

**CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF CHESTERFIELD
PLANNING COMMISSION**

August 13, 2013

A regular meeting of the Charter Township of Chesterfield Planning Commission was held on Tuesday, August 13, 2013 at 7:00 P.M. at the Township Hall located at 47275 Sugarbush, Chesterfield MI 48047.

1. CALL TO ORDER:

Mr. Stabile called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.

2. ROLL CALL:

Present: Joe Stabile
Rick LaBelle
Ray Saelens
Carl Leonard
Jerry Alexie
James Moran
Frank Eckenrode
Brian-Scott DeMuyck

Absent: Paul Miller, excused

Others: Pat Meagher, Community Planning & Management

3. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Motion by Mr. Stabile to approve the agenda with an addition to letter E. for Carleton Equipment on the proposed wall sign. He stated that they mistakenly omitted the resurfacing of the pole sign so he would like to add the resurface of the existing pole sign to letter E.

Supported by Mr. Moran

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion Carried

4. SUB COMMITTEE REPORT (Committee will report on items under Review)

5. PUBLIC HEARING: None

6. REVIEWS:

**A. KEMP BUILDING & DEVELOPMENT COMPANY, SITE PLAN #2013-10:
**KEMP BUILDING CO., 275 W. GIRARD, MADISON HEIGHTS, MI 48071.
PROPOSED NEW INDUSTRIAL BUILDING FOR WELDERS & PRESSES
LOCATED AT 27295 LUCKINO DRIVE. TABLED 6/25/13.****

Mr. LaBelle asked if the applicant had some further input on the proposal because the board had some questions. He directed the applicant to go up to the podium.

Mr. Moran stated that the Township has a brick or better ordinance for the façade of buildings and on the elevations of the building the applicant was still proposing metal siding and he would like to know what can be done to resolve that issue. As well in the parking lot they would need landscape islands and they would also need detail on the dumpster enclosure. Therefore, there are a few items the board would like to talk about.

Mr. Stabile asked if the applicant received the paperwork?

Tom Kemp, 275 W. Girard, Madison Heights, MI addressed the board.

Mr. Kemp answered that he did receive the paperwork. He stated that their concern was what could be done with the elevations that would satisfy the Township. He brought up a drawing and stated that did the prospective to show what would be seen.

Mr. Moran asked if this one was from 21 Mile and the other from I-94?

Mr. DeMuyne asked if that one was from I-94/Town Center Boulevard?

Mr. Kemp answered yes and it does not show all the existing other buildings that are there.

Mr. Saelens stated that they had discussions of brick on the addition and looking at it further the latest elevations show block up 10' and metal siding from there up.

Mr. Kemp mentioned that in a lot of communities metal siding is not considered worse than brick and it is used a lot in this type of building because of the height. These buildings are not exactly the same elevation; in fact the new building is six or seven feet taller than the other for their warehousing. He stated that the metal provides a better insulation factor than the brick according to current Michigan energy codes. He commented that that was their thought and the other concern was speed of construction. However, they are open to discussion.

Mr. Stabile stated that once they reviewed it the brick would probably look very odd and they prefer that the applicant would make it match the other part of the building.

Mr. Saelens explained that would mean single scored block all the way up with no metal siding as opposed to the 10 feet of block with metal siding the rest of the way up because that does not match. He stated the reason was that the board thought adding brick would make it look like a hodge-podge and if there is siding up at the top when no siding in on the existing building that would not look right either. He stated that they would prefer that there would be masonry all the way up with the single scored block as they have on the existing building.

Mr. Kemp stated that the building would be a few hundred feet from the road and there are other existing industrial buildings that would be closer. They would like to work something out. He asked if it was just that elevation where they would like to see all masonry?

Mr. Saelens replied all of it. He stated with this type of block the applicant would meet the energy codes if it were foam filled.

Mr. Kemp stated that there are ways to meet the energy codes. He mentioned that a standard 12" masonry block wall without some reengineering on the interior walls does not meet the current energy code. He stated that they would be required to build double walls with insulation in-between or....

Mr. Saelens stated a composite wall which would lead them back to a split door with a brick veneer with 2 1/4" foam in-between.

Mr. DeMuynck asked if what the applicant was proposing would provide a higher energy code?

Mr. Kemp replied yes.

Mr. Saelens stated that he is a masonry contractor and they build masonry walls all the time with foam insulated 12" blocks which they are doing right now. He commented that he was not an architect and he did not design them, however, he assumed they were meeting the energy codes and these are single block walls. He explained that the blocks would be foam filled and reinforcing every 32" on center and there would not be any problems structurally running it up that high. He stated that what the board is trying to do is keep everything looking the same. He explained that was why they decided that even with the brick, which brick or better is the ordinance, adding brick to the block wall would also look like a hodge-podge. He stated that they thought the building should be all block masonry to match the existing building that is there.

Mr. Kemp discussed it with the owner and he agreed with that.

