

**CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF CHESTERFIELD
PLANNING COMMISSION**

July 14, 2015

A regular meeting of the Charter Township of Chesterfield Planning Commission was held on Tuesday, July 14, 2015 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
Brian Scott DeMuynck
Carl Leonard
Ray Saelens
Jerry Alexie
James Moran
Frank Eckenrode

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. Saelens

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion Carried

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

5. **PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

- A. **SPECIAL LAND USE #2015-09: Gary Gendernalik for Curtis Outdoor Inc., 44 Grandville Ave. S.W. #001, Grand Rapids, MI 49503. Propose to remove 23 Mile Road pylon sign and replacing with “Pure Michigan” monument sign, I-94 sign and a billboard with display area. Public Hearing was set on 6-9- 2015.**

Motion by Mr. Miller to open the Public Hearing on Amendment to Special Land Use # 2015-09

Supported by Mr. DeMuynck

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion Carried

Gary Gendernalik, 52624 Laurel Oak, Chesterfield, addressed the board.

Applicant stated that the location of this billboard would be at the back end of the Lion’s Den storage facility and is zoned M1. He mentioned that with the submission he gave the Commission a detailed explanation of the location. The sign would be 10’ from the right-of-way and they addressed Special Land Use in their visual. He stated as far as location it would be adjacent to the Dick’s Sporting Goods and he went over to the plans and indicated the location. He added that this would be ground level versus a pole and indicated in detail where the billboard would be located. He showed a depiction to the board of what the sign would look like as a finished product. He mentioned that this would not just be a Pure Michigan monument sign as indicated on the agenda, it would also be a message sign.

Mr. Miller asked how many messages would be on the sign through the rotation?

Applicant stated that his client could answer that question better than he as far as the sequence.

Bob Klausmeier, 39555 Orchard Hill Pl., addressed the board.

Mr. Klausmeier stated that there would be potentially eight different messages on the display; representing eight different local businesses and it would be running in sequence. The first message would stay for ten seconds and then the next message would replace the first and it would all be done in sequence.

Applicant stated that in conjunction with the messages they would also use the board for Amber alerts.

Mr. DeMuynck asked Mr. Meagher what the ordinance states as far as how often a reader board message can change? Isn't it something like every thirty seconds?

Mr. Meagher replied that he was reading the ordinance right now.

Mr. LaBelle asked if there are any residents on either sign of the freeway near this sign?

Mr. Klausmeier replied yes.

Mr. LaBelle stated that when he is going down I-94 in St. Clair Shores when it is foggy out those signs glow so brightly.

Mr. Gendernalik stated that he would address that issue because there is different technology being used for this sign. He mentioned that the location of the sign would be here.

Mr. LaBelle stated so the location of the sign would be right across the freeway from a residential subdivision.

Mr. Gendernalik mentioned that there is a lot of vegetation in that area that would screen the sign from the subdivision.

Mr. LaBelle replied that might be the case in the summer, but in the winter with the bare trees the sign would be visible in that area.

Mr. Gendernalik showed the board a depiction of a typical billboard with spotlights and then showed what their LED lit sign would look like in comparison.

Mr. LaBelle stated that the one in St. Clair Shores that he is referring to is a LED lit sign that changes messages and when it is a little foggy, the sky glows from that billboard.

Mr. DeMuynck stated that he thought the one on Hall Road going west just past VanDyke before Utica Road...

Mr. Klausmeier replied that the billboard in St. Clair Shores is 1,200 square feet in size which means they are four times the size of this billboard and they feel they run them too bright. He stated that the illumination is very controllable.

Applicant explained that the company would set it to a certain illumination and then the computer program adjusts it periodically to meet the lighting conditions in the area. He mentioned that part of the lighting sequence is under the jurisdiction of MDOT, so once they get the Township's approval they would need to get approval from MDOT. He explained that MDOT has rules and regulations concerning the lighting of the billboards and they also have programs in place as far as vegetation. They would get a permit from them to control the vegetation in the MDOT right-of-way.

Mr. Miller asked if this sign would be the size of the JC Penney sign at Waterside?

Applicant replied that this sign would be a little bit taller and that it would basically sit up eight to ten feet off the ground. He sign would be on a steel pipe foundation with concrete but the elevation would only be slightly above grade.

Mr. DeMuynck asked if the sign would be at the shoulder of the freeway, pointing to a depiction of the sign?

