

**CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF CHESTERFIELD  
PLANNING COMMISSION**

**December 9, 2014**

A regular meeting of the Charter Township of Chesterfield Planning Commission was held on Tuesday, December 9, 2014 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  
Rick LaBelle  
Joe Stabile  
Brian Scott DeMuynck  
Carl Leonard  
Jerry Alexie  
James Moran

Absent : Ray Saelens, *excused*  
Frank Eckenrode, *excused*

Others: Patrick Meagher, Community Planning & Management  
John Palin, Community Planning & Management

**3. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

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

**Supported** by Mr. Moran

**Ayes:** All

**Nays:** None

**Motion Carried**

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

5. **PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

None

6. **REVIEWS:**

A. **SITE CONDO APPLICATION #2014-18: Joseph D'Angelo, 211 Merrill Suite#503, Birmingham, MI 48009. Proposed new road and court for the entrance to the Freedom Pointe (C-3) commercial development located on the N.W. corner of Jefferson & Rosso Hwy. Tabled 10-14-2014.**

Carlos Santia, 35890 Monterey, Clinton Twp., MI 48035 addressed the board.

Applicant stated that he was representing the developer Freedom Pointe.

Mr. Miller stated that they reviewed the site plan and the preliminary master deed is required, however, they have typically required this after the final condo approval. He mentioned that the zoning ordinance requires that the proposed road be a public road unless this is a planned development, which it appears to be; so they do not have any objections to the private road. However, the board is concerned about the access to Hall Road as mentioned at the previous meeting and the Commission would like a cul-de-sac down there until Hall and Jefferson are reconfigured. He asked the applicant what were the plans on that aspect of the development.

Applicant stated that they took a look at it and at the available site distance. He explained that the right-of-way will be cleared of all vegetation and looking to the west along Rosso Highway, they basically have about 900 feet of site distance available to be able to see vehicles to the north so a driver can make a decision whether to turn right or left. He stated that in terms of left turns into the site they are dealing with the Department of Roads and they will probably want a left turn lane there. He is not sure they want to do that at this time. He stated that they would be willing to prohibit the left turn in because they do have the additional entrance on Jefferson where traffic can be accommodated for people inbound to the site from the west. He proposed a right-in/ right-out at Hall Road because it could be beneficial to them and from a safety standpoint, and they feel there is adequate site distance to accommodate that.

Mr. LaBelle stated that he personally had a problem with having access on to Hall Road. He does understand the applicant's statement about the 900', but there is a very large curve there and he is concerned because of how fast people travel down Hall Road, at this time until they realign Jefferson and Hall Road, he feels it is dangerous. He would suggest that they temporarily block

off that entrance with temporary landscaping, a gate, a barricade or something of that nature. He stated that in his opinion and he does not know how the rest of the board feels.

Applicant replied that they meet the criteria for right-in/ right-out and with a bypass lane they would meet the criteria for a left turn as well because they meet the minimum site distance requirements that the Department of Roads would impose on them.

Mr. LaBelle asked if they would have to put in a deceleration lane in then?

Applicant replied yes for left turns in, but they are willing to give that up because at this point in time, they do not want to spend the money on the left turn lane. He explained that the base had a meeting with the Department of Roads this past week and they are both on board with the round-about and they are just waiting for some federal dollars. He mentioned that the developer has pending approval of federal dollars and they have agreed to pick up the base's share of that improvement as well.

Mr. DeMuyne asked with regard to the round-about, where does the applicant think the Department of Roads is at this point. Is this something coming within the foreseeable future?

Applicant replied that was hard to predict at this point in time; they would hope it was soon because it would help their development as well.

Mr. DeMuyne verified so the Department of Roads is fine, they are just looking for the money to do the construction?

Applicant replied yes, unless they are willing to put in the entire sum which would not make their project feasible.

Mr. Miller stated that he thought the consensus of the Commissioners would be that they would like that road blocked for now and if that would be the case, they would probably approve it tonight.

Applicant asked what about just a right turn out? He stated that they do have the site distance looking north along Jefferson for people to make the right turn out safely.

Mr. Leonard asked if it would just be a single lane turning out then?

Applicant replied yes.

Mr. Leonard asked so there would only be room for one vehicle at a time?

Applicant replied yes.

Mr. Leonard stated that he drives that road quite a bit and it is a fast moving road and a dangerous curve right now.

