one other problem that she sees is the donation of future interest in park land for the Township. She felt that this would be a huge problem. She felt that the Township should not have any interest in the park property. She noted that currently the Township is facing a lot of development proposals, which means that they will probably face a lot of zoning litigation.

She stated that the Township is not collectible, they have no insurance and the only property that the Township owns is where the Township Hall is located and it used to be a dump. Mr. Olson stated that the Township is collectible and that they do have insurance policies.

Ms. James stated that if the Township owned 70 acres on Milford Road, it would make the Township invitingly collectible to developers. She cited an incident that happened in Novi.

Mr. Elkow stated that the Township needs to have their attorney guide them through this. He stated that the Oakland Land Conservancy is a flexible organization.

Ms. James asked Mr. Quinn if the Township has an interest in 70 acres of prime land how would they be affected. Mr. Quinn stated that it is not prime land. Mr. Olson stated that half the land is wetlands. Mr. Elkow stated that two-thirds of the land is upland with good dirt.

Mr. Quinn stated that if the land was titled in the Oakland Land Conservancy with a right for the Township to draw it out in the future, he felt that it could be set up so that the land could not be drawn out by a creditor.

Mr. Hemker noted that when they were given the presentation by the Oakland Land Conservancy, it was indicated that it could be set up so that the Township can only pull the land out of the Conservancy for certain types of uses.

Mr. Bisio stated that they are getting closer. Mr. Elkow questioned if they could get conditional approval from the Commission this evening at the 25%.

Mr. Soper stated that he gives Ms. James a lot of credit for the point system that she used. He stated that they have talked about this before, and felt that this was a defensible way of discussing this. Ms. Williams stated that the only issue she has with the point system is that it is not in an approved ordinance. She noted that this is criteria that has been proposed for the Master Plan.

There was discussion with regard to the types of improvements that will be made to the intersection.

Mr. Shapiro stated that he does not have a problem with the 25%. He stated that if they could get a conditional approval for the 25% with the understanding that they budget the \$250,000 for the improvements and understanding that they are going to work in good faith as they move forward with more detailed engineering and to eliminate the 1/2 mile of paving and to find a way to accommodate the \$250,000 cap that they have.

Mr. Olson stated that they ran into a lot of problems with the Woodwind approval having nineteen conditions. He noted that they should narrow the conditions on approval and not broaden them.

Mr. Green stated that with regard to the duplex units, they are comfortable with the plan they have. He stated that they really have tried to address the concerns of the Commission. He noted that the Commission wanted 100' lots, and they put them in, which resulted in the loss of some duplex units. He noted that the Commission wanted more room between duplex units, which they put in, and this too resulted in the loss of some lots. He stated that they are sort of facing a situation, that the Commission has some magic number in their heads, but the developer is looking at this as a lot of speculation on their part. He stated that certain numbers that they thought were fine, they now know that this will not cover what they need to do. He stated that they don't know what the costs are until they actually go through the engineering process.

Mr. Green stated that with regard to the flood plain issue, their engineers tell them that it is really not a flood plain. He stated that with a little bit of grading these lots are doable. He stated that they don't know this for certain yet and it may be that they lose lots.

Mr. Green stated that the need to try and achieve a plan with a number that works for them. He stated that if the Commission were to give them preliminary approval of this plan at 25%, then they have one of two options, they have to go back and develop the final plan consistent with the Commission's recommendation and then come back or they will come back and say that they can't meet the condition placed on them. He stated that he does not know of any other way to move this forward other than getting a conditional approval from the Commission.

Mr. Barber stated that he can see that a lot of work has been put into this. He stated that he can see that there are miles and miles of sewer and water in this development. He stated that there is still a lot of uncertainty. He noted that there is not another development in this community that will be like this one.

Ms. James stated that the 25% is based exclusively on the criteria and she felt that it is defensible.

Ms. Masson-Minock stated that if a motion for conditional approval of 25% density was given, then what is being stated is that if and only if the developer meets these conditions then the Commission has obligated themselves for approval. She stated that if they come back and say that they can only get to 26% in lieu of 25%, then the Commission can recommend denial on the basis that the developer did not meet the conditions of approval.

Mr. Green stated that they will go back and do the engineering to find out what things are going to cost and hopefully there won't be any surprises. He stated that they will then come back and try to meet the 25% with all things preserved.

Mr. Hamilton stated that he really doesn't like the density in the middle of the Township. He felt that they should preserve the rural character.

Ms. Williams stated that she would be worried that other developers will come in and want 20%, 25% or higher for density because they have given it here. She was concerned about legal issues. Mr. Quinn stated that the way he understands this is that the trend of amending the PD ordinance

is

to put an absolute cap in the ordinance. He stated that this will get rid of the problems with that type of negotiating.

Mr. Bisio stated that there are a lot of great amenities and that this is a nice development. He stated that once they open the flood gates, they are stuck with it.

Ms. James stated that if you take the criteria that she used to calculate the 25% and use it on other developments coming in, she felt that they would only end up with 8 or 9 percent. She stated that if the developer wants more, then they are going to have to come up with more. She stated that she feels comfortable calculating the density bonus this way.

Ms. Williams stated that any motion made should identify the criteria used as well as the methodology. Mr. Olson stated that he would like to see a real well formatted motion that covers contingencies so that they are not there two years down the road for final approval. He stated that when the Commission makes a preliminary approval, they are basically saying that final approval is going to happen providing all the other jurisdictions that get to comment on this give this a go.

Mr. Bisio questioned the quad units. He noted that the two middle units are 900 square feet. Frank Didario, Curtis Builders responded that the two outside units are the larger units with attached three car garage. He stated that the middle units, however, are larger than 900 square feet.

Mr. Bisio questioned the cost of the units. Mr. Didario responded that they will be \$250,000 to \$300,000.

Mr. Bisio questioned the burned out farmhouse on the property. Ray Cousineau, South Hill Construction, responded that Bob Harris informed him that the farmhouse will be removed this week.

Mr. Barber made a motion to recommend approval of the revised plans and documents to the Township Board for AP-04-02, Woodwind Glen Condominiums. Mr. Hamilton supported the motion.

Voice Vote: Ayes: All
 Nays: None

Motion approved unanimously.

Amendment to Lyon Towne Center, schedule a public hearing.

Mr. Doozan noted that there is a special meeting scheduled for Thursday, February 26, 2004. This meeting is a joint meeting of the Township Board, the Planning Commission and the DDA.

Mr. Doozan briefly explained the amendment needed to the planned development plan for Lyon Towne Center.

Ms. James made a motion to scheduled a public hearing for February 26, 2004 at 7:00 PM. Mr. Barber supported the motion.

Voice Vote: Ayes: All
 Nays: None

Motion approved unanimously.

7. MISCELLANEOUS DISCUSSION NONE

8. ADJOURNMENT:

Mr. Hemker adjourned the meeting at 10:34 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Deby Cothery

Deby Cothery
Recording Secretary