Applicant replied no the sign would be on private property. The sign on the poster is an artist's rendition where they superimposed the sign and it would not be in an MDOT right-of-way. He reiterated that the sign would be 10 feet outside of the right-of-way.

Mr. DeMuynck verified that it would be 10' outside the right-of-way on the other side of the fence.

Applicant replied yes.

Mr. Miller asked the total height of the sign?

Mr. Klausmeier replied that billboard would be 25' in total height.

Mr. Alexie asked if they would be removing any other signs?

Applicant replied yes they would be removing the pole sign for the Lion's Den.

Mr. LaBelle asked the height of the sign they were removing?

Applicant replied it was approximately 25' in height.

Mr. Meagher stated that Mr. DeMuynck asked a while ago about what the ordinance said about the time between message changes. He stated that the ordinance dictates that the message can change once every minute or every sixty seconds.

Mr. DeMuynck stated so the 10 seconds is not going to fly in Chesterfield. We have had that problem with other businesses with signs changing too often and Mr. Saelens brought one to his attention.

Mr. Saelens mentioned that just about every LED sign that has been put up pushes the boundaries on the time.

Mr. Klausmeier replied that they can work within the confines of the ordinance.

Mr. Stabile asked if the eight different businesses would be satisfied with that?

Mr. Klausmeier remarked that what he was speaking to was standard business practice. He stated these rules and regulations vary across the board depending on the community. They have done a lot of boards where they cannot change but once a minute. In that case, they take a different approach in their method of advertising, but they can work within those parameters they would just have to change the structure.

Mr. Leonard stated that they mentioned the drugstores are going from signs to reader boards and the messages are supposed to be up for only so many seconds. He mentioned that at one time there was a discussion about what the messages could or could not be; for instance they did not want someone to advertise that they were selling a car and that the message would have to pertain to that business. He was curious if they need to add anything on this subject if it is approved as far as the types of messages? He stated that when he saw this he thought this was just a Pure Michigan sign.

Mr. Meagher explained that this is a billboard and it is going to advertise off-site uses and it would not be uncommon for it to advertise numerous off-site uses. He mentioned that they are going to have to reexamine their sign ordinance, not only in this community, but in every community based on a recent Supreme Court decision regarding signage. He stated that he thought Mr. Gendernalik included that information in their packets. He has become very familiar with the decision over the past few weeks and it basically prohibits any type of content regulation; so there are going to have to take a serious look at how they regulate signs.

Mr. DeMuynck stated that the ordinance about how long a message can be up on a reader board would still stand at 60 seconds.

Mr. Stabile stated that someone mentioned Code Enforcement because there has been such an abuse of all of this. He asked if something was happening with that?

Mr. DeMuynck stated that one of the Board Members mentioned a particular sign that was not in compliance and he mentioned it to Code Enforcement. He knew the owner of the business and let him know that he needed to address the situation before Code Enforcement does.

Mr. Miller stated that if the sign changes every sixty seconds they will be in compliance.

Mr. Stabile remarked that with every reader board they approved the applicants agreed to abide by the 60 second rule, just like this gentleman did and almost every one of them has a sign that changes too often.

Mr. Leonard added that some of them flash and the messages are changing every 10 to 15 seconds.

Mr. Stabile asked if Code Enforcement is not going to do anything, how are they going to approve another one without getting that time frame in regulation.

Applicant stated that basically the Supreme Court decision on June 14th stated that they cannot regulate the content and methodology of the sign because of Freedom of Speech. The decision was brought about by a church and a municipality that said for certain organizations they had to limit where there signs were and when they were up. The Supreme Court decided that those restrictions were not valid. He stated that there are always Code Enforcement issues and that the board cannot deny an application because other people have not been compliant after their sign has been approved.

Mr. Saelens stated that they are not trying to limit what is put on the sign only the amount of time the sign is displayed.

Applicant stated that his client has agreed that they can live with the one minute time display.

Mr. Saelens stated that the reason for the time ordinance is for the safety of drivers because when signs are flashing and graphics and the message is changing every few seconds, it is a distraction.

Mr. Meagher stated that this Commission is not an ordinance enforcement body. Their job is to react to the requirements of the ordinance and look at everything on a subjective basis. Their only option is to let the administration and Township Board know they are extremely disappointed in ordinance enforcement and outside of that they really do not have any directive.

