

**THE CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF CHESTERFIELD
PLANNING COMMISSION
September 25, 2012**

A regular meeting of the Charter Township of Chesterfield Planning Commission was held on Tuesday, September 25, 2012 at 7:00 p.m. at the Township Hall located at 47275 Sugarbush, Chesterfield MI 48047.

1. CALL TO ORDER:

Chairman Miller called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL:

Present: Frank Eckenrode
Rick LaBelle
Paul Miller
Jim Moran
Ray Saelens
Joe Stabile
Carl Leonard
Linda Hartman

Excused: Paula Frame

Others: Brian Wilson, Community Planning & Management

3. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:

Motion by Mr. Miller, supported by Mr. Moran to approve the revised agenda.

All Ayes

Motion Carried

4. SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT: (Committee will report items under Reviews)

5. PUBLIC HEARING:

A. The following Section 76-331.(g)(2)b to read as follows:

Sec. 76-331. Provisions applicable to Agricultural and Residential districts.

Motion by Mr. Miller, supported by Mr. Saelens to open the Public Hearing on Section 76-331 (g)(2)b at 7:23 p.m.

All Ayes

Motion Carried

Motion by Mr. Miller, supported by Mr. Moran to close the Public Hearing on Section 76-331 (g)(2)b at 7:28 p.m.

All Ayes

Motion Carried

A roll call vote was done to take action tonight on the provisions to Section 76-331 (g)(2)b.

Ayes: Mr. Eckenrode, Mr. LaBelle, Mr. Miller, Mr. Moran, Mr. Saelens, Mr. Stabile,
Mr. Leonard, Ms. Hartman

Nays: None

Motion Carried

bottom two tenants from Gratiot.

Mr. Leonard confirmed that the proposed sign has five tenants listed and a reader board on the bottom. He also said that the full height of the sign cannot exceed 12 feet.

Mr. LaBelle, suggested that if the sign was placed six feet underneath it could meet the 12-foot stipulation, but would only allow six feet of actual sign.

Mr. Safie stated that if he eliminated the reader board, he would make the sign bigger to increase visibility.

Mr. Stabile stated that he does not see a practical difficulty to deviate from the 12 feet of total height required by the ordinance.

Mr. Leonard asked the applicant if the sign could be repositioned.

Mr. Safie replied that the sign could be repositioned but the electrical would be expensive because it would be necessary to bore under the driveway and cross a couple of green belts.

Mr. Leonard suggested that a sign five feet from the bottom would allow for increased visibility above the rooftop of the cars.

Mr. Safie agreed that if he is given five feet, he would keep the full height of the sign at 12 feet. He added that his signs are currently blocked from other signs that sit further down the road.

Mr. Leonard assured Mr. Safie that there will be a lot of continuity in the future.

Mr. Saelens reminded the applicant that the sign cannot exceed 64 square feet in width.

Mr. Leonard confirmed with Mr. Safie that the sign will have the same five tenants, "Liquor" will remain on the top and there might be a small reader board on the bottom. The only change is that the sign will be five feet from the bottom instead of the four foot maximum allowed by the ordinance.

7. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PRIOR MEETINGS:

Motion by Mr. Miller, supported by Mr. Moran to approve the minutes from September 11, 2012.

All Ayes

Motion Carried

8. COMMUNICATIONS:

A. Discussion of dual signs or 2 signs, Pat Meagher will provide language on this topic at this meeting.

Commissioners requested that Brian Wilson ask Pat Meagher to develop language that would put some stipulations on dual signs. Commissioners would like to keep continuity, but still be allowed to grant a second sign that would not exceed 50% when there is a proven practical difficulty.

Commissioners agreed that 50% is enough to identify a store, but not overpower a building.

Commissioners also agreed that a second sign may be needed on the front, back or side of a building depending on its location within a complex.

Mr. Stabile thought Mr. Meagher was going to develop some language to describe those roads that are like a road, but are actually inside of a parking lot (ex. Pier I plaza).

Mr. Leonard said he is looking for continuity with a little variance, if allowable.

Mr. LaBelle reminded the commission to consider the intent of a second sign. He said that a second sign may only be needed on a building that cannot be seen from the road. He said such a sign may be necessary when there is a problem finding a building within a complex.

Commissioners agreed that there should be some language in place, because dual signs have become a reoccurring issue.

9. NEW BUSINESS:

Commissioners noted that there is a Halloween store opening in the "old" Kmart building that has not sought sign approval from the Planning Commission. They said that the Halloween store in the Target complex was required to have such approval. Commissioners agreed that this new Halloween store should also seek sign approval from the Planning Commission.

Motion by Mr. Miller, supported by Mr. Saelens to require the new Halloween store in the Kmart plaza to come to the Planning Commission for sign approval.

