

**CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF CHESTERFIELD  
PLANNING COMMISSION**

**August 27, 2013**

A regular meeting of the Charter Township of Chesterfield Planning Commission was held on Tuesday, August 27, 2013 at 7:00 P.M. at the Township Hall located at 47275 Sugarbush, Chesterfield MI 48047.

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

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

**2. ROLL CALL:**

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

Others: Pat Meagher, Community Planning & Management

**3. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

**Motion by** Mr. Miller to approve the agenda

**Supported by** Mr. LaBelle

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

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

5. PUBLIC HEARING: None

6. REVIEWS:

A. **PANERA BREAD PROPOSED NEW WALL SIGN – SGN # 2013-59:** Intercity Neon, Inc., P.O. Box 3762, Centerline, MI 48015. Proposed new wall sign located at 51490 Gratiot.

Mr. LaBelle stated that the proposed wall sign did not meet the Township ordinance.

**Motion** by Mr. LaBelle to Table SGN # 2013-59 for up to six meetings.

**Supported by** Mr. DeMuyneck

**Ayes:** All

**Nays:** None

**Motion Carried**

B. **PANERA BREAD PROPOSED NEW DIRECTIONAL SIGNS – SGN # 2013-60:** Intercity Neon, Inc., P.O. Box 3762, Centerline, MI 48015. Proposed directional signs located at 51490 Gratiot

**Motion** by Mr. LaBelle to approve SGN # 2013-60 for the two-foot square signs that are not to exceed three-feet high.

Mr. Stabile stated that he thought the 2 square foot signs were small for the directional signs.

Mr. Walter Schaefer a representative of Intercity Neon, Inc. addressed the commission.

Applicant stated that the 2 square foot signs were very small for directional signs.

There was a lengthy discussion among the commissioners about the size of the directional signs.

Mr. Stabile suggested at possibly increasing the size of the signs to 3 square feet.

The applicant stated that with the Panera logo he would like to see the signs at 3.5' however, if the commission would only approve 3 square feet; they would have to live with that.

Mr. Leonard stated that if 3' is the number that would only be reducing the sign by 2" in height and he does not feel that would be very noticeable, whether 2' or 20' away. He stated that at this point the commission has not even made a decision on 3' as of yet.

Applicant stated that he could work with the 3 square feet.

Mr. Leonard reiterated that the difference from 3 to 3.5 square feet was only a difference of about 2"

Mr. Miller asked the commission members if they were all okay with 3 square feet for the directional signs?

Mr. Saelens verified that only the three directional signs would be 3' and the others would stay at 2'.

Mr. Leonard stated that with the one that had the dual message of Panera Bread and Drive-thru; he understood the need for that one to be larger. However, he asked are the other drive-thru ones going to be 3 square feet as well? He stated that if it only says drive-thru with an arrow, he is not sure they would even need 3' for that sign.

Mr. Stabile stated that he would suggest to also put the Panera Bread logo on the other signs.

Mr. Leonard verified on all of them.

Mr. Stabile replied yes.

Mr. DeMuyneck stated that it would probably be a good idea to verify what it is, because it is going to be a nightmare back there?

Mr. Stabile agreed.

Mr. Leonard asked if there was any reason people would see the drive-thru and not know what it is?

Mr. Stabile replied yes because there are 10 other stores around there and the location is not where you would expect a drive-thru to be.

Mr. Labelle stated that he would rescind the original motion.

**Motion** by Mr. Labelle for Panera Bread Signs SGN # 2013-60 to allow 3 square feet of signage no more than 3' tall only for the three drive-thru signs. He stated that the Do Not Enter and the Thank You which is the same sign will be limited to 2 square feet. He added with the logo on the drive-thru signs.

**Supported** by Mr. Alexie.

Mr. DeMuyck stated so all three signs would say Panera Bread Drive-Thru.

Mr. LaBelle replied correct.

Mr. Leonard stated that three signs were mentioned in the motion

Mr. Saelens pointed to the plans and stated that there were two sides to the signs, side A and side B.

Mr. Leonard mentioned the two signs on the top.