Applicant stated that flashing and lighting is controlled under the Michigan State Highway Sign Act and in conjunction with MDOT and the Federal Highway Safety Administration.

Mr. Saelens asked if the applicant was saying they control the amount of lumens used in sign?

Applicant replied yes. He mentioned that with the LED lights the timing and amount of light emitted can be controlled. He stated to get away from the distraction aspect of the sign, MDOT is certainly concerned with traffic safety on a State freeway where the speed limit is 70 miles per hour.

Mr. Klausmeier stated that it does not do anyone any good to over illuminate a display. People think more light is better, but when looking at a display at night that is over illuminated the image is harder to read because there is a halo of light. He mentioned that he once owned a company that manufactured these displays and they tried to teach people that lower illumination was better at night because they are not trying to blow people away, they are trying to put up a message that is readable. He mentioned that they have put up many signs and that 15 minutes to an hour is considered a long time, but that advertiser on that display has that full period of time; whereas with the standard MDOT scenario, each ad has 10 seconds and then someone else's ad is up there. There are different equations as far as value of advertising depending on how long the message is displayed.

Applicant stated that they have to renew their permit with MDOT yearly with a yearly fee of about \$500 which is based on the size of the sign. If they are not in compliance with what MDOT wants they will be in trouble with MDOT.

Mr. Eckenrode asked so if someone wants to pay more for advertising, their ad could go for two minutes?

Mr. Klausmeier stated that they would comply with the minute within that diminishing return area and they have worked with it before.

Mr. DeMuyck asked who would have control over the Mr. Klausmeier or the Babich's?

Applicant stated that the Babich's would have control because it is on Babich's property and they are removing the sign that is currently there and the Lion's Den will be periodically advertised on that sign.

Mr. Saelens stated that he thought they were only approving a sign for Lion's Den and instead we are being asked to approve a billboard not just a sign for a business.

Applicant agreed. He added that procedurally there are no M2 places along here and so they can apply for a variance based on their recommendations. He mentioned that after the Planning Commission acts, they will have to go to the ZBA and he is just going to file the same documentation with them. He is not sure if they will have to pay a second fee or just be referred to the next group. He does not know if that is up to the Planning Commission, the staff or Mr. Meagher, but his clients are willing to pay that additional fee. He reiterated that he was just going to submit the same documentation.

Mr. Meagher replied that there will definitely be a second fee because it has to be advertised in the paper for ZBA. He stated that basically at tonight's meeting the Planning Commission will review and recommend to the ZBA whether this should or should not go or they may decide to follow the standard procedure and make the decision at the following meeting.

Public Comments:

Ryan Wurtzel, 48135 Gratiot, Chesterfield, addressed the board.

Mr. Wurtzel was in favor of the Commission approving the SLU.

Applicant stated that the Market Place Mall management has no problems with it and a notice went out to the people on the other side of the freeway and obviously no one showed up at the meeting so he assumes they do not have an issue. He stated therefore, he would like their recommendation for the ZBA.

Motion by Mr. DeMuync to close the Public Hearing.

Supported by Mr. Miller

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion Carried

Mr. Miller stated that the normal procedure on this would be to wait two weeks to render a decision, however, he asked the Recording Secretary to poll the board members to see if they want to vote on this matter tonight.

Mr. Miller stated that he would like to vote on the issue tonight.

Mr. LaBelle replied he would like to vote on the matter in two weeks.

Mr. Eckenrode stated two weeks

Mr. DeMuyneck replied two weeks

Mr. Leonard stated two weeks

Mr. Saelens replied two weeks

Mr. Stabile answered two weeks

Mr. Moran answered t two weeks

Mr. Alexie replied tonight

Mr. Miller stated that the vote would take place in two weeks at our next meeting which would be on July 28th.

Motion by Mr. Miller to postpone the decision on SLU #2015-09 to the next meeting on July 28, 2015.

Supported by Mr. Alexie

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion Carried

6. REVIEWS:

- A. PUD SITE PLAN #2015-09: MJC Chesterfield, 46600 Romeo Plank, Suite #5, MacombTwp., MI 48044. Amendment to Northpointe Condos to widen garages on each side to allow homeowners a 2 car garage. Tabled on June 23, 2015.**

Motion by Mr. LaBelle to approve PUD #2015-09 contingent upon the recommendation by AEW and Community Planning Management. He asked Mr. Monte if he had copies of both of those?