All Ayes

Motion Carried

10. OLD BUSINESS: None

11. PLANNER'S REPORT:

- A. **ADMINISTRATIVE REQUEST #85: Paul Esposito 48680 Garfield, Suite 3, Clinton Twp., MI 48036.** Request to leave existing construction trailer in its current location at Eastridge Condos located East side of Gratiot, North of 21 Mile.

Motion by Ms. Hartman, supported by Mr. Miller to approve Administrative Request #85 subject to the applicant obtaining a permit from the building department within 30 days of approval. The applicant must also paint the trailer, cut and maintain the weeds. This administrative approval is only good for one year.

Ayes: Mr. Eckenrode, Mr. LaBelle, Mr. Miller, Mr. Stabile, Mr. Leonard, Ms. Hartman

Nays: Mr. Moran, Mr. Saelens

Motion Carried

Ms. Hartman said that Code Enforcement suggested that the applicant come in for a permit within 30 days and that the permit only be good for one year. They also recommended that the applicant agree to paint and clean up the weeds.

Ms. Hartman explained that the trailer has been there for six years and currently there is no permit for use. She said that the owner's intent is to re-start building in this incomplete subdivision. Code Enforcement said that with some conditions attached to it, this administrative

request is approvable, according to Ms. Hartman.

Mr. LaBelle added that the trailer has been sitting there for quite some time and the center is sagging. He explained that typically there is a construction trailer because the owner is going to start building; the owner pulls the building permits and there are plans submitted to the municipality.

Commissioners confirmed that there is still quite a bit of property waiting for development in that subdivision.

B. ADMINISTRATIVE REQUEST #86: Tom Kemp, 29831 Commerce Blvd., Chesterfield, MI 48051. Request for a 12,784-square-foot addition to existing Dynamic Plastics Co.

Mr. Miller stated that at this time, there would not be any action taken on this request. He suggested that the applicant talk to the Planning Department about how to be placed on the next agenda. Additionally, commissioners suggested that the applicant may want to submit a site plan.

Mr. Wilson said that at this time both AEW and Community Planning & Management did not have any objections to the proposal. He said that in speaking with the applicant, this future addition was outlined in a past site plan.

Mr. Stabile said that the Planning Commission found out today that this addition was on a previous site plan.

The applicant, Thomas Kemp, said that the building was built 10 years ago and Dynamic Plastics Co. thought that this addition would be added on within a few years and included it on the original site plan. He said the construction drawings are complete and the owners are really hoping to get this addition done by the end of the year.

Mr. Kemp explained that when the original building was designed, the area set aside for the addition remained untouched in preparation for it. He said that the owners do not want this expansion to look like an addition and will make sure the materials blend with the existing building.

Dynamic Plastics will be adding some more machinery and using the addition for machine operations, storage, shipping/receiving and for general business operations, said Mr. Kemp.

Mr. Miller and Mr. Saelens asked if there is an expiration date on an original site plan.

Additionally, Mr. Saelens said the plan shows some new parking spaces.

Mr. Kemp said there was land-banked parking on the original site plan and the owners thought it would be a 3-5 year plan.

Mr. Eckenrode confirmed with the applicant that the square footage of the addition is the same as it was in the original plan from ten years ago.

Mr. Wilson told commissioners that Mr. Meagher did a review of this administrative request based on the parking and other general items and it appeared to be okay. However, he did

not do a full site plan review, because that was not what was requested.

Mr. Kemp said that the owners have a different engineer who has taken over the project, but explained that the plan is still a replica of the original site plan.

Mr. Leonard suggested that it might be the original site plan redone to today's standards.

Mr. Stabile said that this may be too large of a project for administrative approval.

Mr. Saelens said that the added parking could be considered a change from the original plan.

Mr. Leonard confirmed with the applicant that the proposed addition was on the original plan and it included the parking and the addition was the same square footage as it is now.

Typically, an administrative request is only acceptable if the addition adds no more than 30% to the original footprint, said Mr. Saelens.

Commissioners agreed that this request is almost 50% of the original site plan and may need to be brought back in as a site plan because it exceeds the normal request.

Commissioners also noted that there are two Dumpsters on this property that are not screened. It was suggested that the Dumpsters be placed within the screening area. Mr. Kemp said he would discuss this with the owners.

12. COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR:

Mr. Stabile asked about pre-planning volunteers for the next meeting. Both Mr. Eckenrode & Mr. LaBelle agreed to participate.

13. PROPOSALS FOR NEXT AGENDA: None

14. ADJOURNMENT:

Motion by Mr. Miller, supported by Mr. Stabile to adjourn the meeting at 8:14 p.m.

All Ayes

Motion Carried

Joe Stabile, Secretary

Amanda Willard, Recording Secretary