Mr. Saelens stated that those signs would be limited to 2 square feet.

Applicant explained that there were actually four directional signs. He went in front of the Commissioners and pointed out the locations of the four signs.

Mr. Leonard stated so there are 4 directional signs.

Applicant replied yes.

Mr. Saelens stated so those four directional signs would be three feet with the logo and the others would be 2'.

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

Applicant stated that he was not sure about the motion on the wall sign at the beginning.

Mr. LaBelle stated that it could be half the size of the original sign they have there.

Applicant verified that it could be half the size of that original sign and then put the drive-thru with that and incorporate them.

Mr. Miller asked if they would like to incorporate that with the drive-thru?

Applicant stated that he would check with Panera and ask them about that. He also asked if the entire drive-thru package was approved as far as the menu board, the preview board, the height limitations and the speaker canopy?

Mr. Meagher replied yes.

Mr. Eckenrode confirmed that the main sign next to the drive-thru was not approved.

Applicant stated that the main sign next to the drive-thru has not been approved yet. He stated that he would suggest if Panera wants it that they incorporate it on their main sign if they want to have the drive-thru on it.

**C. BRIDAL BOUTIQUE PROPOSED NEW WALL SIGN – SGN # 2013-61 Global Signs & Awning, 22907 Dequindre Road, Hazel Park, MI 48030. Proposed new wall sign located at 47025 Gratiot, behind CVS**

**Motion** by Mr. LaBelle to approve Bridal Boutique proposed new wall sign- SGN # 2013-61 – it meets all the Township sign requirements.

**Supported** by Mr. Saelens

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

**D. THE VILLAGE OF EAST HARBOR PROPOSED NEW AWNING # 2013-62 Belle Isle Awning, 20220 Cornielle, Roseville, MI 48066. Proposed new entrance awning located at 33875 Kiely Drive.**

**Motion** by Mr. LaBelle to approve the Village of East Harbor proposed new awning # 2013-62 – it meets all the Township ordinances.

**Supported** by Mr. Miller

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

**7. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM PRIOR MEETING:**

**Motion** by Mr. Miller to approve the meeting minutes from August 13, 2013.

**Supported** by Mr. Alexie

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

**8. PLANNER'S REPORT:**

**A. ADMINISTRATIVE REQUEST # 102: POINTE PRODUCTS, 49755 LEONA DRIVE:  
To allow a prefabricated detached 20' x 50' x 12' steel building to remain in its present location behind the above address.**

Mr. Meagher stated that basically the applicants are asking for approval of a 20' x 50' x 12' steel building. He mentioned that most of the Commission members that have been out there realize that the building is already up. He asked if someone would like to make a motion on this issue.

**Motion** by Mr. DeMuynck to Table Administrative Request # 102 for Pointe Products until the Building Department as well as the Fire Department has had an opportunity to review the construction of this building.

**Supported** by Mr. Miller

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

**B. ADMINISTRATIVE REQUEST # 103: EMERALD RIDGE HORSE FARM L.L.C  
SLU#2013-05: Administrative change to approved Special Land Use, located at 49495 Gratiot. Northeast side of New Haven Road between 26 Mile & I-94.**

Mr. Meagher stated that Emerald Ridge Horse Farm was originally granted a Special Land Use by the Commission and at this point they are asking for several minor changes. He mentioned that the engineering reviewer had no objections, the Fire Department had no objections and he had no objections to the minor changes. He stated that if the Commissioners had no objections he was looking for a motion to approve the request.

**Motion** by Mr. Miller to approve the Administrative Request # 103 SLU #2013-05.

**Supported** by Mr. Alexie

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

**C. ADMINISTRATIVE REQUEST FOR SUGARBUSH TAVERN:**

Mr. Meagher stated that this was an addition to the agenda for Sugarbush Tavern. He explained that they were asking for a 30' x 40' tent which they put up each year for their Oktoberfest celebration to be approved in similar fashion as what the Commission did for Rosie O'Grady's where they do not have to come back every year for approval. He stated that because it would be ancillary to the existing use they are asking to be allowed to have that tent up for three days for a one day event that would take place on the day between the erection of the tent and the removal of the tent. He added that this particular year it would be on the dates of September 27<sup>th</sup>, 28<sup>th</sup>, and 29<sup>th</sup>. He stated that the tent would be erected on September 27<sup>th</sup>, the event would take place on the 28<sup>th</sup> and the tent would be taken down on the 29<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. DeMuynck stated so the tent would actually be in use for one night.