Mr. Monte replied yes.

Supported by Mr. Moran

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion Carried

- B. SIGN REVIEW #2015-53: DaVita Dialysis, 46360 Gratiot Chesterfield, MI 48051. J.L. Geisler Corporation, 28750 Gratiot Warren, MI 48092. Proposed ground sign resurface at the address stated above.**

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

Motion by Mr. LaBelle to approve Sign # 2015-53

Supported by Mr. Saelens

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion Carried

- C. SIGN REVIEW #2015-54: DaVita Dialysis, 46360 Gratiot Chesterfield, MI 48051. J.L. Geisler Corporation, 28750 Gratiot Warren, MI 48092. Proposed new wall sign located at the address stated above.**

Mr. LaBelle stated that items C & D are a little ambiguous. Sign #2015-54 is for a V on the building and 2015-56 is for the actual DaVita Dialysis sign. The applicants are proposing to place both signs on the front of the building and the Township only allows one sign on the front of the building. The applicant wishes to speak to the Commission and plead their case.

Nathan Bertan of J.L. Geisler, 28750 Gratiot, Warren, MI addressed the board.

Applicant stated that the reason they are asking for both signs on the building is because there is a lack of visibility due to tree cover on the next lot. A person would come up to the property and they just cannot see the building.

He mentioned that the full DaVita is very small at 15 square feet; so they are hoping to get more exposure so people can more easily identify the location.

Mr. LaBelle remarked that they are also going to have a pylon sign on the street. He asked if that was correct?

Applicant replied yes. He stated that there will also be two entrances and with this sign they just would like a little more exposure because of visibility issues. He explained that the V is kind of DaVita's calling card; it would be synonymous with the McDonald's Arch. Therefore, when one of DaVita's patients sees that arch they will know that is where they need to be. He asked if it would make a difference if one sign was illuminated and one was not?

Mr. DeMuyne stated that it would still be two signs and we are sticklers on our sign ordinance.

Mr. LaBelle asked if they wanted them to Table these two signs so they would have some time to figure out a different way of doing this.

He replied if they cannot get the V, they will just go with the DaVita. So they will withdraw the application for the V.

Mr. LaBelle stated that the applicant has chosen to withdraw the application for Sign # 2015-54

Motion by Mr. LaBelle to deny #2015-54 the V sign on the front of the building.

Supported by Mr. Saelens

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion Carried

- D. SIGN REVIEW #2015-55: DaVita Dialysis, 46360 Gratiot Chesterfield, MI 48051. J.L. Geisler Corporation, 28750 Gratiot Warren, MI 48092. Proposed new directional signage located at the address stated above.**

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

Motion by Mr. LaBelle to approve Sign # 2015-55

Supported by Mr. Moran

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion Carried

- E. SIGN REVIEW #2015-56: DaVita Dialysis, 46360 Gratiot Chesterfield, MI 48051. J.L. Geisler Corporation, 28750 Gratiot Warren, MI 48092. Proposed new 2nd wall sign located at the address stated above.**

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

Motion by Mr. LaBelle to approve Sign # 2015-56

Supported by Mr. Alexie

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion Carried

- F. SIGN REVIEW #2015-57: Jordan Friesen, 6001 Nimitz Parkway, South Bend, IN 46628. Proposed new wall sign located at 47187 Gratiot for "Advanced Auto Parts".**

The sign does not meet the 8 to 1 ratio required by the Township. He stated that the applicant has asked them to change the request to a resurface of the existing sign, so they would leave the old sign and just clean it up. Therefore, they will reface the sign and replace the lighting, but leave the same structure.

Mr. Saelens asked if he was correct in his assumption in that sign does not meet the 8 to 1 ratio?

Mr. LaBelle stated that the sign has been there for some time and does not meet the 8 to 1 ratio. Therefore, they are just asking to leave the old sign and just clean it up.

Mr. Meagher stated that they would be subject to removing or replacing the sign at their amortization in 2016 which would cover every non-conforming sign in the community.

Brent Forte, 6001 Nimitz Parkway, South Bend, IN addressed the board.