Mr. DeMuynck verified that the block structure would match the existing building on 21 and Town Center Drive now, so this building would look somewhat the same as the existing structure. He asked if the owners were okay with that. It is their building and he does not know the cost factor involved, however, he knows they want to get started on the project.

Mr. Kemp stated that either it is going to be built or the owners will have to find another facility.

Mr. DeMuynck stated that he did not want that to happen and the board wants them to stay in the community and he would like to see them work something out.

Mr. Kemp stated that the owner is willing to accept that criteria and they would modify the plans.

Mr. Stabile asked if they would rather do the brick?

Mr. Kemp replied no they would prefer to do the block masonry all the way up.

Mr. DeMuynck asked Mr. Kemp if he was the engineer?

Mr. Kemp answered no, he was just the builder.

Mr. Meagher stated that it seem to him they could make a motion to approve subject to matching block, subject to items 3 and 4.

Motion by Mr. Stabile to approve Site Plan #2013-10: Kemp Building Co. for a proposed new industrial building with the stipulation that they meet the requirements of the engineers and also the things requested # 1, 2, 3 and 4. He stated that item #2 though would be changed to all single scored block to match the existing building.

Supported by Mr. Alexie

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion Carried

B. ALLSTATE INSURANCE NEW WALL SIGN – SGN #2012-64: LORDEN CORP. EMBREE SIGN COMPANY, INC. , 22312 HARPER AVENUE, ST. CLAIR SHORES, MI 48080. PROPOSED NEW WALL SIGN LOCATED AT 52947 GRATIOT FOR ALLSTATE. TABLED ON APRIL 9, 2013.

Mr. LaBelle stated that the applicant has requested to be removed from the agenda.

Motion by Mr. LaBelle to remove SGN # 2012-64 from the agenda.

Supported by Mr. Moran

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion Carried

C. EZ INDUSTRIAL PROPOSED NEW WALL SIGN #2013-55: M.D. LIGHTING, 3676 HARRISON AVENUE, ROCHESTER HILLS, MI 48307. PROPOSED NEW WALL SIGN LOCATED AT 48750 STRUCTURAL DRIVE.

D. EXTREME TOOLING PROPOSED NEW 2ND WALL SIGN #2013-56: – M.D. LIGHTING, 3676 HARRISON AVENUE, ROCHESTER HILLS, MI 48307. PROPOSED NEW WALL SIGN LOCATED AT 48750 STRUCTURAL DRIVE.

Mr. LaBelle stated that the applicants for C. and D. have asked for a variance to allow two signs in the front of the building. They share a common entrance into the building and there are two businesses inside the structure. They are requesting to have a sign on each end of the building and looking at it he did not really have a problem with it.

Motion by Mr. LaBelle to allow two wall signs for #2013-55 and #2013-56.

Mr. Saelens asked if each sign would be 42 square feet?

Applicant stated one sign would be 27' and the other would be 21'.

Mr. Meagher stated that would be a total of 48 square feet.

Supported by Mr. Saelens

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion Carried

E. CARLETON EQUIPMENT CO. PROPOSED NEW WALL SIGN # 2013-57: ROBB PERRIN PRESIDENT OF BURKETT SIGNS, INC., 15586 E. MICHIGAN CLIMAX, MI 49034. PROPOSED NEW WALL SIGN LOCATED AT 48135 GRATIOT

Motion by Mr. LaBelle to approve SGN #2013-57 with the resurfacing of the existing pylon sign.

Supported by Mr. Alexie

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion Carried

F. IPEX PROPOSED NEW WALL SIGN – SGN#2013-58: HEILEMAN SIGNS, 4797 GRATIOT, ST. CLAIR, MI 48079. PROPOSED NEW WALL SIGN LOCATED AT 52054 SERRA DRIVE.

Motion by Mr. LaBelle to approve SGN #2013-58

Supported by Mr. Mr. Stabile

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion Carried

7. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PRIOR MEETINGS.

Motion by Mr. Stabile to approve the minutes with no changes.

Supported by Mr. Moran

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion Carried

8. COMMUNICATIONS: CHESTERFIELD TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION BY-LAWS

Mr. Meagher stated that at the last meeting they introduced the Planning Commission by-laws so they could be acted on at this meeting. He asked if someone would like to make a motion to approve those by-laws.

Motion by Mr. Moran to approve the Planning Commission by-laws

Supported by Mr. Alexie

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion Carried

9. NEW BUSINESS:

A. HALL PROPOSED REZONING #327: JEFF NIEMETTA, 1124 6TH AVENUE, ST.CLAIR, MI 48079. REQUESTING TO REZONE PROPERTY LOCATED ON THE WEST SIDE OF JEFFERSON, SOUTH OF HOOKER FROM R-2 (TWO FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) TO R-1-C, SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL. SET PUBLIC HEARING FOR SEPTEMBER 10, 2013.

Mr. Stabile stated that they received a letter from the applicant regarding this rezoning. He asked Mr. Meagher to explain.