Mr. Meagher replied yes, from 1 PM to 1 AM.

Mr. DeMuynck asked if this request should actually come before the full Township Board?

Mr. Meagher explained that it would not be required to come before the full board because they are asking for Planning Commission approval under Section # 76-80.

Mr. DeMuynck stated that the only reason he was asking was because usually these requests with the set dates and hours come before the full board.

Mr. Meagher stated that Planning did the same thing with Rosie O'Grady's and gave them a five year approval. He mentioned that they put together that seasonal use provision that was adopted last year or the year before, for those types of requests.

Mr. DeMuynck stated that he did not have a problem with it.

Mr. Alexie asked if they would have music?

Mr. Meagher stated that it would be the same as always.

Mr. DeMuyneck asked if there would be a band outside?

Mr. Meagher replied no.

Mr. Alexie asked if the band would be inside?

Mr. Meagher answered yes, but there would not be a band outside.

Mr. DeMuyneck stated that he remembered doing the same thing for the Fillin Station and it was approved by the full board.

Mr. Meagher explained that they had trouble with Rosie O'Grady's and that was how they got to this ordinance because they wanted to mandate that a trailer be away from the residential area, So they had to move it north up by the building to get rid of the noise. He stated that if the Commission had no objections, he was looking for a motion to approve this for a five year time period.

Mr. Alexie asked if they get the approval for five years could the tent be put up for anything?

Mr. Meagher replied no it would just be approved for Oktoberfest.

Mr. Alexie stated so five different years they would be putting up a tent for Oktoberfest.

Mr. Meagher replied yes for five Oktoberfest events.

Mr. Saelens verified that the dates would change?

Mr. Meagher stated yes. The idea would be there would be one active day for the celebration and another day to put the tent up and another to take it down. They would still be subject to the rules, regulations, and inspections of the Fire Department and the Building Department for the tent.

**Motion** by Mr. Alexie to approve the Administrative Request for Sugarbush Tavern to have a tent in place for the Oktoberfest weekend. The approval would be for a period of five years.

**Supported** by Mr. Saelens

Mr. Miller requested that Mr. Alexie add it to the motion that they must pay the proper application fee.

Mr. Alexie stated that Sugarbush Tavern would also have to pay the proper application fee and the approval would be for a 30' x 40' tent.

Mr. Saelens continued support.

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

**D. SIGN AMENDMENT FOR ADDITIONAL WALL SIGN FOR OUT-LOT BUILDINGS:**

Mr. Meagher stated that they have been dealing with this sign amendment and kind of sitting on it but using it as guidance to grant or not grant additional signs on the out-lot buildings. He stated that they could not approve it that evening, but he wondered if someone would like to make a motion to set the public hearing.

**Motion** by Mr. Miller to set the public hearing on the Sign Amendment for Out-Lot Buildings.

**Supported** by Mr. Alexie

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

Mr. Saelens asked the date of the public hearing.

Mr. Meagher stated that it would be as soon as the Planning Department can publish it. He explained that they would need about 15 days and sometimes that is based on when the paper comes out.

**9. COMMENTS FROM THAT FLOOR PERMITTED BY THE COMMISSION ON AGENDA OR NON-AGENDA MATTERS.**

There were no comments from the floor.

**10. PROPOSAL FOR THE NEXT AGENDA:**

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

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

8-27-13

**11. ADJOURNMENT:**

**Motion** by Mr. Miller to adjourn at 7:31 PM.

**Supported** by Mr. Saelens

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

---

*Rick LaBelle, Secretary*

---

*Grace Mastronardi, Recording Secretary*