Applicant stated that they planned to just resurface the current sign with the understanding that the amortization is scheduled for next year and they will have to comply with it at that time. If they could at this time get the approval for this strict resurface, they would go back to Advanced Auto Parts to see if they have any alternatives for the new sign, probably a different layout, would require an additional application. However, at this time, they would still like to get an approval for the resurface of the existing sign; that way they can take it back as an option. He stated when taking in account the amortization schedule, they may just want to change the sign now, so they do not have to deal with it in 2016.

Mr. LaBelle stated that they could Table it to the next meeting to give them time to figure out what they want to do.

Applicant asked if it would be possible to be on the next meeting?

Mr. Saelens stated yes as long as the information is submitted by next Thursday at noon. He stated that they could also Table it and leave it open ended and when the new sign information is submitted the request will be put on the agenda for a meeting.

Mr. Alexie stated that if the applicants come back with a sign that meets the 8 to 1 ratio, they could take care of it all at one time. That way they will not have to resurface and then come back next year to take it down and put up a new sign.

Motion by Mr. Stabile to Table Sign # 2015-57 for up to six meetings

Supported by Mr. Alexie

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion Carried

Mr. Saelens asked Mr. Meagher when do they take that ordinance into account. He stated would all signs be in compliance until August 2016?

Mr. Meagher stated that at this point if the sign meets the ordinance or if it is a resurface, they are obligated to approve it. However, Code Enforcement is obligated to force the removal of all non-conforming signs as of August 2016.

Mr. Saelens stated therefore, if someone asks for a resurface the day before the amortization schedule, they would still be obligated to approve it.

Mr. Meagher replied yes.

- G. SIGN REVIEW #2015-58: Jordan Friesen, 6001 Nimitz Parkway, South Bend, IN 46628. Proposed new tenant panel insert located at 47187 Gratiot for “Advanced Auto Parts”.**

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

Motion by Mr. LaBelle to approve Sign # 2015-58

Supported by Mr. Saelens

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion Carried

- H. SIGN REVIEW #2015-59: DisplayMix, 18450 Pratt, Armada, MI 48005. Proposed new wall sign submittal for Bayview Medical Center located at 32743 23 Mile Road.**

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

Motion by Mr. LaBelle to approve Sign # 2015-59

Supported by Mr. Saelens

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion Carried

- I. SIGN REVIEW #2015-60: Phillips Sign & Lighting, Inc. 40920 Executive Drive, Harrison Township, MI 48045. Proposed new wall sign for Creative Keepsakes located at 50710 Gratiot.**

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

Motion by Mr. LaBelle to approve Sign # 2015-60

Supported by Mr. Miller

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion Carried

7. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM PRIOR MEETINGS:

Motion by Mr. Miller to approve the meeting minutes from June 23, 2015

Supported by Mr. Moran

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 #142: CMA Design Services, 8183 Rhode, Suite B, Shelby Township, MI 48317. Requesting administrative approval to repair and parapet the front elevation of the Terra Shopping Center located on the northwest corner at 47665 Gratiot.

Mr. Meagher stated that this appears to be a nice refreshment and is something this building needs right now. He mentioned that the amount of brick and stone for the building matches what is out there. He stated that the parapet before is some type of wood and at this time they are proposing to replace it with an efface material which he knows all of the Commissioners have some apprehension about, but with the design of the building it seems to be an opportunity for improvement.

Tony Capusi, CMA Design Services, 8183 Rhode, Suite B, Shelby Township, MI 48317 addressed the board.

Mr. LaBelle stated that the Township does require 90% brick or better for the front of the building, which they will not have in this instance.

Mr. Miller commented that the changes would be a vast improvement to what is currently there and it would improve that block of Gratiot Avenue.

Mr. Stabile commented that the no efface came about when people put up and removed signs that made a mess on the surface. So the efface will improve the looks of the building, but does the owner realize that special care has to be made when signs are changed on that surface.

Applicant stated that they made the recommendations to the owner to use the efface because there is not any way to support any brick above that area. He thinks that would be the most applicable material for that building and it would improve the look of it. He claimed that they have had good success with efface on some of the buildings they have done.

Mr. Saelens asked what the applicant meant about not being able to put brick up? He mentioned that they could use ½ “ brick or ½ “ stone without a structure beneath that.

Applicant replied correct.

Mr. Saelens remarked so it is not correct that the brick cannot be done.

Applicant stated that was correct and that it was more of a structural issue.

Mr. Saelens replied that it is not a structural issue, they would just need lime wall or something to put that on to; it's not like they would need a foundation to put up the bricks.