Mr. Meagher stated that basically the letter indicated that the applicant could not be present at the meeting to set the public hearing. The applicant also asks if the Planning Commission could look into whether the current R2 would allow the R1C use and thus avoiding a public hearing. They did look at this prior to the meeting and in the R2 district they are allowed to have R1C uses. He stated that the site was approved under a special land use so they would end up having them come back as a special land use and they would then have to review the site for condominiums or whatever the case may be that they would offer. So at this point what they would probably need is just a motion to accept the applicants request to withdraw their application to set a public hearing.

Mr. DeMuyneck stated that in other words the applicant would have to come back at a later date for whatever they want to do here.

Mr. Meagher stated exactly.

Mr. Stabile asked so basically it would not need rezoning because it is a lesser density.

Mr. DeMuyneck stated that they would still need to address lot size, set backs and all that.

Mr. Meagher explained that the applicants will need to completely redesign that area to show proper lot sizes meeting R1C, proper street widths and everything else may change as part of this.

Mr. Saelens asked but they don't need to change the zoning to develop it as R1C?

Mr. Meagher answered no they do not.

Mr. DeMuyneck verified that before they can do anything, the applicants must appear before the board as a public hearing.

Mr. Meagher answered yes as a public hearing.

Mr. DeMuyneck stated that as long as that is stipulated as a necessity on this.

Motion by Mr. Saelens to withdraw proposed Rezoning # 327

Supported by Mr. Alexie

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion Carried

B. PROPOSED NEW COMMERCIAL RETAIL SITE PLAN #2013-11: HARVEY WEISS, 32820 WOODWARD AVENUE, ROYAL OAK, MI 48073. PROPOSED RETAIL IN AN OUTLOT IN THE MEIJER PARKING LOT AT 27255 23 MILE RD.

Mr. Stabile stated that there were quite a few concerns on this project and probably way more than the board could deal with at the meeting that evening.

Harvey Weiss, 32820 Woodward, Royal Oak, MI 48073 addressed the board.

Mr. Stabile asked if the applicant got the board's comments on the project?

Applicant replied yes.

Mr. Meagher asked if Mr. Weiss also received the engineer's comments from AEW?

Applicant stated that he did not think so.

Mr. Stabile stated that there were quite a few concerns that had to be resolved and they would not be able to approve it at this time.

Applicant asked how soon could they get in after the issues are resolved?

Mr. Meagher stated that the next meeting would be in two weeks.

Mr. Stabile mentioned that they would have to submit the paperwork by Thursday.

Mr. DeMuynck stated that the paperwork would have to be submitted by noon on Thursday to be on the agenda for the meeting in two weeks.

Mr. Stabile stated that one big concern would be the driveway coming in off 23 Mile Road.

Applicant asked which driveway?

Mr. Saelens stated it was the first driveway west of Gratiot on 23 Mile Road.

Applicant pointed to a drawing and they verified that was the driveway they were concerned about.

Mr. Stabile stated it was too close to the intersection and they could end up with cars stacked up there.

Applicant asked if the board would be okay with right in/ right out over there?

Mr. Stabile replied no.

Mr. Saelens stated if there are a couple of cars there and somebody is backing out of a parking space over there people would be waiting to get in the lot and cars will stack up on 23 Mile Road.

Applicant made some comments that were inaudible.

Mr. Meagher asked if they could just shoot out the back.

Applicant commented that was not ideal for retailers.

Mr. Saelens stated that it would be a lot safer for people to drive in the back and come around than to stack up on 23 Mile Road.

Motion by Mr. Stabile to Table the New Commercial Retail Site Plan # 2013-11 for up to six meetings.

Applicant asked if they could find out all the concerns at that time so they could fix them and get back in front of the board immediately.

Mr. Meagher stated that most of their concerns are addressed on the letter and he thought AEW had a substantial amount of concerns. Therefore, he suggested the applicant contact their review person and talk with them and maybe come in with them for a meeting to get some of their concerns ironed out.

Applicant stated that it mentioned a reciprocal access parking agreement, but with Meijer it is not typically done until later.

Mr. Meagher stated that typically they would allow that to be submitted during engineering.

Supported by Mr. Alexie

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion Carried

10. OLD BUSINESS:

There was no old business.

11. PLANNER'S REPORT: COMMENTS FROM THAT FLOOR PERMITTED BY THE COMMISSION ON AGENDA OR NON-AGENDA MATTERS:

Mr. Meagher had no comments.

12. PROPOSAL FOR THE NEXT AGENDA:

Mr. LaBelle asked for volunteers for the next preplanning meeting.

Mr. Eckenrode and Mr. Saelens both volunteered to attend the meeting.

13. ADJOURNMENT:

Motion by Mr. Stabile to adjourn at 7:28 PM.

Supported by Mr. Saelens

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion Carried

Rick LaBelle, Secretary

Grace Mastronardi, Recording Secretary