Mr. DeMuyneck asked that it would only be a right turn out so they would be looking north on Jefferson on the curve?

Applicant replied yes.

Mr. Leonard asked so what is the site line if they got the right turn out?

Mr. DeMuyneck stated that they could do their driveways in anticipation of something and put up a concrete barrier, like they do on a freeway to block a lane. So there would only be one lane going out, not that the concrete barrier would block their vision looking north on Jefferson. He stated that there would be a no left turn sign, a turn right only sign and people would have to enter the project from Jefferson Avenue.

Applicant stated that they have approximately 1100 square feet of site distance looking north along Jefferson.

Mr. DeMuyneck stated that he thought most of them are envisioning all the cattails, brush and everything on that curve so it is hard to see, but all of that would be revamped and cleaned up.

Applicant explained all of the cattails and brush will be cleaned out and the right of way will be totally clear.

Mr. Leonard stated that he could appreciate the clear vision, but it is a fast moving road with that curve.

Applicant stated that he was aware of the curve and familiar with the road. He explained that before his current job he work for the Macomb County Road Commission for 28 years.

Mr. Leonard asked so there would be no way to turn left into the site?

Mr. Miller stated that there would be a barricade.

Mr. DeMuyneck stated that the developer could put in their driveway, but there would have to be a barricade and signage stating no left turn and the entrance would have to be off of Jefferson.

Applicant stated that even with the right turn in and right turn out, there would be a deceleration lane and since they would be moving out of traffic, he does not see how that would be a problem.

Mr. DeMuynck verified that the applicant still wants a right turn coming in?

Applicant replied that they would like to see that.

Mr. DeMuynck asked so the applicant would like a right turn coming in with a deceleration lane?

Applicant responded yes.

Mr. Leonard stated so there would just be a sign stating no left turn.

Applicant stated that they could design it with an island.

Mr. DeMuynck stated that they could be in an island with a curve in it so a person could not make a left turn in. He mentioned that he would not have a problem with a design as the applicant stated with a right-in/ right-out with a pork chop island.

Applicant agreed that they would put in a channelizing island.

**Motion** by Mr. DeMuynck to approve the Site Condo Application #2014-18 allowing a right turn out, and a right turn in with a deceleration lane but no left turn in off of Rosso Highway.

**Supported** by Mr. Leonard with the addition that the applicants put in the island.

Mr. DeMuynck added to the motion that the applicants must put in the channelizing island.

Mr. Leonard continued support

Mr. Meagher stated that they should also include that it could return to a normal access drive once the intersection is complete.

Mr. DeMuynck replied correct.

Mr. Leonard continued support.

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

**B. SITE PLAN #2014-20: Robert J. Cliffe RS Moiseev/Gordon Associates, Inc., 4351 Delmar Court, Royal Oak, MI 48073. Proposed 3,764 Square foot dental office located on a vacant parcel at 50000 Gratiot.**

Robert Cliffe, 4351 Delmar Court, Royal Oak, MI 48073 addressed the board.

Applicant stated that they planned to put in a 3,764 square foot dental office at northeast corner of Telstar and Gratiot which would be a free standing building with 35 parking spaces and the required retention basin at the rear of the development. He mentioned that this is one of many Brightside dental offices that they have been doing over the last several years. The corporation has continued to expand and they have similar designs in Canton, Farmington. He stated that this office would contain eight treatment rooms and all the other requirements for a dental office. He stated that they are creating a corporate image for this building as with the ones in Canton and Farmington and he showed a picture of the building in Canton and stated that the one in Chesterfield would look very similar and there would just be a few modification to the canopy and windows but overall this would be the image if looking from the corner of Telstar north to the property. He explained that they have done extensive engineering work on the property and have included their plans for landscaping and so forth. At this point, they are just looking for comments from the Planning Commission regarding their project.

Mr. Alexie had no comments.

Mr. Moran had no questions.

Mr. LaBelle asked if the applicant had seen the report from AEW?

Applicant replied that he had not seen any documentation as of yet.

Mr. LaBelle stated that the applicant was welcome to take his copy which he mentioned had the standard requirements for buildings in Chesterfield Township. He asked how the applicant would screen this facility for the neighbors behind and along the side of the property?

Applicant stated that it was noted on the site plan that they have kept their development as close to Gratiot as they could which leaves this entire swath of property in the back as untouched as it is now. He mentioned that the

property is heavily treed and they do not anticipate making any significant alterations to the back of this property.