Applicant agreed with Mr. Saelens.

Mr. Saelens explained that using ½ “ brick or ½ “ stone would accomplish the same as efface. He mentioned that even if they carried the piers up with brick it would still look a lot better in his eyes than just doing the panels in efface. He mentioned that still does not address Joe's issue about the signs. He agreed with Mr. Stabile and stated that when the next tenant comes in and there are holes in the efface from the sign before, too many times it does not get cleaned up and it looks bad.

Applicant stated that this building has always been a five unit building, was built in the 80's, it is 5600 square feet and if a tenant is remove the sign would still be placed in the same area.

Mr. LaBelle asked if they planned on requesting new signage?

Applicant stated that they intend to remove the signs and put those same signs on the new surface.

Mr. Stabile stated that as much as he is against effacing, he is for the changes in this situation.

Mr. Alexie stated that the changes look very nice on the plans.

Motion by Mr. Saelens to approve Administrative Request #142 if they took the piers and ran them up with ½” brick or stone and he would support the rest of it being efface in the center panels.

Mr. LaBelle asked how many piers are there on the structure?

Mr. Saelens replied there are six.

Applicant stated that they did introduce some cultured stone at the base of it to decorate. He explained that brick veneer is fine on the building; they just wanted to give the building a more modern look. He mentioned that he thought the owner is content with what she is proposing and the building itself does not really have any columns.

Mr. Saelens stated that he understood that. He is looking for a better look.

Applicant stated that there are two structural columns at either side at the ends of the building and there is an archway there. They did look at possibly doing a masonry archway, but there is an existing brick veneer on there and at this point all they can really do is wrap it with efface around it.

Mr. Saelens stated that they could wrap that with ½” brick or stone there.

Mr. Eckenrode stated that if they put in some brick columns that would make the structure closer to the requirements of the ordinance.

There was a discussion among the board members about the possible changes to the building.

Applicant stated that they are not touching the elevation of the structure.

Mr. LaBelle asked if the applicant was opposed to what Mr. Saelens was proposing?

Applicant stated that he could go back to the owner and ask her about it.

Mr. Meagher suggested a motion to table this to the next meeting so the applicant can discuss the matter with the owner of the building. Let her know about the 90% brick or better ordinance and about this potential compromise.

Applicant stated that the owner was in the audience and he would go over and ask her.

Mr. Meagher told him to go and confer with her.

Applicant returned to the podium and stated that he discussed the matter with the owner and she is willing to bring the brick up to the archway.

Mr. Leonard stated that does that really address the piers that were suggested by Mr. Saelens because he thought what the applicant agreed to was different from what Mr. Saelens mentioned.

Mr. Saelens stated that he would rather table it so they can submit a revised drawing so he can see they are on the same page.

Motion by Mr. Saelens to Table Administrative Request #142 up to two meetings until they get a revised drawing reflecting the requested changes.

Supported by Mr. Stabile

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion Carried

B. ADMINISTRATIVE REQUEST #143: Torch Development for Bayview Medical Center, 32743 23 Mile Road, Chesterfield, MI 48047. Requesting administrative changes to previously approved plans for Bayview Medical Center parking lot at the above address.

Mr. Meagher stated that Administrative Request #143 is for Torch Development. He explained that there is some confusion as to what they are requesting and they have asked the applicants to clarify the plans and resubmit them so at this time they are asking them to Table it or take no action until the next meeting.

Motion by Mr. Miller to Table Administrative Request #143 to the next meeting.

Supported by Mr. LaBelle

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion Carried

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

Mr. LaBelle asked for volunteers for the next preplanning meeting on July 28th.

Mr. Saelens stated that he would attend the preplanning meeting.

Mr. Alexie also agreed to attend the meeting.

Mr. Leonard stated that on the Terra Shopping Center he was not even sure the owner of the property understood what they were requesting. He suggested that Mr. Meagher give her or the applicant a call and let them know that the Commission really wants to compromise and work with them.

Mr. Meagher stated that he knows the architect very well and if they have any questions, he will contact me.

13. PROPOSALS FOR NEXT AGENDA.

There were no proposals for the next agenda.

14. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Mr. Miller to adjourn at 8:10 PM

Supported by Mr. Saelens

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion Carried

Rick LaBelle, Secretary

Grace Mastronardi, Recording Secretary