Mr. LaBelle mentioned that there is a lead that comes off the retention pond at the back of the property.

Applicant mentioned that they would be clearing the trees to allow for that but everything else beyond that connection here will remain as it is now and at this point they have no plans to make any alterations to the back of the property. He explained that with the amount of trees and natural setting within that property there will be enough of a visual buffer between them and the residential properties. He stated that they will probably be a good 400' from the building to the back of the property line and he believes the residential in that area are fairly large lots so there is a vast amount of distance from the homes. He mentioned that the building is only about 18' at the front of the building and the rear of the building is even smaller. So their footprint on the property is very small considering the amount of acreage they own.

Mr. LaBelle agreed with that but mentioned that there would be cars in the parking lot with lights from cars. He would propose or ask that the applicant supply some type of tree buffer or blockage at the edge of the parking lot along the detention pond to keep the headlights from at the back and the side to keep the neighbors from seeing the lights. He mentioned that Mr. Miller was the landscaping expert and he could probably suggest what type of trees to use in this instance.

Applicant stated that was a reasonable request and they could certainly add in some trees along this portion of the driveway so when people are coming down the lights will not shine into the neighbors homes. He mentioned that fortunately to the north is all industrial and at the south is Viviano's across the street, but they would gladly protect the site lines for the neighbors at the back of the property.

Mr. Miller suggested that maybe they could put in some Colorado Spruce trees on 25' centers just along there. He also mentioned that on the landscape plan that they wanted to use yews along the parking lot and they are not very tolerant to salt. So he thought they might want to consider something that was more tolerant to salt for the winter time.

Applicant replied that they could address that with their landscape architect and certainly could swap those out with something appropriate that would be approved by the Township.

Mr. DeMuyne asked if anything would be done about this because of Telstar?

Mr. Miller stated that they did talk about having an acceleration and deceleration lane on Gratiot.

Mr. Meagher stated that the engineers have brought up that the County may take additional right of way there based on the County plan.

Mr. DeMuyck stated that Telstar is a wreck in that area and that is why he asked about coming in on off Telstar rather than Gratiot because Viviano's is already having a problem with that and it is a pain to get in there and this would be the same thing having to get in off of Telstar instead of Gratiot.

Mr. Meagher thought that any approval would be subject to the landscape and engineer's concerns maybe with the exception of #5 because they are preserving trees on the site, so they may not have to go through with a tree preservation plan at this point.

Mr. DeMuyck stated that his concern was just Telstar, but that would not be their concern; that would have to do with the Road Commission.

Mr. Miller asked Mr. DeMuyck if he would like the applicants to fix Telstar or get permission to come in off of Gratiot?

Mr. Meagher stated that they cannot come in off of Gratiot because they would not meet the spacing requirement for a drive on Gratiot. It would have to be off Telstar, but he stated that if the Township coordinates the design with the Road Commission, they will come up with something workable.

Applicant asked if the deceleration lane would be along Telstar?

Mr. Meagher replied yes.

Applicant asked if they would have to widen Telstar? He stated that he was kind of confused.

Mr. Meagher brought up the fact that the applicant would have to work with the Road Commission. He stated when the applicant's turn in their engineering they will let them know their options.

Applicant asked if Telstar was a County Road?

Mr. Miller replied yes and that all the roads in Chesterfield are County roads.

Mr. Meagher mentioned that the engineer's comments stated that they assume the County will take additional right-of way based on their right-of-way plan, but he reiterated that the applicant would have to work on that with them.

Applicant mentioned that this is a dental office and at most they are talking 18 patients at one time, 9 in the treatment rooms and 9 in the waiting room and maybe 10 employees. There would not be a heavy volume of people going in and out.

Mr. Meagher mentioned that he made a typo on #3; he did not realize he wrote Gratiot over there.

**Motion** by Mr. LaBelle to approve based on the applicant adhering to the AEW report as well as making the landscape improvements.

**Supported** by Mr. Stabile

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

**C. SIGN REVIEW #2014-77: Allied Signs, Inc., 33650 Giftos Drive, Clinton Twp., MI 48035, Proposed new wall sign located at 50700 Gratiot for "Hobby Lobby", variance request submitted Tabled 11/26/14**

Kim with Allied Signs, Inc., 33650 Giftos Drive, Clinton Twp., MI 48035 addressed the board.

Applicant asked if there was any way around this 8 to 1 ratio on the length of the sign?

Mr. LaBelle mentioned that he spoke with the applicant prior to the meeting. He explained that the proposed front sign has a 10 to 1 ratio and the sign in the back has a 9 to 1 ratio. He explained to the applicant that the Township ordinance requires and 8 to 1 ratio or less.

Mr. Miller mentioned that they did approve their neighbor Big Lots at the last meeting with an 8 to 1 ratio and they agreed to reduce the size and stack the sign at 160 square feet.

Applicant replied okay. She mentioned that it was a different customer and she has to go by their wishes.

Mr. Stabile explained that the Commission consistently enforces this one.

Mr. Meagher stated that they are dealing with a slippery slope on this one because if it is not 8 to 1 and it is just 9 to 1, then the next one is just 10 to 1 and the next one is just 11 to 1 and pretty soon it is 33 to 1.

Mr. Miller commented that they have never allowed a variance on that as long as he has been on the Commission.

Applicant replied okay.

Mr. Meagher asked if the applicant was looking for approval subject to meeting that 8 to 1 ratio?

Applicant answered yes, she would like to get an approval of some sort tonight.

Mr. LaBelle stated that the sign does meet the Township ordinance on square footage but it does exceed the 8 to 1 ratio. The applicant has agreed to reduce the size of the sign in some way to adhere to the 8 to 1 ratio.

**Motion** by Mr. LaBelle to approve Sign # 2014-77 based upon the applicant adhering to the 8 to 1 ratio.

**Supported** by Mr. Alexie

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

Mr. LaBelle also mentioned that there was also a rear sign on the agenda.

Mr. Miller stated that the Commission would also like to address the rear sign.

Mr. Meagher asked if they were on the same application?

**Motion** by Mr. LaBelle to amend his original motion and approve both the front and rear signs for Hobby Lobby based upon both signs adhering to the 8 to 1 ratio.

Mr. Alexie continued support.

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

- D. **SIGN REVIEW # 2014-91: MLS Signs, Inc., William B. Siewert, 25733 D'Hondt, Chesterfield, MI 48051. Proposed new ground/monument sign located at 56300 New Haven Road for Empire Farms.**

He stated that the sign does meet the Township ordinance.

**Motion** by Mr. LaBelle to approve Sign # 2014-91

**Supported** by Mr. Moran

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

- E. SIGN REVIEW # 2014-92: Galaxy Sign & Hoisting, 126 Nevada Ave., Rochester Hills, MI 48309. Proposed new wall sign for Medical Weightloss Clinic located at 47079 Gratiot in the North Gratiot Crossing.**

He stated that the sign does meet the Township ordinance.

**Motion** by Mr. LaBelle to approve Sign # 2014-92

**Supported** by Mr. DeMuyneck

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

- F. SIGN REVIEW # 2014-93: Galaxy Sign & Hoisting, 126 Nevada Ave., Rochester Hills, MI 48309. Proposed resurface of existing ground sign for Medical Weightloss Clinic located at 47079 Gratiot in the North Gratiot Crossing.**

Mr. LaBelle stated that the sign does meet the Township ordinance.

**Motion** by Mr. LaBelle to approve Sign # 2014-93

**Supported** by Mr. Miller

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

- G. SIGN REVIEW # 2014-94: Metro Detroit Signs, 23544 Hoover, Warren, MI 48089. Proposed new wall sign with lighting located at 27351 23 Mile Road for Jersey Mike's Subs in the Meijer outlet. (front elevation)**

Mr. LaBelle stated that the sign does meet the Township ordinance.

**Motion** by Mr. LaBelle to approve Sign # 2014-94

**Supported** by Mr. Alexie

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

- H. SIGN REVIEW # 2014-95: Metro Detroit Signs, 23544 Hoover, Warren, MI 48089. Proposed new wall sign with lighting located at 27351 23 Mile Road for Jersey Mike's Subs in the Meijer outlet. (rear elevation)**

Mr. LaBelle stated that the sign does not meet the Township ordinance and the applicant has asked them to Table it at this time.

**Motion** by Mr. LaBelle to Table Sign # 2014-95.

**Supported** by Mr. Moran

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

- I. SIGN REVIEW # 2014-96: MLS Signs, Inc., William B. Siewert, 25733 D'Hondt, Chesterfield, MI 48051. Proposed to move wall sign at 50645 Gratiot to 50140 Gratiot for the establishment Cash Today.**

Mr. LaBelle stated that the sign does meet the Township ordinance.

**Motion** by Mr. LaBelle to approve Sign # 2014-96

**Supported** by Mr. Miller

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

- J. SIGN REVIEW #2014-97: Sign-A-Rama, 36886 Harper Ave., Clinton Twp., MI 48035. Proposed resurface of existing wall sign at 34790 23 Mile Rd. for Classic Pet Supply.**

Mr. LaBelle stated that the sign does meet the Township ordinance.

**Motion** by Mr. LaBelle to approve Sign #2014-97

**Supported** by Mr. DeMuyneck

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

- K. SIGN REVIEW #2014-98: Phillips Sign & Lighting, 40920 Executive Drive, Harrison Twp., 48045. Proposed new wall sign for “Bangkok Cuisine” located at 50645 Gratiot near Hamlin Pub.**

Mr. LaBelle stated that as the sign was drawn it exceeds the 8 to 1 ratio. He explained that prior to the meeting the applicant has agreed to offset stack the Bangkok and Cuisine to reduce it to at least an 8 to 1 ratio but keep it in the allowable size for a sign required by the Township ordinance.

**Motion** by Mr. LaBelle to approve Sign #2014-98 with the agreed changes.

**Supported** by Mr. Miller

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

- L. SIGN REVIEW # 2014-99: Rocktech Systems, 50250 E. Russell Schmidt Blvd., Chesterfield, MI 48051. Proposed new ground sign located at the above address.**

Mr. LaBelle stated that the sign does meet the Township ordinance.

**Motion** by Mr. LaBelle to approve Sign #2014-99

**Supported** by Mr. Alexie

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

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

**Motion** by Mr. Miller to approve the meeting minutes from November 25, 2014

**Supported** by Mr. DeMuyneck

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

**8. COMMUNICATIONS:**

There were no communications.

**9. OLD BUSINESS:**

There was no old business.

**10. NEW BUSINESS:**

There was no new business.

**11. PLANNERS REPORT:**

**A. ADMINISTRATIVE REQUEST #125: Sterling Fence Company, P.O. Box 436, St. Clair Shores, MI 48080. Gary Gendernalik for Bay Winds Townhomes located at the north side of 23 Mile Road, east of I-94. Requesting to install a 6' high decorative privacy fence along their most westerly property line. Tabled 11/26/14.**

Mr. Meagher stated that the first administrative request is for a fence to be placed along the property line of Bay Winds Townhomes. He mentioned that the Fire Department had previously objected to this and now they are saying they are fine with it as long as a gate is added with the understanding that they could gain the access that was promised with the approval of this particular development. He explained that the Fire Department has worked that out with the developer. He mentioned that the developer is asking for a wood fence and they are recommending a vinyl fence at a minimum for maintenance purposes. He stated that it would be approved as a vinyl fence unless the Commission is satisfied with the wood. If not, they can reject the administrative and force it to a site plan review situation.

**Motion** by Mr. LaBelle to approve the fence contingent upon it being a vinyl fence and with the adjustments that have to be made for the Fire Department access which he believes is a gate with a Knox box on there as well.

Mr. Meagher asked Mr. Gendernalik if he was objecting to the gate that the Fire Department asked for?

Gary Gendernalik, 52624 Laurel Oak Lane, Chesterfield Twp., MI 48047 addressed the board.

Applicant stated that he was representing Bay Winds Townhomes. He explained that all the units in that complex have been built and are occupied some by owners and some by tenants. He explained that previously they had put in a proposal for this and the Fire Department objected so he wrote a letter...

Mr. Meagher commented that he understood that and asked if they came to an agreement and agreed to put a gate in as requested by the Fire Department.

Applicant stated he met with Mr. Schroeder and they agreed to put in the gate and the question is with reference to the wood aspect and that is what he would like to address.

Mr. Meagher gave the applicant two minutes.

Mr. Alexie mentioned that there was a motion on the table.

Applicant stated that the motion was made before he made his presentation. He mentioned that when this project was approved they did not have an approved site plan. The approved site plan showed a gate with no driveway improvements. At that time, he met with Mr. Schroeder and they agreed to put in the gate which cost about \$1,600. He explained in conjunction with the site plan that was approved there was an approved wooden fence along the east property line and that was what was constructed. So basically, the homeowner's association is asking now that the trees came down from the vacant land, the wind whips across I-94 and they want the fence to block the snow, wind and noise. He stated that they wanted a wood fence to match the other side. Their current game plan is to put a fence along the west property line and next year put a fence here where they back up to I-94. The bid for the regular wood fence is \$18,750 and for the white vinyl it would be \$35,280 and the beige would be \$39,670. He stated based on the homeowner's budget they can afford the wood which is consistent with what is already there and what the site plan was approved for by the Planning Commission when Mr. Jim Klonowski was the Chairman.

Mr. Miller asked in what year was that Gary?

Applicant stated that it was on January 14, 2003. He claimed that the fence was still in good shape and it has not deteriorated and the new one would be constructed in a similar fashion where there are posts cemented in the ground. He mentioned if they look behind Wal-marts and Menards, they have a vinyl fence and periodically different sections of that fall down. He stated that wood was approved on this project and has been approved on other projects in the area.

Mr. Miller asked the applicant how often the association does maintenance on the fence?

Applicant replied that they told him that they have not done anything with the fence. He stated that it is Cedar and wears on its own. He thought that the property owners should have the right to decide what type of fence they want on their property and it is consistent with what they already have.

Mr. Miller asked if the Township has a new ordinance for fences since 2003?

Mr. Meagher explained that there was nothing new in the ordinance. Basically if the Commission agrees they can approve it administratively and if they disagree it can be treated like a site plan as part of the overall development and someone can look at all of the criteria to get site plan approval.

Mr. Miller verified that would cost them more money?

Mr. Meagher replied yes it would.

Applicant stated originally he did not think the vinyl was an unusual request, then he talked to the fence guy and he found out the vinyl was a lot more money than the wood and they do not have the money that is why they are not doing the whole fence.

Mr. Moran asked the applicant if he could show him on the plans the current location of the wood fence and where they are proposing to put the new fence?

Applicant came up to show them where the old fence was located and where the proposed fence would be placed.

Mr. Miller stated that there was a motion on the floor for the white vinyl fence. He asked if they could Table this so the Commissioners could go out and look at the existing fence and see what it looks like after 11 years.

Mr. Meagher suggested that the Commissioners go around and look at a number of wooden fences in the community and look at how they have endured. They can look at Donner, Briar Towne and a number of others and take a look at how they have held up over the years, especially the ones associated with condo associations because they are supposed to take care of them.

Mr. DeMuyck stated that he can tell them that Briar Towne does not take care of their fence.

Mr. LaBelle rescinded his original Motion.

**Motion** by Mr. Miller to Table Administrative Request #125 to the next meeting on January 13, 2015 so the Commissioners can go around to look at the wood fences.

Applicant stated to put him near the end of the agenda because he has a 5pm ZBA meeting in Macomb Township.

**Supported** by Mr. LaBelle

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

**B. ADMINISTRATIVE REQUEST #133: Hobby Lobby, 7707 S.W. 44<sup>th</sup> Street, Oklahoma City, OK 73179. Change front elevation and entry vestibule located at 50700 Gratiot.**

Mr. Meagher stated that Hobby Lobby wanted to change the front elevation and entry vestibule. He explained that basically they kicked that back into the building and the vestibule is now being built into the existing floor plan.

They originally submitted a plan with efface along the frontage and they have now changed that to brick and they got the revised plans today for Big Lots as well and they are also doing the bricks. Therefore, they are actually improvements, so he would definitely recommend approval of the request.

**Motion** by Mr. Moran to approve Administrative Request #133

**Supported** by Mr. Miller

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

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

Mr. Alexie mentioned that by Jersey Mikes Subs there is a big hole in the ground and it looks like they are planning to put in a monument sign next.

Mr. Meagher stated that he could advise Gary that it appears that they are preparing to put in a monument sign.

Mr. LaBelle asked for volunteers for the preplanning meeting on January 13<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Alexie and Mr. Moran both agreed to attend the meeting.

The Commissioners all wished each other Merry Christmas and Happy New Year.

**13. PROPOSALS FOR NEXT AGENDA.**

There were no proposals for the next agenda

**14. ADJOURNMENT:**

**Motion** by Mr. Leonard to adjourn at 7:50 PM

**Supported** by Mr. DeMuyne

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

---

***Rick LaBelle, Secretary***

---

***Grace Mastronardi, Recording Secretary***